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I.

THE RELATION OF GOD TO THE WORLD.

All theology, and for that matter all philosophy and all science as well, must be Theo-centric; must have God for its beginning and end. There is a great deal of confusion of thought arising from substituting words for thoughts, in the pious claim in vogue nowadays that all Theology must be grouped Christo-centrically. There is an immense sense in which every loyal Christian will recognize this as true. In the first place, the revelation of God in Christ is so infinitely more clear and full than in all the universe beside, that we may well say not only that Christ is God, but also that there is no God other than the one whose consummate self-revelation is in Christ. In the second place, Christ is undoubtedly the Author and Finisher of our faith, and the beginning and ending of human salvation. The entire scheme of salvation begins and ends in his person and work. And in the third place, all power in all worlds is put into Christ's hands, so that all events are controlled by his will, all history revolves around his person, and all science finds its key in his doctrine. Notwithstanding all this, however, Christ is central because Christ is God. The unincarnate God and his natural relations to the universe must be logically prior to and more fundamental than the incarnate God and his gracious relations to his creatures. The Apostle Paul has a deep meaning when he says, 1 Cor. xi. 3: "The head of every man is Christ, . . . and the head of Christ is God," which is equivalent to saying: "The centre of every man is Christ, and the centre of Christ is God."

Three questions, therefore, obviously lie at the foundation not only of all man's religious knowledge, but equally at the foundation.
of every possible form of knowledge. (1) Is there a God? (2) What is God? (3) What is God's relation to the universe? And if he does sustain a relation to the universe which is in any degree intelligible to us, a fourth question emerges, (4) What is the sphere, nature, and extent of his providential action upon or in reference to his creatures?

The answer to the first question, as to the fact of God's existence, we propose in this article to assume as granted. The most certain of all truths is the existence of God.

I. The second question, therefore, presents itself: What do we know as to the essential nature of God? God reveals himself to us through the simultaneously concurrent action of two sources of knowledge, neither of which could give us the information separately. We are each one immediately conscious that we are intelligent, moral, voluntary agents and true causes. This, and all that this involves, comes to us by consciousness. It is the most immediate and certain of all knowledge, and that upon which all other knowledge rests, and we give definite expression to this self-knowledge when we call ourselves spirits and persons. It is precisely this and nothing else that we mean by the words "spirit" and "person." When we come to look upon the course of external nature, to reflect upon our own origin and history, internal and external, and upon the history of the human race and the life of the general community of which we form a part, we immediately and indubitably discern everywhere the presence and control of a being like ourselves in kind. In that intelligible order which pervades the infinite multiplicity and heterogeneity of events which makes science possible, we see and certainly know the presence of intelligence, of personal will, of moral character—i.e., of all that is connoted by our common term "personal spirit." God is seen to be of common generic character with ourselves. The great difference we see is that while we are essentially limited in respect to time, or space, or knowledge, or power, God, the personal agent we see at work in nature and history, is essentially unlimited in all these respects. The only reason that so many students of natural science have found themselves unable to see God in nature is that their absorption in nature has made them lose sight of their own essential personality. Hence they have attempted to interpret the phenomena of consciousness in the terms of mechanical nature, instead of interpreting nature under the light of self-conscious spirit. But the scientist, after all, comes before his science, the reader before the book he deciphers; and the intelligibility of nature proves its intelligent source, and the essential likeness of the author of nature who reveals himself in his work, and
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the interpreter of nature who retraces his processes and appreciates alike the intellectual and the artistic character of the design.

Since God is infinite, of course a definition of him is impossible. Obviously no bounds can be drawn around the boundless. God can be known only so far forth as he has chosen to reveal himself; and being essentially infinite, every side and element of his nature is infinite, and every glimpse we have of his being involves the outlying immensity or transcendent perfection which cannot be known. But since we have been created in his likeness, and since we discern him in all his works as like ourselves, an intelligent and moral personal spirit, we can define our idea of him by stating (1) the genus or kind to which he is known to belong, and (2) the differentia or differences which distinguish him from all other beings of that kind. The best definition of the idea of God ever given is constructed on this principle: First, as to his kind; God is a Personal Spirit. Second, as to his difference from all other spirits; God is infinite, eternal, unchangeable, and in all his moral attributes absolutely perfect; and he is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable alike in his being, in his wisdom, in his power, etc.

First, as to his kind; God is a personal spirit. We mean by this precisely what we mean when we affirm that we ourselves are personal spirits. This conception comes wholly from consciousness, and it is absolutely certain. We see and know God as manifested in his activities alike in the whole world within us and around us as far as the remotest star, to be another of the same kind with ourselves. We know ourselves to be intelligent causes. We see him likewise to be an intelligent cause and the original, the absolute, and the perfect one.

In applying this law in constructing our idea of God, we proceed according to three principles of judgment: (1) That of causality. We judge the nature of every cause from what we see of its effects. We judge the character of every author from what we read of his works. So the manifold works of God, past and present, physical and spiritual, reveal his nature as first cause. (2) That of negation. We deny of him all those attributes and conditions the possession of which involves imperfection—e.g., materiality, bodily parts or passions, the limitations of time or space. (3) That of eminence. We attribute to him all that is found to be excellent in ourselves in absolute perfection and in unlimited degree.

This leads necessarily to the discrimination, in the second place, of those properties which distinguish God from all other personal spirits.

1. We know ourselves as causes. We can really originate new
things. But we are dependent and limited causes. We did not originate, and we cannot sustain ourselves. We can put forth our causal energy only under certain conditions, and we can bring to pass only a limited class of effects; but God as a cause is absolutely independent and unlimited. He is the uncaused first cause of all things. He is an eternal and necessary being, who has his own cause in himself. He is not only the first link in the chain of causation, but he is the everywhere present, sustaining, and actuating basis of all dependent existence and the originating concause of all causation, because we and all other dependent causes act only as we live and move and have all our being in him.

2. We know ourselves always and necessarily as existing, thinking, and acting under the limitations of time and space. We can think or act only under these limitations. But God necessarily transcends them all and condescends to them only on occasion, at his own pleasure, in the way of self-limitation.

We began to be at a definite period in the past. We continue to exist and to think and to act through a ceaseless succession of moments, the present moment ever emerging out of the future, and immersing into the past. But God is without beginning, or succession, or end. All duration, past, present, and future, is always equally comprehended in his infinite consciousness as the ETERNAL NOW.

We are in space definitely, and are surrounded by it, and pass from one position to another through all the intermediate portions of space in succession. But God fills all space; not by extension, like the water of the sea, or as the atmosphere; not by multiplication nor by a rapid movement, like a ubiquitous general along the line of his army; not as represented by his agents, as the head of an army or state may be said to be, and to act wherever his agents carry out his orders; not by his knowledge or his power merely, as when an astronomer may be said to be in thought wherever his telescope points, or as when a great statesman may be said to reign wherever his laws are obeyed, but by reason of his own infinite perfection, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are in their whole undivided being present at every point of space at every moment of time. The whole God is always everywhere; within all things, acting from within outward from the centre of every atom, and from the innermost springs of the life, and thought, and feeling, and will of every spirit; without all things, embracing them as an infinite abyss, and acting upon them in a thousand ways from without.

3. We know ourselves as possessing the spoiled and defaced lineaments of a moral character, the main elements of which are truth,
purity, justice, and benevolence. We know that God, who has revealed his character in the external physical world, in human history, and in the Person of his Son, Jesus Christ, is the absolute norm of our moral ideal. Our morality is reflected; his is the original and radiant. Ours is defective; his is absolute. It has become the weak and conceited mode of those who pose as the advanced thinkers of this luxurious age to emphasize the benevolence of God at the expense of his immaculate holiness and justice. They teach us that the cultured mind finds the old doctrines of blood expiation and of eternal perdition utterly inconsistent with its better idea of God. They think the great God is altogether such a one as themselves, and therefore better represented in their "Christian Consciousness" than in his inspired Word. The ground of this widely advertised opinion is purely subjective—the "Christian Consciousness" of the cultured elite in contradistinction to the historic Christian Consciousness of the ages. The facts are all on the other side. The terrible record of human history blazed all along its line with the fires of judgment kindled by a sin-hating God, the death-throes of individuals and of nations; the answering cry of the human conscience in ceaseless rites of blood on altars and penitential stools; the entire voice of revelation, from the cherubim with the fiery sword driving out the homeless, helpless first pair from Eden; the appalling thunders and lightnings of Sinai; the history of Canaan exterminated and of Israel chastened; the awful horrors of Gethsemane and Calvary; the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion and bondage of the Jews; on through all history to the final issue of the Lake of Fire, set as the background to the picture of the Paradise Regained; the eternal wailing and the smoke of torment ascending forever and ever—these facts all stand as the unquestionable evidence of the existence of other moral perfections in God besides Benevolence.

II. The third question remains, What relation does God sustain to the universe he has called into being?

It is very evident that since we are able to comprehend neither God's essential being nor his mode of existence superior to the limits of either time or space, nor the nature of his agency in creating, upholding in being, or in governing his creatures, we cannot by any central principle or a priori mode of reasoning think out a perfect theory of his relation to the universe. We can only state severally the separate facts as we know them, leaving their complete elucidation and reconciliation to the future; and we are both assisted and confirmed in our effort to present all the facts comprehended by the circumstance that different heretical schools of
thought emphasize one or another of these facts, while they deny or suppress the rest. Here we have a new and striking illustration of the universal principle that all heretical dogmas are partial truths—true in what they assert, false in what they deny or ignore. Orthodoxy is always catholic truth, embracing and integrating all the possibly separate and apparently incongruous parts and aspects of the truth. Thus in the present instance we have the Agnostics, who maintain that the Infinite is the Unknowable; the Deists, who set God apart from the world, separate upon his throne in heaven, and those who maintain exclusively the fact that God is immanent or uniformly and universally present in all things, while they deny or ignore his equal transcendence above and over all things. True Christian Theism maintains all these partial truths as equal parts of the one truth. God is at once the unfathomable Abyss, the transcendent Father, King, and Judge, the immanent and vital Spirit.

First, God is unknowable, the infinite Abyss of darkness in which the universe floats as an atom. Herbert Spencer's philosophy emphasizes the truth that the more science advances the more must the questions as to origin, first cause, ultimate force and end be pushed back into darkness. If you light a spark in a starless night it will fill a small sphere of illuminated space extending equidistant in all directions. If the spark becomes a candle, if the candle becomes a flame of gas, if the gas flame becomes an electric arc, if the electric arc becomes a sun, in every case the sphere of light will grow as the cube of its radius, and as the sphere of light becomes larger and larger, in exact proportion will it be enfolded within an ever-growing sphere of darkness. In this sense the more we meditate upon him, God is ever beyond. In this sense while the sphere of human knowledge is ever increasing, and will through eternity never cease to increase, God is always unknowable; and the sphere of a creature's knowledge, be it that of an infant, or of a man, or of a philosopher, or of a prophet, or of a saint, or of an Archangel in heaven, will float as a point of light athwart the bosom of that God who is the infinite Abyss forever. This tremendous fact conditions all human knowledge in every stage of it. We can know anything only imperfectly, whether in Science or Theology, because we only know things in parts, and can never comprehend the absolute whole. The botanist cannot comprehend a single flower, except as he takes in the whole plant, nor the whole plant except as he takes in the whole species, nor the whole species except as he takes in the whole genus, nor the whole genus except as he takes in the whole system of organized life, the entire fauna and flora and all their history on the earth. The teacher may easily explain the laws and movements
THE RELATION OF GOD TO THE WORLD.

of the solar system to his class, but knows them himself very partially, since he knows so little of the realities or of the history of the stellar universe of which the solar system is so small a dependency. All things go out into mystery. All our knowledge is conditioned upon the essential unknowableness of God. In all our knowing and in all our worship the infinite God is always beyond.

This side of the truth is taught as clearly in the oldest word of revelation as it is in the latest word of science. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea." (Job xi.7-9.)

Second, God is transcendent—that is, he is a distinct person separate from the world and from all other persons, who speaks to us face to face, who commands our wills and regulates our lives from on high, who upon occasion when he wills acts upon the universe or any part of it from without. He is objective to each one of us as a distinct person, alike when he speaks to us and when we speak to him. He created all things out of nothing. The universe is not a modification of his essence, nor is it confused with his substance; he is essentially something other than any one, or than all of his creatures, the extra-mundane God. The relation he sustains to the universe, therefore, is analogous to that of a Maker to his work, of a preserver and governor of a mechanism, of a Father to his children, of a Moral Ruler to his intelligent and responsible subjects.

This view of the nature of God and of his relation to the world, and especially his relation to created spirits, is common to Deists and Christian Theists. It is denied utterly by Pantheists, and it is ignored in whole or in part by the modern special advocates of the immanence of God, as containing all the essential truth related to our interests in the matter. Yet this view just presented of God's separate personality and agency and objectivity to man, and transcendence above the world, is true and infinitely important, although we concede it is not the whole truth known to us on the subject. The view of God as extra-mundane is essentially the moral view of his relation to the world; that which recognizes his immanence is pre-eminently the religious view. If he be not extra-mundane, if he be not a separate transcendent person revealing himself objectively, commanding from above, and working upon his creatures from without, it follows that he cannot sustain either social or governmental relations to us; he cannot be truly our Father, or our Lawgiver, or our moral Governor, or our Judge, distributing rewards and punishments; he cannot come down at his will from
without and work miracles of grace or power as signs and seals to his intelligent creatures.

This is the prominent view embraced by the mass of the worshippers in all theistic religions, Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans alike, and among all historic bodies of Christians, Greeks, Romanists, and all classes of Protestants. It is realized in the consciousness of every repentant sinner and of every believing Christian. It is implied in all faith and obedience, in all prayer and praise, and hence in all the psalms, hymns, and prayers of the Church. It is taught equally in all Scripture, the New Testament as well as the Old, which shows forth Jehovah as sitting upon his throne in heaven, and as sending his messengers, and of transmitting his energies and his judgments from heaven to earth, as marshalling the hosts of heaven and the nations of the earth from afar. Above all is this truth made patent as the sky, a matter of daily experience in the personal incarnation of God in Christ. Christ is God. Christ is the same to-day and forever as he was when he lived on earth. God is therefore a Person who is outside of and distinct from the world and all other persons; who speaks to us and we speak to him; who hears us and we hear him; who commands, leads, and guides us from without as another, and in whose personal society and under whose blessed reign we shall be transcendentally happy forever.

In the third place, God is Immanent. He is everywhere present in every point of space and within the inmost constitution of all created things at the same time. God's activity springs up from the central seat of energy in all second causes, and acts from within through them, as well as from without upon them. He reveals himself in us and to us through our own subjectivity, as well as objectively through the things presented to our senses. He is the universal, present, and active basis of all being and action, the first cause, ever living and acting in all second causes.

This is evident (1) from the essential nature of God as omnipresent and as first cause, the foundation of all dependent existence, and the ultimate source of all energy. (2) This is evident from what we see very plainly in the entire sphere and history of the physical universe. The impression made by the most transient observation is abundantly confirmed by science, that the continuity of physical causation through all worlds, through every sphere of mechanical, chemical, and vital action, and through all succeeding ages is absolutely unbroken. There are no broken links, no sudden emergencies of disconnected events, but a continuous sequence of cause and effect everywhere.

The deistical conception of God's relation to the universe is anal-
ogous to that of a human mechanist to the machinery he has made and operates. He sits outside his engine, feeds its forces, adjusts its parts, controls its action, and thus directs its energies upon the accomplishment of its appointed ends.

The conception of God and of his action as immanent in the universe—as acting from within through the spontaneities of the things which he has made rather than upon them from without—is analogous rather to the action of the vital principle of a plant, which as a plastic architectonic energy is ever present within the germ from its first formation, and continues to control all the natural physical forces engaged in the upbuilding of the organism through all its organs during its entire life. The works of man are built up by the adding part to part, by external forces. The works of God grow continuously, through the evolution of germs from within, by internal forces. Thus in spite of the infinite number and diversity of the forces interacting in all the physical universe, and of all the wills interacting in human society, the history alike of the physical universe and of human society presents the absolutely continuous unfolding of a single plan.

The same great truth is illustrated in our religious experience. A divine power not ourselves working for righteousness enters us on the side of our own subjectivity, and is confluent always with our most spontaneous and least deliberative exercises. Thus regeneration is an effect of God's immediate working within the soul below our consciousness, giving a new character to all our conscious states and acts. God acts in us constantly to will, and by willing to do, of his good pleasure; and thus also while each book of Holy Scripture was written by a human author in the language and style peculiar to his age, his nation, and to his personal character and in the perfectly free exercise of all his faculties, yet all are the WORD OF GOD. His suggestive, elevative, and directive influence has so worked in the writers from within, mingling freely with their own spontaneities, that the writing is at once both God's and theirs, both supernatural and natural, because they, being men, wrote as they were moved by the immanent Spirit of God. Angels and men influence each other from without by objective presentations; God influences all from within by subjective inspirations and impulses. Hence all realize the truth complementary to that of his extra-mundane existence, that we live and move in him, and have all our being in him. In some distant sense, as the birds draw their life from and have their being in the air, God is the one essential fundamental environment and life-condition of all creatures.

The consequences of this great fact of the divine immanence are:
1. The whole universe exists in God. As the stars in the ether, as the clouds in the air, the whole universe floats on the pulsing bosom of God.

2. All the intelligence manifested in the physical universe, all the larger and timeless intelligence which embraces and directs the limited and transient intelligence of the human actors in the drama of history, is of God. In the physical world we see an infinitude of blind, unconscious forces, apparently independent in their nature and source, working together harmoniously to build, upon a continuous and universal plan, the most intricate and harmonious results, as the great cathedral dedicated to St. Peter in Rome rose out of the marble quarries of Italy through the agency of multitudes of thoughtless men and beasts of labor working without concert for many years, yet conspiring to balance harmoniously in the air a miracle of mechanical construction and of artistic beauty. It was because all the agents in that work of all kinds and during the entire period of its development were subject to the suggestive, elevative, and directive inspiration of the great Michael Angelo.

3. Hence also, in the third place, it follows that all the effect-producing energy seen in the universe is ultimately the efficiency of God. The first cause must be the efficient cause of all second causes, and the ultimate source of all the dependent energy they ever exercise. As the sun's rays shining on the tropic seas raises by evaporation the vast oceans of aerial vapors, which, condensed by our northern cold, precipitate in rain and generate the immense forces of our rivers and waterfalls; as ultimately all the energies of nature distributed from our central suns, holding the worlds together in the form of gravity, and differentiated into the thousand forms of vegetable and animal life, and into the mechanical movements of the currents of wind and of tides, and of electric currents, and of radiant light—so all these issue ceaselessly from their ultimate source in God. What the sun is to our solar system, what the furnace is to the steamship, what the great centre of nerve force is to our bodies, that is God to the universe, and infinitely more.

4. Hence, lastly, it follows that everywhere the universe reveals God. The power of the indwelling spirit to express its changing modes through the changes of the body is a great mystery, and nevertheless it is one of the most obvious and constant of facts. Pallid fear, raging passion, calm contemplation, assumed confidence, radiant joy, determined purpose, have each their universally recognized signs of expression current among all races of men and animal tribes. So the constructive dream of the architect, the ideal of the sculptor and painter, the high theme of the musician, are all ex-
pressed in the several forms of their respective arts. The great artists are immortal, since they ever live speaking and singing in their works.

As our souls animate and manifest their presence and their changing modes in every part of our bodies, since God is ever immanent and active in all his works, so all nature and the course of universal history ever manifest the presence and reflect the thoughts of God. All men always recognize events of an extraordinary character as expressions of the will of God. Whatever is recognized by us as providential expresses to us the divine thought. Even Shakespeare says that "there's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may." The Christian recognizes every event as providential. Every hair of our head is numbered, and not a sparrow falls to the ground except our Father wills it. He works in us all to will and to do his good pleasure in all things. Hence every flower is a thought of God. The firmament reflects his immensity, and the order of the stars his limitless intelligence, and the myriad-fold beauty of the world unveils the secret chambers of his imagery. The tempest is the letting loose of his strength, and the thunder utters his voice. To the Christian the universe is not merely a temple in which God is worshipped, but it is also the ever-venerated countenance on which the affections of our Lord toward his children are visibly expressed. Everywhere we see God; everywhere his ever-active and fecund benevolence toward us is articulated in smile, and word, and deed.

This view of God, which we signalize by the word "immanence," is not a new one; nor is it confined to philosophers or to theologians. The plainest and most practical Christians of all our churches live in the habitual exercise of this faith from day to day. To the babes in Christ every event is providential, and marks the constant thought and care of God. Especially have evangelical Christians of the school of Augustine and Calvin always recognized this divine immanence, the constant dependence of the creature, and the constant inworking of the divine energy as the controlling source of all our spontaneous affections and actions. It is a first principle in their theology that a creature can act only as it is first acted upon by the First-cause. The doctrine of prevenient grace, which is the grand evangelical distinction, implies this. God must first move the sinner to good before the sinner can begin to co-operate with that grace which ever continues to prompt and assist him. Thus they argue for a previous, simultaneous, and determining concursus—i.e., continuous co-working of the ceaseless activities of God with the activities of his creatures. They held that even the sinful actions of men originated in God as to their matter, while as to their form or
moral quality they originated in the creature alone, as when a great artist handles an instrument out of tune the sound that issues is due to the artist, but the discord which deforms it issues only from the unbalanced organism of the instrument, the unstrung cords, or the unadjusted pipes. The claim made by the advocates of the "New Departure" in Theology, that this view of God as immanent and constantly active in all his works is new in the thoughts of Christians, that it has ever been denied or seriously ignored, or that it is in the least inconsistent with the complementary view of his personal transcendence and objective presentation and working from without, is absolutely without shadow of evidence. The Church has always held together both sides of this double truth, as both equally essential and precious. Neither is this view of the divine immanence to be confounded with Pantheism. They both alike emphasize the common truth that God is within us; that he is to be sought in the sphere of the subjective as well as of the objective; that he is the immediate basis of all created existence, and ultimate source of all the intelligence and energy manifested in the external world.

But Pantheism holds that the whole universe of extension and thought is one substance, and that substance God; that God exists only in the successive forms or events which constitute the universe. These forms are various, but God is one. They are successive, but God endures the same. He is not a person, but all persons are transient forms of his being. He has no existence other than that of the sum of all finite existences and no consciousness nor intelligence other than the aggregate of the consciousness and intelligence of transient creatures.

Hence Pantheism denies the freedom of man and the personality of God. It makes all events proceed by a law of absolute necessity. All evil precisely as all good comes immediately from God, and evil men are related to him precisely as are saints and angels. It confounds the doctrine of immanence with ontological identity, and it turns it into a heresy by denying the complementary truth of the divine transcendence. It allows no place for a Heavenly Father behold ing us complacently and providing for us benevolently. It makes no place for a Moral Governor and Judge ruling over us, distributing rewards and punishments, teaching, disciplining, and acting upon us from without. It makes no place for a supernatural world, for revelations or supernatural truths, for miracles or supernatural works, for a "kingdom of God," a supernatural state, or for a future or supernatural life.

Therefore Pantheism in its very essence renders all morality and religion alike impossible. The Christian doctrine of the divine
Immanence, on the contrary, is the very essence of all religion. It admits and adjusts itself to the complementary doctrine of the divine transcendence. We begin, as we have shown above, with the conception of God as a distinct person of absolute intellectual and moral perfection, self-conscious, self-determinate, absolutely free and sovereign, righteous and loving. This is our Heavenly Father, the Lord and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. He created us in his likeness, rules us as our righteous Moral Governor and Judge, and executes through all the universe and through all ages his all-perfect and immutable plan conceived in the infinitely wise and righteous counsel of his sovereign will.

This being, moreover, transcends all the limitations of space and time. He is everywhere present in his eternal essence. His whole essence, with all its inherent properties, is present every moment of time to every point of space. As first cause he is the constant, abiding, supporting, and actuating basis of every second cause. All creatures exist and act only as they exist in him. At the same time he acts through every atom from within and upon every atom from without. "In him all things live and move and have their being." "He turneth the hearts of men even as rivers of water are turned." "He worketh in us to will and to do of his own good pleasure."

This is a function of the divine personality. The fact that the whole indivisible God is eternally in each point of space transcends our understanding, but it does not rationally necessitate the belief in many Gods, nor in a divided God, nor does it in any way invalidate the proofs we possess establishing his personality. The Scriptures clearly teach both truths together. The practical faith and experience of all Christians embrace both of these truths together, in the same acts of trust and love. Both truths are together implied in all religious experience recognizing God as our Father, speaking to him and listening to his voice, obeying his word, trusting his love, and at the same time recognizing him as present everywhere, and in all things and events; recognizing his hand in every object and occurrence, trusting him in everything, because all nature executes his will, and hence reveals his presence and his thought.

The extension of our knowledge of the physical universe effected by modern science, rendering visible to us the absolute unity of the cosmos, the uninterrupted continuity of the chain of cause and effect, as well as of design through all space and time, has not altered, but it has greatly emphasized this religious conception of the "divine immanence." An eminent Christian scientist said to me recently: "God is either in all things or in none." It is not possible, when looking along the lines of natural creation and provi-
dence, to believe that God comes down upon them at disconnected intervals from without. In the miracle he does precisely that—i.e., come down upon the course of nature, at an interval and from without, because a "miracle" is a "sign," the essence of which is its articulate significance to the answering intelligence of man. But in the natural course of providence the immanent God works continually without interval from within through the spontaneities of the things themselves in which he dwells. He is not in any object or event more than he is in all others. The whole course of the universe is divine in every part, except as far as sin has marred it, and all the normal activities of men and angels are religious—i.e., have their source and their end in God.

This view, therefore, evidently differs from Pantheism in that (1) it asserts the distinct personality of God as the head of a moral government administered over free and responsible agents by a system of ideas and motives. (2) It asserts the distinct personality and moral freedom and responsibility of men. (3) It maintains the distinction of the human and the divine agency, although making the former depend upon the latter. (4) It embraces and adjusts itself to the complementary doctrine of the divine Transcendence which Pantheism renders impossible. (5) While Pantheism makes freedom, morality, and religion impossible, this view of the divine Immanence in all things is the necessary basis of the most perfect freedom, and of the most exalted morality, and of the most vivid religion conceivable. (6) This view as held by Christians not only admits but affords the most rational basis attainable for the supernatural—that is, for the activity in the sphere of nature of that God who in himself infinitely transcends all nature.

III. In this catholic, Christian doctrine of the relation of God to the universe we comprehend all the half truths or heresies which have divided the schools. We recognize all the facts, and we reconcile the practical faith of Christians with the highest science, and we provide a rational basis alike for the natural and the supernatural; for the reign of law and for special miracle; for science and for practical religion. Here we stand under the blended light of nature and of grace, of science and of revelation. God the infinite, and therefore the timeless and the spaceless, the absolutely unknowable, remains ever the unfathomable Abyss. In all our knowing God is always BEYOND, hid in the light which is impenetrable.

At the same time he is always ABOVE us, enthroned in heaven, commanding, revealing, ruling, showering myriad blessings from above.

At the same time the same infinite God is BEFORE us, looking
upon us and speaking with us face to face. He is our Heavenly Father. He has formed us in his own image. Our highest life and blessedness is found in his personal communion—that is, personal interchange of ideas and of affections—for our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ.

At the same time God is ever within us, the ultimate ground of our being and the unfailing source of our life, the well spring of eternal life, the inspiration of all spiritual knowledge and beatitudes, springing up within us to the ages of the ages.

All these glimpses of this immeasurable mystery of God's nature and his relation to the universe afforded by the light of nature are re-enforced and gloriously supplemented and illumined by the revealed truths of the Trinity of Persons, and of the Incarnation of the Eternal Word.

A. A. HODGE.
II.

THE CHURCH OF ETHIOPIA.

The name of Ethiopia is found already in the earliest Græco-Roman literature. From the time on when Jupiter and the other Olympian gods went on their twelve days' banquet tour to the Ἀισίων (Horn. II., 1, 423), the name and the people are mentioned again and again in the records of fact and fiction handed down by the classical nations. But the same atmosphere of vagueness, or, rather, mystery, which surrounds the Homeric account, surrounds these people ethnographically, geographically, and otherwise throughout the whole classical period.* In this regard the term and conception of Ethiopia corresponds remarkably to the Biblical Cush, a word which has received additional importance through recent Assyriological discoveries.† Both the Greek and the Hebrew terms were used in a wider and more general sense than the word Ethiopia has in later centuries assumed, both in a geographical and in a political sense. Another and more recent name by which the country, people, and language is known is that of Abyssinian, a late Arabic term from Ġeže, signifying a mixed people, probably given them by their enemies, but emphatically rejected by the Ethiopic people themselves, and is not found in their language or literature.‡ The people of Ethiopia call themselves either by the name of Ethiopians, derived from the Greek, or by the name of Geez, which can be called the native and national name, preferred by these people themselves. The fundamental meaning of the stem geeza is the same as that of גזע, and probably refers to the fact that at one time the people now inhabiting the highlands of Abyssinia came across the Red Sea or immigrated from Arabia Felix, for which change of habitations we have excellent historical

* Cf. Encyl. Brit., ed. 9, vol. 8, p. 611 sqq., and especially the collection of passages and the discussions in Ludolf, Commentarius in Historiam Æthiopicam, 1691, Book 1, ch. 17; 2, 16; 3, 15. Ludolf's Historia Æthiopica, together with the commentary, are a monument of vast industry and learning, and to the present day yet constitute the great thesaurus for students of Æthiopica.
† Cf. Schrader, A. T. K., ed. 2, on Gen. x. 6.
‡ Cf. Ludolf, Hist. 5, 1.
and linguistic proof.* The name would, in the first instance, accordingly mean "immigrants," and would then furnish a historical parallel to the name Hebrews, by which appellation the children of Israel were known to the inhabitants of Palestine, because they had come from across the Euphrates or Jordan. In the usus loquendi, however, of Ethiopic literature the word Geez is not employed in this primitive sense, but in the derived and secondary meaning of "Freedmen," so that the native appellation of the people is "the nation of freedmen," corresponding to the term "Franks," chosen by certain nations of Western Europe. Probably the only reason why the term "Ethiopia" is used by these people more than the name "Geez," is because the latter term was unknown to other nations; and the fact that the whole literature of Ethiopia, with insignificant exceptions, is a literature of translations, chiefly from the Greek, and later from the Coptic and Arabic, made the use of the Greek term Ethiopia more acceptable and more readily intelligible.

While it would be a hopeless task to undertake to extract consistent harmony and construct a rounded result from the mass of information which antiquity has handed down to us in connection with the name of Ethiopia, and to separate from the hull of fable and fiction the kernel of truth, there can be no doubt as to the general character of the people and the leading features of their history, as also of this fact, that the halo of strangeness and mystery which the records of the past have thrown around this people and their history is not without foundation in actual fact and truth. The Ethiopians are a peculiar and remarkable people in character and history. It is a favorite theory in ethnological science that the surroundings of a nation constitute a powerful formative agency in the historical development of a people and in the settling of their national and individual peculiarities, so that the geographical, climatic, and similar factors, in connection with the natural bent of their minds, will go a great way in explaining a nation's history and peculiarities. Of this theory the Ethiopians are an excellent illustration. In many respects they are a people sui generis. Their physical and mental peculiarities, chiefly their language, marks them as a purely Semitic people, the only people of that family which as a nation settled and worked out its historical mission on the dark continent. They have ever been, and are yet, both in their own consciousness and in the opinion of the nations that surround them, strangers in a strange land, in no wise akin with their duskier neighbors of Hamitic extraction. This has been the feeling

* Even in the days of Homer and Herodotus, the Ethiopians were divided into an eastern and a western branch. Cf. Her. 7. 70. Hom. Ody. 1. 23.
throughout the course of the history of this people, as far as it can be traced, and there has always existed between them and the surrounding nations either active hostility or armed peace. Notwithstanding that for centuries the Ethiopians have been the only Semitic and Christian people in Africa, the influence of the peoples around them has been but a minimum on the thought or actions of the Ethiopians. It is a mistake, repeated from one cyclopaedia to another, that the copia verborum of the Ethiopic language shows a strong influence of Hamitic or African words. Such is not at all the case, and even the mass of pluralittera found in the lexicon of this Semitic dialect can be in nearly each and every instance traced back to shorter Semitic roots, lengthened by processes found, though in a more circumscribed sphere of activity, also in the other dialects;* while the pliability of Ethiopic syntax and its ability to express complex relations of thought to an extent far beyond even the Arabic is, of course, in no wise owing to the models of the Hamitic tongues of Africa, but rather to the moulding influence of Greek, the spiritual and literary mistress of Ethiopic in its earliest literary stages. But even this powerful influence of the Greek has not succeeded in putting upon Ethiopic syntax an un-Semitic impress; we see in the syntax only the highest development of possibilities that exist only in rudiment in Hebrew and Syriac, and in a more developed stage in Arabic. To this ethnographical isolation has come also the geographical and religious. "The Switzerland of Africa," as travellers love to call the mountains and high table-lands of Abyssinia, has always been a natural bulwark against the approach of friend and the attack of foe, and thus has aided in making a people naturally inclined to repel foreign influences still more inaccessible, although this feature of the country was of the greatest blessing to the people when the Mohammedan conqueror overran Egypt and North Africa; for, according to the meagre accounts of those memorable days from Arabic, Ethiopic, and other

* Cf. Stade, Uber den Ursprung der mehrlautigen Thatwörter der Ge'ezsprache, Leipzig, 1871. The study of the Ethiopic language was almost entirely neglected since the days of Ludolf and his grammar and lexicon of the Ethiopic language, but it has in late years been revived, chiefly through the master work of Dillmann, now professor in Berlin, whose Æthiop. Grammatik (1857) and his Lexicon Lingua Æthiopica (1865) are based upon the soundest principles of comparative Semitic philology and the result of accurate and painstaking scholarship. Cf. also Schrader's De Lingua Æthiopica cum cognatis linguis comparata indoles universa, 1860. An excellent grammar, chrestomathy and glossary of the language has just been published, in German and Latin, by Professor F. Pretorius, of the University of Breslau, as the seventh and eighth in the well-known series of short Oriental grammars called "Porta Linguarum Orientalium," edited by Professor Hermann L. Strack, of Berlin, and published by H. Reuther, of Carlsruhe and Leipzig.
sources, it seems that the followers of the Prophet of Mecca never succeeded in entirely subduing the highlanders of Abyssinia, and at least did not manage to spread their religion further south. Then the religious beliefs of the people separated them from the Church general, and assigned them to a protesting but decided minority sect. Together with the Coptic Church of Egypt, the Abyssinian Church embraced monophysitic and monotheletic doctrines of the person of Christ, and ever since the Synod of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., when these views were condemned, the Coptic and Ethiopian, together with some sections of the Syriac Church, withdrew from the orthodox Greek Church, established a separate religious communion, elected their own Patriarch, who resided in Egypt, and thus withdrew from all connection with the spiritual life and theological development of the Eastern and the Western churches. To these three factors came in the seventh and eighth centuries a fourth—namely, the wars of the Mohammedan Califs and Wezirs, who by the conquest of Egypt and Northern Africa drove a wedge between the Christians of Europe and those of Abyssinia, and thus outwardly also separated what had been separated inwardly ever since the Synod of Chalcedon. These factors all conspired together to isolate this peculiar people and permit them to develop their faith and national character almost entirely unaffected by extraneous influences. It seems, then, that a providential arrangement of historical forces was effected in such a manner that the people of Ethiopia, in their national, religious, and social life, could go through a process of development entirely different from, and in but few particulars similar to, that of any other people. The powerful conservative tendency inherent in all the Semitic peoples was intensified by these historical forces, with the result that the Ethiopian Church, the only Semitic people that as a nation ever accepted the revelation and faith of the New Testament, and the only Christian nation on the African continent, was found to be, when rediscovered by Christian navigators of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, chiefly the Portuguese, in faith and form of worship exactly at the same stage of development at which it had been when it disappeared from the historical horizon and from all intercourse with other Christians in the years after the monophysitic controversies and the Mohammedan victories. And in this condition we find the Ethiopian Church at the present hour. Christian mission enterprise, commenced by Ignatius of Loyola and his Jesuitic fathers in the sixteenth century, continued chiefly in our own day by Roman Catholic and Protestant societies, the latter sending out such zealous men as Gobat, afterward Bishop of Jerusalem, Isenberg, Kraft, and others, have not been able to break
through the crust of centuries and rejuvenate or revivify the faith and Church of Ethiopia. The Ethiopic Church of to-day is, as it has been for centuries, the petrifaction of the Greek Church as it existed at the time when the two separated. The spirit and living faith may have departed, but the form of word, in dogma, in literature, in liturgy, in worship, is still preserved, and for this reason this Church has a peculiar interest not only for the specialist in Church history, but also for all intelligent readers of the growth of the Christian Church.

The Church of Ethiopia has been asleep for more than ten centuries, or, rather, it has been in a state of stupor during that time, from which the missionary zeal of the nineteenth century has not been able to arouse it. Sad as this condition of affairs in itself is, it has, in the providence of God, proved to be a great blessing to the Church in one particular at least—namely, in the preservation of valuable literary remains of Christian antiquity, which otherwise might have, either entirely or in part, been lost to Christian scholarship. As it has been the boast and the glory of the Church of Abyssinia that it has preserved intact the Christianity of the ante-Chalcedonian period, and has maintained this doctrinal status over against all the later innovations and changes of the Oriental Greek and the Roman Catholic churches, it has in its retirement and seclusion also kept as a treasury a number of old Christian books upon which that faith and that stage of doctrinal development were based. As in the wild days of the Middle Ages it was the mission of the monasteries to preserve for the scholars of a more favored day the works of early Greek and Roman civilization, as also many of early Christian literature, thus, too, the seclusion and isolation of the Ethiopic Church and people, as aiding factors to their natural conservative tendencies and their determination to adhere to the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, enabled them to preserve many a literary treasure that might otherwise have fallen a victim to the warfares of the States or the neglect of changing theological views. While not all the ancient Christian works of which we still have the titles and extracts in the early Church historians and other writers are found in the Church of Abyssinia, and while not even all that have been preserved have been published, enough has been issued, especially by the Christian scholars of the last thirty or forty years, to vindicate to the literature of the Ethiopic Church a claim of high importance and great value. We purposely here speak of the literature of Ethiopia as belonging to the Church of that country, for the literature in that language is specifically a Biblical and an ecclesiastical literature. They have no secular or profane literature, the few
workson legal and medical subjects so far known are written from a
Christian standpoint, and are generally as theological as they are
legal and medical.* Another peculiarity of this literature is that it
is κατ' ἔκδοσην, a literature of translations, and it is in this regard
almost alone that the Ethiopic people have shown their dependence
upon other nations and followed in their footsteps. While it is not
the case here, as it has been in scores of others and is yet, that
Christianity introduced letters into the country it converts, it is
nevertheless true that the Christian religion has been the first and
controlling factor in this literature, and that the Church from which
the first gospel tidings came to the Ethiopians was also the source
of the oldest and best specimens of Ethiopic literature. The
Ethiopic alphabet is not a gift either of Christianity or of the Greek
Church, for we have yet some pre-Christian inscriptions, several of
them written in βουστροφησόν style, which show that the alphabet
of the Ethiopians was probably derived from their Himjaritic
brethren across the Red Sea in Southern Arabia.† But aside of
these few remnants, some of which are even of doubtful authority,
the whole literature of Ethiopia is Christian, and fully nine tenths
are translations. These translations belong to different periods and
are made from different languages. The oldest and best books are
from the Greek; and when the connection with that Church ceased,
Coptic models were taken, especially for works referring to Church
government and Church worship, as the Egyptian was the mother
Church of the Ethiopic and the leader in the monophysitic branch;
and thirdly, the Ethiopic has preserved a number of works from the
certainly rich, but little studied, Christian Arabic literature.‡ The
native literature is confined almost entirely to chronicles, which have
historical value from about the twelfth or thirteenth century,
although they give the lives of Ethiopian kings from the days of
Menelek, the reputed son of Solomon, while many of the lives of
saints, collected in the Ethiopic Synaxarion or flos sanctorum, a kind
of an ecclesiastical and ascetic year book giving for each day a

* Cf. Dillmann's Lexicon, Prolegomena, p. 10. A portion of the Fetcha Negest, the
Corpus Juris of Ethiopic jurisprudence, was published by M. Schmidt in 1841, in
Halle.
† The two leading inscriptions are published by Rüppell, in the atlas to his Reise in
Abyssinien, 1838-40. The smaller contains thirty lines, the larger fifty-two, describing
the military achievements of the King Halan, of Axum and Himjar. The descriptions
of Abyssinia given in the travels of Bruce (1780) and Salt (1819) contain some of the
smaller inscriptions.
‡ It must not be forgotten in this connection that some of these Coptic and Arabic
models were themselves translations from the Greek; as, e.g., the Coptic Apostolic
Canons and the Arabic Sayings of the Wise Prophets, published in Ethiopic by Cornill
in 1875.
sketch of the life and doings of some great saint, are translations from the Arabic.*

In date, influence, and importance the translation of the Bible stands at the head of Ethiopic literature. It was done from the Septuagint, in all probability soon after the time when Christianity was introduced into Ethiopia—namely, in the first half of the fourth century. It is to be regretted that we have not the data on hand to fix the date and other particulars of this translation; nothing concerning it is historically certain except that it stands at the head of Ethiopic literature, and that it is made from the version of the Seventy. Its critical importance for modern Biblical scholarship consists in this, that it will necessarily have a weighty voice in deciding the condition of the Septuagint text in the early Christian centuries, as it represents an age and a condition of text about parallel with the Codex Sinaiticus.† Christian scholars are now fully convinced that, in order to secure the oldest and best controlling and corrective forces over the Massoretic text, a critical edition of the Septuagint, as also of the Peshitto, are of prime importance. When the first of these two immense tasks is to be performed the Ethiopic version of the Old Testament will render a not unimportant service; for the version is really an excellent one, but is based in many respects on readings different from the common Septuagint text. Professor Dillmann, the leading Ethiopian scholar of the century and the editor of the Octateuchus Æthiopicus and its Apparatus Criticus (1853), speaks of this version as late as 1877 as follows: ‡

"With regard to the translation, it must be said that it is a very faithful one, generally giving the Greek text verbatim, often even the relative position of the words; it abbreviates only now and then whatever seemed superfluous, and must, on the whole, be called a successful and fortunate version. Notwithstanding its entire fidelity to the Greek text, it is very readable, and, especially in the historical books, smooth, and frequently coincides with the meaning and words of the Old Testament in a surprising manner. Of course there is a difference in this respect between the different books. The Ethiopian translators were by no means very learned men, and had not an absolute command of the Greek language; especially when they were compelled to translate rare words and technical terms this clearly appears, and consequently some misunderstandings and mistakes have crept into the text through the fault of the translators."

This work of comparing the Septuagint and the Ethiopic texts has been done by Dillmann for that portion of the Old Testament which he has edited—namely, the Octateuch, i.e., the Pentateuch,

---

* The Coptic (or Ethiopic) Synaxarion was translated from the Arabic by Wüstenfeld, Gotha, 1879.
† A masterly and model specimen of its value for this purpose can be found in the Prolegomena to Cornill's critical edition of Ezekiel, published 1886, p. 69 sqq.
‡ Herzog's Real-Encyklopädie, 2d ed., vol. i., p. 204.
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together with Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. In the critical apparatus appended to this edition is contained a great deal of material of value to the student of the Septuagint text. This volume, as also the second containing Chronicles, Ezra, Esther and the four books of Kings, i.e. two of Samuel and two of Kings, issued in 1871, also with a critical apparatus, was published with the financial help of the German Oriental Society, but the undertaking proved so expensive that no further portions of the Old Testament could be issued in so thorough and scientific a manner. Dillmann has, however, published, in connection with the commentary of Merx on Joel, an edition of the Ethiopic version of that prophet.* In the portions of the Old Testament that have been published Dillmann everywhere distinguishes a threefold text—namely, (1) the original translation, corrupted at places and found in but few manuscripts; (2) a later text revised and supplemented from the Greek, the most common Ethiopic text, the xoivr̩; (3) a text corrected in later years after the Hebrew, the youngest of all. Other portions of the Ethiopic Bible have been published, but not with critical skill, and accordingly have not the value for the researches of thorough scholarship that Dillmann's editions have. The New Testament was published already by the Jesuits in Rome in the sixteenth century, and from time to time other portions were printed—e.g., in the London Polyglott. Ludolf in 1701 published a fair edition of the Psalms, and the New Testament was edited for the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1830 by Th. P. Platt.

In connection with the Bible, the Ethiopic Church preserved a large number of books of considerable antiquity and authority, which are for them a Biblical literature in a deeper sense than they are for us or were for the Greek Church. The Ethiopic Church has never known the difference between canonical and non-canonical books in a sense anything approaching that fixed by the terminology of Christian theology for fifteen or more centuries. While naturally recognizing a difference between revelation and the literary composition of men, there was no impassable gulf fixed between them, but rather a debatable ground, so that the Christians of Ethiopia were at times accustomed to count as Biblical books works not revealed, but of great authority in the Church. They had no fixed Biblical canon and no fixed number of Biblical books. Such works as the Book of Enoch, Fourth Ezra, the Book of Jubilees, Third

---

* A complete list of all the Biblical texts published in Ethiopic, both those issued earlier and some few smaller texts published in our days, is given in Pretorius's Grammar, under the head of "Litteratura," p. 23 sqq. Pretorius's list, indeed, embraces everything that has ever been published of Ethiopic literature in all its departments.
Maccabees, as well as the whole collection of Apostolic Canons and constitutions embraced in the collection called by them "Synodos," are frequently found in the codices of the Bible, and are counted as Biblical books.* It is probably to a great extent owing to this attitude of the Church over against these books that we owe the preservation of literary remains of a high order that clustered around the Biblical canon when the Church of Ethiopia separated from the Greek. There is no reason to believe that in the Greek Church at the time of the disunion these books enjoyed anything like the esteem in which the Ethiopic Church has for centuries and centuries been holding them. This attitude toward the Canon is more likely the growth of the centuries after this separation, when the Church of Abyssinia found in these books the expression of their faith, and still more the guide for the Church life and government. The Church was accustomed to divide these books into several groups, according to their contents, and assign to each a distinct name. Under the name of Synodos is known a group of apostolic injunctions and commands with reference to the government of the Church, and to some extent also its faith, corresponding to, and in most cases translations from, the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons of the Greek Church.† As is the case with all similar collections still found in the Ethiopic Church, such as the monastic rules of Pochomius,‡ the ecclesiastical regulations are observed to the present day yet, at least as far as form is concerned. Of this group of documents Fell has published the Apostolic Canons—i.e., not the Ecclesiastical Canons, but the Apostolic, found appended to the eighth book of the Greek Apostolic Constitutions, though differing in many respects from the Greek original, and agreeing with the Coptic, from which the translation has been made. The Ecclesiastical Canons were published by Ludolf in his Commentarius, p. 314–328, and the Apostolic Constitutions were edited by Platt in 1834, with an English translation, under the title "The Ethiopic Didascalia." This class of literature has recently been shown to have a new claim on the attention of Christian scholarship as the outcome of a line of development that finds its germs in the "Teaching of the Twelve

* Cf. especially Dillmann, in Ewald's Jahrbücher, 1853, pp. 144–51, on the comp of the Ethiopic Biblical Canon. Cf. also an article by the present writer in the New York Independent, Feb. 11, 1886.
† Cf. W. Fell's edition of the Canones Apostolice Æthiopice, Lip. 1871, pp. 5–12, for a description of the whole Synodos. Cf. also the translation by the present writer in the Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, June and December, 1883, pp. 61–73.
‡ Translated in The Presbyterian Review, Oct., 1885.
Apostles."* As yet no critical examination of the various portions of the Synodos has been made, but a closer reading convinces the student that such an examination would yield much for the settling also of the Greek texts. The Ethiopic Synodos, however, contains a number of later recensions, as also some collection of Canons, of which we have no remains in the Greek or Coptic.†

Probably next in importance is the corpus of liturgies of the Ethiopic Church, called by them technically the "Canon," many of which belong to the oldest that the Christian Church has produced. The literature of the Abyssinian Church is rich in this regard; however, but a small portion has been published. Rev. J. M. Rodwell in 1864 published, as a reprint from the Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, a pamphlet of translations from Ethiopic manuscripts in the library of the British Museum and of the British and Foreign Bible Societies, as also of an edition of Ethiopic liturgies printed at Rome in 1548. This pamphlet contains sixty-one pages of Ethiopic Liturgies and Prayers, among which are the most common and important of that Church. A second pamphlet by the same author followed in 1867, which contained Ethiopic Prayers and Baptismal Offices, as also selections from the Degus, or Hymnal of Jared, and also the hymns of the Abyssinian Church. The English reader can secure from these translations probably the best idea of the richness of Ethiopic literature in venerable forms of Christian liturgies. The full Baptismal Book of the Ethiopic Church was published in 1878 by the lately deceased Orientalist of Munich, Professor Trumpp,‡ from which text the writer of this article published an English translation in 1882.§ In many of its features this document reproduces a number of most ancient practices and ceremonies of the Church in the administration of the Baptismal Sacrament. Many treasures of this class are yet hidden in manuscript form, especially in the libraries of Great Britain, and it is certainly a consummation devoutly to be wished that more texts and further discussions of these appear at the hands of competent scholars.

† Cf. Prolegomena to Dillmann's Lexicon, col. viii., and Fell, l. c.
§ In the Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, Jan. number. The Liturgie zum Tauf-Fest der Aethiopischen Kirche, just published by Carl v. Arnhard, is not a second baptismal liturgy, but a liturgy of services held on the memorial day of John the Baptist. The introduction of Arnhard is of special importance, as he shows that the story, repeated from century to century, that the Ethiopic Church is anabaptistic, is without any foundation in fact.
The Church of Abyssinia is further entitled to the gratitude of Christian scholars for its preservation of important Jewish apocryphal works, as also of versions of some very early specimens of Christian literature. It is almost a matter of congratulation that this venerable Church incorporated into its canon a number of books which the Greek Church either rejected, or at least disregarded, and which otherwise, either entirely or in part, would have been lost to the Church. We refer here to such interesting relics as the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, an old version of Fourth Ezra, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Pastor Hermæ, and the like. The value of the Jewish apocalypse is usually much greater than may at first sight seem to be the case. In the comparatively new theological discipline, called the History of New Testament Times, which has endeavored with such excellent success to portray the growth of the New Testament Revelation in its proper historical background and reproduce a truly historical conception of Christ and early Christianity by surrounding the Saviour and his work with all the agencies and factors of time, place, contemporary thought and feeling, and thus lay the foundation for a truly scientific structure of New Testament and Biblical theology—in this important theological investigation these apocalypses have found a new importance and bearing. In them we find reflected and reproduced in more or less vivid colors the process of development which finally culminated in the Pharasaic self-righteousness of New Testament Judaism, the chief opponent of Christ and his work and teachings. The historical blank between the two Testaments was a period of intense feeling and marked change in the attitude of Israel's faith and religion, and of the genesis of the errors of what later appears as New Testament Judaism, as also of the character of the Jewish orthodoxy in the days of the Lord and his disciples. This we find depicted in these apocalypses, not as much, indeed, by what they directly state as rather by what they do not state, and by the general spirit and animus of the contents. As an historical phenomenon the remarkable departure from the faith of the Old Testament on the part of Christ's contemporaries is not capable of a rational explanation from Old Testament premises alone; in the centuries after the spirit of prophecy was hushed in Israel, and before it was heard again in Vox Clamantis, there were evidently agencies at work in the religious life of Israel which managed to change that faith, and finally end in the caricature of Old Testament faith and religion found in the New Testament Jews. One of the chief means of securing a rational explanation of this phenomenon is to study carefully the literary links of the Jewish people between the two Testaments and those that were written at
the same time or with the books of the New Testament. Nothing, for instance, throws more light on the problem as to how the contemporaries of Christ could, notwithstanding all the prophecies of the Old Testament, maintain the appearance of the Messiah as a great earthly ruler, with a kingdom of this world, as do the so-called Psalms of Solomon, a lyrical production of the first century before the Saviour's birth. And in this way each and every one of the apocalypses has its work to perform in the general problem of constructing a truly accurate History of the New Testament Times.*

And then these literary remains preserved for us to a great extent by the Church of Ethiopia alone promise in the future to be even of greater importance than was just mentioned. The discussions attending the appearance of the Revised Translation of the Old Testament has made it a pium desiderium of the greatest importance that all the aids and helps which can possibly be brought to bear in order either to correct or to confirm the Massoretic text should be laid under contribution before a truly correct and reliable Old Testament text can be secured. The only reasons why the Septuagint and the Peshitto, notably the former, are considered as leading aids in this regard is because they are translations of the Old Testament, made at a very early date. Among the secondary aids, the first in importance, probably even more important than the citations of the fathers, appear to be these Apocalypses. They are no translations of the Old Testament, but they are saturated with Old Testament thought and Old Testament phraseology, and having been written either before the birth of Christ or soon after, they ought to furnish the observing students a great deal of information as to the condition and contents of the Old Testament texts used by the authors of these books. That they really do furnish such material has already been proved in the case of one of these works. We refer here to the so-called Book of Jubilees, a Haggadic reproduction of the Book of Genesis and the opening chapters of Genesis, written either at the end of the first or at the beginning of the second Christian century.† Dillmann has published in the Berichte der könig. Preus. Akad. d. Wissenschaften in Berlin, 1883, p. 323-40, an article entitled "Beiträge aus dem Buche der Jubiläen zur Kritik des Pentateuchtextes," in which he compares the Hebrew text which lies at


† The book is found only in the Ethiopic. A translation into German was published by Dillmann in Ewald's Jahrbücher, 1849-50, from a single MS.; in 1859 he published the Ethiopic text from several MSS., and from this edition the present writer has made an English translation, which began to appear in the Bibliotheca Sacra in October, 1885, and continued through several numbers.
the bottom of the Book of Jubilees with the Massoretic Textus Receptus. Dillmann starts out with the statement that in the three or four centuries between the Septuagint and Aquila we have no means to judge of the condition of the Hebrew text, as the Hebrew and Aramaic writings of this period treat only of a few selected passages, and even in these instances of the Greek translation; and then he makes a new collation of the text of the Book of Jubilees and the Hebrew text of Gen. i. to Ex. xii., and in doing so uses two new manuscripts which he did not possess when editing the Ethiopic text of this book. His conclusions are that the author of this apocalyptic book had the Hebrew text before him, but in a form which differed in many respects from the later Massoretic readings. In a number of passages the author of the Book of Jubilees agrees with the Septuagint, and not with the Hebrew text, but in these cases changes were made by the Greek translators of this book. Dillmann maintains that the chronological and other numerical features of the Book of Jubilees, which also agree with the Book of Enoch and Fourth Ezra, are older and more correct than those found in the traditional Hebrew text. Whatever may be thought of these conclusions of Dillmann, it is certain that the method and process he points out are correct, and if followed out according to the legitimate principles of textual criticism, will be fruitful in good results.

It is true that, in regard to this particular, probably no other apocalyptic book will be so rich in valuable results as is the Book of Jubilees; but this is owing to the peculiar character of that book; and the others are more valuable from other standpoints. To the treasures of Ethiopic literature belongs the queen of uninspired apocalyptic literature, the Book of Enoch.* It was a book of great authority in the ancient Christian Church, being quoted by many fathers. In its present shape it consists of three parts: the oldest being a kind of a manifesto of the Chasidim, the pious and patriotic party in the days of the Maccabees, to their fellow-sufferers; the second, a calmer document from the days of the Herodian rulers, describing, under the figure of three similitudes, the advent and rule of the Messiah and his judgment; and the third a fragment, similar to the first part in contents, revealed to Noah and not to Enoch.†

* This book was lost to the Church for centuries. It was rediscovered in an Ethiopic translation about a century ago, was published and translated by Laurence in 1821. A new and critical edition of the Ethiopic text was issued by Dillmann in 1836, and two years later he made a German translation. A new English translation, with two introductions and copious notes, was prepared by the writer and published by Warren F. Draper, Andover, 1882.
† Cf. for particulars the introductions to the Andover translation.
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Another important apocryphal work preserved only in its Ethiopic dress is the Ascension of Isaiah, quoted frequently by the early fathers as ἀναβασιλικῶν Ἡσαίου, and occasionally as ἀνόρκρυφον Ἡσαίου. It is a Jewish production, but later additions were made by Christian hands in order to make its statements more directly Messianical. Such a pia fraus was not an uncommon thing in the literature of the day, although theoretically the Jesuitical maxim that the end justifies the means had probably not yet been uttered. Later interpolations, in order to produce a vaticinium post eventum, we find also in the Sibylline Books, which have been so interlarded by later writers that, aside of a portion of the third book, scarcely a single section of the collection can be relied upon as pre-Christian. This Ascensio Isaiae was also a favorite book in the early Greek and Latin churches, but was, with so many other literary treasures, eventually lost. Early in the present century Laurence found a MS. copy of it in the Bodleiana and published it, together with an English and a Latin translation, in 1819. In 1877 Professor Dillmann, from a number of better MSS., published a critical text, together with a German translation, and an English version from the writer's pen appeared in the Lutheran Quarterly in October, 1878.

We can mention here but two more works given to us by the Church of Ethiopia, for which she is deserving of recognition and gratitude. The Fourth Book of Ezra has always been recognized as one of the most important works of its kind. It had, indeed, not been lost entirely to the Church, but the recension of it as it appeared in the Ethiopic dress, as also in the Arabic published in 1877 by Gildemeister, lends valuable help in settling the Greek text. The discovery of an Ethiopic version of Pastor Hermæ by the French scholar and traveller, d'Abbadie, was welcome news to students of Oriental languages and early Church history. It appeared, together with a verbatim Latin translation by the discoverer, among the publications of the German Oriental Society in 1860, and in the classical edition of the Apostolic Fathers, by Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn, it is accorded a leading place in the critical apparatus.*

It would be a comparatively easy matter to mention and describe other specimens of literature preserved to Christianscholarship through the Church of Ethiopia; but enough has been said in this regard to show her claims to recognition and appreciation. And the works which have appeared in print are but a small portion of the whole literature of this Church. In the English libraries, especially those of the British Museum and the Bodleiana, then the library at Rome, Paris, the Berlin, Frankfurt, Tübingen, and Dresden

libraries in Germany have a large number of Ethiopic MSS. which have been examined only in part, but never studied thoroughly. With the exception of Dillmann's catalogue of the British Museum MSS. and d'Abbadie's *Catalogue Raisonné*, even the general contents are but imperfectly given. But one by one new specimens are published, and each adds to the honor due to the Church of Abyssinia for keeping these literary remains for the research of our day.*

It would transcend the limits of a magazine article to give a full and succinct account of the history of the Abyssinian Church, or to describe *in extenso* its condition at any stage in the present or past. Nor is this necessary, as at least the external features of this history can be found satisfactorily given in our leading Church histories and *cyclopædias*. But a brief discussion of some prominent turning points in that history, especially in the light of facts as furnished by the native chronicles of Ethiopia, would not be out of place. One of the most perplexing problems in this regard is the question as to the religion of the people of Ethiopia when Christianity was there introduced. It is true that the fable of a conversion of this country by the "eunuch of great authority under Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians" (Acts viii. 27), has found believers, not only among the Ethiopians themselves, but also among the Greeks; † but the conversion of this nation in the days of Constantine the Great, chiefly through the instrumentality of Frumentius, is not only the accepted belief of the early Greek historians, such as Socrates, Sozomenus, and others, but is also the recognized conviction of the Abyssinian Church. In one of the oldest of Ethiopic chronicles which has been incorporated into their *Synaxarion*, we have the following account of this conversion through Frumentius, called by them Abba Salâmâ, which we here translate on account of its historical worth,

* Among the latest publications in this line are Hommel's edition of the *Physiologus*, a specimen of that remarkable mixture of theology and natural philosophy which found such favor in the early medieval Church, and of which translations appeared even in the Icelandic. This work appeared in 1877. Secondly, Dr. Cornill, of Marburg, published in the *German Oriental Society Journal* in 1876, pp. 417-66, an edition of the monophysitic confession of Jacob Baradeus, the leader of the monophysitic sections of the Syrian churches. This confession was translated by the writer into English, and appeared in the *Lutheran Quarterly* for October, 1882, from which it was republished the next year in Dickinson's *Theological Quarterly*, published in London. Triumpp's edition of the *Baptismal Book* has been mentioned. His "*Hexaëmeren des Pseudo-Epiphanius*," 1882, is a noteworthy publication. A few years ago he published also the text of the Book of Adam and Eve, a favorite ascetic book of the Oriental churches. It was translated into English by Rev. S. C. Malan, of England, and published by him in book form in 1882. Undoubtedly the near future will witness the appearance of other noteworthy publications in this line. Cf. the list in Prætorius's *Grammar*.

† We find it as early as Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* II. i. 13.
as also because it is a fair sample of an extract from the native chronicles.* It reads:

"Concerning Abba Salâmâ—on this day (it is the 26th of Chémâ †) died Abba Salâmâ, the revealer of lights; bishop of Ethiopia, and the following is his history: There came a man from the land of Greece, whose name was Miropius, a prince of wise men, and with him were two children of his family; the name of one was Frumentius, and of the other Adesius, but some called him Sidrakos. And they came to the shore of the Ethiopians, and he (Miropius) saw all the good things his heart wished for. But when he desired to return to the sea, they came over him as his enemies, and slew him and all that were with him; and these two small children were left. And the men of the city took them prisoners, and showed them the deeds of murder, and gave them as presents to the King of Axum, whose name was Elaadad. And the king made Adesius keeper of the servants’ house, and Frumentius watcher over the laws and scribe of Axum. And afterward the king died, and left a young son with his mother, and Aznan ruled them, and Frumentius and Adesius remained, educating the child and taught him the faith of Christ—to whom be glory—gradually; and they built for him a chapel, and gathered around it children, teaching them psalms and hymns. And when this boy had reached the proper age they asked him to send them to their city. And Adesius went to Tyre, near the sea, to see his relatives; but Frumentius went to Alexandria, to the archbishop, Abba Athenasius, and found him new in office, and he announced to him all these things, and also concerning the faith in the land of the Ethiopians, how they believed in Christ—to whom be glory—and had neither bishop nor elder. Then the Abba ordained Frumentius as a bishop for the land of the Ethiopians, and sent him away with great honor. And going to the land of the Ethiopians in the reign of Aberha, he went and preached the peace of Christ—to whom be glory—in all the provinces, and therefore his name is Abba Salâmâ [i.e., the father of peace]. And after he had taught the people of Ethiopia, he rested in peace.

"Hail! with a voice of joy I cry, Extolling and lauding him, Salâmâ, the portal of mercy and grace, Who opened Ethiopia to the splendor of Christ’s light When before that in it was darkness and night."

It will at once be seen that this account agrees throughout with the statements of the early Church historians. In fact, it would probably not be necessary at all to mention the story about a conversion to Christianity already in the days of the Apostles, were it not for the fact that this early conversion is connected with a number of other things, historically incorrect, but which are repeated again and again by writers on Abyssinia, chiefly because they are not acquainted with the literature and Church of that country.§ To these stories belongs the claim that the Abyssinians, before their conversion to Christianity, were not heathens, but were adherents

---

* The Ethiopic text is found in Dillmann’s Chrestomathia Αἰθιοπικά, p. 33 sqq.
† The eleventh month of the Abyssinian calendar, our July.
‡ Official title, like Doctor Seraphicus, Doctor Angelicus, etc.
§ We mention in this connection only the two otherwise interesting articles of Thiersch, in the July and August numbers of the Conservative Monatschrift for 1884, published a year ago in England, translated by Sarah Pereire. These are well written, but very fragmentary, and quite uncritical.
of the Jewish faith. In maintaining this thesis, some stress is laid upon the fable of the Queen of Sheba. It has ever been the pious belief of the Abyssinians that this was a queen of their country, who had been attracted to Jerusalem through the reports brought by merchants of the wisdom and glory of Solomon's rule. The native chroniclers narrate that she—called by them Maqueda—went to Jerusalem to visit Solomon, and soon after her return gave birth to a son from him, named Menelik; that this Menelik was sent to his father at Jerusalem to be educated, was there taught the faith of Jehovah, returned with priests and prophets, brought to Ethiopia the Ark of Covenant, which he had stolen from the temple, and set up the worship of the one God in his native land.* Apparently in confirmation of this early conversion of the Ethiopians to Judaism is the further fact that the Abyssinian Church to the present day has maintained some peculiar customs which would indicate that at one time Jewish peculiarities had been a powerful factor in the religious life of these people. To these must be removed the practice of circumcision, the observance of the seventh as well as of the first day of the week as a day of worship and rest, the abstaining from the flesh of swine and certain other meats, the marriage of a woman to the brother of her deceased husband in case the latter died childless. But the Ethiopians themselves have always stoutly maintained that these practices were not remains of a former Jewish faith, but were observed for other reasons. The strongest testimony in this regard is the famous Confession of King Claudius, one of the greatest rulers of this country, who, when appealed to by the Jesuitic fathers of the sixteenth century, when they were endeavoring to convert Abyssinia to the Roman Catholic communion, to set forth a confession of the Church of which he was the political head, did so, and in this excellent and important document—which, by the way, has never yet been translated into English—nothing is more clearly stated than that these observances are due to anything but an Old Testament spirit.† And as this document—although in no

* The story of the Queen of Sheba is one of the most widely spread among the southern branch of the Semitic peoples, and the Arabs and Ethiopians have contended loud and long for her possession. The Ethiopians have quite an extravagant fable of her adventures, which was published by Praetorius, now professor of Semitic languages in Breslau, as a doctor-dissertation in 1870, as Fabula de Regina Sabaea apud Ethiopeis, Halts. The Ethiopians claim a regular descent of their royal house from Menelik, and in their chronicles have long (but spurious) lists of kings from the days of Solomon down. Among the Arabs the queen's name is Bilkis, and she has found her way even into the Koran, Sura 27. The story in its Arabic dress is found in the lately published elementary Arabic grammar of Socin, professor in Tübingen, Chrestomathy, p. 47-71.

† This confession is printed in the Commentary to Ludolf's History of Ethiopia, 237-41.
wise a compendium of Abyssinian belief, chiefly because it does not cover the whole ground—is one of great importance and quite brief, we will add it here in a translation. It reads:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, one God.

This is my faith, and the faith of my fathers, the Israelish kings,* and the faith of my people, who are within the bounds of my kingdoms. We believe in one God and in his only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, who is his Word and his power, his Council and his wisdom, who was with him before the world was created. But in these last days he has come to us, although he did not descend from the throne of his divinity, and he became man from the Holy Spirit and from the holy Virgin Mary; he was baptized in the Jordan in his thirtieth year, and became a perfect man, and was suspended on the cross in the days of Pontius Pilate; he suffered, died, and was buried, and arose again on the third day. And then on the fortieth day he ascended into heaven and sits on the right hand of his father. And again he will come in glory to judge the quick and the dead, and there will be no end to his rule.

And we believe in the Holy Spirit, the life-giving God, who proceeds from the Father.

And we believe in one baptism unto the remission of sin. And we hope for the resurrection of the dead unto a life to come unto eternity. Amen.

But we continue on in the royal, plain and true path, and do not depart, either to the right or to the left, from the doctrine of our twelve apostles, and Paul, the fountain of wisdom, and of the seventy-two disciples, and of the three hundred and eighteen orthodox fathers who were assembled at Nice, and of the one hundred and fifty at Constantinople, and of the two hundred at Ephesus.†

* So called on account of their pretended descent from the house of Solomon.
† The Abyssinian, with the Eastern churches in general, denies the filioque. This, next to the two natures of Christ, was the chief point of dispute in the discussions of the Jesuitic patres and the Abyssinian Church in the sixteenth century.
‡ These are the three councils officially recognized by the Abyssinian Church. The condemnation of the monophysitic doctrines by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 caused the adherents of this faith to withdraw from the Church general. The Abyssinians throughout their history have been very severe in condemning this Council, showing all the rabid religious zeal in the regard so well known in Semitic and Oriental peoples. Their later books are full of wildest denunciations of "the religion of the Franks," and "the unclean religion of Leo" (a letter from Pope Leo to the Synod having apparently given the decisive impetus in the Council in condemning the Monophysites). As specimens we quote from the Confession of Baradeus, already mentioned. There Baradeus, in a manner typical for the attitude of the whole Ethiopic Church, says: "And the six anathemas with which Dioscorus cursed the fourth Council, I accept and believe in them that they are right. The first anathema: The holy Dioscorus, Archbishop of Alexandria: Cursed be the fourth Council, and all with it, and all that follow it, for it has falsified the faith of the three hundred and eighteen fathers, by saying and adding a second nature to Christ. If they had not feared the curse of the three hundred and eighteen fathers, they would have added one to the hypostases in the manner of Nestorius. The second anathema: Behold he cursed all those who assembled themselves in the fourth Council, because they have tramped upon the holy canons and changed the ordinances which the first and the middle and the last fathers [i.e., the three earlier Councils] had prescribed. The third anathema over the fourth Council: Because the bishops of Berytus were in it, and many fathers who had taken part in the third Council, and they honored the person of Marcion and transgressed against the Lord Christ; and their handwritings were in the protocol of the third Council, and they
Thus I proclaim and thus I teach, I, Claudius, King of Ethiopia, and my royal name is Atznaf-Saghedi, the son of Wanag-Saghedi, the son of Noadi.

But with reference to our celebration of the first Sabbath [i.e., Saturday]. We indeed do not celebrate it like the Jews, who crucified the Lord, saying, His blood be over us and on our children. Because these Jews do not draw water, nor light a fire, nor cook meat, nor bake bread, nor go from one house to another. But we celebrate it in such a manner that we on it administer the Holy Supper, and practise on it the agape feasts, just as our fathers the apostles have prescribed in the "Didascalia" (Constitutions).

Nor do we celebrate it as the Sabbath of the first day, as it is a new day, concerning which David has said, This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it. Because on that day our Lord Jesus Christ arose from the dead, and on that day the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles in the room of Simon, and on that day Christ became incarnate in the womb of the Mary, who is a virgin forever, and on that day he will come again to remunerate the just and punish the wicked.

But with reference to circumcision, we do not circumcise as do the Jews, because we know the words of Paul, the fountain of wisdom, who says: For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision; but rather faith working through love. And again to the Corinthians: Whosoever has received circumcision, let him not be called uncircumcised; all the books of doctrines by Paul are in our possession, and they teach us concerning circumcision and concerning uncircumcision. But circumcision with us is in accordance with the custom of the land, just as the incisions in the face are made in Ethiopia and Nubia, and the piercing of ears in India. What we thus do is not in accordance with the laws of Moses, but rather according to human custom.

But with regard to the eating of swine's meat, we are not prohibited on account of the observation of the law of Moses, as the Jews are. For we do not hold him in abomination who eats of it, nor do we judge him unclean; nor do we compel him who does not eat thereof to do so. For thus our father Paul writes to the Romans [quotations from Rom. xiv. 3, 17, 20], and Matthew the evangelist says [Matt. xv. 17]. And thus he makes all things clean. But when Christ uses these words he destroys the whole structure of the error of the Jews, who learned these things from the laws of Moses.

But my religion and the religion of the learned presbyters who teach according to my command in the whole circuit of my kingdom, is such that it does not depart from the way of the gospel, nor from the doctrine of our father Paul, either to the right or to the left, and in a book called Tarich,* extant among us, we read that Constantine the king had commanded in the days of his rule "that all the Jews that had been baptized should eat of the meat of swine on the day of the resurrection of our Lord."

would not turn and assemble another Council concerning the faith, and that every one who would assemble another Council besides the third should be accursed, and among them are those who have taken the curse upon their own heads." Ex uno omnia; the other anathemas are in the same strain. The series of curses ends in this energetic language: "And on this account may the fourth Council be cursed! And may our lady Mary say: Let it be cursed: And may the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit say: Let it be cursed! And may angels and men say: Let it be cursed! And may the heavens and the earth say: Let it be cursed! And may the curse rest upon the fourth Council unto eternity, as long as heaven and earth exist, and upon every one that speaks according to its words, and upon every one that follows them or believes in their faith." This is a locus classicus, and typical of the spirit of the Ethiopic Church, maintained to the present day over against those not sharing their peculiar beliefs. Now, however, it is the hatred based upon a lifeless, though historic, dogmatic system.

* A history known also among the Arabs.  Cf. Ludolf, I. c.
But in so far as it seems to be good to any one, he can abstain from the eating of the meat of animals. For there are those who delight in the meat of fish, or in the meat of chickens; some abstain from the meat of sheep, or of anything that seems good to them. And thus the matter rests with the opinion of men. But concerning the eating of the meat of animals of the field, there is no law, no canon, given in the New Testament. All things are clean to the clean. And Paul says, that he who believes may eat all things.

But this it is that I wished to write, in order that you might know the truth of my religion. It is written in the year 1555 from the nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, on the 23d day of June, in the city of Damot.

This document is important not only as the confession of faith on the part of one of Ethiopia's greatest kings, but its explanation on subjects that seemed to point to a pre-Christian Judaism in Ethiopia is fully corroborated by other authorities. It is accordingly evident that these peculiarities, which are practically almost the only ones that distinguish this Church from that of the Greek in the fourth and fifth centuries, are the results rather of local causes than of a difference in religion.

Nor does the existence of that remarkable tribe of people called the Falashas, or Black Jews, in the western part of Abyssinia, change anything in this matter. It is true that these strange people have the Old Testament in an Amharic translation; that they adhere to the Mosaic laws, although they show no signs of Talmudic spirit, and thus must have been early separated from the rest of the Jewish Diaspora; yet this has no bearing whatever on the ancient religion of Ethiopia. Ethnographically the status of the Falashas is still unsettled; their relations to the Abyssinians were nearly always hostile and not friendly, and in general too little is known of them to warrant any far-reaching conclusions.* From all the evidences that can be gathered from both the Greek and Latin authors, as also from Ethiopian sources, there are no grounds to warrant an acceptance of Judaism being the religion of Ethiopia in pre-Christian times.

The other leading periods of interest in the history of this peculiar church are the controversies after the Synod of Chalcedon, the troubles with the Jesuitic fathers three hundred years ago, and, thirdly, the missionary enterprises during the present century. But as it is a comparatively easy matter to find full information elsewhere on these subjects, and as the object of this article is rather to sketch those features of this venerable structure of dogma and

worship which are beyond and above local interest and are of importance rather for the whole Christian Church, we need not enter upon them here. Concerning the troubles of the monophysitic movement, the Church historians and Church history supplies ample information; concerning the endeavors of the followers of Ignatius Loyola to bring Ethiopia to the feet of the Roman Pontiff, and the revolutions and bloodshed these efforts brought with them until the final expulsion of the fathers, we have the fullest documentary information in the second book of Ludolf's History and Commentary—in fact, this is the richest part in his elaborate tomes; and concerning the missionary work of the present century as carried on by the workmen of the British and the Basel Foreign Mission societies, as also with reference to the doings of that wonderful man Theodorus, King of Ethiopia, and the British expedition to Magdala under Lord Napier to release the imprisoned missionaries, the reports and descriptive works of these men furnish the fullest intelligence. We here refer not so much to the earlier works of Bruce and Salt, or even to Rüppell's scientific reports, but rather to the volumes of Isenberg, Gobat, Kraft, and others. These missionary reports have, indeed, not been able to bring to the Christianity of the West intelligence of great conquests and of a widespread out-pouring of gospel power in the land of Ethiopia, but the case is by no means hopeless. These enterprises show only again that it is more difficult to labor among those who are errorists in their Christianity than among those who are tabula rasa as far as a knowledge of Christianity is concerned. Centuries of isolation and separation from all living Christianity has caused the Christianity of Abyssinia to become a petrified formalism, a massive ruin that speaks an eloquent though sad voice to evangelical Christianity. In the wise providence of God Ethiopia has had its mission to perform in the history of the Church general; she has preserved and restored to Christian literature many treasures of great value to Christian scholarship; the lessons and warnings of this history are well worth heeding. And as she has done her share for the benefit of the Christian Church, it is no more than right that evangelical Christendom should repay good for good, and endeavor through missionary zeal and enterprise to awaken this venerable Church from the sleep of centuries, to instil into her a renewed life, and make her what she once was—an honor and a jewel in the crown of the one Church of Jesus Christ.

GEORGE H. SCHODDE.

Columbus, Ohio.
III.

RATIONALISTIC CRITICISM OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

The writer who attempts to trace the history of Rationalism in any department of thought is met at the outset by a difficulty similar to that which embarrasses the attempt to describe the practical outcome and relations of Darwinism. The difficulty lies in the fact that the word Rationalism is not a fixed but a floating term, to which every reader, and particularly every English reader, attaches his own meaning. Some, overlooking its evil, are inclined to understand by Rationalism the habit which wishes to prove all things and hold fast to that which is good. Some, understanding by the word the spirit of unbelief, the Antichrist, fail to give it credit for the possession of any good. And others, making rationalistic equivalent to unorthodox, are unable to appreciate either its evil or its good.

Nevertheless, in spite of this diversity of ideas, there is a thing which is called Rationalism; not so much a fact as a growth; not a historical appearance, but a spirit which underlies a chain of appearances; not a system, but a school of thought.

In Germany this school has been especially drawn toward the investigation of the groundwork of the Christian religion as it is found in the life of Jesus Christ. Its adherents have assumed in the course of this investigation various positions, which seemingly opposed, are connected by a regular process of development, and rest upon a similar philosophic basis. That basis is such a scheme of the universe as by necessary logical deduction renders impossible a special revelation of religious truth in any particular historical fact or facts. Now the New Testament is, on its face, a historical account of a special revelation from God. Rationalists have, therefore, been compelled to investigate it. The history of German Rationalistic criticism of the life of Christ, then, is the history of the attempts of those men whose scheme of the universe rendered it impossible that Christ could be the incarnate God to account for the contents and origin of the New Testament literature.

Two things have determined the course of this criticism: First, the development of the school of rationalistic thought in general as
it modified from time to time the view of the universe from which
it sprang, and, second, the truth established by the study of the
facts in this special field of investigation. The writer has endeavored
to display the first influence by showing, so far as he has been able
within the limits of a magazine article, how the different elements
which make the spirit of an age have affected the philosophic views
of a portion of the German people; and the second by displaying
the positions taken in regard to the New Testament literature by the
leading rationalistic authors of lives of Christ, together with the dis-
cussions and attacks which have caused the changes in those positions.

The causes of the formation of the view of the universe which was
the basis of the first rationalistic life of Christ are to be sought in
the history of the development of speculation.

Descartes, laying aside the results of all previous metaphysics,
started to construct a new system of the universe, and became the
founder of modern philosophy. His system ended in Dualism; in
the assertion of two opposite and opposing substances, spirit and
matter, the relations of whose origins he did not explain. He was
followed by Spinoza, who attempted to reconcile this paradox, to
reduce this dualism to monism. He did it by pointing away from
the substances to the substance. He explained the single and
peculiar as but different parts of one great all-embracing whole.
But he overlooked the individual. He gave no proper recognition
to the fact that within this one all-embracing whole there are parts,
complete in themselves, possessing the ability to resist the influ-
ence of the whole, and to some extent determine their own form of
being. Hence his system was fatalistic, and, whether he was a pan-
theist or a materialist, whether he called his one substance God or
matter, made no difference in the practical outcome, which was a ten-
dency to destroy personality and hence moral responsibility.

Leibnitz saw and attempted to supply the deficiency. He said
the system of Spinoza does not take all the factors into account.
He has overlooked the fact of individuality. His Substance may
explain the existence of the substances, but it does not explain their
form. For that we must introduce a new idea, that of "power."

By thus reasserting the importance of form as against mere exist-
ence, of the individual against the entirety, he won again a place
for personality and moral responsibility.

The system of Descartes was dualistic—that is, it explained the
universe in terms both of mind and matter; the system of Spinoza
was materialistic—that is, it explained the universe in terms of a
substance whose distinguishing characteristics were those of matter;
the system of Leibnitz tended, as against Descartes, to be monistic,
and explain the universe in terms of one substance, and, as against Spinoza, to be spiritualistic in that it found the distinguishing characteristic of this substance in a quality of mind.

Spinoza found in his system no legitimate place for moral responsibility, and therefore no possibility of a revealed religion; for himself, indeed, no need for religion at all. In the Christian revelation he found, therefore, a contradiction with the results of philosophy. This contradiction Leibnitz undertook to remove by the construction of a natural theology and a natural religion. Leibnitz never worked out his views into a completed system, and they were interpreted to and became the property of the age through the work of inferior men, chiefly by that of Wolf and Mendelssohn. Overlooking the deep-lying principles because they could not understand them, they constructed a cheap and popular Leibnitzianism, which avoided the difficulties of the original by leaving out its greatnesses.

The system of Leibnitz was psycho-physical; in the hands of these interpreters it became psychical and physical, and instead of the physical ideas being spiritualized, the spiritual ideas became materialized. For deep, soulful reflection they substituted the operations of logic, working upon premises gathered from the surface of observation, with no appreciation of the depths of thought or feeling. The idea of the immanence of God, which lay like a hidden spring down among the roots of Leibnitz's system, was replaced by a mechanical relation which put God and the world opposite to one another, like a machinist and a machine. That relation of the parts to the whole which Leibnitz had found to resemble a harmony springing from within, this spurious Leibnitzianism found to resemble a bond laid on from without.

To this world they applied the standard of their reason. But when they looked into that mirror of the universe, the soul, they saw, not the real world, but only that false and puny image of it which they had themselves created. As the artists of the time reproduced, not nature, but those belittled conventional models which they believed to be a higher and fuller expression of artistic truth, so these philosophers could never look over the bounds of their schools to the glories and beauties beyond. In the sweep and rush of the stars they saw only the mechanical perfection of an orrery. They could not catch the music of the spheres, and heard instead only the clank of the machinery.

And as their views of God and the world, so also their views of man and the ends of human life. Of the restless striving of the soul for something which it does not possess, they did not understand.
Their system put God away off from the universe, and they were quite content to have Him remain there.

And as they did not have the longing for union with the Divine, so they did not have any appreciation of the difficulties that stood in the way of that union. Leibnitz had regarded sin as incompleteness, a lack of perfection; but this belief, held side by side with the consciousness of that striving after completeness and perfection which it hindered, did not lessen its pain or blind his eyes to its weight. The introduction of this active principle changed the negative into a positive. But when this striving was thrown out of the account, then sin became a necessary accompaniment, a mere incidental evil, to overcome whose inconvenience a wise man need only choose the best of many possible means; much as a cripple might select the most practicable of many varieties of crutch. The immortality to which they looked forward was but a continuation in the next world of the conditions of life with which they got on very well in this. That optimism which Leibnitz deduced from the nature of God, they were rather inclined to rest upon the belief that man was the centre of the universe, for whose benefit all that is was made; and that benefit they saw not in the promotion of development, but of existence.

It was characteristic of this tone of thought that, while announcing that "the proper study of mankind is man," it failed to see the greatness and the glory of man. Asserting human sufficiency it came to assert human equality, and lost appreciation of individuality. Consequently it was unable to understand, or even to study, history. Genius it could not appreciate. To admire a civilization whose spirit was not their spirit, to perceive the good of a system whose results did not tally with the results of their system, was beyond their ability. With a besotted Pharisaism, they thanked God that their age was not as other ages had been. Mendelssohn expresses his gratitude that he is not like Plato, and finds that Homer would have been a very superior poet if he had not had these shadowy conceptions of many gods.*

Never, perhaps, was there a spirit which, claiming to be so broad, was so narrow; asserting so loudly its right to be critical, was so little able either to appreciate or condemn; preaching so steadily the glory of man, tended to strip him so completely of all that is godlike; boasting itself of such exalted, had such little ideals, as this spirit of the eighteenth century, whose practical rule of life was a combination of peddler morality and the etiquette of the best society, a mixt-

* Kuno Fischer.
It was necessary for the believers in any scheme of the universe which thus put God so far off from the world that it was impossible for Him to make to it any special revelation, to explain the facts recorded in the New Testament in such a way as to destroy belief in them. This task was undertaken by Hermann Samuel Reimarus, well known as the author of a now-forgotten book on "The Most Distinguished Truths of Natural Religion," which, in its day, ran through six editions and was translated into French, English, and Dutch. His book upon the Christian history is called "The Apology for the Reasonable Worshippers of God," and its tone is sharply and strongly hostile. As regards the Bible, it is destructive from the first line to the last; and yet it is justly called an apology rather than a criticism; for the author's object is not only to overthrow what he considers the false religion, but to establish what he considers the true. While he is an anti-Christian, he is by no means an anti-religionist. He believes firmly in the existence of God, of a moral law, and the immortality of the soul.

His reasons for beginning to doubt that the Bible was a revelation from God he gives himself in the preface of his Apology.

1. It seemed to him impossible that a revelation from God, which was intended to guide the human race, should have been made in the complex form of a collection of historical, philosophical, and poetical books, rather than that of a short, plain, and simple catechism or hand-book containing a straightforward statement of religious or moral truth. The ideal of such a revelation which he had before his mind was probably such a book as Wolf or Mendelssohn might have written. 2. The difficulty of forming a clear or, indeed, any idea of the Trinity. 3. The eternity of hell taught by the New Testament, which offended his sense of justice. 4. The impossibility of God, after having made the world and established its laws, interfering with their operations, and thus altering the relations between it and Himself by approaching closer to it.

He thus (a) assumes, a priori, in his fourth position that any revelation is impossible, and (b) asserts in his first three that, granting the possibility of a divine revelation, the contents of the Bible do not agree with our ideas of what such a revelation should be. He then proceeds to prove a posteriori, by a detailed investigation of the Bible history (c), that, assuming propositions a and b to be false, the Bible could not even then be considered as divine, because of the moral character of the men by whom this revelation was communicated. Running through the books of the Old Testament, he
finds that Noah was a frantic raver, who expressed his disgust over
his own faults by cursing his innocent children; Abraham an honor-
less husband, who was willing to suffer the dishonor of his wife for
money; Moses a demagogue, whose ambition led him to carefully
scheme and carry out by means of cheap conjuring tricks the decep-
tion of inspiration from God; and David a cowardly, treacherous,
cruel, and licentious usurper. Proceeding to his investigation of the
New Testament, he finds in the apostles a band of unscrupulous,
ambitious men, who, losing their political hopes by the death of their
leader, cleverly turned their effort to obtain political power into an
ecclesiastical revolution; and instead of founding a new kingdom,
endeavored to found a new hierarchy. When he comes to the char-
acter of Jesus, he slightly changes his tone. He finds that Christ
had two plans: first, the proclamation of the necessity of moral
reformation, and, second, the intention to establish a worldly
kingdom. The first he finds pure and admirable, but the second
draws in its train many impurities, and affixes ineradicable stains to
the character of Jesus. He finds Him guilty of a deceitful pre-
arrangement with John the Baptist of raising the wonder and belief of
the ignorant crowd by false miracles which He was afraid to attempt
before the learned Pharisees. He finds the buying and selling in
the courts of the temple a very justifiable and necessary proceeding,
Jesus cleansing of it but the first step in an unjustifiable and
personally ambitious revolution, and concludes that the Sanhedrim,
as the defenders of the Jewish commonwealth and constitution,
‘‘could not have done otherwise than as they did; that, therefore,
Jesus died, not innocently, but on account of His own crime.’’

As far as concerns that criticism of the Old Testament which
Reimarus regarded as the foundation of his criticism of the New, he
had established, granting the presuppositions which underlay it, a
reasonably strong position against such as attacked him on his own
ground. It was possible, of course, to point out the particulars in
which he had misinterpreted the Bible, or where he had interpolated
his own suppositions into its histories; but to those apologetes who,
because Abraham was the Father of the Faithful, deemed it neces-
sary to defend his conduct with Abimelech, or who tried to show
that the king, warrior, and poet, David, was not the scoundrel of
Reimarus’s fancy by holding him up as a model to the burgher-house
fathers of their time, the admirers of the apology could make many
strong and cutting replies.

To attack the suppositions which underlay that position, the time
was not ripe. The general spirit of the age was so incapable of true
historic investigation that it was impossible for it to recognize the
greatness of Jewish literature or the glories of Jewish history. In regard to the criticism of the New Testament the case was better. Pure water does not come from a foul spring. If the figure and teaching of Christ as presented in the gospels were drawn by the hand of the apostles, then they could not have been a set of deceitful and ambitious adventurers, and if they were in any sense reproductions of reality, then the original could not have been a political conspirator with rather elevated moral ideas. But the time was too blind to the real worth and grandeur of Christianity to give even this obvious argument its decisive weight. It was a small age, and sceptic and believer alike were too apt to look at the world through the minimizing glasses which they themselves had made.

Nothing is easier in historical study than to take the part either of an advocate or a prosecutor, and yet nothing is more unjust or leads to falser views than to yield to such an impulse. Therefore, in considering the German Aufklärung of the eighteenth century, one must guard against a too-sweeping contempt and condemnation; an overlooking of the good which was mingled with its evil. Even in its extreme wing there was something to find true. If its spiritualism was materialized, still it was spiritual and not materialistic. If its morality was small, still it was moral. If its idea of God was little, still it had a God. If its views of destiny and the final relations of things were mechanical, still it had an immortality and prayed to a Father in heaven. From the same philosophic system which it misinterpreted sprang a succession of nobler souls, who, even in this very age, fought its small morals, its unscientific spirit, and its mechanical religion. If the close of its influence was marked by a dreadful political humiliation, there yet remained in the people who suffered it the strength that prepared itself for a great historical uprising. This was the golden age of German literature—the age that has given it its right to claim a place among the great literatures of the world. Herder, Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe lived in the eighteenth century.

Reimarus's book has now lost its power. Its criticisms are based on and appeal to a spirit and a view of the world which to-day have but little influence. It is only, indeed, in America that such criticism seems to meet with any but exceptional and occasional following, from people whose social position ought to be a guarantee of some slight degree of education.

The process by which this has been accomplished is not simply, or chiefly, one of controversy and pressure, but of inward growth and change. The agencies which have accomplished it are not so much the direct ones of attack upon results, as the indirect ones, by
which the providence of God, overruling even evil for good, has destroyed the spirit in which this form of attack had its origin.

The first impulse to the destruction of this spirit came, to use a not unmeaning pleonasm, in a new Renaissance, in a return to real classicism from the false classicism. The first thing for the age to do to escape its own littleness was to become conscious of it. In order to do this it was necessary for it to have means of comparison; it must turn its eyes away from itself toward the study and appreciation of other ages.

Winckelmann began this process in the domain of art. In his "History of Antique Art" he turned from the false and indecent half nakedness of contemporary classicism to show the beauty and purity of the nudity of the real classic.

And the process in art was matched by a similar one in literature. As against the classicism borrowed from France, with its materialism and rules for the manufacture of poetry, there arose a school which, resting on the example of English literature, asserted the ideal nature and imaginative qualities of the poet. The deeply rooted religious view of the world, the sturdy sinewed moral sense, the clear exalted view of human destiny, the defiance of man and fear of God, of those men who beat back the armada and saved Europe from the grasp of the Inquisition, was held up before the young genius of the generation in the living characters of Shakespeare. Klopstock, aroused by the study of Milton, abandoned, like Milton, his original design of writing a great national epic to compose the Messiah.

Herder pointed out the greatness and beauty of Hebrew literature, cut the ground from under the feet of Reimarus's criticism of the Old Testament by pure literary arguments, and combated his criticism of the life of Christ by pointing from the details to that ideal beauty of the whole which Reimarus was incapable of appreciating.

Lessing, though sympathizing with Reimarus far enough to posthumously publish, and to some extent defend, his book, yet by his literary work, consciously or unconsciously, helped to destroy the spirit to which it appealed, and was led by the far-seeing instinct of genius to assume in "Nathan the Wise" that higher position in regard to religion which critical rationalism only reached years after by the slow process of logical development.

The youthful Schiller and Goethe expressed in "The Robbers" and "Sorrows of Werther" that excessive individuality, that self-introspective, self-worshipping egotism which, evil in itself, was but the necessary and healthy revolt against the taste for elegant mediocrity, which would measure all things by the same little pocket rule,
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and in their later works taught with the success of genius that ideality and beauty also have a place in life.*

But the destruction of the spirit to which the criticism of Reimarus and his followers appealed was accomplished, not only indirectly by the influence of historical investigation and literary criticism and creation, but also directly through the foundation by Kant of the critical school of philosophy.

He formulated and enunciated that change of spirit and tone which literature was helping to cause and express. His criticism of the methods of investigation of the ruling speculative system destroyed the theory of knowledge which was its base. He showed that the knowledge upon which philosophy is founded and to which it appeals, is determined, not so much by that at which a man looks as by the man who looks, and by his demonstration of the relativity of knowledge and the impossibility of stepping beyond the limits of personality to lay hold on pure truth, destroyed root and branch the arrogant Deistic systems which would permit no mysteries, and measured the infinite with the hard and fast rules of their logic.

But another agency was to enter into the process. The thought and spirit of Germany was to be disciplined and developed, not alone by literature and philosophy, but also in the stern school of experience.

From the French Revolution sprang the modern Attila, Napoleon. That Prussian State which, since the death of Frederick the Great, had been growing ever hollower and hollower, went to pieces at the first touch of the mighty Frenchman. Its boasted army was annihilated at a single blow in the disgraceful fight at Jena, and as the victor marched toward the capital, officer after officer, the representatives of the proudest names in Prussia, surrendered the fortresses.

* It is a striking fact that almost all the great men of the greatest period of German literature display a more or less hostile attitude toward the Church, and even toward essential Christianity. Of the great men of English literature perhaps exactly the opposite is true. This final lack of sympathy between German writers and the Church does not seem to have been the result of any personal indifference or hostility. It is a noticeable fact that nearly all the greatest men in this period displayed in their youth an interest in theological studies. Klopstock, Lessing, Herder, Burger, Jean Paul Richter, Wieland, Winckelmann, Schiller and Goethe, all devoted themselves in their youth to the study of theology. Now, so far as these men came into variance with the Church and the theological system, does not this unanimity among men of the same poetic and literary temperament as those who in England have not developed this variance, seem to indicate that there was something wrong in that from which they turned? Does it not seem that there must have been some falsehood inherent in the spirit, or some lack of adaptability in the method of presentation, or some lack of spiritual life in the Christianity of the German Church, which rendered those who were within her walls unable to carry on victoriously the contest against the first stage of Rationalism?
without firing a shot. The fall was terrible. Never perhaps in modern history has a nation gone through a more humiliating experience. But the moment of deepest degradation marked the beginning of the rise.

Perceiving at once that this was no mere adversity of fate, but the legitimate outcome of complete national degeneration, the thinking and noble men set themselves carefully and deliberately to work to remedy the evils that lay at the root. Recognizing that the only security for the independence of a nation was in the character of its citizens, and that the only hope for saving their country lay in a change in the social and political atmosphere, they entered into a tacit conspiracy to educate a nation which should fight and drive out the invader. Hatred of the foreigner and duty to country were taught in the schools as part of a far-reaching and organized system.

This system was pursued silently and patiently for years, until at last the nation felt that it was ready, and only waited for opportunity to strike the blow. It came. The army of France perished in the snows of Russia. Hesitating and half afraid, the king was induced to issue his "Call to my People," appealing for volunteers who should arm and equip themselves, and for contributions to feed them. The reply of the nation was to rise as one man to arms. Peasant and baron, gray-haired men and half-grown boys, marched to the field. The mechanic dropped his tools and the scholar his pen. Professors closed their lectures and carried a musket in the ranks of their scholars. The young poet wrote on a saddle in his tent a battle hymn that stirred the hearts of his countrymen like the blast of a trumpet, and then rode out in the early morning to find that hero's death he had sung. The philosopher who had abandoned his metaphysics to write the German Philippics, came on crutches to volunteer, bringing with him his half-grown son; and, unable to bear the fatigues of campaigning, returned home to die of the fever that his wife had brought from the hospitals where she tended the sick and wounded. Men sold the clothes from their backs to buy a gun or a sabre, and those who had nothing, begged, in the name of the fatherland, the money for arms to defend her. Women who had no money to give cut off their hair and sent their wedding rings to the melting-pot.

At Leipzig Napoleon held this terrific force of a nation determined to win or die for three days at bay; but even his genius could not resist it, and Prussia shook off the yoke of France.

After their victory it was impossible that the people should fall back again into the moral degeneracy from which they had risen to
achieve it. They had learned that there are things not only to live for, but things to die for; that even in this life man does not live by bread alone.

To a nation who had passed through such an experience as this the old rationalism could not appeal. The spirit from which it arose and by which it was supported had vanished, and it must assume a new form. Henceforth the supposition of Reimarus, that the authors and actors of the New Testament literature were liars and knaves, had lost its force, and some entirely different method must be found to explain the origin of the New Testament.

Paulus, indeed, made the attempt along the old lines to reconcile the new spirit of the age which perceived the greatness and purity of Christ and the New Testament literature, with a belief in the impossibility of revelation. He found in the miracles lucky chances, the operation of natural laws unknown at the time, or the self-deception of excited spectators. He found in many of the teachings of Christ the expression of a self-conciousness that was so pure, exalted, enthusiastic as to be unbalanced and self-deceiving. But his attempt had the inherent defects of the old Rationalistic criticism. It appealed to a false moral standard. Reimarus had failed to perceive the fact of moral greatness, but Paulus failed to appreciate the nature of moral greatness. He failed to perceive that it was incompatible with the moral greatness of Christ, that He should be willing to trust in lucky accidents to support spiritual teachings, and that self-deception in regard to His own relation to the Father lowered the moral dignity and purity of His character.

But the age perceived what Paulus overlooked. Speculative Criticism or Rationalism had worked through its first and reached its second and higher stage. In its further investigation of the life of Christ it altered both its speculation and its criticism, laid aside not only the explanation of the New Testament literature given by Reimarus, but also the theory of the universe which prompted him to that explanation.

The mechanical view of the universe, which regarded God simply as the Creator, was exchanged for a spiritual one which regarded Him also as its Sustainer. The sharp dualism with its small logic, which tolerated no mysteries because it was unable even dimly to appreciate them, was exchanged for a brooding pantheism, with deep mysteries and vague but lofty ideas. For the small self-satisfaction of the previous age was substituted a noble and aspiring discontent.

The immediate cause of this change of philosophic base on the part of Rationalistic Criticism was the Hegelian philosophy. It
has been said that it is possible to translate Hegel adequately into Greek, but never into English. But it seems possible, even for the Anglo-Saxon, to secure an idea of the practical outcome of Hegel's system in the influence it exerted on criticism of the life of Christ as shown in the second stage of rationalistic controversy. Kant's system of the universe laid the conditioning stress on the ego. It resulted in an implied dualism, for, behind the phenomenon or appearance perceived, lay the reality of the thing which was never perceived, and behind the categories which conditioned the knowledge lay the mind which possessed the categories. As Leibnitz had tended to resolve into monism the dualism of Descartes without that neglect of some of the factors of the problem which he found in Spinoza, so the development which ended in Hegel tended to resolve into monism the dualism of Kant, while still taking into account the new factors to which he had pointed. It did away with the difference between the thought, and both the mind which possessed it and the thing that made its content. It tended to destroy self-determination, because it left nothing apart from the determination itself to be determined. That standing ground for individuality which enabled Kant to make the distinctively personal faculty, the determinative one, disappeared; and individuality was left floating in the air, seeking vainly for a resting-place.

And with this tendency to destroy the possibility of giving the attributes of personality to the individual, the possibility of giving the attributes of personality to God tended also to disappear.

The effect of this view of the universe upon the criticism of the life of Christ is clear. The ground principle of the two first forms of rationalism, different as they may appear, is the same. Both are based on the denial on philosophic grounds of the possibility of special divine revelation. Lessing, living in the time of the first stage, but occupying by the instinct of genius the position of the second stage, has summed up that which is common to both when he says: "Religion can never have its basis in the belief on historical facts." When applied to the life of Christ this general proposition reads: "That view of those historical facts which explains this life as the incarnation of God for the salvation of men is a priori impossible." This is as much the position of the second stage of Rationalism as it was that of Reimarus and Paulus. The statement of his reasons is, indeed, an exact contradiction, but the result is precisely the same. The old Rationalism had put God so far off from the world that His special interference in its laws became impossible, and this new Rationalism brought Him so close to the world that His special interference became equally impossible. The first view
of God's character and relation to the universe excluded the possibility of revelation because it was too personal; the second because it was too impersonal.

But Rationalistic Criticism had changed not only its philosophic position, but also its critical methods. Through the influence of Schleiermacher and Hase a new turn had been given to the controversy.

The Older Rationalism had posited the Scriptures, and then discussed their interpretation. It assumed the historicity of the accounts of the events of the life of Christ, and then attempted to explain them. Reimarus said these miracles are the results of false and deceitful conjuring tricks, while Paulus attempted to show them as lucky chances or necessary delusions. But the maintenance of these positions in the newer age was impossible, for the same principles made the founders of all religions either fools or liars. This was simply unbelievable. But Christianity is a historical fact, and has for its basis a series of historical facts recorded in an extant literature. If the Rationalist said Christianity could not be a true religion because a true religion could not be based on historical fact, he must account for the existence of that literature; and as the old explanation had lost its force, he was compelled to give a new one.

This new explanation David Frederick Strauss attempted to supply. He changed the whole ground of discussion. He turned attention from the events of the New Testament to the record of those events.

The dilemma presented to him was this: The events recorded in the New Testament either took place or they did not take place; if they took place, then Christ was the incarnate God; if they did not take place, then He and His Apostles were deceivers and knaves. Now, if the second condition involved an inadmissible conclusion, then the only way to escape the first conclusion was to break the dilemma. This Strauss attempted to do by his theory of "myths." He said, although the events here recorded did not actually take place, yet the men who recorded them are not liars and knaves, because when giving their false report they believed that they were giving a true one. These events have taken place, but not exactly in the way recorded. As Strauss expressed it, the old Rationalistic criticism said "that which happened in this manner cannot have been divine," and endeavored to explain away the essential meaning of the historical documents; he, as representing the newer Rationalism, said "the divine could not have happened in this manner," and denied the historical trustworthiness of those documents. The New Testament literature arose at a time of nervous excitement.
and amid a circle that was ready to seize upon and exaggerate into wonders anything which would exalt Him whom they worshipped as a transfigured God. The imagination working on the historical facts gradually and unconsciously worked into the account of how things did happen, all the prevailing ideas of how they ought to have happened. "The Gospels, therefore, contain not history, but the poetic metamorphosis of history myths."

The facts in regard to the composition of Strauss's "Life of Christ" are interesting. William Vatke has told how, walking one evening in the Thiergarten in Berlin with Strauss, then twenty-seven years old, the latter, speaking of the lectures of Schleiermacher, told his companion how much he owed to them, but added that they did not satisfy him, that the author remained in a half-way position. "I am going back to Tübingen," he continued, "and I tell you, Vatke, I am going to write a life of Christ according to my idea." One year later the entire book was ready in manuscript.

And a remarkable book it was. It marks an era in the history of German, indeed, of the world's theology. With the date of its appearance begins the period of modern theology. There probably never has been a book which summed up and expressed more completely that side of the spirit of the age from which it sprang, and therefore there have been few books—perhaps no modern book—which has met with such instant attention and ready recognition. It ran through four editions, and called forth numbers of opposing books, pamphlets, and articles, and since its appearance no discussion of the life of Christ has been possible which has not been influenced by the position it assumed.

That position had two sides—constructive, in that it endeavored to explain the origin of the New Testament history by tracing the way back through the mythical accounts of the different events to the actual fact with which those accounts started; and critical, in that, both directly and by necessary implication, it attacked the Church theory of the origin of the New Testament literature.

When Strauss's book first appeared there was much talk in Prussia of a prohibition, and it was perhaps only the courage and tolerance of Neander that prevented this suicidal denial of the principles of Protestantism, this fatal attempt to fight spiritual battles with carnal weapons.

But although it could not be fought by the State, it could be fought on its own ground of historical investigation. It could be attacked on both of its two sides; to its criticism could be opposed a constructive presentation of the facts, and to its constructive side a critical investigation of its theory. Neander led the way in one
CRITICISM OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

line, and Tholuck and Ullmann in the other. In his "Life of Christ" Neander opposed the criticism of Strauss by showing a logical consistency, an organism, of the life of Christ as presented in the Gospels which prevented its being resolved into opposing sections of historical and mythical elements; while Tholuck used the material of Lardner to oppose the mythical theory in detail; and Ullmann pointed out the weak points in its general logic.

Strauss was not chiefly a scholar. There was a sense in which, as Holtzmann says, "he had no right to speak in matters of pure scholarship." He was not an investigator who collects materials, he was an advocate who presents a case. His book transferred the point of discussion from the character of the authors and actors in the events of the New Testament history to the truthfulness of the accounts of those events, but the final result of his book was to turn the discussion to the authenticity of the writings in which those accounts were contained. Strauss had applied the idea of a myth to the explanation of the New Testament literature without any adequate investigation either of what that literature was and how it arose, or of what a myth was and how and under what circumstances it arose. But that investigation which he omitted his opponents conducted. The discussion of the second of these points was carried on through the application to the Gospel history of the new science of biblical theology, and of the first through the criticism of the sources of the life of Christ by the Tübingen school and its opponents.

To point out the logical relation of the Tübingen school to the mythical position of Strauss, to show how the discussion progressed from one to the other, is difficult. They can perhaps best be regarded as not logically, but historically connected methods, whose appearances at the same time and from the same source gave each an influence on the other. Both started from the same basis, a disbelief in the possibility of an absolute revelation in a historical fact or personage, but the spirit of Strauss was destructive, while that of Baur and his school was constructive. Strauss says the object is to find out "how we are not to present the Gospel history." Baur said "a negative result is not a scientific theory, but a confession of the incapacity of science." The object of criticism of the life of Christ is to discover its historical kernel, and that can only be accomplished by criticism of its sources. That historical kernel which lies at the basis of these sources he and his followers strove accordingly to find, not in the investigation of their contents, but by examination of the circumstances under which they arose. They found this explanation not in unconscious "myths," but in conscious "tendencies."
These two theories ("Myth" and "Tendency") were from their nature opposed, and yet springing, as they did, from the same view of the universe, and with the common purpose of explaining the New Testament literature in accordance with that view, they had points of affiliation, and exercised a strong mutual influence.

Strauss had omitted the investigation of the sources of the life of Christ, but the omission was a grave strategic error. If the Gospels, whoever their authors may be, were composed in the circle of those who had lived with Christ and only thirty years after His death, then it is impossible to account by his supposition of unconscious mythical distortion for the rise of the belief in those events of the life of Christ which do not accord with rationalistic presuppositions. Some time after the life of an individual, and among people who have not known him, a belief in the divinity of a hero might, with unconscious untruthfulness, finally express itself in a mythical account of his life, but not within one generation, and in the circle of the hero’s immediate friends. Hence Strauss’s theory implied that the prevailing views in regard to the time of the origin of the Gospels should be investigated and set aside. This was undertaken by the Tübingen school, not, however, in the interest of Strauss, but of their own theory. They endeavored to transfer the period of the rise of the Gospels from the first to the second century, from the time of the contemporaries and successors of Jesus to that of several generations later. Their method was that of historical criticism, but their basis and starting-point, like that of all forms of Rationalism, was metaphysical. The chief reason why they disputed the sufficiency of the proofs of the composition of the Gospels within four decenniums of the death of Christ, the chief argument for their later origin, remained, as Baur said, "always this, that each for itself, and much more all together, they relate so much about the life of Christ in a way in which it in reality never could have happened."

The theory of the origin of the New Testament writings, in whose interests they thus sought to transfer the date of the composition of the Gospels, was directly opposed to the theory of Strauss. As Neander had turned the idea of the life of Christ as an organic whole against Strauss’s destructive criticism of the details of that life, so the Tübingen school used the idea of each of the Gospels as an organic whole against his theory of their origin as a mere collection of myths. You can, it is true, look at any one gospel as a mere collection of materials, but it is much more. Those materials are arranged according to a plan. The picture which arises from each of the parts fits into the conception which one draws from the
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whole. Now, this plan, this purpose of the writer of each of these Gospels, gives the key which will explain his position in regard to the history he is writing, and the means of distinguishing in his work the historical material from that which is intentional and artistic working over and addition.

As Baur found his chief reason for rejecting the historical accuracy, and therefore determining the later date of the Gospels, in the view of the universe taught by Hegel, so he found the explanation of the form of these Gospels in the principles of Hegel's philosophy of history. According to this view, historical development proceeds by the rise, from the mutual interaction of two opposing principles, of a new reconciling principle, which again divides by the emergence of new elements; again reunites in a new form; and so on ad infinitum. These two opposing elements Baur found in Judaism and Paulinism, or the old narrow view of Christianity, held by Christ and His apostles, and the broad, universal view of Paul, who was the founder of modern Christianity. The Gospels arose under the influence of the conflict between these views, and the object of their authors was either to show that one had been the original teaching of Christ, or to help and strengthen that union which had been founded on the modification of both and the final triumph of Paulinism.

It is impossible, within the limits of this article, to trace the progress of the Tübingen school. Almost all possible combinations of the Gospels, and all possible shades of difference in regard to their historical accuracy, have arisen within its bounds. Two tendencies early made themselves manifest within it: (1) A tendency to decreasing disbelief in the historicity of the Gospels, which found its highest expression in the "crazy logic" of Bruno Bauer, who finally even doubted the existence of Christ; and (2) a tendency to an increasing belief in their historicity, which has kept on its steady growth until the present time. But with all these shades of difference the common standpoint remains the same—i.e., a denial of the admissibility of the historicity of the Gospels (Rationalistic) and a reference of their origin to the original conflict in the Apostolic Church (Tübingen).

The result of this working together of these different hypotheses of Strauss and the Tübingen school was to concentrate the weight of the discussion on the Gospel of John. The Gospel of John is an account of Christ's life written by an eye-witness of the events recorded, and to it is appended an attest of authenticity claiming to be from those who had known the author. The strong and full testimony to its apostolic origin has never been doubted until this century, and yet its character is such that the maintenance of its
genuineness is fatal alike to the "Tübingen" and "Myth" theory of its origin, or any combination of them. It is so pervaded with a belief in the divine character of Christ as to render it impossible that its author could have failed to believe that which he teaches so strongly unless he were a conscious liar; and at the same time so organic, complete, and compact that it is impossible to reduce it back to a collection of myths.

Even granting that one who had lived with Christ might in the lapse of time have come to see separate events in an exaggerated light, and to throw around them mythical elements, it is perfectly inconsistent with a belief in his honesty to suppose that he could have invented such a scene as the raising of Lazarus, with its minuteness of detail and the underlying belief that Christ had raised one who had been three days dead, unless there were some historical fact behind his belief. The only alternative is to return to the position of Reimarus, and make the author a conscious falsifier.

Then, if this Gospel, with its undeniably spiritual view of Christ's mission and kingdom, was written in the end of the first century, and accepted as genuine and historical by the Church, it is impossible to believe that narrow Judaistic views of that mission and kingdom could have had the influence which the Tübingen theory gives them. Hence it is at once evident why, in the face of these two theories and their combinations, the Gospel of John became the turning-point of the controversy.

The fortunes of the conflict have been varying. At first the victory leaned strongly to the side of the defenders of its genuineness. In his third edition of the "Life of Christ" Strauss withdrew many of his objections to the genuineness of John, confessed that he had overlooked many of the favorable arguments, and seemed about to withdraw his doubts in regard to it; but in his fourth edition he withdrew again his too-hasty admissions, and reasserted more strongly his old position. In 1855 Hase, in his open letter to Baur, defended the genuineness of John, but, according to his own testimony, "almost the entire free investigation of German Protestant theology went in the end against me." Later, Hase himself modified his position, and found that the Gospel was not written by the beloved disciple, but by one of his scholars shortly after his death, using materials gathered from his teaching. In 1875 Keim said: "Over no question in the province of the Gospels has the newer criticism, in spite of all bulwarks of prejudice, become so united as over the impossibility of using the Gospel of John for the more exact history of Jesus." And Hase remarks that it had come to such a pass that one who recognized
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the genuineness of John "almost put his scientific honor at stake."
"But," he continues, "that has not always been so, even among
those who had no lack of mind and willingness for untrammelled
investigation, and it can again become different without any injury
to intellect and intellectual freedom."

After the first demand for Strauss's "Life of Christ" was satisfied,
twenty years passed without the necessity of a new edition. Then
Strauss turned from the theologians, whom he had at first addressed,
to the nation, and published in 1864 his "Life of Christ for the
German Nation." The difference between the tone and the stand-
point of the two "Lives" is apparent from a glance at their prefaces.
The first work had been scientific, and proposed to accomplish in
the main a scientific purpose. His second is personal, and proposes
to accomplish a practical purpose. That purpose is "to drive
the little popes out of the Church;" and it is only as a means to this
end that he proposes to "put miracle out of religion." It is to
this, which he calls the completion of the work of the reformers,
that he summons the German nation. Not that he will therefore
"call it away from its political undertaking," but as a help to that
undertaking. "For we Germans can become politically free only
so far as we have succeeded in making ourselves intellectually,
religiously, and morally free."

Whence came this difference? What caused this change of tone,
and what is the reason for this confounding together of two entirely
distinct things, this looking at the Church of Christ as the turning-
point of a political system, as the obstacle in the way of a people's
unity and freedom? Simply that the parties in the strife had made
the terrible mistake of failing to render unto Caesar the things that
are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

Between the two editions of Strauss's book came a time of great
political ferment. During this period most of the absolute mon-
archies of Germany received limitations; across the tops of the barr-
icades constitutions were put into the hands of the people. But
this successful popular agitation, which followed the French Revo-

* It is a curious illustration of the tendency of human discussion and knowledge to
return upon itself that the Gospel of John should have become the centre of the
modern conflict over the life of Christ. There is an old tradition that this Gospel
was written against the Gnosis of Cerinthus, who denied that Christ had come in the
flesh, denied the identity between the man Jesus and the heavenly Christ. Now, what
is this but the essence of modern rationalism as stated by Lessing, that "religion can-
not have its basis in the belief in historical facts," or as applied to Christianity by
Strauss, "that the Christ ideal never has been or could be realized in a historical in-
dividual"? Are not both essentially the same thing—the denial that religion rests or can
rest on a fact and not on a doctrine? (Bernhard Weiss, Einleitung zum Evang. Joh.)
olution, brought reaction in its train, when the court parties endeavored to withdraw the concessions that had been wrung from them by the people. Then came those sorrowful times when the fortresses of half the States of Germany held captives who languished for years unable to obtain a trial, often for some such offence as a hot-blooded word spoken as a half-grown boy at the university. Now, a certain strong party in the German Church during this period of struggle made the great mistake of allowing the Church of Christ to be involved in the conflict. They carried the ark into the battle. Hengstenberg with the Evangelical Church newspaper, the most influential organ in the Prussian Church, deliberately set out to oppose rationalism and democracy as two necessarily and logically connected things. He preached the divine right of kings, asserting that God, "who names Himself Father, Lord, Judge, and King, has representatives in the earthly fathers, lords, judges, and kings, in which He reveals Himself; yes, God is not a God who is at a distance, but a God who is near. These images of God it is a service of God to obey."

But to this teaching in regard to the political duty of Christians to the State was added also a teaching in regard to the duty of the State to the Church. "The pretty phrases of liberal statesmen and teachers of political rights about the unconditional neutrality of the constituted powers in regard to all religions, and the unconditional toleration of the same, are nothing but mist and false appearance. It is entirely impossible for a constituted authority to treat in the same way in which they do their own religion those religions which are completely opposed to it."

It was the unformulated pressure of principles like these which made Neander and Ullmann, the first men who, when Strauss's "Life of Christ" appeared, resisted and made head against the panic it produced, withdraw from their connection with the organ which taught them. Their effect uttered during such a period, combined with a State policy which, scarcely more than a generation ago, imprisoned men for worshipping God according to their conscience, can be imagined. It seems as if in the last analysis it would be found one of the chief causes for that estrangement from the Church of the active, thinking, progressive men of Germany which still seems to exist to a greater or less degree.*

* Shortly before the appearance of Strauss's second "Life of Christ," Tholuck said, "Baur and Strauss are dead:" and Schwarz answered him, "Yes; but it is the German police State and the German police Church, through which the sad political reaction has been transferred to this circle also, that has killed them." The statement and the reproach may be utterly untrue and unfair, but is not the mere fact that it could be used in itself significant?
But the "Life of Christ for the German Nation" does not differ from the "Life of Christ" simply in tone and purpose. The earlier work had been criticised for lack of proper preliminary investigation of the sources, and in this life of Christ Strauss devotes a quarter of the whole space to that purpose. It had been criticised for its lack of positive result, and Strauss now devotes another quarter to a "Life of Christ in its Historical Outlines." But the most significant change is the adoption from the Tübingen school of the "tendency" theory as a support of his own "myth" theory. The pressure of criticism and the light of investigation had led him to join forces with the theory he had at first opposed. He says: "I have in this new presentation of the life of Christ, chiefly in consequence of Baur's argument, allowed much more room to the supposition of conscious and intentional composition, but I have found in this no reason to change my original idea...."

Strauss sums up his starting-points somewhat as follows:

I. "That the working principle in Christ is exclusively the divine; that from this His entire speaking and acting is without limit determined; this, and still more, is the presupposition of the New Testament authors, and therefore the evangelists find the miraculous in the life of Christ the surest guarantee for His superior dignity and the truth of His teaching."

II. That as, according to the standpoint of the science of the age, the Divine in Christ could never have expressed itself save in the form of the human, in compliance with the laws of natural working, "therefore the evangelists are not historical."

He then proceeds to show what portion of the evangelists' reports can be reconciled with the present position of science, and to account for the use of that in their reports which cannot thus be reconciled.

It was in regard to the first of these positions (1) that Strauss was the most vulnerable on his own chosen ground. It was a striking method of attack to oppose the man who endeavored to explain the Gospels by the idea of the myth, by attempting to show him that he had misunderstood both the nature of that which he attempted to explain and of that by which he attempted to explain it. The science of biblical theology was turned against Strauss with deadly effect.

Whatever date be assigned to the Gospels, we possess in some of the other books of the New Testament writings of earlier or contemporary date, and if the stories of Christ's life contained in the Gospels are the result of the ideas of the early Christian community seeking expression in consciously or unconsciously falsified history, then those ideas must appear in the other contemporary writings as
tendencies working or beginning to work. Now, in regard to the
general proposition that the evangelists find the surest guarantee
for the higher dignity of Christ in His miracles, it can be shown as
an absolute fact that the New Testament writings do not point to
the miracles of Christ as a proof of His divinity at all. How, then,
in a community that did not use the miracles of Christ as a proof of
His divinity, could a myth which asserted them have arisen from a
desire to express by them the belief in His divinity? Strauss had
committed the error of transferring to the age when the New Testa-
ment writings were composed the theological ideas of the age when
he composed his criticism of them.

But there is in the "Life of Christ for the German Nation" not
only a marked change of tone, but a logical evolution of philosophic
standpoint. Pantheism seems very remote from atheism, but it is
really very close to it. The next thing to all God is no God. If
there be in the universe but one all-embracing substance, if I who
think, the thought that I think, and that about which I think, are one
and the same thing appearing under different forms, then it requires
but a choice of another mode of expression, to put this whole into
terms of matter rather than of mind, and from idealism to come to
materialism. Strauss had received the pantheism of Spinoza
through Hegel, but he accepted it in the materialistic form of its
originator rather than in the new and more spiritualistic shape of
its combiner. He made God = man; but whereas Spinoza had been
indifferent to the resulting loss of moral freedom, Strauss was not.
His tone of thought was practical. His strongest sympathies were
for the moral autonomy, for the assurance that in the end all
depends upon the moral tone of feeling and practical honesty. For
long he held the two together without perceiving the contradiction
between them.

Hegel had found the unity of all things in the idea, and God
became "the eternal movement of the substance continually making
itself subject," or, in other words, "the always personifying itself." But if God be "the always personifying itself," then is the moment
of absoluteness to be found, not in the beginning, but in the result
of the process. Pantheism changes to anthropologism, and the
equation reads Man = God.

This was the step taken by Feuerbach, who, denying God and
immortality, proposed to make the worshipper the object of his own
worship, man his own God. He denounced religion as not only a
negatively imperfect, but a positively injurious idea, and defined it
anew as "the relation of man to himself or to his essential being,
but as if to another essential being." But although Feuerbach
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denied all that makes religion possible, he still tried to cling to
religion. He tries not to fall into that belief in nothing except
individual atoms and their connections, which is raw materialistic
atheism. "He speaks of the idea of the race, mankind, as of a
real existence unto which the individual has to raise himself and
through which he has to purify himself. In short, he makes out of
this general idea which has taken possession of the throne of the
Godhead, a mythical existence, about which he speaks with an
enthusiasm and devotion peculiar to himself."

It was this anthropological materialism that Strauss had adopted
and made the philosophic basis of his new life of Christ.*

Luthardt said that the last book of Strauss was an anachronism,
that it belonged to a past age; and his prophecy that it would not
make the impression of the first "Life of Jesus" has been fulfilled.
He gave as a reason for thus regarding it that it was written from a
philosophic and not a historical standpoint. "Whoever desires
to write a 'Life of Christ' must write in such a way that we under-
stand Christianity from the person of Christ out, and must not point
us back to the Hegelian process of the idea. We have passed that
stage. For that we have become too scientific and historical."

And he was right. The criticism of the life of Christ had, since
the time of the publication of Strauss's first book, entered on a new
stage. It had become positive, scientific, and historical. This
change, although accompanied in the case of representative men by
a change of philosophic starting-point, yet was not caused by that
philosophic change. It was not so much conditioned by an altera-
tion of philosophic basis as by the adaptation of a new method, and
the transference of the starting-point outside the realm of phi-
losophy.

* (Strauss, "Old and New Faith," 11th edition, 1881.) Following this direction, the
greatest "genius of denial" that Germany has seen finally reached the end of all
things, and raised in the "Old and New Faith" the standard of crass materialism. He
denies God and the immortality of anything that thinks; sharply denies that he and
his followers are in any sense Christians, and then naturally remains in doubt as to
whether they have any religion. Mixing together eighteenth century deism, Laplace,
Haeckel, and the bathybius, Goethe, Kant, and Von Hartmann, he finally draws from
this compound a view of the universe, which shows man "standing helpless within an
enormous machine, with iron-toothed wheels and heavy hammers, which on the
smallest incautious movement will tear and grind him to pieces." And in his final
word on Jesus Christ he returns to the judgment of Reimarus. "As much as we pity
Christ because of the superior qualities of His heart and the noble objects of His activity,
as much as we feel compelled to consider the punishment inflicted on Him as a cruel
and unjust one, still we cannot help the judgment that such weakly sentimental ex-
pectation only receives its due when it is destroyed by failure." As Hase sadly re-
marks, "That was the conclusion of Strauss's investigation of the life of Christ."
The advance in natural science and the sudden prominence given to its methods exerted a great influence on the criticism of the "Life of Christ," as it did on all other branches of human inquiry. That influence produced such a change of temper in the learned world as made it henceforth disinclined to base an entire estimate of a series of historical facts like the life of Christ, solely on philosophical presuppositions in regard to the nature of the universe. Impossible as it is to reach a final conclusion on any subject having practical relations to life without reference to the investigator's scheme of the universe, the time was past in which a scheme of the universe could be assumed as the sole foundation and absolutely determining factor in an investigation of fact. When we hereafter speak of Rationalistic criticism of the life of Christ, it is not true Rationalism that we mean, not a system of criticism which denies a priori the possibility of the incarnation, but a weakened Rationalism which is not the logical Rationalism of the older stages, but rather an inherited disinclination or disability to believe.

This position is insecure because it is indefinite and rests upon a feeling whose formulated and logical statement its possessors would consider unscientific. Hence it has laid them open to attack from both sides, and they have been assailed not only by those who are more willing to believe, but also by those who decline to believe at all. Strauss,* representing the retrograde movement which has carried him back to the position of Reimarus, and speaking of the attack which had been made upon his last utterances by the combined forces of this third stage of Rationalism, their orthodox opponents, compared himself to Paul before the Sanhedrin, and said it was only necessary for him to cry out: "Men and brethren of the belief in the Godhead of Jesus, I am called in question," to divide his accusers into two hostile bodies and turn them against each other.

But the ways in which the different writers of this third stage of Rationalistic Criticism endeavor to explain the existence and contents of the New Testament, differ from the positions of the previous stages not only because they are based less upon a priori considerations, but also because of the necessities of discussion and the facts established in regard to the life of Christ.

Strauss had avoided the necessity of affixing moral stain to Christ while disbelieving in the reality of His miracles and the truth of His exalted claims in regard to Himself, by considering the reports of those miracles and claims exaggerated myths. The Tübingen school had either disregarded the moral stain which their theory

---

* In his "Old and New Faith."
affixed to the New Testament writers, or removed it from the immediate circle of Jesus, by changing the date of the composition of the New Testament literature to the second century. There was, however, one fatal defect in their system. The four letters of Paul were admitted to be genuine and written by one whose claim to have talked with the apostles and examined certain facts in regard to the life of Christ shortly after His death, there is no reason to doubt. Now, from these letters of Paul we gather three facts in regard to the belief of the apostles about Jesus, which involve both the mythical and the tendency theory in tremendous difficulties. We learn from them, first, that Christ impressed His followers and daily companions as a supernatural being possessed of supernatural powers; second, that He had prophesied to them His return in the clouds of heaven to judge the earth; and third, that they believed Him to have risen from the dead and appeared to them three days after His burial. Neither the “myth” nor the “tendency” theory can account for the existence, so short a time after the death of Jesus, of such impressions in the minds of men who had actually known Him.

The effect of Strauss’s first “Life of Jesus” and the theory of the Tübingen school had been to transfer the discussion first to the apostolic and then to the post-apostolic age; but the outcome of that discussion brought it back again to the life of Christ. If, as Baur said, the chief reason for rejecting the authenticity of the New Testament writings always remained that they related what could not have happened, then it was necessary to investigate that which they related in order to see if it could have happened. It was seen that the three beliefs of the early Church shown in the letters of Paul, that Christ possessed miraculous powers, that He prophesied His return in the clouds of heaven, that He rose from the dead, required some explanation in the life of Him to whom they were attached.

The doctrines and systems of the Church might have been developed by the contest between Paulinism and Judaism, but this contest could never have created the historical groundwork of belief which it developed, because that groundwork existed before Paul entered the Church. The basis and starting-point of Christianity is not “an idea striving to develop itself in an unending process,” but a historical person.

And the position of the newer Rationalism was also modified by the result of the discussion in regard to the date and authenticity of the New Testament literature. The modern lives of Christ, though relying on various forms and combinations of the “myth” and
"tendency" theories to supply many points of explanation, yet differ from both Strauss and Baur. They differ from Strauss in that they are more positive, and start not from the most uncertain, but from the most certain. They differ from Baur in that they find this most certain in historical facts of the life of Jesus of Nazareth. Perhaps this cannot be better shown than by an extract from Schenkel's criticism of Strauss's "Old and New Faith." "It is far from my intention to depreciate the value of the service performed by Strauss in his 'Life of Christ.' Like a fresh breath of wind it blows through the desert steppes of Rationalism, like a weighty sword-stroke it beats down the half logic of Supernaturalism. But from his doctrinaire sceptical standpoint Strauss has never been just to the reality of the facts and the concrete powers of history. And especially in this book he decides more like an opposing advocate than an unprejudiced investigator in regard to Jesus and Christendom. His assertion that the three first Gospels are compilations made to serve a purpose in the beginning of the second century is a categorical claim that those who have made no personal investigation of the gospel literature may trust, but as thus expressed it is, to say the very least, a sturdy anachronism. The Tübingen school, indeed, a generation ago, tried to found a similar conception of the origin of the Gospels, but the new scientific investigation as it has been conducted by Holtzmann, Weizsacker, Hilgenfeld, Keim, Lipsius, Hausrath, and other honored names, has long ago shown that the origin of the three first Gospels falls in the first century, and the compilation of the evangelical basis writing (Mark) before the destruction of Jerusalem—that is to say, before the year 70."

Along with and closely related to this positive historical element comes another new element which we may call the biographical. This is traceable to the influence of the "Life of Jesus" by Renan, which, although exerting less scientific influence, won a much larger popular success than the books of Strauss. In four years it ran through thirteen French editions, and was quickly translated into every European language. It is the dramatic element which was new in the book, and it is the plastic power of its historical imagination which makes its charm.

And since Renan, this biographical and dramatic element has always been present in German lives of Christ. Even those of the strongest orthodox tendencies give weight to the plain fact that He who lived from childhood to manhood on the earth possessed not only a human body, but a reasonable soul, and that, even as the first grew, so the second must have developed. They have perceived and pointed out the error of Strauss in claiming that the Christ of
the evangelists is a character without the possibility of development, who brings everything from heaven with Him that is necessary for His purpose, and have striven to answer his demand, so far as it can be answered, for a life of Christ that, "biographically considered, can be mentally grasped."

These, then, are the characteristics of the newer criticism of the life of Christ; that it is more a posteriori and less a priori, giving more weight to historical investigation of the sources and less to philosophical presuppositions; second, that it is more positive and less negative; and third, that it is biographical and dramatic.

As representatives of these men whose rationalism differs from that of the earlier stages of the criticism of the life of Christ in that it is, to a greater or less degree, an inherited rather than a self-assumed position, a tendency rather than a logical principle, let us take four: Schenkel, Hausrath, Volkmar, and Keim.*

It is a remarkable fact, because it is in no sense a necessary result of their position, that these four men, who since the time of Strauss have made the most influential attempts to present the life of Christ from a standpoint that in any proper sense can be called rationalistic, are theists. They all believe in a God, a creative and preserving Spirit, who resembles the human spirit more than anything else within the range of our knowledge.

And this is only one of the necessary outcomes of the philosophic position of the preceding generation. Pantheism is a floating position which cannot be long maintained. As soon as it descends from metaphysical speculation to the firm ground of a practical undertaking, it must abandon its position of changing equilibrium and begin to determine itself toward one of two resting-places. These are materialism and speculative theism. The first was reached by Feuerbach and popularly expressed by Strauss; the second by the men whom we are considering.†

Strauss said that when "Hegel pictured the universal, all-embracing substance as a subject or mind, he gave his interpreters a riddle


† The middle position occupied by Von Hartmann in his "Philosophy of the Unconscious," in which the world is expressed in terms of a substance partaking of the qualities both of mind and matter, has not yet found its practical expression in the historical field of the life of Christ.
and his followers a refuge." That refuge they have found in "Speculative Theism."

The difference between "Speculative Theism," indeed, the Theism of this age in general, and that of the eighteenth century, is difficult to express; but no one who compares Janet’s "Final Causes" with Paley’s "Natural Theology" can fail to perceive that there is a difference, readily appreciable though not easily formulated. Dualism and monism, transcendence and immanence, mechanical and dynamic, inner and outer design, have all been used to explain this difference. It is not either possible or necessary to follow here the points of this contrast. It is sufficient as an indication of its practical influence on the criticism of the life of Christ to notice not where it differs, but where it agrees, with the old theism. No one who still forms his idea of the universe in accordance with Paley will care to quarrel with the practical religious outcome of the "modern view" of that universe, so long as, with Lang, although denying a "personal" it admits a "living God;" an absolute spirit that stands opposite the perishable as a something to which the personal pronoun can be addressed; a creative principle for which 'Father in heaven' is not only the most beautiful, but also the deepest and most exhaustive name.*

Secondly. The positive presentations agree in ascribing to Christ a peculiar religious genius, a peculiar moral purity and relation to God, which no other man in the history of the world has ever possessed. Hence it is that He has produced effects and assumes a position which has no parallel among religious teachers. He is not, it is true, a God, but He is the greatest of mankind. And so the criticism of the life of Christ from this side tends to return to a belief in the broadness and universality of His teaching. The change from the criticism of the contents of the Gospels to the criticism of the Gospels themselves had transferred the interest from the age of Christ to the age of the apostles; and the study of the age of the apostles had brought the emphasis of inquiry back again to the age of Christ through the letters of Paul. But the Christ thus reached was naturally more the Christ of the man by whose writings He was reached. While the Tübingen school had appealed to the Judaism of Christ to account for the narrowness of Peter, these later presentations of the life of Christ appeal to the broadness of Christ to account for the universalism of Paul.

Thirdly. They all agree in a deep veneration for Christ and in giving the highest value to His influence and worship. Even while

* Perhaps the best definition of Speculative Theism is belief in a God "in whom all things live and move and have their being."
refusing belief they use the language of faith. Volkmar, after rejecting the immaculate conception, the resurrection, and most of the miracles, closes his book with this confession of faith: "The Church of God, according to the meaning and foundation of Jesus, is as immortal as He Himself. Who, then, can prevent us, on the occasion of the consecration of every child to the intent that it may become a child of God by the hand of Jesus, from speaking out our faith with the Church of all ages?

"I believe on the one God, the Almighty Father, who has created us.

"I believe on Jesus Christ, the Son of man and Son of God, who has redeemed us.

"I believe on the Holy Ghost, who sanctifies us through the one universal Church to His eternal kingdom of God."

Hausrath says: "Such a personage as Jesus of Nazareth could not live and preach in Judea in the first century," and the death of Jesus followed of necessity from the existing circumstances. "That the springs of this life course belong, in spite of this, to a higher order it is superfluous for us to say. Our faith gives to the question, Why was it necessary for Christ to die on the cross? another answer than that given by the history of Christ's age, and a more complete one; for the history of the ideal is never a single history, and has always a deeper meaning than that which lies within the striving and streaming of days that rush swiftly by; an eternal meaning and an absolute content that does not belong to the history of an age, but of the human race, and in which every individual has to honor a mystery of grace realized in himself." "The origin of Christianity cannot be found in the circumstances of the age. Favoring relations, possible conditions, unavoidable catastrophes, have existed before, and still no new religion has proceeded from them because the formative, creative spirit was wanting to the chaos. Christianity is the work of Christ, not of the circumstances. The personal life, however, this creative spirit, is always an immediate act of God that cannot be further explained and accounted for. Here is the thread to be sought through which things are joined immediately to God."

Schenkel says: "Jesus was not an ordinary man. In the department of religious life He stands alone as no one before Him had done, and as no one after Him can do, because He first and once for all has shown to mankind their true relation to God, not only through teaching, but also through personal self-revelation." "He is the object of our faith because we see in Him the most perfect organ of Divine self-revelation in the consciousness of mankind."
"The revelation which He came to make was that God is love. This revelation He made through His teaching, but still more effectually through His death." "The merciful love, as whose self-conscious sacrifice He died, called the ordinances of the law which had killed Him before the judgment-seat. His death was essentially the death of the legal ordinances of the priests, of the bloody offerings of the State religions, and therefore the beginning of the life of a new religion whose characteristics were love of God and love of our neighbor."

Fourthly. They all show a tendency more or less strong to admit a residuum of mystery in the life of Christ after the sharpest historical criticism, a something which defies analysis and rises above explanation, a something before which science and scientific methods are powerless. In other words, being all theists, they show a tendency to unite the life of Jesus of Nazareth with the existence and purpose of God.

Strauss has said a good test of a man’s belief in regard to Christ, as well as a criterion of his views of the universe, is afforded by the position he takes in regard to the resurrection of Jesus.

Reimarus considered it a cheat. Paulus a mistake. Strauss, opening a new era, transferred it from the realm of fact to that of fancy, and found in it a poem. (In his last or retrogressive position he called it "a world historical humbug.") Baur admitted the belief of the apostles, but did not explain it.

To display the views of the four representatives of modern Rationalism on this subject will show at a glance the way in which an inherited disinclination to disbelieve modifies their conclusions, and how in practice they give a determining influence to a priori considerations which they deny in theory.

"It is," says Schenkel, "a reliable fact that in the early morning of the first day of the week which followed the crucifixion, the grave of Jesus was found open and empty." It is also "a reliable fact that the apostles were convinced that they had seen appearances of their crucified Master." And third, "it is a reliable fact that the appearances of the resurrected Master which the elder apostles saw were, according to the conviction of the Apostle Paul, of the same nature as the vision of Christ which he himself beheld." And yet "the reference of objective results to purely subjective causes is a supposition from which science shrinks. When the picture of the crucified Master gleamed out in the minds of the disciples as that of a victor over death and the grave, we can see in it not the mere chance of a passing nervous excitement, but the work of a Divine providence; and in this picture, even though its form and coloring
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were products of subjectivity, the imperishable existence of the personality of the Master as lifted far above earthly limitations was displayed to the disciples. Here we have arrived at a point where history finds its bounds. We stand here before a mystery of faith, and the origin of Christianity as an origin in faith is proved to us as through a certainty.

"But the last riddle of the resurrection still remains the open and empty grave." To account for this Schenkel supposes that Pilate repented of his grant of an honorable burial, and fearing lest the tomb of Jesus should become the centre of a cultus, and willing to please the hierarchy, gave them permission to remove the body. This they secretly did, and the story of the seal and watch of Matthew is the outgrowth of a real fact.

Volkmar says: "The resurrection of the crucified Master after three days was the chief thing in the preaching of the apostles. Their belief in this fact became the impulse for the formation of the Church." That belief arose as follows: "As Simon Peter went toward Galilee after the crucifixion, revolving in his heart all the life of Jesus, the Master, as the first historian suggestively relates, went before him the whole way, remained spiritually continually before his soul, until at length on the third day He appeared before his eyes, and he cried out in ecstasy: 'Thou art the Christ.'" The belief that Peter had formerly perceived and confessed this truth at Caesarea Philippi is an error. "This confession could only have been made at the end of Christ's whole ministry, which He sealed by the cross; yes, only after He had triumphed over that cross and on the first day of the week appeared at the right hand of God." The author of the Gospel knew this perfectly well, but transferred the confession to the middle of his book. "For if the world-historical life of Christ, with the healing for all which it wrought, was to be presented in the frame of His life before the cross, then the presentation of the confession of Peter must close the account of His labors before the historian went on to the presentation of His sufferings." There are, indeed, references in the "primitive documents" to the appearance of Christ to others, but "all these appearances were of such a similar nature in the glory of heaven like the one to Paul, that we can join them altogether in one—the one at the beginning in Galilee to Peter, that quickly became a possession of the others." "It is evident," says Volkmar, "that Christ was not buried after crucifixion." First, it is impossible that Pilate would have permitted it; second, it is uncertain that the disciples would have had the courage. Mark must have known perfectly well that Christ was not buried, for he was a native of Jerusalem, present
at the arrest, and had full opportunity of finding out everything in regard to the end of the Lord; but he could not permit his Master to be thus dishonored, "and so his Gospel began to build for the crucified King His honorable grave—the kingly grave with closing stone." "Whoever takes the account of Matthew as historical," Volkmar continues, "can only think of an earthly appearance of the risen One by the grave"—that is, "an awakening from a merely apparent death which robs Him of all Easter joy," or fall back on the belief in "a cheat on the part of the disciples." Just why Volkmar considers this dilemma necessary does not appear. Strauss had said in his latest book: "To speak to an educated man of the ascension as a historical fact is to-day an insult." And from his position of raw materialism, which denied God and immortality, his assertion, though arrogant, is logical. A similar position on the part of the Pantheist, who believes that "the idea never reaches its highest realization in a historical individual," or of the Deist, who makes the relation of God to the world too mechanical to permit Him to interpose in the working of its laws, is also logical. But that a man who proceeds on a purely historical method without metaphysical presuppositions, who believes in a God, uses the Lord's Prayer, and considers Christ as "an appearance for which there is hardly an analogy and no parallel in the entire history of mankind," should thus pass by absolutely without consideration the explanation that Christ really rose from the grave, can only be accounted for on the supposition that he is unconsciously swayed by a priori considerations whose right to decide in such a case he denies. Why should he think it a thing incredible that God should raise the dead?

Keim, upon whose youthful shoulders Strauss had once hoped that his mantle would fall, said finally of the resurrection: "The vision hypothesis either assigns the origin of Christianity to a chance, or believes that God inflicted on the apostles a self-deceiving ophthalmia." In view of the "unrejectable, reliable, and full testimony," another explanation must be found. "There is only one remaining—that is, the old view of the apostles, 'We have seen the Lord'—a view that to-day is still frankly held by many investigators, in whom, with all possible freedom of thought, the belief on higher regulation ruling over natural regulation is not lost."

German Rationalism in the persons of some of its noblest representatives seems to linger on the threshold half afraid to enter. Clinging to those beliefs which alone can bring the fragrance of the spring into the days of life's autumn, and light the falling darkness with the colors of dawn, they stand at the portal of that great temple where for twenty centuries human fears have been stilled, human
sorrows soothed, human hopes assured, looking with loving hearts at that face which makes visible to mortal eyes the God in whom all things live, wishing that they might fall at His feet and cry: "My Lord and my God."

One thing becomes clear to the student of the criticism of the life of Christ. If any theory can be formed to account for that life other than that of the men from whom we gain our knowledge of it, it must be a composite one. If those who defend the belief of the apostles have been, and are, involved in difficulties in regard to the details of the life of Christ, those who refuse to accept that belief have been, and are, involved in difficulties in regard to their main theory of that life.

Every theory that has attempted to account for the facts has broken down. Reimarus attempted to find an explanation of the New Testament literature in the weak badness of the founders of Christianity, and Paulus in an artificial explanation of the facts. Strauss strove to find it in the unconscious exaggeration of a myth-building age, but was compelled to admit the necessity of assuming, with the Tübingen school, the intentional deception of the New Testament writers, and thus, through them, to support himself partly by the position of Reimarus. The modern Positive school reject both Strauss and the old Tübingen position, but they call in their aid in many steps in their presentation of the life of Christ. They reject the natural explanations of Paulus, looked on with scorn by the previous mythical school, and yet in their explanations of the healing wonders as a whole, and in regard to the empty grave of Christ and other points, they have fallen back upon their support.

The result of three generations of discussion of the life of Christ cannot be said to have established an unfavorable polemic position for those who claim that the facts recorded in the New Testament, and the belief of the men who made and accepted those records, can only be accounted for on the supposition that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God.

The positions which they may assume and defend, not as matters of religious faith, but on purely historical grounds, seem to be as follows:

1. If it be admitted that there is a God, and that He is capable of revealing Himself to man, it can be shown from the three Synoptic Gospels and the Greater Epistles that God has revealed Himself to man as incarnate in Jesus Christ.

2. If the question as to whether there be a God and what that God is like is left open, then from the three Synoptic Gospels and
the Greater Epistles it can be shown that there is the strongest reason to believe that God lived on earth as Jesus Christ.

3. If it be decided that there is no God who could live on earth as Jesus Christ, and at the same time admitted that the Gospel of John is from the hand of an apostle, then the admission destroys the decision, for it can be shown, according to the rules of historical criticism, that the life of Jesus of Nazareth can be accounted for on no other supposition than that He was the incarnate God.

Whether the great mass of critics on both sides of the controversy will ever come to grant to the Gospel of John such a degree of authenticity as they now grant to the Synoptic Gospels cannot be foretold. But one thing is certain: such a result can only be obtained, either in Germany or in this country, by a full, free, and untrammeled investigation on the purely historical basis, without prejudice or acrimony, ruled by that truly reverent spirit which knows that the only foundation of faith is knowledge, and the only worthy end and outcome of knowledge is religion.

Paul van Dyke.
THE PROPOSED SCHOOL OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AND PHILOLOGY IN THE EAST.

EVER since the genius of Dr. Edward Robinson was turned to the subject of Palestine exploration, the land of the Bible has occupied a prominent place in the minds of all students of the sacred Scriptures. Before his time feeble attempts had been made to dispel the darkness that hung over the desolated country, but Dr. Robinson gave the scholarly world the first clear light upon the subject; and that light has shone so effectively that it has not been dimmed by the labors of later explorers. The superficial work of Palestine exploration has, it is true, been carried out much more completely since his day, but no one has entered so profoundly into the essential questions at stake or given the subject a more scientific treatment than he. His reputation is as great in Europe as in America, and no one pretends to write on the subject of Palestine without making a careful study of "Biblical Researches in Syria and Palestine." It must always be a source of pride to American scholars that one of their own number should have led the way into so important and fruitful a field of discovery.

In the light of our present knowledge it seems at first sight almost unaccountable that the Church of Christ managed for so many centuries to miss the true significance of the land of the Scriptures. Ever since the Empress Helena flashed back to Constantinople the news of the supposed discovery of the true cross, the heart of Christendom has beaten warmly at the thought of the "Holy Land." Nothing has had power to suppress the conviction that in some way or other Palestine has a wealth of meaning to the world which ought not to be ignored. In days of comparative ignorance that feeling has taken on extravagant and even monstrous shapes. Jerome was disgusted at this form of puerility in his day and attempted to stem the tide of absurdity. Chrysostom laughed at the extravagant mania for pilgrimage which led many people to make long journeys into Arabia to visit the dunghill upon which the patient patriarch sat and scratched himself with a potsherd. Yet
underneath this passion for pilgrimage there has been a vein of honest simplicity and even pathos. Of its most modern aspect Mr. Charles Dudley Warner remarks: "We hear more of the pilgrimage to Mecca than of that to Jerusalem; but I think the latter is the more remarkable phenomenon of our modern life. I believe it equals the former, which is usually overrated, in numbers, and it certainly equals it in zeal and surpasses it in the variety of nationalities represented. The pilgrims of the cross increase yearly; to supply their wants, to minister to their credulity, to traffic in their faith, is the great business of the Holy City. Few, I imagine, who are not in Palestine in the spring have any idea of the extent of this vast yearly movement of Christian people upon the Holy Land, or of the simple zeal which characterizes it. If it were in any way obstructed or hindered, we should have a repetition of the Crusades on a vaster scale and gathered from a broader area than the wildest pilgrimage of the holy war. The driblets of travel from America and from Western Europe are as nothing in the crowds thronging to Jerusalem from Ethiopia to Siberia, from the Baltic to the Ural Mountains. Already for a year before Easter season have they been on foot, slowly pushing their way across great steppes, through snows and over rivers, crossing deserts and traversing unfriendly countries, the old, the infirm, women as well as men, their faces set toward Jerusalem. No common curiosity moves this mass from Ethiopia, from Egypt, from Russia, from European Turkey, from Asia Minor, from the banks of the Tigris and the Araxes; it is a true pilgrimage of faith, the one event in a life of dull monotony and sordid cares, the one ecstasy of poetry in an existence of poverty and ignorance."

As we trace this strange phenomenon down through the centuries we discover certain interesting phases appearing at different stages, in which each succeeding combination seems to include all that went before. The first phase may be called the building era. The eloquent words of Eusebius at the dedication of the first chapel of the Holy Sepulchre gave the key-note to the epoch. Royalty set its seal upon the spirit of devotion by erecting churches throughout Palestine, the remains of many of which exist to the present day. As long as the Roman Empire continued to police the Mediterranean pilgrims flocked to the Holy City in increasing numbers. Jerome dwelt in the cave at Bethlehem. St. Sabas and his followers chose their retreat the wild gorge of the lower Kidron. The precipices of the Wady-el-Kelt and the cliffs above Jericho swarmed with

* "In the Levant," pp. 71, 72.
hermits. The whole country became a shrine. Every rock was a chapel, and every pool or running stream a baptismal font.

When these venerated altars fell into the hands of the Saracens, when freedom of pilgrimage and worship was interfered with, when disgrace and ignominy were heaped upon the heads of the Christians, when cruel persecution, robbery, murder, and a lingering death in the damp dungeon faced the pious pilgrim, the dawn of a new and a bloody era was ushered in—the crusading era. This time the impetus came from a new direction. Not now the magnificent patronage of the court at Constantinople, but the more than royal edict from the pontifical chair at Rome, backed by the iron thrones of mediæval Europe and the aroused indignation and religious zeal of Celt and Saxon, gave the key-note. The best blood of Europe was poured out freely, and the shrines of the earlier pilgrims were stained and consecrated by the sacrifice. Mediæval Europe did its best, and alas! to how little purpose!

Then followed a long period of stagnation. Pilgrims, who had been soured by the long contest of arms, kept pouring into the country. Jerusalem became the arena for a bitter, unrelenting, Christless struggle of sect. Absurdity was heaped upon absurdity, and blows were answered by blood, until the Moslem soldiers grimly took their places in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to keep the Christian mobs from violence.

The brilliant Frenchman, M. Renan, has called Palestine "The Fifth Gospel." A profound fact lies under this happy figure. Since the days when Christianity first came out from under the cloud of the early persecutions her followers have been trying to read this "fifth gospel." They have read it, for the most part, as they read the other four, with their imaginations rather than with the eye of understanding. As it has been the work of our generation to vindicate the genuineness and validity of the four gospels with a force of emphasis never before reached, so it has fallen to the lot of this century to open up to view the real text of this "fifth gospel," to show its harmony with the other four, to bring its plain meaning home to the hearts of men. The age of relic-hunting is over and the era of exploration has come. Modern unbelief assails the Bible at the point of reality, the question of fact. Christian scholarship has met the objectors on their own ground. No ancient manuscript of the four gospels, or, indeed, of any writing of antiquity, ever received a keener scrutiny or passed through fiercer fires of criticism than the text of this "fifth gospel."*

* See Christian at Work, August 5th, 1886.
Dr. Edward Robinson began the work of profound research in 1838. With the aid of the veteran missionary and scholar, Dr. Eli Smith, he went over the whole field and startled the world of Biblical scholarship by his remarkable discoveries. Soon after appeared his "Biblical Researches in Syria and Palestine," published simultaneously in America, England, and Germany. He made a second journey to Palestine in 1852, after which he brought out a new volume and carefully revised his earlier treatises. In the mean time Lieutenant W. F. Lynch had made extensive researches under the United States Government, and in 1849 had published his "Exploration of the Jordan and the Dead Sea." De Sauley, Tobler, and Van der Welde had already begun their patient labors. Dean Stanley's brilliant treatise, entitled "Sinai and Palestine," appeared in 1857. In 1859 came the first edition of Dr. William M. Thomson's monumental work, "The Land and the Book." In 1864 the English Palestine Exploration Fund was established "for the accurate and systematic investigation of the Archaeology, Topography, Geology and Physical Geography, Natural History, Manners and Customs of the Holy Land for Bible Illustration." In 1870 the American Palestine Exploration Society was organized. The labor of exploration was then divided, the English going on with their work in Western Palestine and the Americans taking up the much more difficult task of exploring the dangerous territory east of the Jordan. The Egyptian Exploration Society, receiving its funds both from America and England, has lately attracted great interest, and the Wolfe Expedition to Babylonia in 1885 shows that American scholars are not content to let the mysteries of the ancient world go unsolved.

It is impossible in this connection to notice the large number of treatises which have appeared under the patronage of these various societies. A mass of facts has been collected, the value of which has not yet been fully appreciated. The hindrances to the work have been many, but it has been pushed steadily along. The more important sections of Palestine have been accurately surveyed. Extensive excavations in the Mesopotamian valley have almost revolutionized Shemitic learning. Old languages have come forth from the tomb of the centuries, and unknown nations have come upon the stage of history. From the discovery of the Moabite stone until the very recent unearthing of "Pharaoh's house in Tahpauhe," in the north-eastern portion of the delta of the Nile, the world of Biblical scholarship has been gratified by a constant succession of valuable and startling discoveries; and the end is not yet. Any light that can be thrown upon the ancient Shemitic world will illu-
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minate the Bible. Although we cannot expect any remarkable results to come from excavations in Western Palestine, it is certain that the archaeological treasures still under the soil of Western Asia vastly exceed in amount and value those that have yet come to light.

But the results thus far in this era of exploration have exceeded the expectations of all. To-day we have enough light to enable us to go to work profoundly upon the various and intricate problems of ancient life and thought in Western Asia. The work of exploration is by no means finished, but we have already entered upon a new era, which includes all that have gone before and which will dominate the future. To borrow a figure from physiology, it may be called the era of assimilation. The dry bones have been discovered; we must now clothe them with flesh. We have the text of the "fifth gospel" fairly edited; we must now get at its full meaning. Scholars have been reaping the benefit thus far; the matter must now be brought within the grasp of all, and the text of the Scriptures illuminated by the rays of the Syrian sun. The "letter" of this "fifth gospel" is not so important as its "spirit."

To be sure that the era of classification and assimilation has really begun, one has only to take a brief glance at the religious publications of the day. If the interest in Oriental and especially Biblical questions is to be measured by the amount of literature relating to these lands of the East, it would be difficult to find a rival. A school of vigorous young scholars has arisen of late in America which has emphasized and popularized Semitic learning. It has been remarked that more volumes devoted to a narration of the life of Christ have appeared during the last quarter of a century than during any equal period of time. Bible helps have sprung up on every side. The local coloring thrown upon the sacred text has made it a fresh revelation to many. Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments are out of date which do not "smack of the soil." The Bible, while it more and more impresses itself upon the world as a cosmopolitan book, is seen to be a distinctively Oriental book, and must be interpreted from the Oriental standpoint. Many errors have crept into our interpretation of the Scriptures because we have been blind to this fact. We have been reading into them too many Western ideas. We have done too much of what Dr. Schaff calls eisegesis and too little exegesis.

If one thing more than another is indicative of the powerful hold the Bible has upon the Christian world, it is the anxious scrutiny which Christian students give to every fact that seems to affect the text and interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. In his "Life of Christ," Weiss remarks: "This age has turned from a one-sided
preference of idealistic speculation, and longs for the realities of history." Our practical age has turned its eyes to Palestine and the East, and is resolved to get at the facts from every side. "A divine revelation," says Dr. Merrill, "implies history and history implies locality; hence it would seem that the last ought to be carefully studied if the Old and New Testaments, which originated in Palestine, are to be thoroughly understood."

The only work in the way of exploring Western Asia that has been at all fruitful has been systematic work not far removed from the base of supplies. The various exploration societies were founded on this conviction. Dr. Robinson and Dr. Thomson and other individual explorers fully understood the disadvantages under which they labored. Their genius appeared in the rare faculty they possessed of making all sorts of men and circumstances useful to their work. The great majority of individual enterprises came to an untimely end. But even systematic work carried on at great expense has at times failed because it was carried on at too great a distance from the base of operations. The inexperience of untried men has injured the cause even when it has not brought complete failure. There is a strange fatality about this once sacred land which makes it advisable for a man while here to put himself under double bonds to keep the peace. Practical men are wanted who combine a scholarly interest in these themes with a knowledge of human nature. Dr. Robinson was fortunate in securing the co-operation of one of the most experienced of American missionaries in Syria, without whose aid he never could have achieved the success he did. Dr. Eli Smith, with his thorough knowledge of local and idiomatic Arabic, and his tact in dealing with the people of this land, rendered Dr. Robinson and the cause of Biblical scholarship an inestimable service. Dr. William M. Thomson put a lifetime of careful observation into his more popular book on Palestine. The fact is, that the great work of bringing to light the vital facts concerning the land of the Bible has been done by a few men who, whether sent out by some society or dependent upon their own resources, have been able systematically and independently to carry out their own ideas. The Turkish Government has always been suspicious of these large exploration societies; but individuals resident in this country, and who, by long experience, know how to deal with troublesome matters, can come and go at will. A few efficient men quietly and constantly pushed to the front and successively handing over their work to trained successors would do more, far more, to advance the work of exploration than formidable societies whose work has to be made a subject of international diplomacy. For the best results both in
exploring and in assimilating the facts brought to light it is necessary
that there should be system, continuity, and an unfailing base of
supplies in Syria; and the only practicable way of securing these is
to concentrate the work in an institution thoroughly equipped for
the purpose. A favorite way of exploring the regions of the north
is to send on a colony to the highest practicable point, there to settle
down to a life of observation, and when the way is open to make a
dash for higher latitudes. Such a plan seems feasible for the student
of the Orient. A colony of American scholars living in the East
and carefully observant would gather a most valuable experience,
which in the end would be used in pushing on to the outlying region
just as soon as the way would open.

American scholarship, following in the line of English and German
enthusiasm, has succeeded in establishing at Athens a school to pro-
mote the study of ancient Greece and its literature. The advanced
study of Greek interests comparatively few, but the school has
received a backing which promises it assured success. It was
founded not so much for exploration as it was for the more popular
design of furnishing facilities by the use of which the student can
pursue his studies in the atmosphere of ancient Greece, and thus get
a more vivid impression of its life and thought. But if a study of
Greece and its literature makes necessary or useful such an advanced
school at Athens, the study of the Orient, and especially of Palestine
and its sacred literature, would seem to call for equal, if not better,
facilities by the use of which a student may become thoroughly
familiar with its topography, its archaeological treasures, its customs
and manners, as well as the living and dead languages which have
exercised such a controlling influence over the world's destinies.
Dr. Philip Schaff advises every theological student who can afford it
to complete his Biblical education by a visit to the Holy Land.
"It will be," he says, "of more practical use to him in his pulpit
labors than the lectures of the professors in Oxford or Cambridge,
Berlin or Leipzig, valuable as these may be. The best thing, of
course, is to combine the most thorough theoretical study and personal
experience on the spot."

But no one knows better than Dr. Schaff the difficulties in the way
of carrying out such a plan of study under present arrangements.
The length of time required to complete such a project in any thor-
ough way, the heavy expense incurred in travel or residence in the
East, the possibility of discomfort and ill-health, the uncertainties
as to localities and facilities for study, and the lack of any thoroughly
equipped library in the East present insuperable obstacles in the
path of many a student who would like to carry out such a practical
course of study. The student of the Orient has the unpleasant sen-
sation of leaving his tools behind him in the libraries of Europe and
America. He can hope at best to make only a hurried incursion
into the East, gather what materials come to hand, and then retire
to the libraries at home to work them out.

A school established at some favorable point on the eastern Medi-
terranean on the same general plan as that at Athens would change
the conditions of the whole problem. Such a school would be the
natural centre of the work of American scholars in the East. Its
scope should be wide enough to embrace all philological, topo-
graphical, archaeological, historical, and natural history questions
that can be most profitably investigated on the spot. American
scholars were fortunate enough to lead the way to a scientific
exploration of Palestine; they have now an opportunity to lead the
way in the equally difficult but equally important task of maturing
the results of the discoveries made and of popularizing the study of
the land of the Bible.

Where should such a school be located? To any one who has
looked into the question there can be no hesitancy in the answer.
Cairo is at one side, expensive, unhealthy in winter, and intolerably
hot from May to November. Jerusalem seems to be the senti-
mental centre, but is altogether out of the question when the matter
of comfort, expense, or health is discussed. Damascus is too far
inland. Beirūt is the only spot in the East which gives encourage-
ment to such an enterprise. Already it is the educational and
literary centre of Syria. Its situation is one of great beauty, and
the climate is charming from November to June. The lofty range
of Lebanon looks serenely down upon the city, and a pleasant ride
of three hours takes one up into a temperate climate three thousand
feet above sea level, where the summers are spent in a delightful
manner. Through the hottest months of summer the thermometer
averages 72° F., and the nights are cool and refreshing. Beirūt is
accounted the most healthful city in Syria. An English company
has supplied the city with pure water from the neighboring Nahr-
el-Keeb, and another company is to put in gas throughout the city.
The streets are wide and clean. Beirūt has a number of fine
hospitals and the best of physicians and surgeons. It has a large
and pleasant circle of American and English residents.

Beirūt is the centre of the work of the American Mission in Syria.
The missionaries are men of experience, and take pleasure in making
that experience useful. The Syrian Protestant College with its
medical school, and the adjoining Mission Theological Seminary,
have in their faculties a number of cultured scholars who have had
long experience in the country. Advanced students are always welcomed at Beirūt, and the college has for some years opened its doors to graduates of theological seminaries and universities, and has given them every facility for the furtherance of their studies. During the last year a fellow of Harvard University and a graduate of Union Theological Seminary made the college their centre.

Beirūt is also a central place. With the present facilities for travel the tourist reaches any of the following places in less than twenty-four hours after leaving Beirūt: Damascus, Hums, Tripoli, Cyprus, Sidon, Acre, Carmel, Nazareth, Jaffa, and Jerusalem. Egypt and the southern ports of Asia Minor are only two days away. Beirūt is in direct telegraphic communication with the most distant parts of the world. The mails are frequent and regular. The traveller from New York reaches Beirūt in seventeen days by the fastest route, and London can be reached in a little more than a week. When the railway north from Salonica is completed it will be possible to reach London in five days and New York in eleven or twelve. The resident of Beirūt is reading the London Times long before the resident of Chicago receives a copy of the same issue.

But if its central position, its accessibility, its healthfulness, its atmosphere of study, its agreeable society, and its experienced scholars did not settle the question, there is another consideration that is decisive. It is doubtful whether the school could ever obtain the permission from the authorities which would be necessary if it should attempt to start on an independent basis. This is not the place to expand upon this significant fact. It is imperative that a school of Biblical archaeology and philology should find its shelter under the wing of some institution in this part of the world, which is strong enough in Syria and at home to give adequate shelter to such an enterprise.

This subject is by no means a new one to the college, although it has not had a thorough consideration until quite recently. The college charter (from the New York Legislature) contains a clause that looks forward to some such a development. Several of the earliest projectors of the college, especially Dr. William M. Thomson, author of "The Land and the Book," were extremely anxious that a Biblical museum should grow up along with the college, and that something might be done to facilitate the investigation of Bible lands. The whole tone and history of the college has been in sympathy with such pursuits. Still the notion of establishing a distinct school of Biblical Archaeology and Philology in connection with the college is an altogether new idea, and has not been urged upon the college before this last year.
However, at the last commencement of the college (July 22d, 1886) this whole matter was brought to the attention of the Board of Managers and urged upon their immediate consideration by means of a memorial prepared by two young Americans who for a year and more had been pursuing special studies in the East and had made the college their headquarters, and who had learned from their own experience the need there was for some such school. They were not certain at the time whether the college, founded for the distinctive purpose of giving Syria the benefits of a higher education, and having already so many and grave responsibilities upon its shoulders, would be able to do more than give its kindly co-operation to such a scheme.

The Board of Managers of the college is a body of twenty-three gentlemen, the most of them American missionaries in Syria, all of whom are well acquainted with such subjects. After a thorough discussion this body voted unanimously and enthusiastically to give its aid to the enterprise and to commend it to the consideration of the Trustees in New York. It was proposed to endow a new and independent department in the college which should have a sort of autonomy of its own and be called "The School of Biblical Archaeology and Philology," having somewhat the same relation to the college that the Sheffield Scientific School has to Yale College. The school is to be responsible, not to the general faculty of the college, but directly to the Board of Managers. It is to have its own Dean or Director, and its own faculty, of which the President of the college is to be an ex-officio member. Its funds will be inalienable, and the school will manage all its own affairs. It was considered necessary to raise a fund of $100,000 as a permanent endowment.

It is, of course, impossible at this early stage of affairs to settle all the details of the school. In a general way it may be said that the main object in view is to get a library together which shall have in its alcoves every publication needed in the pursuit of Oriental studies. It is proposed to secure as Director of the school some enterprising American scholar who is a specialist either in Biblical Philology or Archaeology. The Seminarium would occupy a prominent place in the line of instruction. The very best native instructors in Arabic, Syriac, and Turkish would be furnished. The original text of the Bible would receive careful attention. Gradually an archaeological and natural history museum, with special reference to the Bible, would be brought together. The college has a fine start in the line of natural history already. Its botanical collection has the most complete assortment of Syrian plants to be found in the world. The college has at present facilities for the comfortable
accommodation of a limited number of students, and is ready to increase its facilities to meet the demand such a school might make upon it.

The year would be divided somewhat as follows: Four months (from July to November) would be spent in the summer home of the school at some pleasant point on the Lebanon range. During this time excursions can be made in many directions, but especially to Hermon, Baalbek, and the Cedars. This takes in the whole Lebanon range, and presents a great variety of fascinating themes for consideration. The five months following (from November to April) would be spent in Beirūt, during which time an opportunity would be given for a trip to Egypt to those who desired to go. April, May, and June are the favorable months for travel, and excursions would be made in several directions, but especially down through Palestine and around to Damascus.

It is the unanimous feeling of the Americans in Syria that such an institution is eminently practicable and timely. The thought has grown out of the necessities of the hour. A strong pressure has been brought upon the college to increase its facilities in this line. It seems wise, when a wave of interest in these subjects is advancing so rapidly, to take advantage of the impetus. Nothing short of the highest and best results should content those who have the matter in hand. The difficulties to be overcome in this case are much less formidable than those connected with the establishment of the Archæological School at Athens. In this case we have (1) the backing of a long-established and successful institution; (2) an experienced body of scholars and practical workers who are unanimous in their enthusiasm; (3) a comfortable and congenial home prepared for the school at a central and most convenient locality; (4) the whole world of Biblical scholarship to rely upon, and (5) free scope for the idea to work out its own destiny. The college is thoroughly disinterested in the matter, and asks the friends of the enterprise to do their part, give the school a firm financial basis and relieve her of all anxiety about it, so that the college may the more untiringly and successfully move on in its own more distinctive work of raising Syria on to a higher educational plane. Yet it is evident that such a school in successful operation within the college premises would be a constant help to the college. It would bring it into greater prominence in England and America and widen its constituency. The library and archæological and natural history collections will be useful in the ordinary routine of the college classes. The school with its advanced students will add an intensity to the scholarly atmosphere of the college, and will elevate it still higher in the esti-
nformation of the Syrians when they see men flocking to the school from distant lands.

The natural patrons of such a school are more especially Theological Seminaries and Universities having Oriental departments. Oriental, Archæological, and Geographical societies would also be interested. Churches, Sunday-schools, clergymen, and Bible students in general would be interested in an institution whose aim was to advance our knowledge of the Bible. The reflex influence of such a school in successful operation must be very great upon Oriental, and especially Biblical, learning. It might easily take an important place in any thorough preparation to fill chairs of Oriental history or philology in the seminaries and universities of America.

The school would expect to draw its students mainly from recent graduates of Theological Seminaries. Shemitic and archæological students in general would be attracted by so advantageous a place in which to pursue their studies. There would also be a large number of clergymen who would take advantage of this school to make a thorough study of the land of the Bible. Present arrangements for travel in Palestine are often uncomfortable and always expensive. A hurried run through the land, quite likely in bad weather, is extremely unsatisfactory. Such a school would manage matters so that the expense of a trip to the East would be curtailed at every point. With a thoroughly furnished store of camp furniture and an intimate knowledge of the country and the people, more than half of the expense in Syria can be saved. While the school cannot go into the business of a dragoman, even for two months in the year, it can still arrange matters so that multitudes who could not otherwise visit the East can afford to make a thorough study of the land of the Bible. Under these circumstances from $600 to $800 will enable a man to spend a year in most fruitful study of the Bible's greatest commentary. A prominent New York clergyman once offered to help the trustees of a prominent Theological Seminary raise a fund of $100,000, on the interest of which to send ten young men from every class graduating from that Seminary to study a year in Palestine. If one Seminary should in this way offer ten fellowships to each class, other institutions would be compelled to do likewise.

Such a school of Biblical Archæology and Philology would take up one after another the difficult problems that remain to be solved in the East. The range of such subjects is very extensive. In this connection it will be possible to suggest only a few of the more obvious ones. The most important as well as the most popular subject is that of Bible Illustration. The land is by far the freshest, the most suggestive, the best commentary on the Book. It is a
"gospel" that throws light over the whole of the sacred text. As a study in Homiletics it is unrivalled. A more limited but even more fascinating theme is that of Hebrew poetry. These mountains and plains, hills and valleys, these fountains, rivers, and lakes, the "great and wide sea," these birds and animals, flowers and trees, the sky, the clouds ("those bottles of heaven"), the revolving seasons with their infinite variety of aspects, are all invaluable helps to the student of the poetry of the ancient Hebrews. Dr. Thomson has written eloquently on "The Physical Basis of Our Spiritual Language." The theme is exhaustless. Again, Syria was the home of the Phoenicians, who were such an important factor in the ancient world, and about which we know so little. Every day some new discovery is made which helps fill in the gaps in our information. In Cyprus (a sail of only ten hours from Beirut) we find the links which connect the Phoenicians with the Greeks. The whole subject of the Hittites can be studied at Beirut to the best advantage. Assyria and Babylonia are accessible, and advantage can be taken of the first opportunity to make excavations in that important field. It is hoped that before many years are past the museum of the school will possess a good collection of Assyrian inscriptions. It is impossible under present arrangements to make excavations or carry things out of the country. It will be possible to collect such articles to be kept in the country.

The study of Syriac literature as related to early church history is still in its early stages. The old Syriac church still exists in northern Syria, the same old liturgy is intoned in the ancient tongue, and the archives of several of the wealthiest monasteries in the world are as yet unexplored. The school would make it a special point to collect manuscripts in this language. It would furnish the best possible facility for the study of the various ancient Christian sects in this vicinity—the Maronites, the Greeks, the Greek Catholics—as well as other sects outside the pale of orthodox Mohammedanism, such as the Metâwhileh, the Druzes, and the Nusairiyeh. Then there is the whole vast subject of Mohammedanism and Arabic literature and the folk-lore of this land. The topography of the Crusades has never been thoroughly studied, and would receive the careful attention of the school. The natural sciences—botany, geology, and zoology—would furnish fresh topics. Beirut is a good centre from which to study the subject of Christian missions. *Iam uno disce omnes.* The whole question of Eastern history, and especially Church history, as well as the complicated Eastern question of our day, can be investigated with advantage at Beirut.

But time would fail us to give even a summary of the important
and fascinating questions that would receive systematic treatment at the hands of the proposed school of Biblical Archæology and Philology. That such a school will be organized by some one and somewhere in the near future is a certainty. The wonder is that such a sober and sure method of pushing investigation in the East has not been undertaken before. The work of the American Exploration Society did not result in all its friends had hoped, and it has ceased to exist. Here is an opportunity for American scholars to retrieve their reputation and to add a brilliant finish to the work so successfully begun by Dr. Robinson. The man who is ready to put the school on to a firm financial basis would do a deed that would embalm his memory in the affections of all the generations to come. The Pope has already elevated the Jesuit College in Beirût into a Roman University, with the intention of furnishing facilities for the study of Oriental languages. England, France, and Germany will not be long in seizing upon the idea. Americans have now the chance to lead the way under the most favorable circumstances to a sober and practical method of pushing the work of investigation in Western Asia.

HENRY W. HULBERT.
V.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA — WHAT IT IS, AND THE MODE OF AMENDING IT.

I.

THE CONSTITUTION—WHAT IT IS.

In the United States and at the present time the term Constitution, when used in reference to the laws of an organized society, is ordinarily employed in the complex sense of indicating (1) a written instrument, (2) which sets forth the fundamental principles of the government of the society, and only such principles. This meaning, it is believed, was first attached to the word in the United States. It was so attached, as will be seen, only a short time before the adoption of the "Constitution of the Presbyterian Church," when other meanings were generally recognized in both Church and State. These old meanings, though still prevalent in Great Britain, have in process of time become well-nigh obsolete in this country; it must be evident, however, to every thoughtful mind that they could not at once be displaced from the thought and use even of educated men by the newly adopted signification.

The employment of the term as denoting written laws not necessarily fundamental has prevailed for centuries among English-speaking peoples. When used in this sense, however, it is generally in the plural, constitutions; if employed in the singular it is with the definite article, a constitution. Thus we read of the Apostolic Constitutions, the Constitutions (or Laws) of Justinian, the Constitutions of Clarendon. Hooker, in his Ecclesiastical Polity, uses the expression: "The positive constitutions of our Churches." In this sense the term occurs in the Laws of the Church of Scotland. The first sentence of the famous Barrier Act reads: "Enacted, that before any General Assembly of this Church pass any acts which are to be binding rules and constitutions of the Church," etc.* Principal Hill,

* Compendium of the Laws of the Church of Scotland, Part II., pp. 69, 205.
in his Theological Institutes, writes of the Barrier Act itself as "a binding rule and constitution to the Church." In all these instances the term is manifestly used, not in the American sense as indicating written fundamental law, but as a synonym for law or rule.*

The singular term with the definite article, "the Constitution," as indicating the fundamental principles of a body politic, has long been in use in the British Empire. In Britain, however, it is employed as indicating an unwritten body of principles. On this subject the following is quoted from the Encyclopædia Britannica, under the title CONSTITUTION:

"In one important respect England differs conspicuously from most other countries. Her constitution is to a large extent unwritten, using the word in much the same sense as when we speak of unwritten law. Its rules can be found in no written document, but depend, as so much of English law does, on precedent modified by a constant process of interpretation."

Principal Hill uses the term in a similar sense when writing of "the constitution of the Church of Scotland." † He was not referring to any written document, or collection of documents so entitled, such as the Constitution of the United States; but, using the term in the British sense, he was contemplating the general principles underlying the organism of the Church. These principles he had been striving to determine and "delineate" from a consideration of her history and enactments.

The first use of the term in the restricted American sense that the writer has been able to discover was by the Convention that, in 1776, framed "The Constitution or Form of Government" of Virginia. In 1780 a similar instrument, similarly entitled, was adopted in Massachusetts. In 1787 national importance and prominence was given to the new signification by the submission of the "Constitution of the United States of America" to the vote of the people. This new signification, by force of the fact that the term used in this sense is the legally established title of the fundamental instruments of our national and State governments, has naturally and necessarily become prevalent in the United States. It could not, however, as before remarked, at once displace other and familiar meanings from the thought and language of the people;

---

* In the political compact entered into by the Pilgrims of the Mayflower, the word occurs in this general sense: "We . . . do, by these presents, . . . combine ourselves into a civil body politic, . . . and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions," etc. The one hundred and twenty laws drawn up by the celebrated John Locke for the government of the Colony of Carolina are entitled "Fundamental Constitutions."

† See "Extracts" in Compendium, Part I., pp. 463, 467, 468.
and, consequently, there must have been, for a considerable time, confusion in the use of the word, even by intelligent men.

The first occurrence of the term in the records of our Church that the writer has been able to find is in the following resolution, adopted by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, in 1785, when appointing the Committee that prepared the original draft of our existing Form of Government (italics mine):

"Ordered, That Dr. Witherspoon [with nine others] be a committee to take into consideration the constitution of the Church of Scotland, and other Protestant Churches, and agreeably to the general principles of Presbyterian government, compile a system of general rules for government of the Synod, and the several Presbyteries," etc. (Records, p. 512.)

It seems manifest that in this resolution the term constitution was used in the British sense. It is true that the American use had then been originated; it had not, however, become national. But beyond this there were no Constitutions of the European Presbyterian Churches in the American sense; and, still further, had such written documents been contemplated, the term employed would necessarily have been the plural constitutions. The use of the singular term points to an ideal something that, in the thought of the author of the resolution, lay at the basis of the systems of laws established in the several churches contemplated.

The Committee appointed under the foregoing resolution reported the next year a draft of "a system of discipline and church government." This draft, sometimes styled by the Synod "A Plan of Church Government and Discipline" and sometimes "The Book of Government and Discipline," engaged the attention of that body at its meetings in 1786 and 1787. In 1787 the Synod made a few alterations in the Westminster Confession, and also ordered that the amended Confession and the amended Book of Government and Discipline should be printed and distributed for the consideration of the Church. Direction was also given that the Committee charged with the duty of printing should revise the Westminster Directory for Worship, and print their revision in connection with the other books.

The next year, 1788, the Synod, which body claimed and exercised full legislative power, adopted the Confession, the Catechisms, the Books of Government and Discipline, and the revised Directory for Worship, and declared them to be collectively the Constitution of the Church. The several minutes of adoption and declaration are as follows:

"[May 28th.] The Synod having fully considered the draught of the Form of Government and Discipline, did, on a review of the whole, and hereby do ratify and adopt the
same as now altered and amended, as the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America, and order the same to be considered and strictly observed as the rule of their proceedings by all the inferior judicatories belonging to the body. And they order that a correct copy be printed, and that the Westminster Confession of Faith, as now altered, be printed in full along with it, as making a part of the Constitution.

"Resolved, That the true intent and meaning of the above ratification by the Synod is, that the Form of Government and Discipline and the Confession of Faith, as now ratified, is to continue to be our constitution and the confession of our faith and practice unalterable, unless two thirds of the Presbyteries under the care of the General Assembly shall propose alterations or amendments, and such alterations or amendments shall be agreed to and enacted by the General Assembly." (Records, p. 546.)

"[May 29th.] The Synod having now revised and corrected the draught of a Directory for Worship, did approve and ratify the same, and do hereby appoint the said Directory, as now amended, to be the directory for the worship of God in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. They also took into consideration the Westminster Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and having made a small amendment of the larger, did approve and ratify the said Catechisms, as now agreed on, as the Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church in the said United States. And the Synod order that the said Directory and Catechisms be printed and bound up in the same volume with the Confession of Faith and the Form of Government and Discipline, and that the whole be considered as the Standard of our doctrine, government, discipline, and worship, agreeably to the resolutions of Synod at their present sessions.

"Ordered, That Dr. Duffield, Mr. Armstrong, and Mr. Green be a committee to superintend the printing and publishing the above said Confession of Faith and Catechisms, with the Form of Government, and the Directory for the Worship of God, as now adopted and ratified by the Synod, as the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and that they divide the several parts into chapters and sections properly numbered." (Records, p. 547.)

The following points must be manifest to the careful reader of the foregoing exhibit: (1) That the initial movement toward the formation of what is now known as the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church contemplated the formation of nothing more than a Book of Government and Discipline; (2) that the term CONSTITUTION was not applied to the books framed or amended until their final ratification in 1788; (3) that when the term was employed it was with singular lack of precision; at first the Form of Government and Discipline were alone so styled; then, as by an afterthought, the Confession was ordered to "be printed in full along with it as making a part of the Constitution;" next, on the following day, the amended Directory and Catechisms were classed with the other books as parts of the standard; and, finally, in the concluding resolution the complex of all the books that, in the immediately preceding deliverance, had been styled "the standard of our doctrine, government, discipline, and worship," was denominated "the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." It is probable that the records of no deliberative body of acknowledged intellectual power can show a similar indeterminateness in the use of an important term at such a juncture. The most probable explanation of so
singular a fact is that the term was employed in a new and not thoroughly appreciated sense. In confirmation of this view, attention is called to the fact that it was only in the preceding year that national prominence had been given to the new use of the word by the framers of our national "Constitution."

It must also be manifest that the term was not used by the Synod in what is now regarded as its strict political sense—namely, as a written document setting forth only the fundamental principles or laws of government. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, according to the final enactment of the adopting Synod, embodies not only the fundamental principles of government, but the rules of procedure in discipline, and the formulas of doctrine and worship. There seems to have been a vibration in the minds of the members of Synod between the American sense of the term and the British sense when applied to written laws—as in the Barrier Act of the Church of Scotland, in which all standing rules are styled constitutions.

It is here in place to remark that, in the judgment of the writer, no uninspired book can be the Constitution of the Church of Christ in the American sense of that term. A Constitution, in the American sense, is essentially the work of the Sovereign, and Christ alone is Sovereign in His Church. The kingdom of Christ is in no sense a Republic with authority to determine the fundamental principles of its government. Those principles are to be sought in the revealed Word of God, and the utmost that the Church is empowered to do in reference to them is to set forth a digest of them—a digest which, however useful it may be as a guide and help, should never be regarded as her Constitution in the American sense. This is unquestionably the doctrine of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, which declare not only that "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only rule of faith and obedience" (Larg. Cat., Ans. 3; see also Conf., ch. i., sects. 2, 6, 9, 10), but also that—

"All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both." (Confession, ch. xxxi. 3.)

It is, of course, admitted, in the language of the Confession (ch. i., sect. 6): "That there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the Church common to human actions and societies which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed."

On such matters, ecclesiastically styled the Prepa, the Church has
power authoritatively to legislate. Her enactments, however, form no part of her Constitution in the American sense; they are analogous to the laws enacted by Congress under the authority and within the limits of the Constitution.

Nor can any section of the Church usurp a prerogative that does not belong to the undivided Body of Christ. Each denomination of Christians, it is true, externally, in its relations to the State, may be regarded as a voluntary association, having the right to adopt such constitution as it chooses that does not conflict with the rights of others. Internally, however, each denomination, as a portion of the one Church, is bound to receive as the fundamental principles of its government those which Christ has set forth in His Word; save in respect of the Prepa, it has no right to legislate. It is admitted that a denomination erring in its interpretation of divinely enunciated principles, if error be unintentional and within limits, does not thereby cut itself off from the Body of Christ; but, at the same time, it is affirmed that any denomination that assumes to itself the right of determining the fundamental principles of its government, or that consciously declares aught as a principle that Christ has not so declared, or consciously omits to accept aught that Christ has established, usurps the crown rights of its king, and becomes guilty of both heresy and schism.

The term Constitution as applied to the Books of our Church is, in the judgment of the writer, not only a misnomer, but most unfortunate; it necessarily suggests to the minds of Americans an analogy between those Books and the Constitution of the United States which does not exist. The Bible alone contains the Church's Constitution. Our subordinate standards (as such books are correctly styled in the churches of Scotland), in so far as they set forth fundamental principles of government, are but digests of the judgments of the Supreme Court of our Church concerning such principles; in so far as the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship set forth matters pertaining to the Prepa, they are the legislative enactments of the body that is at once the Supreme Court and the supreme legislative body.* The Confession of Faith and the Catechisms are sui generis; there is nothing analogous to them in the Law Books of the State; they are the digested judgments of the Supreme Court of the Church on matters of doctrine, inclusive (so far as the Confession is concerned) of some of the fundamental principles of Church Government.

* This body, it should be carefully noted, is not the General Assembly, but the General Assembly in conjunction with the Presbyteries. The General Synod exercised both powers in completeness.
It may be said, however, that the Synod of New York and Philadelphia had as much right to use the term Constitution in a new and peculiar sense as had the National Convention. This is undoubtedly true, although the abstract wisdom of such a course on the part of that body may be questionable; but, whatever may be thought of the wisdom manifested in the choice of the term, it is acknowledged that we must now accept it. In so doing, however, we should be careful to distinguish it from the term as applied to the Constitution of the United States. It is unquestionable that by the phrase "The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," is properly contemplated that collection of written formulas severally entitled: The Confession of Faith, the Larger Catechism, the Shorter Catechism, the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, the Directory for Worship, adopted by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1788, as those formulas have been legitimately amended.

II.

THE MODE OF AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION.

Four views have been held in the Church on this important subject—namely:

1. That the amendment must be proposed by an Assembly and then be ratified by the affirmative votes of at least a majority of the Presbyteries returned in writing to a subsequent Assembly, the sole office of the latter body being to canvass the returns and to declare the result.

2. That the amendment must be proposed by the concurrent action of at least two thirds of the Presbyters, and then be ratified by the vote of a subsequent Assembly.

3. That amendments of the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship are to be effected by the first of the preceding modes, and those of the Confession and Catechisms by the second.

4. That the proposed amendment must be overtured to the Presbyteries by one Assembly; must then receive the affirmative votes of at least a majority of all the Presbyteries, which votes must be reported in writing to a subsequent Assembly; and, finally, must be ratified by the affirmative vote of the Assembly to which the returns are made.

Those who adopt the first of these views, which this article con-
templates as the correct one, base their opinion on Form of Government, ch. xii. [xi.].* 6, which is as follows:

"Before any overtures or regulations proposed by the Assembly to be established as constitutional rules [standing rules]† shall be obligatory on the churches, it shall be necessary to transmit them to the Presbyteries, and to receive the returns of at least a majority of them in writing approving thereof."

Those who adopt the second view do so on the basis of the resolution supplementary to the original adopting act of the Synod of 1788.‡

The reasons for the third view, so far as the amendment of the Confession is concerned, will be set forth in the language of the distinguished committee (Drs. Hoge, Hodge, Spring, Leland, and N. S. Rice), by which it was presented to the O. S. Assembly of 1844 as a portion of a report:

"The Form of Government, ch. xii., sect. vi., gives power to the General Assembly to propose overtures which, if approved by a majority of the Presbyteries, shall have the force of CONSTITUTIONAL RULES. This provision, it is thought, does not apply to altering or amending the Confession of Faith, 1st. Because it relates to the powers of the General Assembly, and is plainly designed to limit their power in respect of legislation. 2d. The use of the terms 'Overtures or Regulations' defines with sufficient clearness the meaning of the expression 'Constitutional Rules,' and limits its application to the rules of government and discipline, but excludes alterations of the doctrinal and fundamental principles of the Church. 3d. Unless the language used necessarily and certainly embraces alterations of the latter kind, it would be unwise to resort to a forced construction, and thus jeopard the stability of the great principles of faith and order embraced in our Standards. . . . That Synod [1788] in the adopting act inserted a provision that 'two thirds of the Presbyteries may propose alterations or amendments which shall be valid if subsequently enacted by the General Assembly.' So far only as this embraces Constitutional Rules, this provision has been changed, but in every other respect it remains in full force." §

The fourth view is based on an illegitimate combination of selected portions of the first and second modes. It has no basis in any of the acts or deliverances of the Church, and it has but few supporters.

* The double numeration of the chapter is due to the introduction of an initial chapter by the Revision of 1821. What is now known as "Ch. I. Preliminary Principles" formed no part of the Form of Government as at first adopted. In the original Book that chapter appeared as an "Introduction," being an explanatory address to the Christian public.

† The words within the brackets, "standing rules," are those employed in the original Book. They were altered to "constitutional rules" by an amendment first proposed to the Presbyteries in 1799 (Minutes, p. 180), and finally declared to have been adopted by a majority of the Presbyteries by the Assembly of 1805. (Minutes, pp. 304, 333.)

‡ This resolution may be found in Records, p. 546; and in Moore's Digest, p. 51; it appears in full on pp. 87, 88 of this article.

§ The full text of the portion of the Report bearing on the point at issue may be found in Moore's Digest, p. 328; Minutes, 1844, pp. 422, 423.
CONSTITUTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

It has been claimed by some that the Assembly of 1827 acted in accordance with this view in "rejecting" five amendments which had been sent down to the Presbyteries by the preceding Assembly, and which had received the affirmative votes of a majority thereof. It appears, however, from a careful consideration of the records that the Assembly did not "reject" the proposed amendments; it simply declared that the vote of the Presbyteries had been irregularly given, and that therefore the amendments had not been legitimately ratified. The right exercised by the Assembly was not the alleged right of ratifying or rejecting, but that of canvassing the votes and declaring the legal result.*

Before proceeding further, it is proper to call attention to the fact that the question before us is not the abstract one as to the best mode of amending the Constitution, but, What is the mode already established and which is obligatory until it be regularly altered?

At first glance it may seem as though there should be two distinct modes of amending the Formulas of our Church. Those Formulas contain two entirely distinct classes of articles—the first, definitions of revealed truth; the second, enactments within the limits of ecclesiastical authority. The consideration of proposed amendments respecting the one or the other of these classes calls for the exercise of widely different powers of the human mind; in the one case a Presbyter acts as an interpreter of God's Word, in the other he judges, in view of existing circumstances, what will be for the best interests of the Church. It may also seem that, in introducing the phrase CONSTITUTIONAL RULES into the Form of Government, the Church had in view a distinction in mode. This manifestly was the view of the distinguished Committee that reported on the subject to the O. S. Assembly of 1844. Without at present discussing the question of the propriety of establishing different modes, it is remarked that the united Church has never established them, either at the time of the adoption of the Constitution or by any subsequent action; but that, on the contrary, she has never contemplated more than one mode. This will appear in the following discussion, in which it will incidentally appear that in the substitution of CONSTITUTIONAL RULES for STANDING RULES in Form of Government, ch. xii. [xi.], 6, it was with the distinct declarations by the Assembly proposing the change that it was proposed because the latter phrase was ambiguous, and that both phrases referred to ARTICLES OF THE CONSTITUTION.

It may also be remarked that, without a recasting of our Formulas, the establishment of different modes in effecting amendments would

* See Minutes of 1827, p. 218.
involve an obvious impropriety. It would not do to draw the line between the Confession and Catechisms, on the one hand, and the other books on the other. The Books of Government, Discipline, and Worship contain some of the most important definitions of revealed truth; it would be utterly incongruous to subject these definitions to one rule of amendment and those of the Confession and Catechisms to another; nor would it be possible to draw the line in the Books of Government, Discipline, and Worship between what belongs to the Faith of the Church and what to the Prepa. These matters are so intermingled in those Books that it would be practically impossible to distinguish between them; there are not only many chapters in all of them, but many articles, that contain both definitions of revealed truth and enactments concerning the Prepa.

It is now in place to present the considerations that, in the judgment of the writer, make manifest that the established mode of amending all portions of the Constitution is the one first mentioned—namely, by a majority vote of all the Presbyteries upon overture from a General Assembly.

It seems to be unquestionable, it must be acknowledged, that it was the intent of the majority of the Synod that framed and adopted "The Constitution" to establish as the rule of its amendment the resolution supplementary to the adopting act. If such was their intent, however, their mistake was in not making it a part of the Constitution itself; the more especially was their failure to do this a mistake, in view of the fact that apparently another and an inconsistent rule was set forth in Form of Government, ch. xii. [xi.], 6.

But, whatever may have been the intent of the adopting Synod, it is unquestionable that the united Church has never acted on the supplementary resolution. So far from acting thereon, the united Church from the beginning, even when prominent members of the Synod of 1788 were in her Assemblies, has always acted on the rule contained in the Form of Government. This is abundantly evident from a careful examination of the records of the Church, which makes manifest the unsoundness of the position of the Committee that reported to the O. S. Assembly of 1844 that (italics mine):

"So far only as this [the supplementary resolution] embraces Constitutional Rules this provision has been changed, but in every other respect remains in full force."

The implications of this sentence are two: First, that the Church has distinguished between the Constitution and the Constitutional Rules contained in the Constitution; and, second, that she has changed (amended), in effect at least, the provision of the supple-
mentary resolution in respect of the "Constitutional Rules." On the contrary, the records show, first, that the united Church has never made the distinction implied; and, second, that so far from changing (amending) the supplementary resolution of the Synod of 1788 she has unvaryingly treated it as of no authority, and has acted on the provision of the Form of Government, ch. xii. [xi.], 6, as though it alone touched the matter of Constitutional amendment and also covered the entire field thereof. Not only has every amendment been adopted, but every proposition for amendment (including one for the amendment of the Confession) has been made on the basis of the provision in the Form of Government.

So far as appears from the records, the matter first came before an Assembly for consideration in 1799, eleven years after the adoption of the Constitution. The Presbytery of New York memorialized that body, objecting to the enactment by the preceding Assembly of certain rules for the government of Presbyteries in the reception of foreign ministers. The ground of the objection was that the enactment of such rules by the Assembly alone, without submitting them to the vote of the Presbyteries, was in violation of the article in the Form of Government that we are now considering. It should be noted that this was before the alteration in that article of the words standing rules into constitutional rules. The Assembly by vote refused to rescind the action of the former body, and adopted the report of a Committee setting forth the reasons for refusal, the first part of which is as follows:

"The first reason assigned by the Presbytery of New York for their request is founded on a misinterpretation of an ambiguous expression in the Constitution. The sixth section of the eleventh [xii.] chapter is thus expressed, 'Before any overtures or regulations proposed by the Assembly to be established as standing rules shall be obligatory on the churches, it shall be necessary to transmit them to all the Presbyteries and to receive the returns of at least a majority of the Presbyteries approving thereof.' Standing Rules in this section can refer only to one of the following objects: 1st. To articles of the Constitution which, when once established, are unalterable by the General Assembly; or 2d. To every rule or law enacted without any term of limitation expressed in the act. The latter meaning would draw after it consequences so extensive and injurious as to forbid the Assembly to give the section that interpretation." (Minutes of 1799, p. 179.)

The manifest force of this deliverance, which denied the validity of the second alternative interpretation of the rule in question, was to affirm the validity of the first—namely, that by the words standing rules was indicated "articles of the Constitution"—or, in other words, to declare that, by a provision of the Constitution itself, the Constitution may be amended by a majority of the Presbyteries upon overture from the Assembly.
But it is inconceivable that this Assembly could have acted in ignorance of the supplementary resolution of the adopting Synod. Only eleven years had elapsed since the action of that body; there were certainly four men in the Assembly who had been members of the Synod, all men of mark—namely, the Rev. Dr. Samuel Stanhope Smith, President of Princeton College; the Rev. Dr. William Tennent, the Rev. Messrs. James Boyd and Nathan Grier; besides these there were present several other distinguished men whom we cannot suppose to have been ignorant of the exact history of the adoption of the Constitution; the answer to the memorial of the Presbytery of New York was drawn by the Rev. Messrs. James Graham and Archibald Alexander, and Elder Jonathan Elmer. In view of these facts it is impossible to suppose that the Assembly acted in ignorance or oversight of the resolution of 1788. The only tenable hypothesis of its course seems to be that its members regarded the two provisions concerning amendment as in conflict, and that as the one was in the Constitution itself it should prevail over the other.

But whatever may be the explanation of its course, it is certain that the Assembly did regard the provision of the Form of Government as having respect to the amendment of "Articles of the Constitution," and did so declare; and it emphasized this opinion by overturing to the Presbyteries, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee that prepared the answer to the Presbytery of New York, the proposition to remove from the provision what in the answer had been styled "an ambiguous expression" by substituting therein constitutional rules for standing rules. The minute of overture is as follows (italics mine):

"The respective Presbyteries were and they are hereby required to send up to the next Assembly their opinion on the section of the Constitution referred to, and if they think proper to advise and empower said Assembly to make the alteration therein proposed in the phraseology of this section, according to the mode pointed out in the Constitution for effecting any alteration in that instrument." (Minutes, p. 180.)

The Assembly of 1800 manifestly agreed in opinion with its predecessor. It appeared on canvassing the returns that less than a majority of the Presbyteries had voted on the proposed amendment; the Assembly, however, continued the overture that proposed alteration. And not only was the overture continued, but a memorial from the Presbytery of Baltimore similar to that from the Presbytery of New York of the preceding year was answered in the negative. It is also manifest that this Assembly could not have been ignorant of the provision of 1788. This appears, first, from the composition of the Assembly; five of its members were among the most
distinguished members of the adopting Synod—namely, the Rev. Drs. Samuel Stanhope Smith, Alexander McWhorter, John Rodgers, and Ashbel Green, and the Rev. Jedidiah Chapman—Dr. Rodgers and Mr. Chapman being representatives of the protesting Presbytery of New York. And, in the second place, the following preamble and resolution, together with others bearing on the same subject, were presented, placed on record, and, after discussion, referred to the next Assembly:

"Whereas, The Synod of New York and Philadelphia, at their sessions in the year 1788, after adopting the Constitution, made and recorded a resolution on the subject which is conceived by some to be at variance with the Constitution, and by others to be of equal authority with the Constitution itself; therefore

"Resolved, That the Presbyteries instruct their commissioners to the next General Assembly on this subject, and authorize them to annul the said resolution, or to reconcile it with the Constitution." (Minutes, pp. 205, 206.)

The presentation, discussion, and reference of this paper not only show conclusively that the Assembly was not in ignorance of the supplementary resolution of the adopting Synod, but the phraseology of both the preamble and the resolution go far to confirm the hypothesis set forth as explanatory of the course of the preceding Assembly, and also to show the correctness of a similar hypothesis in reference to the course of the Assembly now under consideration—namely, that the majority of the members regarded the provisions of the supplementary resolution and that of the Form of Government as in conflict, and that, as the latter was a provision of the Constitution itself, it should prevail.

It is to be regretted that the Assembly of 1801 took no action on the paper that had been referred to it other than to refer it to its successor. There can be no doubt, however, that the judgment of this body on the point at issue was in harmony with that of its predecessors. It again happened that a majority of the Presbyteries failed to vote either for or against the proposed amendment. This Assembly did not, it is true, so far as appears from the minutes, resolve by vote to continue the overture to the Presbyteries, but neither did it withdraw it; and that the overture was by universal consent regarded as continued is manifest from the fact that the following Assembly canvassed additional returns. It is beyond question that had not the Assembly of 1801 agreed in opinion with those that preceded it, it would have withdrawn the overture and rescinded the Regulations concerning foreign ministers as unconstitutional. But not only did it fail to take these actions, but it adopted the famous Plan of Union,* the abrogation of which in 1837

---

* Minutes, pp. 224, 225.
was one of the most potent influences resulting in the disruption of the Church. Now, it must be evident to every thoughtful mind that the articles of the Plan of Union were far more inconsistent with Form of Government, ch. xii. [xi.], 6, as that provision was interpreted by the Presbyteries of New York and Baltimore, than were the Regulations concerning foreign ministers. The Plan of Union could have been adopted by the Assembly only in view of an interpretation of that provision coincident with the view of the preceding Assemblies—namely, that it had sole respect to the amendment of the Constitution.

The evidence that the Assembly of 1802 agreed with its predecessors is also complete. In view of the fact that a sufficient number of Presbyteries to decide the case had not reported, it ordered a continuance of the overture of amendment. It also ordered a reference to the next Assembly of the preamble and resolution originally offered to the Assembly of 1800.

The Assembly of 1803 continued the overture, with injunction to the delinquent Presbyteries to take action. This Assembly also dismissed [tabled] the resolution relating to the apparent conflict between the supplementary resolution of the adopting Synod and the provision of the Form of Government that had been referred by the preceding Assemblies,* doubtless in view of the fact that the appointment of a special committee was contemplated, which was shortly after appointed,

"To consider [inter alia] whether any, and, if any, what alterations ought to be made in the said Confession of Faith, etc.; to make such preparatory arrangements on the subject as they shall see proper; and to report to the next General Assembly."

(Minutes, p. 282.)

The committee appointed under this resolution consisted of several of the most distinguished men in the Church, of whom four had been members of the adopting Synod—namely, Rev. Drs. Blair, Tennent, and Green, and Rev. Mr. Irwin.

At the next Assembly, 1804, it again appeared that a number of Presbyteries sufficient to decide the question of the proposed amendment had not voted. The Committee on Revision appointed by the preceding Assembly reported, recommending that no alteration of the Confession or Catechisms should be proposed,† but that twelve amendments of the Form of Government and one of the Book of Discipline, thirteen in all, should be overtured to the Presbyteries

---

* Minutes, p. 278. The record is somewhat obscure. There can be no doubt, however, in the mind of the careful reader as to the intent of the minute.

† This recommendation was not based on any alleged difference in the modes of amending the Confession and the other Books, but on the inexpediency of amending.
for adoption. It is proper to call attention to the fact that this report, which was adopted, proceeded on the basis of alleged provision for amendment in the Form of Government, ignoring altogether the provision of the adopting Synod. Near the close of the report occurs the following (*italics mine*):

"No amendment can be made in our Standards till a majority of the Presbyteries shall have expressed their approbation thereof in writing." (*Minutes*, p. 305.)

The judgment of the Assembly of 1805 on the point at issue is no less manifest than that of its predecessors. The Committee to which was referred the returns of the Presbyteries on the proposed amendments reported, first, the state of the vote, from which it appeared that *two* of the proposed alterations had received less than a *two-thirds* vote, and, secondly, "that all the amendments proposed by the last Assembly have been approved, and on their part sanctioned by a *majority* of the Presbyteries." * There is no record of any formal vote on the question of the approval of this report; near the close of the meeting, however, there was adopted, in connection with a resolution ordering the Trustees of the Assembly to publish a new edition of the Constitution, the following (*italics mine*):

"And whereas, all the amendments proposed by the last Assembly have been approved by a *majority* of the Presbyteries, and this approbation certified by them in writing to this Assembly,

"Resolved, That the Trustees cause the said amendments to be incorporated in the Plan of Government and Discipline," etc. (*Minutes*, p. 340.)

That this Assembly ignored the supplementary resolution of the adopting Synod, and acted on the provision of the Form of Government, is evident not only from the declaration that the proposed amendments had been '"approved by a *majority* of the Presbyteries,'" but from the further fact that *two* of those amendments had been approved by a majority *less than two thirds*.

But a still more significant fact, as indicative of the mind of the Assembly, is that one of two amendments that failed to receive a *two-thirds* vote was the one that had so long engaged the attention of the Church—namely, changing *Standing Rules* to *Constitutional Rules* in Form of Government, ch. xii. [xi.], 6. There are those who contend that up to the time of the adoption of this amendment the *two-thirds* rule was the law of the Church in reference to all the articles of the Constitution, but that by the amendment the law was changed in reference to matters of mere ecclesiastical arrangement. Indeed, this is the implied position of the Committee reporting to the O. S. Assembly of 1844. The act of the Assembly in declaring this amendment adopted shows most clearly the fallacy of that

* *Minutes*, p. 333.
position. Manifestly, unless the Assembly had utterly ignored the Supplementary-Act, regarding it as of no authority, and had looked upon the provision of the Form of Government, even in its original form, as the fundamental and only law touching amendments, it could not have declared that the change had been legitimately effected.

It must be evident to every thoughtful reader of the preceding exhibit that seven continuous Assemblies, from that of 1799 to that of 1805, in all of which there were many distinguished members of the adopting Synod, declared either expressly or impliedly that the only law providing for the amendment of the Constitution is the one found in the Constitution itself. And not only so, but no dissent from this position was ever placed upon the records of any one of these Assemblies, nor, so far as appears, did any Presbytery ever utter a protest.

And still further. From the time we have been considering to the present, every proposition for amendment, including one in 1826 for an amendment of the Confession, has proceeded on the basis of the provision in the Form of Government, and every declaration of adoption or rejection has been made on the same basis. The action of the Assembly of 1826 in proposing an Amendment of the Confession, and that of the Assembly of 1827 in canvassing the Presbyterial returns, are highly significant on the point at issue. The former Assembly overruled to the Presbyteries the question whether ch. xxiv., art. 4, of the Confession "shall be erased?" It also sent down eight proposed amendments to the Form of Government and the Book of Discipline.† There is not the slightest intimation on the minutes that the Assembly contemplated that these proposed alterations should be effected in different modes and by different Presbyterial majorities. The special Committee to which was referred the returns made a report, the first part of which was as follows:

"There are connected with the Assembly eighty-eight Presbyteries: forty-four, therefore [a mere majority], are necessary to make any alteration in the Constitution of the Church.

"In regard to the proposed erasure of the fourth section of the twenty-fourth chapter of the Confession of Faith, sixty-eight Presbyteries have reported; fifty of them against the erasure, and eighteen in favor of it. The section, therefore, is not to be erased." (Minutes, p. 217 sq.)

There is, indeed, no formal declaration that this report was voted upon. It is a universally recognized fact, however, that it was adopted; and its initial sentence makes manifest the fact that the

* Minutes, p. 177.  
† Minutes, pp. 188 sqq.
Assembly regarded the alteration of the Confession as being on the same basis with the alteration of the other Books of the Constitution. From that time until the present it has been the expressed or implied declaration of every Assembly of the United Church that has delivered or acted on the subject that a proposed amendment of the "Constitution" or "Standards" must be ratified by a "majority" of the whole number of the Presbyteries. Thus the Assembly of 1833 declared: "There are 111 Presbyteries, of which 56 [a majority] are requisite to authorize any alteration of the Constitution;" * the Assembly of 1836: "By the Constitution of our Church the consent of a majority of the Presbyteries is necessary to authorize the alteration contemplated." † Similar declarations by Assemblies since the reunion could be cited did space permit. It is vain to object that all the proposed amendments, save one in 1826, respected books other than the Confession. This, indeed, is true; but the object of amendment mentioned in the deliverances of the Assemblies is the Constitution, and of this the Confession forms a part. It should also be carefully noted in reference to the proposed amendment of the Confession that both the Assembly of 1826 and that of 1827 treated it on the basis of the provision in the Form of Government.

The only expressed dissent from the otherwise unbroken chain of deliverances of Assemblies, from the first action on the subject until now, is that of the O. S. Assembly of 1844. If there be any force in the unvarying judgment of the Supreme Court of the united Church as to the interpretation of its Constitution, then is it manifest that the rule for the amendment of all portions of the Constitution is the one contained in ch. xii., art. 6, of the Form of Government.

E. R. CRAVEN.

* Minutes, p. 400.
† Minutes, p. 276.
VI.

CRITICAL NOTE.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE PARABLES.

The subject of this note is not the nature of the parable, its distinction from myth and fable, its importance, or beauty, or usefulness, but simply the question whether the parabolic narratives found in the first three Gospels can be classified according to their contents and so arranged into an orderly system. The prevailing opinion among writers on the subject has been that this can be done, and nearly all of them, save Archbishop Trench and Pastor Goebel, have made the attempt. The result has been almost as many systems as authors, each differing more or less from the others, and each bearing the marks of its author's peculiarities. See, for example, this résumé (taken from Goebel) of the leading German authorities. Lisco makes three main classes of parables: 1. Such as describe the kingdom of heaven as a divine force; 2. Such as represent it as a Church founded by the divine forces of the Word; 3. Such as consider the members of the kingdom as regards disposition, walk, and destiny. In De Valenti's work, which appeared in the same year as Lisco's (1841), there are two main classes: 1. Such as treat of the kingdom of heaven in the proper sense as a vast moral association; 2. Such as treat of it in the improper sense, and represent it as the inner moral condition of the members of the kingdom. Arndt (1842) comprises his studies of the parables under three heads: 1. The glory of the kingdom of heaven; 2. Conditions of entrance into the kingdom; 3. Hindrances. Dr. J. P. Lange tries to point out a threefold cycle: 1. The seven parables showing, as is supposed, the historical development of the kingdom of God from the beginning to the end; 2. Such as depict the government of divine grace; 3. Such as depict God's judicial righteousness. Here the discrepancy is marked and obvious. The different writers start with a preconceived notion, and seek to mould the matter before them into a coherent and symmetrical plan in accordance therewith. The division does not spring out of the subject, but is imposed upon it. Hence the wide and glaring diversity. The same thing appears on a closer examination of several later writers, many of them men of signal ability, who have given special attention to this interesting portion of our Saviour's discourses. It is proposed to consider these in some detail, canvassing the principles of their classifications and the method in which they are carried out.

I. Professor Westcott, in an appendix to his "Introduction to the Study of the Gospel" (1860), considers the parables as designed to furnish lessons
THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE PARABLES.

from the natural world on the progress and scope of Revelation, and the testimony which man's own heart renders to the Christian morality. He divides them therefore into those which are drawn from the material world and those which are drawn from the relations of man. Under the first head he places (1) the sources of the elements of natural or spiritual life, the Sower the power of good, the Tares the power of evil; (2) the silent mode of their development, the Seed growing secretly; and (3) the fulness of their development, outwardly the Mustard-seed, inwardly the Leaven. Under the second head he puts first man's relations to the lower world, in that he destroys the worthless, the Draw-net; labors with the unfruitful, the Barren Fig-tree, and seeks to reclaim the lost, whether it has been lost by its own wandering, the Lost Sheep, or by his carelessness, the Lost Drachma. Then come man's relations to his fellowmen, (1) in the Family, on one hand, mercy in the Unmerciful Servant, and its correlative, gratitude in the Two Debtors; on the other, forgiveness in the Prodigal Son, and its correlative, obedience in the Two Sons; (2) in Social Life, as explaining his relations to the Church, (a) zeal in prayer, whether for others, as in The Friend at Midnight, or for ourselves, as in The Unjust Judge, (b) patience in the course of life, both for others, endurance, as in the Ten Virgins, and in ourselves, self denial, as in The Lower Seats (Luke xiv. 7-11), (c) regard for outward ordinances, as a feeling from within in the Great Supper, and as required by their dignity, the King's Marriage-feast; (3) in regard to his means, as explaining our devotion to God's service, (a) thoughtfulness in planning his works, both as to his own power, absolutely in the Tower-builder, relatively, in the King making war, and as to their effects upon others, in the Unjust Steward; (b) in his works, as to himself, fruitfulness, absolutely in the Talents, relatively, in the Pounds, and as to others, unselfishness in the Wicked Husbandmen; (c) after the completion of his works, as to himself, humility, in the Unprofitable Servant, as to others, dependence, in the Laborers in the Vineyard. Finally, under this head come man's relations to Providence, as teaching that spiritually as well as temporally advantages imply duties, whether we obtain them unexpectedly, as in the Hid Treasure, or after a zealous search, as in the Man seeking Pearls, or by natural inheritance, as in the Rich Fool.

No one can deny to this classification the praise of great ingenuity, or to its author the power of keen and subtle analysis, yet there is room for criticism. It is confessedly imperfect, for it leaves out three of the most important and instructive parables, The Publican and the Pharisee, the Good Samaritan, and the Rich Man and Lazarus. To call them "symbolic narratives," as Dr. Westcott does, does not take away their parabolic character, and if a scheme affords no place for them, it is presumptive evidence that the scheme is not rightly constructed. And to divide the three parables uttered on the same occasion and recorded in the same connection, so that two of them (the Lost Sheep and Coin) teach one thing, and the third (the Prodigal Son) teaches another, is unnatural. To put the emphasis of such a richly significant narrative as the Great Supper on its bearing upon outward ordinances is frigid beyond
measure, and to make endurance the meaning of the Ten Virgins is to miss the
very point of the utterance. Indeed, the whole arrangement strikes one as arti-
ficial and forced. It is not suggested by the narratives themselves, but the out-
lines are first conceived and then the specific cases are made to fit in without
regard to their original purpose or their dominant theme.

II. A much less elaborate scheme is contained in the volume of the Rev.
D. T. K. DRUMMOND, B.A., Oxon., entitled "The Parabolic Teaching of Christ;
or, the Engravings of the New Testament" (1855). The author gives the
widest possible expansion to his theme, enumerating no less than seventy-five
different parables, and he expresses "the deepest admiration at the rich profu-
sion with which all the great objective and subjective truths of the Gospel are
found scattered throughout them." The arrangement he makes is suggested
by his study of their contents and their mutual relations. He finds six classes,
as follows: 1. Those which have expressly to do with the kingdom of dark-
ness, both in regard to the ruler of the kingdom and his subjects. Under this
head come the Rich Fool, the Unprofitable Servants, and more than a dozen
similitudes (such as the Mote and the Beam, the Blind Leading the Blind,
etc.), which are not properly parables at all. 2. Those which expressly illustra-
tes the person and character of the Lord Jesus Christ. These are the Door,
the Vine, the Rock, the Bridegroom, the Brazen Serpent, the Living Bread,
etc., scarcely one of which is entitled to the name of Parable. 3. Those which
refer to Christ's work of grace in its personal and experimental character.
Among these are the three in Luke xv., the Two Sons, the Barren Fig-tree, the
Good Samaritan, etc., together with a number of figurative utterances, such as
the Wind Blowing where it Listeth, the Salt of the Earth, etc. 4. Those
which give a full and accurate description of the reception and progress of the
Gospel in the world. These are the seven in Matthew xiii. with the corre-
sponding one in Mark iv. 5. Those which relate to the great change from the
Jewish dispensation to that of the Gentiles. These are the Great Supper, the
Wicked Husbandmen, and the Marriage of the King's Son. 6. Those which
expressly refer to the Second Coming of Christ. These are the Ten Virgins, the
Talents, the Sheep and the Goats, and a half a dozen similitudes, such as the
Woman in Travail (Jno. xvi. 21).

It seems plain that this classification, instead of being suggested by the para-
bles themselves, has rather originated from the author's own conception of the
relations of Scripture truth. Nor are the lines drawn distinctly. The class
which has to do with the kingdom of darkness omits that parable (the Sower)
which speaks most expressly of Satan's activity in taking away the Word sown
in men's hearts, and it contains two which make no reference whatever to the
evil spirit. The second class is given to a theme, the person and character of
our Lord, which is not, and, indeed, hardly could be, treated in parabolic nar-
rative. The third and fourth classes run together, and the contents of the two
might exchange places without any departure from propriety. The fifth class
errs in giving to the Great Supper a limitation of meaning which is not found
either in the utterance itself or in its connection. A similar objection applies to
the sixth class, because all the true parables it contains would have a great wealth of meaning even if the Second Advent of our Lord were to be understood as merely figurative. This truth, therefore, cannot justly be considered as determining their aim and character. Mr. Drummond has succeeded in arranging his work so as to render it an orderly treatment of much precious truth, but this is gained rather by ingenious and skilful manipulation than by following the natural and obvious suggestions of the parables themselves.

III. Professor Godet, in the Schaff-Herzog "Encyclopædia," says that, "out of thirty parables, properly speaking, six refer to the kingdom of heaven in its preparatory existence under the old dispensation; six to its actual realization in the form of a Church, that is, to the new dispensation from its foundation to its consummation; and eighteen, finally, to the life of the individual members of the Church." Under the first head he places the Wicked Husbandmen, the King's Marriage-feast, the Great Supper, the Strait Gate, the Barren Fig-tree, and the Two Sons, all of which he refers to the Jews, either in themselves or in contrast with the Gentiles. The second group consists of the first four and the last one of the seven parables of the kingdom, contained in Matt. xiii., together with that of the Unjust Judge, which set forth the founding, the mixed character, the growth inwardly and outwardly, and the final discrimination of the Church, and its dangerous state, requiring persistence in prayer. The last group sets forth individual life in the kingdom. One half refers to such as are entering the kingdom. Thus the three in Luke xv. describe the entrance by God's grace and man's faith; the Pharisee and the Publican, and the Friend at Midnight show the conditions of effective prayer, repentance, and faith; and the Hid Treasure, the Goodly Pearl, the Tower-builder, and the King making War treat of the absolute decision and complete sacrifice of everything else required to enter the kingdom. The other half respects those who are already members. Thus the Lower Seats and the Vineyard Laborers inculcate humility, the former with respect to brethren, the latter with respect to God; the Unmerciful Servant and the Good Samaritan inculcate Charity, the former in the way of forgiving others' faults, the latter in that of pitying their sufferings; the Unjust Steward, Dives and Lazarus, and the Rich Fool teach the right use of the good things of this world, not for egotistic enjoyment but in the service of charity; the Talents and the Ten Virgins require the believer to add to virtue, humility, charity, etc., practical activity, and perpetual vigilance in the service of Christ.

The careful reader will observe that Professor Godet inserts among the parables one utterance (the Strait Gate) which is usually omitted, and omits one (the Pounds) which is usually inserted, and in both cases errs. Nor can his divisions be accepted, since they are arbitrary. Surely it is not the meaning, either wholly or chiefly, of the Strait Gate that the larger portion of the Jews are to be shut out from the kingdom because they will not enter through the strait gate of humiliation while the Gentiles shall enter in in multitudes. Nothing in the passage itself or its connection suggests such a thought. Nor can the Two Sons be confined to the Pharisees and the Publicans, but the lesson is for
all time. So, again, the Mustard-seed and the Leaven can just as well be applied to individuals as to the Church in general. On the other hand, not a few of the third group could properly be inserted in the second since they express relations and duties belonging as much to the collective body as to its individual parts. If we are to have divisions at all they must be mutually exclusive and not constantly overlap. Nor does it seem likely that our Lord would devote so large a portion of His parabolic teaching to the old dispensation as Dr. Godet places in his first group. The drapery, indeed, suggests the action of Israel after the flesh, but not in or for itself, but as expressing errors and dangers of perpetual recurrence. The wicked husbandmen of one parable, and the cool rejecters of a gracious invitation in another, represent not only the carnal Jews but worldly-minded hearers of the Gospel in every age, and are just as pertinent and instructive now as when originally uttered.

IV. Dr. Henry Calderwood in his work, "The Parables of our Lord" (London, 1880), discusses the relations of these sayings to each other, and finds the central point of connection, the key to the system, in the phrase with which so many of them open, "The kingdom of heaven, or (as Mark and Luke put it), the kingdom of God, is like unto." From this he infers that they may be regarded as a consistent and complete representation of the kingdom of God in this world—that is, the spiritual kingdom which He has established on earth through the atoning work of the Lord Jesus Christ. The parables depict different aspects of this kingdom, and the consideration of these gives four divisions: first, those which are concerned with entrance into the kingdom; next, those which describe its privileges and duties; thereafter, those which set forth its relations to the present world; and, finally, those which illustrate its relations to the world beyond. The first group is made up of the three in Luke xv., and the Pharisee and the Publican. The second contains the Great Supper and the Marriage of the King's Son, which set forth the stores of blessing; the Friend at Midnight and the Unjust Judge, which exhibit the privilege of prayer and encourage perseverance therein, and the Two Sons and the Good Samaritan, which represent service to God and to our neighbors. The third consists of the seven parables in Matt. xiii., together with the Unjust Steward, or the wise use of this world's possessions, the Laborers in the Vineyard, or work and wages in God's service, and the Wicked Husbandmen, or unfaithfulness in office-bearing. The fourth begins with the contrast shown in Dives and Lazarus, makes Christ's Coming the test of profession in the Ten Virgins, and then considers the Talents, or different gifts yielding equal rewards, and the Pounds, or equality of gifts with diversity of results.

There is beyond doubt an orderly progress and a rounded completeness in this analysis which recommend it highly. Yet it may be questioned whether the key-note is rightly struck. That a considerable number of the parables begin with a reference to the kingdom of God hardly warrants the conclusion that all of them are to be arranged and explained in reference to that kingdom. Nor are the lines drawn in the grouping as distinct and clear as they should be. All the parables placed in the first division could just as well be put in the third,
and many of those in the third (the Sower, the Mustard-seed, the Leaven, etc.), have an equal claim to a place in the first. So the Pounds and the Talents in the fourth division could exchange places with the Unjust Steward, and the Laborers in the Vineyard in the third, without any sacrifice of appropriateness in either case. At first view the suggestion of the fourth division, as containing the parables that show the relations of God’s kingdom to the future state of existence, seems very happy, but a closer consideration shows that all of these bear just as directly upon the duties and interests of the present world. Dr. Calderwood’s classification, therefore, must be held insufficient. There is, however, a paragraph at the end of his chapter on the subject which is well worth quoting. It relates to what is not found in the parables. “The kingdom is described as an existing kingdom; but there is no representation of the laying of its foundations. There is nothing in the parables as to the eternal purpose of God. Nothing as to the everlasting fountain of love out of which the reign of grace has sprung. Of those deeper, more mysterious, but essential realities, there is no indication in the parables. There could not be parabolic representation of such truths. These things are hid, as are the foundations of a building. The parables trace only what admits of analogy with human experience. For this reason also we have no parabolic representation of the death of the Saviour, nothing which comes even so near the grand truth as the figurative saying of our Lord, ‘The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.’ We are not, indeed, without some reference in the parables to the death of the Son of God as in that of the Vineyard, but it is only in illustration of the rebelliousness of those who cast Him out from the vineyard. Of satisfaction to the holiness of God, there could be no parabolic representation, for there is no analogy of human experience which could be employed for such a purpose. No parable depicts to the eye the anguish of Gethsemane—the lifting up of the Saviour, that men might be drawn to Him—and that unfathomable experience of our Lord, when He made His soul an offering for sin, after which He bowed His head and gave up the ghost.” This admirable statement not only sets for than indubitable truth but gives the reasons for it. It occasions the more surprise, therefore, that its author did not see the inherent difficulty of framing into a complete system discourses which, however excellent and striking, still of necessity leave out of view some of the most significant disclosures of the divine mind.

V. Dr. Lange in his Bibelwerk on the Gospel of Matthew somewhat varies the distribution mentioned in the first paragraph of this note. He puts first the progress and development of the kingdom; second, the grace in which it is founded; third, the retributive justice with which it is administered; and fourth, the judgments which complete and usher in the kingdom. The individual contents of each class are stated thus. The first class contains the seven parables of Matt. xiii., with their complement, the Seed Growing Secretly, in Mark. The second begins with parables showing men’s misapplication (1) of God’s temporal blessings in the Rich Fool, and (2) of his long-suffering in the Barren Fig-tree. Then comes the Good Samaritan, indicating
pure compassion, divine or human, and after this the Great Supper, or compassion turning from the blinded to the poor and needy. From this the transition is easy to Saving Mercy as exhibited in the three parables of Luke xv.; its conditions, viz., penitence and faith, in the Pharisee and the Publican; its delays and answers, in the Unjust Judge and the Friend at Midnight; evidences of its experience, in the blessing attached to mercifulness, or the Unjust Steward; and the judgment pronounced upon unmercifulness, whether worldly, as in the case of Dives and Lazarus, or spiritual (uncharitableness), as in the Unmerciful Servant. The third class includes the Laborers in the Vineyard, which shows the reward to be of free grace; the Talents, or the reward of quiet, persevering faithfulness, and the Pounds, or the blessing attached to the faithful use of the gifts entrusted to us as contrasted with the curse attaching to the misapplication of them. The fourth class contains the Marriage of the King's Son, the Two Sons, the Wicked Husbandmen, and the Ten Virgins.

It is not easy to see the force or propriety of this classification. Many of its features seem arbitrary. In the first class, the Hid Treasure and the Pearl have no bearing upon what is said to be the characteristic feature of the class, viz., 'progress and development. In the second it is very forced and unnatural to treat the last three parables there set down as having any connection with the mercy of the Gospel. So in the third, one can easily see how the Laborers in the Vineyard expresses the free grace of the Kingdom, but it is a far cry from this to retributive justice which directs the divine administration. And in the fourth, the Two Sons, which speaks only, or at least mainly, of the acceptance of publicans and harlots upon their repentance, has nothing to do with judgments; whereas the Draw-net and Dives and Lazarus, and yet others beside, might very well find a place in the series which tells of retribution. The whole statement has the vagueness and incertitude which attach to so many of Dr. Lange's prelections, brilliant as they often are.

VI. In Smith's Bible Dictionary the article "Parable," written by Professor Plumptre, contains an attempt at a classification, founded partly on the supposed time of delivery of the parables, and partly on their contents. Three classes are made. The first is the group with which the new mode of teaching is ushered in, and which have for their subject the laws of the divine kingdom in its growth, its nature, its consummation. The second class were delivered in the interval between the mission of the Seventy and the last approach to Jerusalem. They are drawn from the life of men rather than from the world of nature. The third class were uttered immediately before and after Christ's entry into Jerusalem. They are theocratic, but the phase of the divine kingdom on which they chiefly dwell is that of the final consummation. They are prophetic, in part, of the rejection of Israel; in part, of the great retribution of the Coming of the Lord. To the first class are assigned the seven parables of Matt. xiii., with the one in Mark iv. 26-29; to the third, the Pounds, the Two Sons, the Wicked Husbandmen, the Marriage-feast, the Ten Virgins, the Talents, and the Sheep and the Goats; while to the second are given the sixteen remaining of the thirty-one which Dr. Plumptre enumerates.
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So far as this classification is founded upon chronological considerations it may be viewed with favor, but beyond that it furnishes no solid basis to rest upon. No clear discrimination of the second class from the first is made, for the Fig-tree is just as much drawn from nature as the Mustard-seed, and surely the merchantman seeking goodly pearls is as truly taken from the life of man as is the story of the Unjust Steward. Nor is there any attempt to show an advance in the teachings of the second group over those of the first. So in regard to the third group, it is not easy to see why the Two Sons are more in place there than in either of the others; and there is as much prophecy of retribution in Dives and Lazarus as there is in the Wicked Husbandmen. Like many other schemes this one at first blush seems reasonable and satisfactory, but when closely examined it turns out to be artificial and improbable, the result not of any inherent relation between the narratives themselves, but rather of an acute and orderly mind seeking to invent and establish such a relation.

VII. In the clever volume entitled "The Public Ministry of our Lord," issued by Dr. W. G. Blaikie in 1883, there is a chapter on the subject of Parabolic Discourses. The author does not observe the distinction made by judicious writers to the effect that the term parable applies only to parabolic narratives, while there may be and are maxims or extended symbolic comparisons, e.g., the Blowing of the Wind (Jno. iii. 8), the Vine and Branches (xv. 1–8), the Two Builders (Matt. vii. 24–27), which are indeed of a parabolic character, but not strictly parables, because they are either not narrative or furnish no connected narrative. Thus in the case of the last-mentioned a fact is narrated, but this is not to give a continuous history, but only to place in contrast the proceedings of two builders and the different results of their proceedings, without the two men being otherwise placed in any relation to each other. It is, however, possible that, as Dr. Blaikie treated the subject only incidentally, it best answered his purpose to put everything which was at all parabolic under one head. He observes that these utterances of our Lord may be classified either according to the audiences to which they were addressed, or according to the purpose for which they were designed. In the first case he makes four audiences; the mixed multitude (δῆμος), the priests and rulers, the disciples generally, and the special disciples or confidential followers of our Lord. The four are afterward reduced to two; the outer world and the circle of disciples more or less in sympathy with Christ. In the second case he makes two divisions. Certain parables deal with "the kingdom of heaven," the followers of Christ in their united or social capacity; others deal with men individually. Under the first head come those which refer (1) to the origin of the kingdom, as the Sower, and the Tares and the Wheat, (2) to its growth, as the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, (3) to its elements of value, as the Hid Treasure and the Pearl, and (4) to the service it requires, as in the Labours in the Vineyard, the Ten Virgins, the Talents, etc. Under the second head are ranked those which set forth (1) God's feeling toward the sinner, as the Prodigal Son, (2) the Convicted Sinner's feeling toward God, as the Pharisee and the Publican, (3) God a forgiving God, as the Two Debtors, (4) Christ the
way to the Father and the propitiation for sin, as in the Good Shepherd, (5) Christ the source of all spiritual life and strength, as in the Vine and the Branches, (6) this life vitally connected with that which is to come, as in Dives and Lazarus, the Unjust Steward and the Pounds, (7) prayer not only a duty but a privilege, as in the Importunate Widow, and (8) the Christian duty of neighborliness, as in the Good Samaritan.

It is very clear that these classifications, however interesting and suggestive, are not exhaustive. The able author admits as much in regard to the first one, when, to his list of Christ's audiences, he appends the remark, "Some parables were spoken to individuals, or smaller groups." It is, besides, only in a limited degree that the kind of audience will guide us in ascertaining the drift of a parable. The Barren Fig-tree, the Good Samaritan, and the Marriage-feast must have the same meaning under any circumstances. So in respect to the second classification, simple and general as it is, it is easy to find a parable in the first class which could with equal propriety be placed in the second, and vice versa. It is not necessary to adduce examples, since Dr. Blaikie remarks, "that while it is convenient to view the followers of Christ in their two-fold capacity—as individuals, and as members of a community—the two aspects often run into each other, and cannot be wholly detached by any hard line." This frank acknowledgment shows the inherent, if not insuperable, difficulties of the subject. Every systematic arrangement rests upon subjective rather than objective grounds. Dr. Blaikie answers with satisfying point and fulness the questions, On what principle did our Lord select the parables that are given us? When and where did he prepare them? And what permanent homiletical lesson is to be deduced by preachers from his frequent use of this form of address? But he succeeds no better than others in the matter of classification.

VIII. In the Parabolic Teaching of Christ, an able work issued by Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D., in 1883, we find a classification something similar to those of Lange and Plumptre, but more elaborate and thorough. The acute and learned author starts from the assumption that our Lord's teaching ministry falls naturally into three divisions. "He was a Master or Rabbi, with disciples whom He made it His business to instruct; He was an Evangelist, going about among the common people and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom to the poor; and He was a Prophet, not merely or chiefly in the predictive sense of the word, but specially in the sense that He was one who proclaimed in the hearing of His contemporaries the great truth of the moral government of God over the world at large and over Israel in particular, and the sure doom of the impenitent under that righteous government." This being the case the parables may be conveniently, and, as the author believes, usefully distributed into three groups corresponding to these three departments of Christ's ministry, and answering to the three titles, the Master, the Evangelist, the Prophet. First, there is a class which may be distinguished as the theoretic, containing the general truth, or what has been called the "metaphysic" of the divine kingdom. Then there is a large group which may legitimately claim to be called dis-
distinctly the \textit{evangelic}, their burden being grace, the mercy and love of God to the sinful and the miserable—in some more obviously and directly, in others by implication rather than by express statement, but none the less really and effectively. Then, lastly, there is a group which may be characterized as the \textit{prophetic}; using the term not in the predictive so much as the ethical sense, to convey the idea that in this class of parables, Jesus, as the Messenger of God, spoke words of warning and rebuke to an evil time. "Christ was the Light of the world; and in His parabolic teaching He let His light shine upon men in beautiful prismatic rays, and the precious fruit is preserved for our use in three groups of parables; first, the \textit{theoretic} parables, containing the \textit{general} truth concerning the kingdom of God; second, the \textit{evangelic} parables, setting forth the divine \textit{goodness} and grace as the source of salvation and the law of the Christian life; third, the \textit{prophetic} parables, proclaiming the \textit{righteousness} of God as the Supreme Ruler, rewarding men according to their works." It is added that most of Matthew's parables belong to the first and third groups; most of Luke's to the second, a point which has been observed by Trench and also by Renan. The distribution under the heads proposed is given in this way.

1. \textit{Theoretic or Didactic Parables.} The seven in Matt. xiii. with Mark iv. 26-29, all relating to the general nature of the kingdom of God. Besides these, the Selfish Neighbor and the Unjust Judge, relating to the delays of Providence in fulfilling spiritual desires or to perseverance in prayer, the parable of Extra Service (Luke xvii. 7), and the three parables concerning work and wages in the kingdom, the Hours of Labor or laborers in the Vineyard, the Talents, and the Pounds. In all, fourteen.

2. \textit{Evangelic.} To this belong the four of Luke, which together constitute Christ's apology for loving the sinful; the Two Debtors (vii. 40) and the three in chapter xv., the Children of the Bridechamber being an apology for the joy of the children of the kingdom. With these are the Lower Seats, and the Pharisee and the Publican, teaching that the kingdom of God is for the humble; the Great Supper, teaching that it is for the hungry; the Good Samaritan, the Unjust Steward; Dives and Lazarus, and the Unmerciful Servant; the two last together teaching which are the unpardonable sins. In all, twelve.

3. \textit{Prophetic or Judicial.} The children in the market-place, containing Christ's moral estimate of the generation amid which He lived; the Barren Fig-tree, the Two Sons, and the Wicked Husbandmen, and the Marriage of the King's Son, exhibiting more or less clearly the action of divine judgment upon the nation of Israel; the Unfaithful Servant, and the Ten Virgins, exhibiting similar judicial action within the kingdom of God. In all, seven.

The author of this plausible arrangement says that it was not gotten up for the occasion, but insinuated itself into his mind in connection with his studies on the Gospels, which is no doubt exactly true. Yet, if any one made the same analysis of Christ's general teachings which Professor Bruce has done, viz., into His functions as Rabbi, as Evangelist, and as Prophet, he could hardly help distributing the parables into a similar threefold system. Neither of them seems to us well-grounded or satisfactory, just because they cannot be consis-
tently carried through. They make lines of demarcation which do not exist naturally. Professor Bruce sees this, and seeks to forestall the objection. "It must not be imagined that every parable so decidedly comes under one head that it could not with propriety be ranged under any other. This holds good probably of most, but not of all. Some parables are, if we may so express it, of an amphibious character and might be ranged under either of two categories, because partaking of the nature of both. Such, for example, is the parable of the Great Supper, which, while full of mercy toward the homeless, hungry wanderers on the highway, presents an aspect of stern, judicial severity toward those who accepted not the invitations sent to them; and might be classed either as an evangelic or prophetic parable, according as we took for its key-note the word of mercy, 'Compel them to come in,' or the word of judgment, 'None of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.' As another instance, we may refer to the parable of the 'Unprofitable Servants,' as it is commonly called, or, as we prefer to call it, the parable of 'Extra Service.' If we start in our interpretation from the words, We are unprofitable servants, we shall regard the parable as intended to teach that there is no room for merit in the kingdom of God, that all is of grace, and so relegate it to the evangelic category. If, on the other hand, we regard it as the purpose of the parable to impress on the servants of the kingdom the exacting nature of the service to which they are called, and that no man is fit for that service who is disposed to murmur, or who ever thinks he has done enough, then we may not improperly range the parable under the first of the three categories, and treat it as one setting forth one of the properties of the kingdom of heaven." This is very true, but it gives up the whole case. What is said of the two parables referred to may be said of at least one half of the rest. The didactic element, the gracious, and the admonitory, are so blended in these utterances that they refuse to be classified in separate categories, and the attempt to do this is apt to lead astray in the whole conception, or at least to put the emphasis where it was not intended to be laid. It is far safer to judge each parabolic narrative by its natural application in view of the time and place when and where it was delivered, the persons in whose presence it was spoken, and its association with other parables. It is hard enough to do this when one is troubled only by the prejudices of education or tradition, but it is far harder when he is further pressed by the exigencies of a system which draws its lines hard and fast under promise of bringing confusion into order and darkness into light. The temptation is almost irresistible to contract or expand, to bring into prominence or to thrust into obscurity, to interpret literally or figuratively, in accordance with the demands of the classification.

IX. All that remains is to adopt the view of Pastor Göbel, as stated in his work, "The Parables of Jesus: a Methodical Exposition." He denies the possibility of classifying the parables according to their contents. All such attempts lack a scientific aim, and therefore scientific value. They would have such value only in case they sought to formulate the special doctrinal system of the parables. But in that case the parables would be viewed as an integral
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constituent of Christ's synoptical discourses in general, and in settling the doctrinal system of these it is impossible to separate the parables delivered at different times and on various occasions from the non-parabolic discourses. Thus the only scientific justification for a separate treatment of the parables, apart from practical needs, is simply their peculiar form which requires a correspondingly peculiar method of exposition; but this does not justify us in assuming a doctrinal import peculiar to them in contrast with the other discourses of Jesus. The only value of classifications is that they give a synopsis of the parables, arranged in the order of their contents with more or less success. Accordingly he furnishes such a synopsis in two parts; first, the nature and development of the kingdom of God, including (1) the founding of the kingdom; (2) its development (a) in the immediate future (b) down to the end, and (3) its completion; secondly, the right conduct of the members of the kingdom (1) toward God, and (2) toward the world (a) to men (b) to worldly goods. Yet he affirms that such a synopsis, however attractive it may be, is unfit to be the basis of an exegetical treatment of the entire material. Because, on one hand, it compels the exegete following this plan, whenever he approaches a new parable, to assume its doctrinal import, and therefore to assume beforehand the result which it is the aim of his entire work to ascertain, and, on the other, it compels him to break up the connected groups found in the Gospels in favor of his own scheme, and thus to tear a considerable number of single parables from the relation in which they stand to each other. A careful examination of the classifications already given will show that both these evils have been incurred by their authors. The parable is separated from its connection, and its meaning is strained in order to make it fit into the system.

Goebel, therefore, in his volume, confines himself to the chronological or historical order. Three groups strike the eye in the synoptical Gospels. 1. The first series of parables at Capernaum; 2. The later parables according to Luke; 3. The parables of the last period. The first, of course, consists of the seven in Matt. xiii., with the addition of the one which Mark (iv. 26-29) gives as delivered at the same time. The second contains the twelve parables recounted in Luke x.-xvi., xviii., beginning with the Good Samaritan and ending with the Pharisee and the Publican. In all, twelve. Strangely enough Goebel omits the striking parable of the Two Debtors (chapter vii.), because it is so closely interwoven with the narrative of the events which called it forth, and so clearly forms the basis of the longer address delivered thereupon by Jesus that it cannot with propriety be treated apart as an independent passage! This capricious omission is well paralleled by Professor Bruce in his leaving out of consideration the parable of the Rich Fool, because, forsooth, it conveys no new or abstruse lesson, but simply teaches in concrete, lively form a moral commonplace! A more rigid application of such a rule would lessen very considerably the number of parabolic narratives. The third class comprises the Unmerciful Servant, the Laborers in the Vineyard, the Wicked Husbandmen, the Marriage of the King's Son, together with the Ten Virgins, the Talents, and the Pounds. In all, seven. Here, again, there is an omission that is ob-
jectionable. The short and simple parable of the Two Sons is denied an independent treatment and is handled only in brief in the introduction to the Wicked Husbandmen. This seems to be setting up human wisdom against divine. If our Lord thought two parables needful to set forth the conduct of the Jews, it is not for us to say that one would suffice.

Upon the whole, it seems very clear that a doctrinal classification of the parables is out of the question. The wise and learned of different ages and countries have been laboring on the subject, but without success, certainly without coming to any agreement which commands a majority of votes. Nor is any great advantage to be expected even from the accomplishment of the object. The parables are jewels which shine most when viewed separately. They belong more to the ethical than the doctrinal side of the Gospel. They are popular rather than scientific statements of truth, and they lose rather than gain impressiveness by being strung on the bones of a system. They resemble the exquisite beds of wild flowers which are found every spring in the land where these words were first spoken. No human order has been followed, the flowers sprang up of their own accord, yet they make an impression upon the casual spectator deeper and more lasting than that of any elaborate trophy of the florist's skill. A botanist might seek to make a scientific arrangement of them, based upon size, or color, or structure, but he would inevitably destroy the charm and beauty of the bed. So we think that the parables are better left to the place in which we find them instead of being ingeniously woven into a connected and orderly plan. Their true place is that of illustrations in any fair system whether of didactic or of biblical theology, and as a repository for the pastor and the homilist in all the varying occasions of ministerial experience. Making no system themselves they yet fit in admirably along the line of systems constructed on a broader scale or taking in larger portions of the divine Word. And used separately they are of unspeakable worth. Sometimes, indeed, they seem to say with the Samaritan woman, "Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep," and even very wise and good men dislike to affirm positively that they have settled the sense beyond doubt; but so far as the meaning is ascertained, the form gives it a weight and beauty and impressiveness unsurpassed anywhere else. As Dr. Blaikie well says, "To put a sermon into a dozen of lines or a drama into half a page; to bring out the highest lessons as vividly as in the most elaborate composition; to leave them rankling in the conscience and grappling with the will, thus modifying one's whole view of life and duty, is a feat of spiritual dexterity beyond human powers."

I conclude this note with two paragraphs from the Introduction to Dr. William Arnot's Parables of our Lord (1869), which are in substantial agreement with the positions here taken.

"It is doubtless competent to any inquirer to frame the doctrines which the parables illustrate into a logical scheme, and in his exposition to transpose the historical order, so that the sequence of the subjects shall coincide with his arrangement. This method is lawful in regard to the parables particularly, as
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it is in regard to the Scriptures generally; but as a method of prosecuting the inquiry I think it loses more on the side of topical and historical than it gains on the side of logical precision. As the Bible generally is in its own natural order both more engaging and more instructive than a catechism compiled from it, although the compiler may have been both skilful and true; the parables of the Lord in particular, taken up as they lie in His ministry are both more interesting and more profitable than a logical digest of the theology they contain, however faithfully the digest may have been made.

"Any one may observe, as he reads our Lord's parables, that some of them are chiefly occupied with the teaching of doctrine, and others with the reproof of prevailing sins; but when on the basis of these and other subordinate distinctions, you proceed to arrange them into separate classes, you are met and repelled by insurmountable difficulties. When Bauer, for example, has arranged them in three divisions, dogmatic, moral, and historic, he is compelled immediately to add another class called the mixed, as dogmatic-moral and dogmatic-historic, thereby proving that his logical classification has failed."

It may not be amiss to append the opinion of Dr. Edersheim as given in his "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah" (Vol. I., 580, II., 233). He says distinctly of the parables: "Their artificial grouping (as by mostly all modern critics) is too ingenious to be true." He therefore resolves them simply into three series, which are determined by obvious considerations of time and place. First is the Galilean series. These were purely symbolical. They presented unseen heavenly realities under emblems which required to be translated into earthly language. They set forth the elementary truths concerning the planting of the kingdom of God, its development, reality, value, and final vindication. The second is the Peræan Series, which are thirteen in number, and, with the exception of the last, are peculiar to, or most fully recorded in, the Gospel by St. Luke. These could, as they were intended, be understood by all. They required no translation. They were not symbolical, but typical, in the sense of indicating an example, or, perhaps more correctly, an exemplification. They are also intensely practical, and their prevailing character is not descriptive, but hortatory. The third series, consisting of eight parables, are neither symbolical nor typical, but their prevailing characteristic is prophetic. As befits their historical place in the teaching of Christ, they point to the near future. They are the fast-falling, lengthening shadows cast by events near at hand. The kingdom of God is presented in its final stage of ingathering, separation, reward, and loss. One thing, however, is common to all the parables, and forms a point of connection between them. Each is occasioned by some unceasingness on the part of the hearers, and that even when the hearers are professing disciples.

Talbot W. Chambers.

New York.
VII.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

COLLEGE CONFEDERATION IN ONTARIO.

The Province of Ontario has a State College, situated at Toronto, and it has several denominational colleges. Of these the principal are Queen's College, Kingston, Victoria College, Cobourg, and Trinity College, Toronto. Both the State College and the Church Colleges have for some time found their revenues greatly inadequate. The new learning asserts its claims beside the old, and it will not now suffice that a college should have four or five chairs, and should teach Greek and Latin, Mathematics, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and a little Natural Science. Physics, Natural Science in its many branches, the modern languages, the Oriental languages, Comparative Philology, Ethnology, Political Science, Constitutional Law, etc. (not to speak of special professional studies), must all be provided for in college or university. In this fact the difficulty arose.

How could the several colleges of Ontario secure the funds absolutely necessary to respectable equipment? The provincial establishment, the University of Toronto, had a revenue much larger than any of the others; yet its resources were quite insufficient, and its development was consequently arrested. In these circumstances it appealed to the Province—whose child it was—to supply the needed increase of funds. It was a public institution, the crown of the educational system of the Province, and clearly it was the duty of the Province to maintain it in a state of efficiency. But no sooner was this appeal made than the denominational colleges raised their protest. They claimed to be doing at least half of the higher educational work of Ontario. Whatever additional funds should be given to the provincial university would come from the supporters of these colleges as largely as from those who availed themselves of the State institution, and thus an unfair advantage would be given to the University of Toronto over its competitors. The opposition of the denominational colleges was rendered keener by remembrance of the withdrawal, a good many years ago, of an annual grant from the Legislature, which they had previously enjoyed.

Into the merits of the controversy between State colleges and denominational colleges we shall not here enter. Happily, in this instance, an element which has sometimes lent importance to that controversy was eliminated; for no one contended that education should be secular in the sense of being irreligious. The importance of having education in harmony with the principles of the
Christian religion, and pervaded by salutary religious influences, was on all hands allowed and asserted. But the discussion ran as follows: The Provincial University maintained that the State was bound to care for its own institution and furnish the means for its better equipment; the denominational colleges replied that the State must not devote the money of the whole people to build up an establishment which only part of the people are disposed to patronize, and whose superior equipment would render it well-nigh impossible for the other colleges to compete with their wealthy rival.

The community was so equally divided that no Government or Legislature could feel free to do anything. It was clear that the University of Toronto required increased revenue, but it was equally clear that the adherents of colleges whose incomes were not half so great would not consent to the increase. Thus there came a deadlock; the Government was powerless. But there were on both sides of this question many thoughtful and fair minded men who really comprehended the situation, and who anxiously sought for a way by which to harmonize the interests of State colleges and denominational colleges, while securing the important end for which the University of Toronto was contending —more adequate provision for higher education. The keenness of controversy was giving way to comparison of view between the opposing parties, with sincere endeavor to find some solution of the problem which might be accepted by all, and might advance the interests of all the colleges.

At this juncture the Minister of Education for Ontario invited representatives of the University of Toronto, of the Denominational Universities, and of the Theological Schools in Toronto to meet him in conference, with the view to construct, if possible, some scheme which might be helpful on all hands, while it should not traverse the educational policy to which the Province was committed. After protracted consideration these gentlemen agreed upon a plan of College Confederation, the main features of which shall now be described.

1. The scheme proposes to form a Confederation of Colleges carrying on, in Toronto, the work of the Arts Curriculum of the University of Toronto. The following institutions—viz.: Queen's University, Victoria University, and Trinity University, Knox College, St. Michael's College, Wycliffe College, and Toronto Baptist College, shall have the right to enter into confederation with the University of Toronto; such of these institutions as have the power of conferring degrees (except degrees in divinity) keeping this power in abeyance so long as they remain in confederation, and all degrees, whether in Arts, Medicine, or Law, being conferred by the Provincial University.

2. The provincial institution, as a teaching body, shall be divided into two sections, to be denominated University College and the University Professoriate, respectively. (At present the University of Toronto is merely an examining and degree-conferring body, all instruction being given in University College. The model is the University of London.) In the College the following subjects shall be taught—viz.: Greek, Latin, French, German, English, Oriental Languages, and Moral Philosophy; while the University Professoriate shall give instruction in Pure Mathematics, Physics, Astronomy, Geology, Mineralogy,
Chemistry (Pure and Applied), Zoology, Botany, Physiology, Ethnology (including Comparative Philology), History, Logic and Metaphysics, History of Philosophy, Italian and Spanish, Political Economy and Civil Polity, Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, Engineering, and such other Sciences, Arts, and Branches of Knowledge as the Senate of the University may from time to time determine.

3. The Curriculum in Arts shall include the subjects of Biblical Greek, Biblical Literature, Christian Ethics, Apologetics, and Church History. These subjects are made options of the third and fourth years. They will not be taught by the provincial institution, but by the theological colleges in the Confederation; but, as options, they are not limited to students who have the Ministry in view. The colleges which teach these branches will also examine on them, and the University will accept the certification of the colleges.

4. Except in cases specially provided for, all students shall enroll themselves in one or other of the colleges and place themselves under its discipline, while the University Professoriate shall have power of discipline in regard to all University work and duties.

5. The University Endowment and all additions thereto shall be applied to the maintenance of the provincial institution in its several parts, and to it only. The Denominational Colleges, whether Arts or Theological, shall receive nothing from the public treasury.

6. The University lectures shall be free of charge to all matriculated students who are members of a college.

7. The work of University College and of the University Professoriate shall be carried on in the same building (the present University building), and the President of University College shall also be Chairman of the University Professoriate. The Confederating Colleges will, of course, have each its own buildings. Already four of these have buildings contiguous to the University of Toronto, and any that may come from a distance to join the Confederation will require to erect premises near to the University.

8. The governing body of the University, the Senate, shall be composed as follows: The graduates in Arts of the Provincial University shall elect twelve members of Senate, the graduates of each of the other universities shall elect four, and each of the colleges in confederation shall be entitled to two representatives, one of whom shall be the head of the college. The Provincial Government appoints a certain number of members in addition. After six years separate representation of the universities shall cease, and all the graduates, as one body, will unite in electing a number of representatives equal to those elected by the several universities in confederation. The graduates in Medicine of the several universities shall together elect four representatives, and the graduates in Law two representatives.

The scheme comprises many important details, but the provisions here summarized embody its distinctive features. Its central idea is that of a Common University and University Professoriate, while each college will teach a limited number of subjects, and will have the moral supervision of its own students.
It is hoped that the advantages of a public system and a denominational system of higher education will thus be largely combined. The resources of the State will enable a far more complete equipment of the teaching body than would be possible for the confederating universities should they remain separate, while the denominational colleges will have full opportunity of promoting the moral and religious well-being of their students in the way which they deem best. Nor must it be inferred that the students of the provincial college will, in this respect, be uncared for. In this institution the work of every day is preceded by prayer, students in residence attend morning and evening worship, while each student is required to attend the church preferred by parent or guardian. It may further be mentioned that a vigorous and highly useful branch of the Y. M. C. A. exists in University College, and that many of its students are preparing for the ministry and reside in the affiliated theological colleges.

The theological schools are gratified with the provision which places five of their subjects on the Arts Curriculum. They regard the curriculum as not degraded, but enriched thereby. The arrangement has the following results: (a) Students for the Ministry can take two of these subjects as options in their third Arts year, and two in their fourth; and, as the theological seminars will give them credit for the work thus done, their entire course of training may be shortened by one year—i.e., they may complete their Arts and Theological courses in six years instead of seven. Considering the high standard of matriculation in the University of Toronto, this is, perhaps, as long a period of study as the Church should demand. But whilst it will be possible to complete the course in six years, in ordinary cases students will be encouraged (by the Presbyterian Church at least) to give seven years to the work, and the great majority of them will continue to do so. (b) Students for other professions will have it in their power while proceeding to their degree in Arts to gain some good acquaintance with important branches of theology; and we cannot doubt that some of them, to their great advantage, will do so; the religious effect will surely be good.

This scheme of confederation was drawn up by representatives of nine universities and colleges, and if accepted by all these institutions it would bring nearly all the higher education of Ontario into the league. The scheme was submitted by the Minister of Education to the governing bodies of the universities and colleges for their consideration, with the result that it was, in substance, approved of by the University of Toronto, the three theological colleges, and St. Michael's College; rejected by Queen's University; while Victoria University approved with certain non-essential modifications, and Trinity University suggested modifications much more radical.

The Government of Ontario could not, of course, give effect to confederation unless it should receive a measure of support from the denominational colleges; and as Queen's had declined to enter the alliance, and the final action of Trinity was doubtful, everything seemed to turn upon the decision to which the Methodist Church should come in respect to Victoria. The Provincial Government would go forward if it secured the vote of Victoria in addition to that of
the colleges which had already signified concurrence. The matter awaited the action of the Methodist Quadrennial Conference, which was to meet in Toronto in September, 1886; for the approval of the Regents of Victoria College required confirmation by the Supreme Court of the Methodist Church, to which Victoria belonged.

The friends of confederation both in the Methodist Church and beyond it were looking forward with much interest to the meeting of the Conference, and no one could predict how the matter would issue. Local conferences had voted, some for and some against the scheme, and there was certain to be a strong debate in the general Conference. Accordingly, when the Conference met the question was discussed with remarkable ability for nearly four days. We cannot profess to give an adequate summary of the arguments for and against; little, indeed, remained to be added to the reasonings already set forth in the newspapers and in pamphlets. The opponents of confederation urged that it was a departure from the traditional policy of the Methodist Church; that it would separate the interests of Victoria from those of the other denominational colleges, with which she had hitherto made common cause; that the cost of removal from Cobourg to Toronto and of commencing the new status would be too great; that the interests of Victoria could not safely be entrusted to a body constituted like the University Senate; that no adequate provision was made in the scheme—no adequate guarantee furnished—for giving its due place to religion; that the Church could not be expected enthusiastically to support an institution whose fortunes would be bound up with those of the provincial establishment. The advocates of the scheme maintained that, while, in form, it departed from the policy hitherto pursued, it really secured all which that policy aimed at; that it was right and proper—the duty of the Methodist Church to her own people and to the country—to claim her share in the Provincial University and contribute her part toward its increased efficiency; that the Methodist Church could not without injury isolate herself from the general educational life of the Province; that, while removal to Toronto involved expenditure in the first instance, it would ultimately be cheaper than continuance at Cobourg, seeing that the development of the University Professorate by the Government would obviate the necessity, already urgent, of establishing new chairs in Victoria College; that the Confederation would possess a completeness of equipment and an educational efficiency which no separate college could hope to rival; that the religious interests of the students would not suffer, because their connection with the college would be as close as before; that the composition of the common University Senate, on which all the colleges and theological schools would be fairly represented, would be ample guarantee that antichristian teaching should find no shelter in the University.

The vote was at length taken, and confederation was carried by a majority of 45 in a house of 251. It is to the credit of the Conference that the members who had taken part against confederation are prepared loyally to work with those who supported it in making the scheme successful. A committee representing both sides in the debate was at once appointed, and steps to procure
the necessary funds began to be taken. On the floor of the Conference one gentleman promised $50,000, two $30,000 each, and another $25,000. This is a good beginning for a young country, and we cannot doubt that the Rev. Dr. Potts, one of the ablest and most energetic members of the Conference, who was immediately appointed Educational Secretary of the Methodist Church, will succeed in completing the amount required for building and endowment.

The legislation necessary to give effect to confederation has yet to be obtained, but the Government of Ontario will, doubtless, secure the enactment of a measure which will make the stipulated changes in the form and administration of the University of Toronto and University College, and will provide means for the expansion of the professoriate and the erection of additional buildings. The Ontario Legislature meets about the new year, and the matter may be expected to come before it without delay.

We do not feel at liberty to indulge in any predictions respecting the action which may eventually be taken by the colleges which have for the present declined confederation, or have not signified adherence to it. Some friends of the movement are sure that in time Trinity College will accept the scheme, and that Queen's will review its decision and cast in its lot with the new organization. Queen's has not only good professors, but a good local position, being situated about half way between Montreal and Toronto; and after the removal of Victoria to Toronto there will be no degree-conferring body in all this distance, except the Roman Catholic College at Ottawa. It cannot be necessary to her existence that she should leave her present home; whether her adhesion to confederation would promote her efficiency and prove advantageous to the general cause of higher education are important questions, which it may be somewhat premature to discuss.

Perhaps some readers of The Presbyterian Review may be interested in this problem of Canadian colleges, and may regard it as not without significance in relation to the general movement toward securing greater efficiency and more perfect adjustment of interests in the Higher Education.

William Caven.

Toronto.
THE PENDING OVERTURES.

We are in great danger just now arising out of hasty legislation, and there is need of another Barrier Act to serve a purpose somewhat different from that for which the Church of Scotland framed the old one. The danger with us is not that we shall legislate without consent of the Presbyteries, but that the Presbyteries will be asked to legislate prematurely and without adequate consideration on the part of the General Assembly of the Overtures sent down to them. The idea that the Presbytery is the fountain of power seems to have the effect of weakening the sense of responsibility in the General Assembly, and the result is that Presbyteries are sometimes called upon to vote upon matters affecting the doctrine and polity of the Presbyterian Church without knowing what the mind of the Church is so far as that mind is supposed to be represented in the General Assembly. It may be wise in rare cases for the Assembly to submit alternative Overtures to the Presbyteries simply for the sake of testing public sentiment, and with a distinct reserve of its own legislative rights; but for an Assembly to submit Overtures to be voted upon by Presbyteries, with the understanding that they become law the moment a majority of the Presbyteries approve of them, and without any adequate discussion beforehand on the part of the Assembly as to the wisdom of making the legislative changes involved in these Overtures, is a serious wrong.

But will any one pretend that the Overtures now before the Presbyteries were adequately discussed in the General Assembly? A member of that body proposed an Overture respecting the eligibility of Ruling Elders to the Moderatorship; it was referred to a committee which (after an adverse Report and a recommittal) reported in its favor, and it was thereupon sent down to the Presbyteries with little or no debate. The same is true of the Overture concerning the proposed change in the Confession of Faith, except that it originated in a Presbytery. Both of these Overtures involve important points in Theology, Polity, and Constitutional Law. They concern matters about which serious difference of opinion exists. Yet there was little or no discussion. There was no effort to invoke the judgment of those whose experience and learning give them a special right to be heard. There was no effort to put matters in a clearer light by discussion upon the floor of the Assembly, or by reference to a committee instructed to report at the next Assembly. It must be said in justice to Dr. Craven, the Chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, that, while he was in favor of submitting to the Presbyteries the Overture affecting the Confession of Faith, he believed that the question should be first discussed in the Assembly, and gave notice on the floor of the Assembly of his readiness to discuss it. Many, we do not doubt, were opposed to one or both of the Overtures, but were content to feel that the lower courts could be trusted to do right, and that responsibility goes with power, both being lodged in the Presbyteries.

If there were no other reasons for voting against these Overtures than the fact
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that they were not fully considered by the Assembly before being sent down to the Presbyteries, we should vote against both of them; for it is time, we think, that some protest were made against the perfunctory manner in which the General Assembly performs its duties when it sends down Overtures to the Presbyteries, involving serious changes in the doctrine and polity of the Church, without having taken the trouble to determine by careful deliberation whether these changes are right and wise.

The sense of responsibility which every member of the Assembly should feel, as a member of a legislative body, ought to prevent him from voting for an Overture unless he is willing to have it become law; and the fact that he may believe that the Presbyteries are the real legislative power, and that the vote of a majority of the Presbyteries is decisive, instead of lessening his sense of responsibility should enhance it. For if the General Assembly is bereft of all legislative function beyond that of opening the door for the passage of an Overture down to the Presbyteries, it behoves it to perform that function with great care, and to remember that the one opportunity for the entire Church to speak simultaneously in matters of legislation is when the General Assembly submits an Overture to the Presbyteries. We do not believe that this is the true view respecting the legislative powers of the General Assembly, but many hold it, and some, we doubt not, apologize on this ground for the growing laxity of the General Assembly respecting Overtures.

It will require a separate article in order to discuss the important points of Constitutional Law which are raised by Dr. Craven in his very able, acute, and painstaking paper printed in this number of THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. We hope to find time to show in our next issue that, in some of his positions at least, Dr. Craven is manifestly wrong; and we shall be certainly very sorry if, on further and fuller inquiry, we find that he is right. For if the view presented by Dr. Craven be correct, it is easy to see what a simple matter the subversion of our confessional system might become.

According to Dr. Craven: (1) The Confession, Catechisms, Form of Government, and Book of Discipline stand on the same level. One and the same rule applies alike to all so far as the mode of amending them is concerned. (2) The mode of changing the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (meaning the Confession, Catechisms, Form of Government, and Book of Discipline) is by Overture embodying the proposed change submitted by the General Assembly to the Presbyteries, it being understood that whenever an Overture receives the support of a majority of the Presbyteries it, ipso facto, becomes law. We deny both of these propositions; and it is of the utmost importance in our judgment that an opposing view be maintained. The case pending may serve as an illustration. It happens to be a proposition to strike out that portion of the Confession that bears upon marriages of affinity. Amendments are likely to come in this way. Small and apparently insignificant changes will be proposed for the sake of better phraseology, or "to remove a stumbling-block," or to secure greater clearness of expression. They are likely to be proposed at intervals, and no single Assembly will have the responsibility of all of them
upon its shoulders. When the revision movement begins it is likely to have a long history. Every Assembly is apt to have at least one man who thinks that he can improve the Confession of Faith, and now and then there will be one bold enough to frame an Overture embodying a change. As the Assembly is increasingly averse to theological debates, it is not difficult to imagine that an Overture embodying a proposed amendment would be submitted to the Presbyteries without much discussion. It is so easy to say that the Presbyteries can do as they please, and that there is no harm in giving them the opportunity to say "yes" or "no." The General Assembly, having no legislative power, lets the matter go before the Presbyteries without bringing the united wisdom of the Church to bear upon the question for the guidance of the Presbyteries. The Presbyteries then vote. It is sheer nonsense to say that every Presbytery that counts one in the settlement of the question is equally capable of reaching a wise decision. Yet they act without concert, without the advantage of previous debate in the Assembly, and under the leadership of the denominational papers, which are not always free from the spirit of partisanship and are beginning to perform the functions that properly belong to the General Assembly. The next General Assembly meets and is formally opened with imposing services, but is found, after all, to have no other legislative use than that of furnishing an audience to the Stated Clerk, who announces also very formally, and with the dignity befitting his office, the fate of the Overtures submitted by the last Assembly. We hope, for the sake of the dignity of this venerable body, that the views of Dr. Craven will not prevail. We hope, for the sake of sound theology, that the safeguards will not be so far removed as to place the revision of the Confession of Faith upon the same level with an ordinary rule of ecclesiastical procedure. And for the sake of peace and harmony, we hope that the present Overture on the Confession of Faith will either pass by an overwhelming majority or not pass at all, so that there may be no chance of a dispute in the civil courts respecting the binding character of the Adopting Act of 1788.

We do not think it necessary to say much on the Elder-Moderator question. Whether there are or are not two classes of elders in the New Testament, there are two classes in the Presbyterian Church, and have been since John Calvin's day. Our Form of Government recognizes this fact, and very wisely provides that the Moderator of every church court from the Session to the General Assembly shall be a Minister. Ministers in our Church are members of Presbytery by virtue of their ordination; Ruling Elders are not. Ministers are ordained by Presbytery; Ruling Elders are not. Ministers are required to have a liberal education, and are rigidly examined in Theology before they are ordained. This is not true of Ruling Elders. Ministers are supposed to have a divine call to preach the Gospel, and usually give up all secular business. This cannot be said of Ruling Elders. It is vain to idealize and suppose that we can undo history and lead the Presbyterian Church back to the New Testament model by making the Ruling Elder eligible to the Moderatorship.

Bishops and Elders are convertible terms in the New Testament, but Min-
ister and Ruling Elder are not convertible terms in the Presbyterian Church; and we cannot make them so unless we insist on a theological education as a requirement for the office of Ruling Elder, or give up our idea of an educated ministry. It is supposed by some that the adoption of the Overture now pending will elevate the eldership, and impress those who exercise the office with the idea of its importance. It is more likely to laicize the ministry, and be a step toward lowering the standard of ministerial qualification, which has been the boast and glory of the Presbyterian Church.

Some years ago we adopted the system of rotary eldership to a great extent under the influence of the idea that the Elder is a layman. It is now proposed to make Elders eligible to the Moderatorship of the General Assembly on the ground that the Elder is a Minister. The tendency of all this is to put Minister and Elder on the same level, and both on a lower level in the eyes of the people than they occupied before the love of change took possession of the Presbyterian Church.

F. L. PATTON.

ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER HODGE.

It is with feelings of uncommon sadness that we place on record here the leading facts that serve to mark the career of the eminent theologian who entered into his rest on the 12th day of November last. The universal sense of loss which found expression in the columns of the religious press both in this country and in Great Britain is a testimony to the large place he held in the esteem of all, the great work he was doing for the world, and the great bereavement that Christendom has sustained by his removal. The sense of loss is, of course, increased by the suddenness of his death. A week before he died Dr. Hodge’s expectation of life, so far as human judgment could foresee, was nearly as great as that of most men at sixty years of age. He was in the zenith of his power, and those who knew and loved him best fondly hoped that the best and ripest work of his life was yet before him. But why do we concede so much to the unchristian thought that a man’s career is bounded by the grave? why, since we believe in immortality, do we not also give practical expression to belief in a perpetuity of service? The writer of the Acts of the Apostles speaks of the earthly life of the incarnate Logos as the beginning of a great career, when he refers to a former treatise of all that Jesus began to do and to teach until the day that he was taken up into heaven. We are reminded of these words when a lifelong friend of Dr. Hodge says to us in a letter just received: “God must have had some wonderful work for him to do, or he would not have cut short the great work that he was doing here.”

Archibald Alexander Hodge was born in Princeton on the 18th day of July, 1823. He was surrounded by a literary atmosphere in his boyhood, and came into close contact with that coterie of distinguished men who met habitually
in his father's study to discuss the great theological topics of the times. "He was clever and genial, and fond of saying extravagant things;" but he "matured slowly," and as a boy was neither indolent nor over-studious. He was the subject of religious impressions at an early age, and religion was always the dominating feature of his life. He had prejudices, and his likes and dislikes were not always under the control of his reason and his will, but they invariably gave way in the presence of his religious feelings and his loyalty to Christ. We have never known a man who exhibited a more unselfish desire to serve his Master. In all he said and did it was manifest that to glorify his Lord was glory enough for him.

Besides his own father, he was in the habit of referring to two other teachers, and it is safe to say that Archibald Alexander, Joseph Henry, and Charles Hodge were the men who specially exercised a formative influence upon his mind. What a combination of intellectual and moral forces these three names suggest! Dr. Alexander, the keen, sagacious seer, was always his type of earthly sainthood. He referred to him frequently, and always with veneration and affection. Dr. Hodge was Professor Henry's favorite pupil, and from him he acquired the taste for physical science which he carried with him through life. In the Theological Seminary he was one of a group of students who were in the habit of reproducing almost verbatim Dr. Charles Hodge's lectures in Systematic Theology. In this way, as well as through the study of Turretine and the preparation of written answers to questions submitted to the class by his father every week, he laid the foundation of his attainments in the department of which in after years he was such a brilliant ornament.

After graduating from College he taught classes for a year in the Lawrenceville Academy, and was for a year after that a tutor in Princeton College. In 1847 he sailed for India under a commission of the Board of Foreign Missions. His stay was brief, owing to his own illness and that of his wife, but his experience as a missionary at Allahabad was invaluable to him in giving him a grasp of the missionary problem, and enabling him in later years to act as a wise and sympathetic counsellor and friend of those among his pupils who contemplated a missionary career. Returning from India, he settled first (1851) in Lower West Nottingham, Md., where he remained until 1855, when he was called to Fredericksburg, Va. Here he labored with characteristic earnestness and fidelity. His preaching was able, earnest, logical, and theological. Occasionally, as we learn from the present pastor of that church, "he poured out a current of thought and feeling irresistible to him and profoundly impressive to the people." He was not specially adapted, however, to the pastoral work, and "confessed and mourned it constantly;" but he was always "earnestly spiritual," was "exceedingly sensitive to the pain, want, or trouble of his people," and was "esteemed and loved by all." It was during the Fredericksburg pastorate that he prepared and published his "Outlines of Theology"—a circumstance that is worthy of note as showing that, in order to do good work in the sphere of theological authorship, a leisurely professorship is not so necessary as some suppose; and, moreover, that it is not impossible to
give homiletical shape to a System of Theology and make it acceptable to the
people. First in Fredericksburg and afterward at Wilkesbarre the several chap-
ters of the "Outlines" were preached in the form of sermons to congregations
of eager listeners. The people may dislike doctrinal preaching, we grant, but
the fault is not in the doctrine nor altogether in the people. Some allowance
must be made for the way in which the doctrines are presented. Dr. Hodge
had unusual power in this respect. He had a rare gift of illustration, remark-
able fluency, an easy command of the whole dogmatic area, and great fervor. No
one could deny the presence of the theologian when Dr. Hodge began to
preach, and as the discourse proceeded the use of technical terms suggested
the scholastic theologian: but it would not be long before the hearer felt him-
self under the spell of a great spiritual power; and when, in his best moods, he
poured out a stream of thought and feeling, of theology and philosophy, of
argument and illustration—flowing smoothly and growing more copious every
moment, choked now and then by an effort to repress emotion, and at last
breaking loose in a torrent of passion and pathos—the effect was simply
wonderful.

In 1861 Dr. Hodge accepted the pastorate of the First Church in Wilkes-
barre, Pa., and in 1864 was called to the chair of Systematic Theology at
Allegheny, Pa. Speaking of his work there, Dr. Paxton says: "His success as
an instructor was not only satisfactory, but wonderful. His plan was first to lecture
upon a subject, and then he would appoint an hour for a free talk with his class
upon the same subject. He encouraged the students to ask questions or propose
objections. His capacity upon such occasions to pour out a stream of instruc-
tion beyond the lecture, his readiness in answering objections, and his singular
power of curious and original illustrations, excited the wonder of the students
and aroused a great enthusiasm for the study of theology." His power as a
preacher soon became known, and he was in very general demand. He sup-
plied the vacant pulpit of the First Church of Pittsburg for a year, and after
that became pastor of the North Church in Allegheny City. "By this arrange-
ment he accomplished the double work of pastor and professor with great suc-
cess. Lawyers, judges, and men of intellect and education gathered to hear
him with great delight." It was during his life at Allegheny that he wrote
his work on the Atonement and his "Commentary on the Confession of
Faith." In both of these books he reveals his strong convictions, his power
of analysis, and his ability to make sharp and discriminating definitions.

In 1877 it became his manifest duty to go to Princeton to lighten his father's
labors, who, owing to the increasing infirmities of age, was beginning to feel
the need of assistance. His inauguration as Associate Professor took place on
the 8th of November of that year, and in the following year he succeeded to the
chair made vacant by his father's death. The years that constitute the closing
period of Dr. Hodge's life were filled up with the manifold duties incident to
his position in Princeton Seminary. He was public-spirited, and took great
interest in all local matters of a political, social, and religious character. As
a Trustee of the College of New Jersey, he was devoted to its interests and
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the spiritual welfare of its students. He was in constant demand wherever there was a vacant pulpit. His pen was always busy, and he had a large correspondence. He was one of the founders of this Review; during the first four years of its existence was its senior editor; nearly every Number has contained some contribution from his pen; and he is now the fourth of those whose names have appeared on its cover who have gone from a career of incessant and toilsome activity to the rest and the reward of Heaven.* There was, however, comparatively little in the career of Dr. Hodge to link his memory with that of great public movements. His life is not, as his father's was, a chapter in the history of the Presbyterian Church. It was uneventful not only in the absence of marked episode of personal experience, but also in its comparative unrelatedness to events of a public nature that occurred during his lifetime. He was opposed to Reunion (though he voted for it at the last), and took no prominent part in the negotiations. He was averse to forensic encounters, and took no part in the debates in the General Assembly. He was not a writer of Review articles as his father was, and therefore did not touch the Church at so many points. His fame will rest upon his didactic writings, his power as a teacher, and the impression produced by him in the pulpit.

Soon after he came to Princeton he published an article in the Princeton Review entitled Ordo Salutis, which as a piece of theologizing addressed to technical theologians is perhaps the most original piece of work he ever did. But, of course, he is best known by his "Outlines," which in the enlarged form was afterward republished in Great Britain and at intervals translated into Welsh, modern Greek, and Hindustani. His power of statement and his positiveness of conviction are admirably illustrated in this volume, though not his power of illustration nor his breadth and catholicity of sentiment. He held tenaciously to the theology which his father taught, but he was looking out all the time for the points of agreement among Calvinistic theologians, and saw very clearly that in the new controversies that were coming or already here, the leading men on both sides of the old debates would, if they were now living, stand shoulder to shoulder. He was a Presbyterian by birth and conviction, though not an advocate of strong jure divino views of Church polity. He regarded all man-made schemes for the reunion of Christendom as Utopian, whether based on the prayer-book or on prelacy; and yet he loved the "Christian year," and had great respect for the ancient formularies. His eminence as a theologian is due not so much to great theological erudition nor to minute and accurate scholarship: but to the fact that he was a strong, earnest, devout religious thinker, who brought the resources of an incisive intellect, a fertile imagination, and a warm heart to bear upon the old loci of theology; and that these loci had been thought over and thought through so often and so comprehensively that he was constantly on terms of easy familiarity with them, and could present them in the pulpit and the professor's chair in the strong light of pertinent metaphor and with the charm of versatile expression.

* An editorial notice of the late Dr. Croskery, who died last Autumn, will appear in our next Number.
Dr. Shedd expresses a sentiment that is shared by many far and wide over the Church when he says, "Princeton has been favored of God in having its theological chair filled by such a father and such a son—duo fulmina belli. Sameness and continuity of influence give great momentum to theological instruction. The two Hodges taught one and the same Calvinism. The two Turretins did not. Long may this system be taught to the classes in Princeton." Dr. Hodge did not "lecture" (as we commonly understand that word); nor did he make slavish use of his father's Systematic Theology. He required the students to master that work as their textbook; but the interplay of question and answer on the part of professor and students was the occasion for his inimitable extemporaneous utterances, in which all the elements of wit, humor, pathos, the sublime, the grotesque, argument, analysis, definition, appeal, apostrophe, and adoring admiration of the Saviour combined to produce a result that filled his pupils with amazement and roused the dullest even to an enthusiasm for theology. "Sometimes," says one of his pupils, "it was a marvellous, original, bold illustration which clinched the doctrine in our memories beyond the possibility of being forgotten; sometimes he would run back to a doctrine discussed some weeks before, and would give us a bird's-eye view of all the connections of the system, carrying us up to the great watersheds of truth, and showing us the country as it stretched out on either side. . . . Our theology, thanks to that method, was inwrought more or less into the warp and woof of our thinking."

Both in the pulpit and in the class-room Dr. Hodge revealed what may be called his distinguishing power as a theologian, and that which more than anything else, perhaps, serves to define his position among contemporary divines—the power of popularizing scientific theology. This was never so manifest to the public as it was in the delivery of a course of lectures in Philadelphia last winter, when large audiences gathered at a busy hour of the day and hung upon his lips, while he talked to them by the hour on the most profound topics in divinity. The interest which these lectures awakened when they appeared in the newspapers, and the enthusiasm with which he was received at Orange, N. J., only a few weeks before his fatal illness led many to suppose that the crowning work of his life, and that for which all his previous attainments were the preparation, would be the awakening of a popular enthusiasm in behalf of theology; and it is when we think of what he was doing and of what, if he had lived, he might have done, that we begin to appreciate our loss. Of course the loss that Princeton Seminary has sustained is irreparable. He came to take his father's place, and we can give him no higher praise than to say that he filled it. He met and more than met every expectation. In the pulpit, at the Conference on Sunday afternoon, in the lecture-room, and through the press he was known and recognized as an intellectual and spiritual force. He was a man of large heart, full of affection, a true friend, companionable, always accessible, full of wit, beaming with kindness and good-nature. It is not strange that one who was his colleague and who shared his confidence should emphasize the loss which they have sustained who were most
closely related to him. It may seem perhaps that our admiration of Dr. Hodge has made us extravagant in his praise, and that, standing in the shadow of a great sorrow, we have supposed that this theological eclipse is visible over a wider area than it is. It is easy to fall into such mistakes, but we believe that our judgment is that of sober truth. From far and near, from other lands and from all quarters in this land, the testimonies have come in that speak of the loss that Christendom has sustained. Dr. Cairns, of Edinburgh, expresses a sentiment shared by multitudes when, in a letter to Mrs. Hodge, he says: "The whole evangelical Church has lost in him a powerful and intrepid defender of its best and dearest beliefs, and, strong as is the array of Presbyterianism on your continent, he was a leader whom we could ill afford to lose."

Of course we claim for him no place of supremacy among contemporary theologians, but no one will hesitate to make ungrudging recognition of his greatness; and those who knew him best knew, too, that he possessed a greatness that was all his own. His thought and learning were those of a genius and a saint, and he occupies a unique position among his peers. He held the Reformed theology as a sacred trust. He defended it with zeal, taught it with enthusiasm, and reflected it in his life. As a thinker he was analytic, comprehensive, and profound. He had an unfailling supply of imagery, and though he cared little for the graces of a polished style, in the power of gleaming utterance he had few equals. Profound theologians do not always shine in the pulpit; but Dr. Hodge was a superb preacher. He had both unction and vivacity; he was both orthodox and original. Those who have heard his sermons on Miracles, the Resurrection, the Immanence of God, or Heaven, will never forget them. His power of expression lent charm to his instruction in the class-room. Professors vary greatly in the impressions they produce. Some succeed in securing the respect of the students on account of their depth or learning. Some interest a few of the choicer minds, filling them with good things, while the rest are sent empty away. Dr. Hodge had the power of enlisting general enthusiasm. He thought, he communicated thought, and he succeeded as few men ever do in stowing thought in the minds of the duldest and most indifferent students. He was bold, simple, singularly sincere, ignorant of diplomacy, and a hater of shams. He was affectionate and full of admiration. He loved as few men do, and those who came within the circle of his friendship loved him with all their hearts. His death was sudden, but never was one more ready for it. He preached with great power and persuasiveness in the College Chapel on Sunday morning, participated in the usual Conference services in the Seminary in the afternoon; was taken ill on Sunday night, and after a period of great suffering found rest in the sleep of death about midnight on Thursday.

A large concourse of friends, consisting of Professors and Students of the Seminary and the College, Professors of other institutions and Ministers from a distance met at the Seminary Chapel on Tuesday to pay the last tribute of respect to his memory. The stores were closed when the long procession passed through the streets to the First Presbyterian Church, where the
simple but impressive services were held. Dr. Paxton, a lifelong and in-
timate friend of Dr. Hodge, gave expression to the universal sense of loss in
an address of singular beauty and tenderness. Young men, chosen from
among his latest pupils, carried him to his last resting-place. We followed
along the rugged street that leads to the place which from time to time has
claimed the best that Princeton had to give: Edwards, the Alexanders, Charles
Hodge, Atwater, Guyot, Maclean—men who have given Princeton a name in
all the earth. We left him in this goodly company, and turned sorrowfully
away.

F. L. Patton.
LETTER ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PRESBYTERIANS AND EPISCOPALIANS IN ENGLAND, BY BENEDICT PICTET, 1708.

ONE of the most encouraging signs of the times is the craving for Christian union, which is manifest in the several denominations of Christians. The "Declaration of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Council assembled, October 20th, 1886," should find a cordial response from the Presbyterian Church. The four terms that are set forth therein as "essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom" are, in my judgment, entirely satisfactory, provided nothing more is meant by their authors than their language expressly conveys.

There is room for some difference of interpretation, but these terms ought to be received in the same generous manner in which they are offered, in the hope that these differences will be removed by conference and discussion.

No Presbyterian can consistently object to (1) "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God," or (3) the two sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, administered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him."

It might be objected that (2) "the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith," is too narrow a plank for a summary of Christian doctrine, and that it ignores the subsequent history of doctrine in Christendom. But Presbyterians can hardly exact from other religious bodies the maximum of the Westminster standards. If Episcopalians are willing to waive their own doctrinal standards in order to union upon the fundamental creed of Christendom, I do not see with what propriety other denominations can refuse to meet them on this common platform. It is not proposed that the denominations should abandon their own symbols of faith, but that they should find a common ground for unity.

The fourth term, "the Historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of the Church," gives more room for differences of opinion. But it is certain that if the English bishops had offered these terms to the Westminster divines, there would have been no separation. The English Presbyterians offered to unite on the basis of "the reduction of Episcopacy under the form of synodical government," proposed by Archbishop Ussher, but the English bishops declined. Presbyterians are bound by their own history to meet the Episcopalians on this platform. If the House of Bishops mean to advance thus far, they have taken a great step toward the reunion of Christendom. The delicate and difficult questions involved in the adaptation of the "historic episcopate" might be removed by friendly conference in the spirit of Jesus Christ.

The House of Bishops say nothing of the Book of Common Prayer or the Canons of the Church. We understand that the following clause refers to them, "That in all things of human ordering or human choice relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, this church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own." If this reference be correct, this proposal is all that could be reasonably required.
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It is our intention to discuss this matter in subsequent numbers of this Review. In the meanwhile we publish an important letter of Benedict Pictet, the famous divine of the Reformed Church of Geneva, that bears upon this subject. It is addressed to Dr. Nicholls in reply to certain queries sent by him to the Reformed Professors at Geneva, and refers to the book of Dr. Nicholls, entitled *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae in qua vindicatur omnium, qua ab adversariis in doctrina, cultu, et disciplina ejus, improbantur*. London: 1707. This letter discloses some of the historic barriers to union that might have been so easily removed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They afford a good basis for discussion at the present time, all the more that the situation has changed so greatly in many respects.

As Richard Baxter said in 1691, "Oh, how little would it have cost your churchmen in 1660 and 1661 to have prevented the calamitous and dangerous divisions of this land, and our common dangers thereby, and the hurt that many hundred thousand souls have received by it! And how little would it cost them *yet to prevent the continuance of it!*"

This letter of Benedict Pictet is contained in the Letter Books of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Vol. IV., pp. 145-50, both in the original Latin and in the English translation that is given below.

C. A. BRIGGS.

To the Reverend Dr. Nicholls, Presbyter of the Church of England, Benedictus Pictet wisheth all happiness.

I do not doubt but that you will pardon me for my so late answering your very kind Letter, when you consider that I must first read over your Book, which you have increased my study with—and then consult with several of my Reverend Collegues about the Queries which you sent me. And now after this done I come to you to thank you for your writing to me; for sending me your Book and for opening your mind to me.

I am not a little grieved that the unhappy Separation has given occasion to your Book; and I put up my earnest Prayers to God, that the minds of all who live under your great Queen may in a short time be happily united together. I confess I cou'd never be ambitious of a greater honour than to contribute anything toward yt promoting peace among you not only by my Writings, but even by spending my very Blood, to bring about that so desireable a Peace among your Churches.

I have read your Book with greediness, but you must pardon me if I freely declare, on the score of the Liberty which you have afforded me, that you too roughly treat our Mr. Calvin, when you make him the Author of the Separation among you, when you say, That he broke the peace of your Church, that he by raising objections against your reformation set those of your Communion a quarrelling; That he was grieved to see his Geneva Discipline to be outshone by the splendour of the Episcopal Government. Spare, good Sir, these hard expressions. He was neither the Author nor yet the Cherisher of your Separation. Therefore I appeal from your self to your own equity. For that great man in his Confession of Faith which he offer'd to the Emperor in the Diet at Frankford, speaks thus:

Wee confess that all and every Church have this undoubted right, to make Laws and Statutes for themselves for the establishing a Common Polity among their own members, since all things in the House of God ought to be done in decency and in Order; That Obedience ought to be paid to these Laws, so they do not lay any burden upon the Conscience nor have any Superstition annexed to them; they that disown this are reckoned among us for Fanaticks and obstinate people.

And so in the 4th Book of his Institutions, Chap. 10, Because in outward Discipline and Ceremonies our Master Christ was not pleased so to prescribe anything in particular for us to follow (because He foresaw that that must depend upon the Circumstances of the times, and that one Uniform Rule would not agree to all ages), we must
needs have recourse to some General Rules which he has given, etc. Lastly, because Christ has laid down nothing expressly, and because these things are not necessary to Salvation, and according to the usage of every Church, and may be variously accommodated for the Edification of the Church, he concludes, The best director of all these things is Charity. Now can any one think that he who wrote these words cou'd ever have begun to break the peace of your Church, or to spread abroad Objections against the English Reformation.

If Mr. Calvin had entertained any prejudices against the Episcopal Order, or if he had had any thoughts of Propagating the Polity of the Genevian Church among other countrys, or if he had thought that that would best conduce to keep up good Order in the Church, how comes it to pass that in that long letter which he wrote to the Duke of Somerset concerning the Reformation of the Church of England, he does not speak one word against the Dignity of Bishops. For then he had a very fair occasion of breaking his mind upon this head, and deserving well of the Church. How comes it to pass that when he wrote to A Bp Cramner, he gives him all the Honourable titles which are paid to that character? Nay, be pleased to hear what he says in his Book of the necessity of a Reformation in the Church, Talem Nobis, etc. Let them give us such an Hierarchy in which Bps may be so advanced that they may not refuse to be subject to Christ, and may depend upon Him as their only head, and refer themselves to Him and so cultivate a brotherly fellowship among themselves, that they be not bound together with any other Knott than that of the Gospel truth; then we shall Confess them to deserve ye Heaviest Curse who shall not reverence it; and pay a willing Obedienc to it. And writing to his friend, Mr. Farell, he observesthat there ought to be among Christians such a hatred of Schism, that they must upon all occasions to the utmost of their power avoid it. Now can he who writes after this manner be the Author of a Separation? unless he were a wicked Hypocrite, which no one will suspect of ou: Mr. Calvin.

Indeed when there was a great quarrel risen at Frankford on the Mein among the English Exiles in Queen Maries time concerning a Form of Prayer; they who were against the English Liturgy as you describe it to me there seem to have been some tolerabiles ineptia; this expression is blamed by many, as also, learned Sir, by you.

But it has been observed by some of Mr. Calvin's friends who have likewise been Defenders of the Church of England,

1. That Mr. Calvin, before these words, said in that Epistle: It is a cutting grief to me, and a very great absurdity, that such a Separation shou'd happen among Brethren, who are banished their native Country for the profession of the same ffaith; a Cause which alone ought in this your dispersion to have tyedyou together wth the same Holy Bond; but now for you to quarrel with one another about the Form of your Prayers, so as to hinder you from uniting into one Body of a Church in that place where you are, is, in my judgem, very ill timed.

2dly. That in the same Epistle he dos profess, that in indifferent matters, such as external rites are, he is very easy and condescending.

3dly. That he found nothing in your Liturgy superstitious, or wicked, or not to be born.

4. That the word ineptia is not so hard as may be thought; for ineptus, sayes Cicero, has its name; because it is nonaptus not fit or proper, Cic. Lib. 2 de Or.

5. Calvin sometimes calls himself ineptus, and sayes that he dos ineptire, as in his Book of Scandals. They must pardon me, if being willing to remove these offences paulatim ineptiam a little while, do something not to the purpose.

6. That Mr. Calvin said fuisse there had been many tolerabiles ineptia; not that there are; so that the Liturgy described by those at Franckford was the first Liturgy of Ed: VI., wth was turned into Latin by Alexand: Alesius.

7. That it is clear from Mr. Calvin's Letter to Doctor Cox, who stood up for the use
of the English Liturgy, that in that description of the Liturgy which he had from them at Frankford, that there was mention made of some things which were no longer retained in the English Church on the coming out of the second Liturgy of Edw. 6.

8. That this great person does not absolutely say that these things are in the English Liturgy, but in the English Liturgy as you describe it to me; from which it is plain that he speaks from 'y judgment of others.

9. That these things only seem'd to Mr. Calvin to have been tolerabiles ineptia.

10. Nay, the discipline of Geneva which you are of Opinion that Mr. Calvin was so very fond of that he endeavour'd to introduce it into other Churches; he only calls tolerable. From the time of my returning to this Church there has been kept up a form of discipline, not indeed a very perfect one, and such as might be wished, but however a tolerable one.

Therefore, Learned Sir, let me intreat you not to suspect Mr. Calvin to have been the Author of your Separation or a favourer of it. This could not enter into so Holy a breast as you call his.

Mr. Beza, who was Scholar to Mr. Calvin, Speaking of those persons who rejected the order of Bps, says, Far be it that any man of a sober mind should assent to their madness; and speaking of the established Church as it was supported by the Episcopal authority, says, that he wishes she may enjoy that singular Benefit for ever.

As to the Tenets of Calvin which you call Atrocia, severe and rigid; I shall say nothing of. Spare all this, I beseech you, by the blood of Jesus Christ, and abstain from hard expressions which only serve to sow 'rand ranker men's minds and not to reconcile them: But I proceed to the matter in hand.

How great an Esteem I have for the Episcopal Dignity I have long ago, both by my Writings and by Word of Mouth testified: Always sacred and Venerable shall be to me the names of Cranmer, Grindal, Whitgift, Ridley, Sands, Latimer, Cox, Redman, Jewel, Morton, Fox, Parker, Bridges, Whitaker, Davenant, Hall, Reynolds, Perkins, Preston, Sanderson, Satclif, Bancroft, Abbot, Downam, Cracanthorp, Prideaux, Andrews, Potter, Warner, Hooker, Ward, Janes, Usher, Fell, Pearson, Tillotson, Stillingleft, Barlow; to the greater part of which the Tenets of Calvin did not seem so rigid and severe.

And I never forbore to own how great an esteem and admiration I have of many of your Reverend Bps, who by their light adorn your Church, whose vertue has advanced them to that high, persons who deserve so extraordinarily of Religion and the Church of God; the most Reverend A Bp Tennison, that splendid light of Great Britain; Henry, Lord Bp of London, a man famous for his piety and Liberality to those who are banished for the sake of Christ; for his patronage of the oppressed; for his Hospitality to poor Strangers; and for his Courteousness to all. Dr. Burnett, Bp of Salisbury, who is greater than any praise I can give him, who has honour'd our Geneva with his presence, and who, as I hear from you, dos retain still a memory of me for I am extraordinarily rejoiced; to mention no other stars of the English Church.

To such Bps I shou'd think it a great honour to be in subjection, and if I might be so bold to do it, I wou'd begg it of the most famous and Learned our Brethren, the Presbyterian Ministers, and by all that is sacred and by the infinite mercy of God; that they wou'd not refuse submission to the Episcopal Government that the Church of England might be one Body, and that the most fortunate of Islands might enjoy a perfect peace under the greatest of Queens. Nay, I would put in my many and my most humble supplications to your most Reverend A Bps and Bps, I wou'd beg of and beseech them by the divine name and by the blood of Christ our Chief Shepherd, that Prince of Peace the Author and finisher of our faith; that they wou'd be pleased to remit something to the humble petition of our dear Brethren, and that they wou'd not exact from them what our learned Brethren profess they cannot comply with unless by offering force to their consciences.

As to the Queries which you sent to me, you shou'd see what some of my Reverend
Colleagues think of them, nay, you shou’d long before this have seen it, but that you have heard how the minds of your Dissenters are so much already exasperated, that there is great fear, our Writing on that subject wou’d do more harm than good.

But tis my opinion that your heats by God’s assistance wou’d be allayed by these methods.

1. If a necessity of Reordination were not imposed upon those who are not ordained by Bps; to which moderation that many excellent Bps of the English Church were inclined we are informed by that noted Epistle of Dr. John Reynolds, the famous Divine of Oxford, write S’ Francis Knollis, A.D. 1588; or if in this repeated Ordination it shou’d be manifest that there was nothing detracted from the first, which was done by Dr. Bramhall, ArchBp of Armagh, and some other famous Bps with respect to the transmarine Divines; nay, I have heard that it was proposed by the famous Mr. Baxter, that without any imposition of hands, the Ordaining Bp should say, Receive power of exercising the Functions of a Presbyter in all places of this Kingdom.

2. If it were not exacted of any Presbyterian to profess that Episcopacy was of Divine Institution, but only that they shou’d submit to the Episcopal Forms and Government and that all the Presbyterian Ministers shou’d be handsomely provided for as long as they live.

3. If a power were not vested in Lay Chancellors to inflict on the people and even the Pastors themselves, Ecclesiastical Censures, especially that of Excommunication and imprisoning those who refuse to submit to them, which I find is a very great Grievance to our Brethren the Presbyterians, who believe it wou’d be much more convenient if Excommunication and other Censures were inflicted by the Bp himself with his clergy when there shou’d be occasion for it; or if this power were committed to every Pastor in his own Parish, unless when any extraordinary case happened the matter should be referred to the Bishop himself or a Diocesan Synod; which the Reverend and famous Bp of Kilmore thinks wou’d be highly convenient.

4. If some things in the Liturgy were altered, which our Brethren’s Consciences are disturbed at or if Subscribers might be allowed to certify that they do agree to all things therein necessary to Salvation, altho’ they may dissent in other things of lesser moment; and if in respect of the other not necessary things the Church of England wou’d be content only with a Pacifical Obedience.

5. If those Ceremonies were laid aside which are occasion of Offence to some good men, which have little advantage in them and are prejudicial to those that make an ill use of them.

Would to God, Learned Sir, that these matters, which I now propose to you I cou’d persuade to all: tho’ I am not so vain as to prescribe any thing to your most Reverend Excellent and famous Bps, whose wisdom is so consummate, their Judgement so exact, and their Piety so remarkable. And I wou’d to God that I might if not with my prayers, yet with my very blood asswage the Spirits of your Dissenters, and be able to put a period to these Wars without triumph on any side; so that there shou’d be no longer an occasion given to the Enemies of the Church to make ravage among us; who so well understand that maxim, divide et impera, divide and Conquer; and so putting on the Sheeps Clothing mix themselves with the Sheep; sow the Seed of Dissention; cherish them after they are sown, divide the Brethren, and when they have done so, like Polyphemy, eat them up. But these are things beyond our power. At the Word only of Our Saviour the Seas are calmed and the Winds are still. At whose knees I throw myself, begging of Him with my earnest prayer, that He wou’d look with a favourable aspect upon our poor Churches, so that with one mouth, one pen, one heart, we may learn and wait those things upon earth, the knowledge of which will last when we come to Heaven. And I begg of him that he wou’d continue, Learned Sir, to a good old age; with this I bid you farewell, and believe and assure yourself of the esteem which I bear you.

*From Geneva, 1st April, 1708.*
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AN HISTORICO-CRITICAL INQUIRY INTO THE ORIGIN AND COMPOSITION OF THE HEXATEUCH (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua). By A. KUENEN, Professor of Theology at Leiden. Translated from the Dutch, with the assistance of the author, by Philip H. Wicksteed, M.A. London, 1886. 8vo, pp. xl. and 344.

In this volume Dr. Kuenen undertakes to establish by a course of inductive reasoning the conclusions of the newest school of criticism in regard to the unhistorical character, the composite constitution, and the gradual formation of the Hexateuch (as it is coming to be the fashion to call the first six books of the Bible), until it finally attained its present form in the second century after Ezra. It will surprise no one to find that, like previous productions of the same distinguished scholar, this treatise is pervaded by the most intense scepticism, by the most exaggerated type of divisive criticism, and by a style of reasoning in which the deductions are shaped by subjective prepossessions, and bold assertions supply the lack of rational grounds.

All schools of divisive critics, however divergent in other respects, seem to be agreed for the present upon partitioning the Pentateuch and Joshua among four documents, which are assumed to have existed originally in a separate state—viz.: two Elohis, P and E, a Jahvist (or, as the translator prefers to write it, Yahwist), J, and a Deuteronomist, D, which, after undergoing sundry modifications, were at length combined as we now find them by a Redactor, R, or series of Redactors, R₁, R₂, etc. The simple and convenient notation which Kuenen employs to represent these documents is adopted with a slight modification from Wellhausen, and has this advantage over the A, B, C, D proposed by Dillmann, or with a somewhat different application by Hermann Schultz, that while the latter suggests a definite order, the former creates no presumption as to the order in which these supposed documents are severally conceived to have originated. It is accordingly capable of adoption by critics of all shades of opinion, whether they place P first or last, whether D is assigned to the middle or the end, and whether J precedes or follows E. We have no objection to regarding the literary partition of the Pentateuch, or even of the Hexateuch, if the critics so please, as an open question, so long as it bases itself on the literary
phenomena which these books present. The method of argument that is commonly employed seems to us in very many respects precarious; the criteria alleged are often fallacious to the last degree; and the resulting partition is extremely dubious, dealing as it does in infinitesimals, undertaking to distinguish the separate origin of individual sentences, clauses and parts of a clause, which are accordingly rent from their present connection and attached to some foreign context. The consideration to which this or any other hypothesis is fairly entitled depends upon its own inherent reasonableness and upon the measure of its correspondence with the phenomena for which it professes to account. The critical partition of the Hexateuch has no external ground of support. It rests solely on the intrinsic evidence of the literary analysis itself. It is justified as a hypothesis just so far as this evidence fairly reaches, and no further. Its justification terminates where this evidence ceases or becomes obscure. Conjectures whose only warrant is that they are necessary to the maintenance of the hypothesis yield it no support. On the contrary, as these are multiplied and the hypothesis becomes in consequence more and more complicated, the probabilities in its favor are proportionately diminished. If a modicum of fact be made the starting-point of endless speculation, and hypothesis be heaped on hypothesis and conjecture on conjecture, the cloudy structure may seem very imposing, but it will have little solidity.

Confident as the critics are that the partition-hypothesis in its present form is firmly established, at least in its general outlines, it is far from working smoothly in its details. Possibly some additional mincing and splicing may be devised to overcome facts hitherto irreducible; but this consummation has not yet been accomplished by the confession of its most zealous advocates. P is the document about which there is most agreement and which is thought to be most clearly defined; yet even here Kuenen complains again and again of a "mixed text," in which the alleged criteria of different documents are inextricably blended, as in the account of the flood (Gen. vi.–viii., p. 67, p. 324, and xxxiv., p. 67, p. 326). In Ex. vii.–xi. "the characteristic terms of one document" are "imported into a text borrowed from the other" (p. 330). In Num. xiii. and xiv., and again in xvi., P is "welded together" with other documents (p. 95). In Num. xx. 1–13 "the welding of P with another account was accompanied by a recasting of P itself" (p. 101). In Num. xxxii. the characteristics of different documents reappear indifferently in the narrative (pp. 101, 102). The only reference made by P to the overthrow of the cities of the plain (Gen. xix. 29) can be linked to nothing in that document but xiii. 11b, 12a, the equally meagre account of Abram's separation from Lot (p. 324). Gen. xxv. 11b (P) presupposes xvi. 14 (JE) Lahai-roi (p. 325); and vice versa Sarah's death is alluded to, Gen. xxiv. 67 (JE), though this had only been mentioned in P, Gen. xxiii., which Wellhausen proposes to evade by changing יָּמִית to יָּמַית, so as to represent Isaac as mourning for his father instead of his mother (p. 325); a device which is further commended by the consideration that thus a contradiction will be created between what P says of the time of Abraham's death (Gen. xxv. 7 seq.) and what would have been implied in xxiv. 67 if the text had been what it is proposed to make it. Gen. xvi. 8–27, with "the linguistic peculiarities of P" in ver. 15, p. 68, "constantly assumes details which are mentioned in the other documents, but not in P." "Before xlix. 29–33 we want the statement that Jacob's sons collected round him and were addressed by him" precisely what the critics have themselves suffered from it in the preceding part of the chapter (pp. 68, 69).

But passing these and a great number of similar defects in P, it is in J and E that critical perplexities are most abundant and serious. Kuenen tells us (p. 64) that "the mutual relation of J and E is one of the most vexed questions of the
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criticism of the Hexateuch." And (p. 39): "As the analysis has been carried gradually further, it has become increasingly evident that the critical question is far more difficult and involved than was at first supposed, and the solutions which seemed to have been secured have been in whole or in part brought into question again." And (p. 144): "It must be admitted (1) that the resemblance between E and the narratives or pericopes now united with it is sometimes bewilderingly close, so that when the use of Elohim does not put us on the track, we are almost at a loss for means of carrying the analysis through; (2) that the accounts which we assign to E on the strength of their language and mutual connection sometimes develop internal differences, which force us to ask whether all that we rank, and cannot choose but rank, under E can really be from one and the same hand." He further says of the portions assigned to E (p. 140): "These sections do not form a well-connected whole; they are but fragments, and, moreover, in spite of all that they have in common, they do not always breathe the same spirit." He adds of J: "It is not more complete than E." And these fragments are not in their original condition, but have been in repeated instances "worked over" (p. 147), as shown by their considerable departures from the style of the document to which they are referred, "recast and expanded by another hand" (p. 153), "largely remodelled" (p. 154). "In Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua we here and there detect just such a parallelism between E and J as in Genesis. But here it is sporadic and by no means so clear as in Genesis" (p. 141).

The fact is that J and E are in an inextricable muddle. In a large number of passages the critics give up the attempt to separate them as hopeless. Where they do attempt it, they differ greatly as to the portions to be assigned to each and the criteria by which they are to be discriminated. Schrader and Dillmann, each in his own way, discover E in various sections of Gen. i.–xi.; Budde and Wellhausen find the first traces of him in Gen. xii.–xix.; while Kuenen assigns nothing to him prior to Gen. xx. (pp. 148, 149). The utmost that he can says of the partition of Ex. i.–xii. is: "Here we find enough agreement to show that criticism is not following imaginary tracks, but enough disagreement to prove that again and again the tracks are obliterated" (p. 151). There are repeated allusions in what is assigned to either document to facts, statements, and expressions exclusively contained in the other. In numberless instances the critics are obliged to assume that the chasms, which they create in each of these documents by their method of partitioning, were originally filled by narratives parallel to those which they have cut away and assigned to the other document. And the severance which they do effect is in large part plainly factitious and arbitrary. In very many cases it is without the pretense of any diversity of diction or style, or any literary ground whatever, other than could be trumped up on any occasion to serve any imaginable purpose. A few disjointed verses or clauses are culled from a continuous paragraph simply because they are capable, when separated from their connection, of having a sense put upon them at variance with the rest of the passage. These are straightforwardly erected into a different version of the affair, and held to represent a distinct document.

Thus Gen. xxxvii. 28a, 36 are alleged to suggest an altered story of Joseph, according to which (p. 146) he "is kidnapped by Midianites without the knowledge of his brothers—not sold by his brothers to Ishmaelites—and is carried off to Egypt, where he becomes the slave of Potiphar, Pharaoh's eunuch, captain of the bodyguard and keeper of the prison, not of a married Egyptian, whose wife slanders him and has him thrown into prison." Num. xxii. 22–34 is "a fragment of an older Balaam legend," in which Balaam "sets out without consulting Yahwe, or, perhaps, against his orders, and is then opposed by the angel" (p. 236). Gen. xxx. 28–43 is alleged to contradict xxxi. 4–13 (p. 145), inasmuch as
they "explain Jacob's great wealth by his own cunning and the care of Elohim respectively" (p. 235). But these are quite consistent, and there is no reason why one should be regarded as a "transformation of the other." "Josh. iv. 4-7, 9, 10, 11A, 15-18 (raising a heap of stones in the bed of the Jordan) must differ in origin from the rest, wherein the stones are piled up at Gilgal" (p. 159), as if the one action excluded the other. "Wellhausen has succeeded in showing the traces of a story in Josh. vi., in which the priests and the ark are not mentioned" in the taking of Jericho; "and likewise in tracing the remains of a narrative in ch. ix. in which the negotiations with the Gibeonites were conducted by the men of Israel and not by Joshua. Again in viii. 1-29 Wellhausen finds in 3a, 12, 13, 14B, 18, 20 in part, 26, fragments of a widely divergent representation of the course of events. Throughout these chapters the earlier account is continuously asserting itself in spite of the author, who endeavors to supplant it by his own representation." Ch. xvii. 14-18 "gives a different and, as we see at once, an older representation of the settlement of the tribes than the one based on a partition by Joshua, which underlies ch. xiii. sqq. elsewhere" (p. 159).

All this cutting and splicing, which might be exemplified without end, is as remote as possible from either honest criticism or sensible interpretation. It is merely an ingenious series of cross-readings, which may exhibit the critic's skill in legerdemain, and entertain and amuse beholders, but has no substantial value. And no limit can be set to such procedure except by the arbitrary dictum of each individual critic. Knobel divides Josh. xxii. 9-34 in one way and Kayser in another, while Kuenen, who magisterially declares the passage to be "an absolutely unhistorical invention," agrees with Wellhausen in not dividing it. Meyer attributes to J an account of the conquest which knows nothing of Joshua; Kuenen (p. 237) is reluctant to go quite so far as to make Joshua "a pure creation out of nothing." And it is this forbearance alone which keeps him from foisting such a view upon J and dividing the text accordingly. Lev. xvi. 3-7 is a very troublesome passage. Kuenen asserts that "the text is mixed;" but he cannot follow Kayser in his attempt "so to analyze them into their two constituent elements as to get rid of the injunction to slaughter beasts nowhere but at the sanctuary" (p. 90); nor Diestel in his endeavor "to strike out everything that refers to the one sanctuary" (p. 267). He accordingly makes this most extraordinary comment upon it: "The commandment in question was only possible of execution as long as the sanctuaries of Yahwe were so numerous that every one could find one close at hand. But in this passage it is given in connection with the one only sanctuary—apparently by some one who was acquainted, at least by tradition, with the ancient practice, and desired to maintain it still." As if any one in his senses could ever have required that every animal intended for food in any part of Canaan should be brought to Jerusalem to be slain; and this because they had anciently been slain at sanctuaries in the vicinity. He adds: "Any one who finds the answer unsatisfactory may note that in this passage the command to slaughter by the dwelling of Yahwe is given by Moses to the Israelites in the desert;" so that after every effort to escape it the legislation in the desert offers the only explanation.

We admit without hesitation that the actually existing literary phenomena of the Hexateuch must be taken into the account in any proposed theory of its origin. If it can be shown that the partition-hypothesis in its present form, or in any other form, is in accord with those phenomena, and offers the most satisfactory solution of them, when they are fairly viewed and honestly interpreted, it will be justly entitled to acceptance. But thus limited it would be comparatively harmless. That against which we enter our most vehement protest is the unreasonable assumptions and the utterly inadmissible style of interpretation in which the divisive critics so constantly indulge, and which gives the hypothesis
all its destructiveness. The artifice consists in annulling the credibility of the
whole by creating a seeming variance among its component parts. The con-
sistency of the record, as it appears to the ordinary reader, is alleged to be
purely superficial. By penetrating beneath the surface the critics profess to dis-
cover serious discrepancies in the original sources, which later editors have con-
trived to adjust and cover up. The whole thing is the most arbitrary and base-
less that is imaginable. If we were to concede the right of literary analysis, and
to admit that the partition has been effected with absolute precision, nevertheless
the materials remain just what they were before. No new element has been
introduced. At the utmost there is but a change of arrangement, and this can
give rise to no such serious consequences as are professedly deduced.

If it were possible to reproduce the hypothetical documents entire, as they are
presumed to have been originally, it would be only just and fair to interpret them
in harmony with one another, as far as the natural sense of their language would
permit. All reasonable historians deal thus with their authorities. The upright
advocate and judge treat the testimony of witnesses in this manner. But the
fact is that all that now remains of these documents is the extracts which are
woven together in the existing text of the Hexateuch. Nothing is or can be
known of them but what is inferred from these extracts. The presumption is
that their true original meaning is that which they have in the connection in
which they are now found. To assume the contrary without clear and con-
vincing evidence is gratuitously to impute incompetency or bad faith to the
redactor, by whom these paragraphs have been combined; and this without
possessing adequate means for forming an intelligent judgment in the case. To
attribute to these paragraphs a meaning alien to their context, which the words
might be made to bear, if isolated or put in some other imaginable connection,
is to act without right or reason. It is proper enough that each paragraph or
series of paragraphs should be individually studied, its peculiarities pointed out,
its standpoint seized, its mode of conception apprehended, the precise measure
of fulness in its statements discovered. These need not be obliterated or lost
sight of for the sake of reducing all to a tame and spiritless monotony. Truth is
many-sided, and variety is quite consistent with harmony. But the critics are in
such dread of harmonizing processes that they continually rush to the opposite
and far more hurtful extreme of setting everything in mutual antagonism. Diver-
gences and contrarieties are needlessly assumed or greatly exaggerated. The
simple absence of allusion where no allusion was to be expected is construed as
ignorance or denial of the fact; and every evidence that there is nevertheless
entire harmony is imputed to some later harmonist. Everything that can be
tortured into an appearance of discrepancy is original; all that shows the
reverse is subsequent addition. Such treatment systematically pursued could,
of course, lead to no other result than that which it has so conspicuously pro-
duced in the hands of Dr. Kuenen. The Hexateuch becomes a jargon of dis-
cordant and conflicting traditions proceeding from various sources; and how
much shall be set aside as unreliable, and how much, if any, shall be suffered to
remain as a truthful residuum, depends entirely upon the temper and caprice of
the critic.

Gen. iv. 16-24 and xi. 1-9, we are told, "know nothing of the deluge, and
derive the present race of men from Cain in unbroken descent" (p. 142), which
is an entirely gratuitous assertion; and the partition thus made has not even
the semblance of a literary pretext in its favor; so that Dr. Kuenen finds it
"hard to decide" whether J in Gen. xii. sqq. is the continuation of these or of
the deluge sections in Gen. vi.-viii., "for the two "prophetic" elements of Gen.
i.-xi. have not only been woven together, but were closely related to one another
from the first" (p. 148). He further says (p. 143) Gen. xiv. "does not contain
the least hint of the wickedness of the men of Sodom, and conversely the author of Gen. xviii., xix knows nothing whatever of the conquest of the five cities, or of the rescue of their inhabitants by Abram." Why a reference should be expected in one chapter to the quite independent event recorded in the other does not appear, nor how any significance can be attached to the absence of such mention; and Dr. Kuenen himself would seem to have altered his mind about the matter, for on p. 324 we read: "The names יֵרָם (Bera) and יִשְׂרָאֵל (Birsha), xiv. 2, are symbolical;" which can have no other meaning than that these kings of Sodom and Gomorrah bear names significant of the iniquity of those cities, the first suggesting גָּזַע, evil, and the second יִשְׂרָאֵל, wickedness. He, further, on his own unsupported authority, in defiance of the judgment of the best critics, of monumental confirmation, and of his own admission of its " archaic form," affirms that ch. xiv. is " a midrash" " of very recent date," and " post-exilian." If this were so, it only makes more apparent how utterly unmeaning the absence of allusion to Sodom's wickedness would be on his own view of the case, since this was proverbial long before, as is shown by repeated references to it in the prophets and elsewhere. He objects to Gen. xv. (p. 143) that " vs. 5, 6 places us in the middle of the night; ver. 12 (continuation of vs. 7-11) and 17 (continued in ver. 18) describe the afternoon and approaching evening. In vs. 2-4 the question is, who shall be Abram's heir, and elsewhere (e.g., vs. 7 sqq., 17 sq.) it is what his posterity shall inherit. The prediction in vs. 13-16, which is itself composite, breaks the connection between vs. 12 and 17." A critic who can infer from these premises that " here two accounts are united into a badly fitting whole, and then further supplemented by elements foreign to both," need never be in want of arguments to sustain any foregone conclusion.

And conflict is not only assumed where there is none, as in a multitude of cases like those just recited, but even in the face of statements and expressions which positively exclude it, these inconvenient obstacles being summarily ejected from the text as the interpolations of some redactor intent upon harmonizing discrepant narratives. Noah is in most passages said to have had the three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth; but Gen. ix. 20-27 preserves an older form of the story with " the triad, Shem, Japheth, Canaan" (pp. 142, 234), a result which is secured by quietly erasing " Ham, the father of" before Canaan in vs. 18, 22. Gen. xii. 10-20 makes no express mention of Lot in Abram's visit to Egypt, though he was journeying with him both before xii. 5 and after xiii. 5. This is construed as a contradiction, although to do so requires the elimination of the words " and Lot with him" in the account of Abram's return from Egypt, xiii. 1 (p. 143). Gen. xxi. 22-34 and xxvi. 26-33 give " mutually excluding interpretations of the origin of Beersheba" (p. 40), to establish which Gen. xxvi. 15, 18 are declared to be " manifest interpolations" (p. 147). Gen. xxviii. 10-19 and xxxv. 15 are held to be variant accounts of the same transaction (p. 39), and the troublesome word יָלָע, again, in xxxv. 9 is set aside as an insertion by the redactor (p. 326). A discrepancy is created between Gen. xlix. 31 and xxxv. 19 by the gratuitous conjecture adopted from Budde that the words " and Rachel" originally stood after " Leah" in the former passage. These words, for whose existence we have no voucher but the fancy of the critic, were erased, we are told, by a harmonizing redactor, who inserted instead the statement now found in xlviii. 7, which ultimately reached its present position by a series of remarkable insertions and transpositions, which he undertakes to indicate (p. 327). " According to E's representation Moses' wife and sons stay behind in Midian," contrary to J in Ex. iv. 20a, 24-26; whence it follows that the words, " after he had sent her back," in Ex. xviii. 2, which mar this critical conceit, are " evidently a harmonizing addition" (p. 157). Kuenen follows Hollenberg in finding
in Josh. v. 2, 3, 8, 9, "an old account of the introduction of circumcision;" and in order to maintain this view ejects from the text vs. 4-7, as well as the words "again" and "the second time" from ver. 2 (p. 133). Seeming contradictions are further multiplied by treating totally distinct transactions as doublets or modified repetitions of one and the same story, a certain general resemblance being held to establish identity, while the points of disagreement are regarded as conflicting representations. In Gen. xii. 10-20 "a saga of which Isaac was originally the subject is transferred, in imitation of Gen. xx., to Abram" (p. 252). He deals in the same manner with the two instances in which water was brought from the rock at Rephidim and at Meribah (p. 100); with the relief of Moses' burdens by judges (Ex. xviii.) and by seventy elders (Num. xi.); with the pitching of the tabernacle outside the camp after the sin of the golden calf (Ex. xxxiii. 7-11), and its normal position in the centre of the camp (Num. ii., sqq., p. 40), etc. Critical processes built on such assumptions (pp. 39, 40) can, naturally enough, only lead to what has been already presupposed at the outset.

Ex. iii. 1-15 and vi. 2-8 are declared to be accounts by two different writers of the first revelation of the name Jehovah (pp. 56 seq., 149); they accordingly avoid the use of this name prior to this event and employ only the divine designation Elohim, in direct contradiction to J, who speaks of Jehovah as in use in the days of Enos (Gen. iv. 26). Consequently in Ex. iii. "Yahwe could not possibly be used before vs. 14, 15." The fact that it is used in vs. 4, 7 is no obstacle. These inconvenient verses are promptly put out of the way by assuming that "another account is welded" to the narrative, or "detached verses added." And by this artifice he seeks to evade the obvious conclusion that the writer attached no such meaning to God's revelation of himself to Moses as Jehovah as excluded the prior use of this name; so that these passages, which are claimed as a main prop of the divisive hypothesis, must first be doctored into accordance with it before they lend it any support whatever.

The following account is given of J and E, which are regarded as the oldest constituents of the Hexateuch: "The Yahwistic document (J) was composed in the North Israelite kingdom within the ninth or quite at the beginning of the eighth century B.C. The Elohistic document (E) was written in the same kingdom by an author who was acquainted with J, and who must have lived about 750 B.C." (p. 248). "The chief consideration that forbids us to assign a higher antiquity to the 'prophetic' narratives (i.e., J and E) is based on their contents. The sagas about the patriachs, the exodus, and the conquest presuppose the unity of the people (which only came into existence with and by means of the monarchy) as a long accomplished fact, which had come to dominate the whole conception of the past completely" (p. 226). "They start from the unhistorical assumption of Israel's national unity at the time of the deliverance from Egypt and the settlement in Canaan, and so cannot have been written till the facts upon which this conception was based had not only occurred, but had settled, as it were, so as to be able to bear a superstructure. This necessitates the lapse of at least two centuries from the union of the tribes. . . . The several sagas were probably of local origin. For example, Isaac belongs originally to Beersheba and Jacob to Bethel. The welding process cannot have begun till the national unity was established" (p. 227). In other words, Dr. Kuenen has a conception of the history which is at variance with the testimony of all existing records. Consequently these records must be false, and a date is assigned to them based on the hypothesis of their falsity. J is put as late as he could be consistently with the admission that he was quoted by Hosea (p. 250). The necessity of a like admission with regard to E is escaped by assigning Gen. xxxii. 25-33 to J in opposition to Wellhausen and
Dillmann (p. 145); so that he only had to place E before the overthrow of the kingdom of the ten tribes, B.C. 722. He evades the conclusion that Hosea cites P' (whom he makes post-exilic) in a very characteristic manner. He says (p. 228) that Hos. xii. 46 "points to an account of a theophany at Bethel after Jacob's return from Aram. Strictly speaking, the only such narrative we possess is from P' in Gen. xxxv. 9 seqq.;" but "we may gather from Hos. xii. 46 that this account was originally contained in J." The hypothesis requires it, and so it must be. He sets aside with equal readiness the allusions which Schrader finds to P in JE; it is only necessary to shift the lines of critical dissection. "Either the references are imaginary, or they occur in verses which belong, not to JE, but to R" (p. 166). He further tells us (p. 228): "There are large portions of the Hexateuch which are never cited at all, or only cited in works dating from the exile." "The prophets of this and of a still later period are wholly silent concerning Joseph, for example, and concerning Joshua's military operations. Noah and the flood are not mentioned by any prophets before Ezekiel (xiv. 14, 20) and Deutero-Isaiah (liv. 9)." Neither are they by any prophets after Isaiah and Ezekiel. If the silence of subsequent prophets is confessedly without significance, so is that of antecedent prophets. The allusions of the prophets to previous history or Scriptures cannot with any reason be made the measure of what was extant in their day; nor can the absence of allusion to what they had no occasion to mention be made an argument of non-existence or of lack of acquaintance with it.

Other delusive criteria employed for fixing the date of different portions of the Hexateuch are "ethico-religious conceptions," which they reflect or embody, and which are allotted to distinct periods in accordance with an assumed scale of gradual advancement (p. 241); and prophetic "references to historical facts" (p. 237), which are in all cases alleged to have been written after the event foretold. "The blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 1-27) combines elements of different dates." This has long been an insoluble puzzle to naturalistic interpreters. The fact is, as they are obliged to confess, there is no one time to which all its predictions converge. It is a forecast of the future, some parts of which were realized at one time and some at another. There is no possible period to which its composition can be referred as a vaticinium post eventum on the ground of its correspondence throughout with the state of things then existing.

Two unfounded assumptions underlie Dr. Kuenen's inquiry into the part of the country to which the hypothetical writers, J and E, belong: One, that the patriarchal narratives were designed to give sanction to various local sanctuaries, particularly in the northern kingdom (p. 230); the other (p. 239), that "the relations of tribes and peoples are presented to us in Genesis in the form of family history," which accordingly reflects the writer's partialities for his own tribe or section, and jealousy of others. How fanciful this is appears from the fact (p. 232) that "Schrader finds an unfavorable aspect of Judah displayed," and "Reuss thinks that Judah is treated with bitter scorn" where "most other scholars find a friendly disposition toward Judah." To bring the text into harmony with his ideas in this matter, he suspects the originality of "Hebron" in Gen. xxxvii. 14, and thinks that "possibly xlvii. 1 has been altered;" that xlvii. 29-31, l. 4 sqq. place Jacob's grave near Shechem and Bethel, at variance with xlix. 29-33, l. 12 sqq. which record his burial in the cave of Machpelah; that "Moriah" (Gen. xxii. 2) has been substituted for the name of some place in Ephraim, etc. (p. 254).

When it is said that J and E were written at the time and place above mentioned, reference is had, not "to these documents in their present form, but to their older and original elements" (p. 250). They have been subjected to two
classes of additions—viz.: those which "serve to continue, expand, or improve upon" the original material of each document separately, and those which were designed to harmonize the two when they were put together. The former are attributed to a Judaean edition of each, which affords an easy way of disposing of whatever in these documents might seem inconsistent with their alleged origin in the northern kingdom, as well as gives free scope to that hypercriticism which detects inconsistencies and contrarieties in the portions assigned to each; while the latter embrace all which proves that, in spite of the arts of the critics, the narrative is one consistent whole.

As a specimen of the Judaean recension of J, "the original narrative was first supplemented by the incorporation of Gen. iv. 2a, 3-16a, a comparatively ancient notice, derived from the same circle of ideas to which the story of Paradise and the family tree of Cain belong. A later writer, to whose knowledge the Assyrio-Babylonian legend of the flood had come, thought good to incorporate it, recast in the Israelitish spirit into J's 'history of origins,' and to make Noah (whom he took from Gen. ix. 20-27) the rescued survivor from the flood and the ancestor of the new race of men; but the saga required this Noah to be the tenth from Adam, and since he could not be a descendant of the fratricide Cain, the original list of Cainites was recast and expanded into a genealogy of ten generations of Sethites, of which we possess the heading only in Gen. iv. 25, 26, and a fragment in Gen. v. 29" (p. 252).

He makes similar havoc with his Judaean edition of E (p. 251). Thus its "Sinai records... have undergone several successive recensions... The Decalogue and the account of its proclamation (Ex. xix. 3a, 10b-19; xx. 18-21, 1-17), together with the associated story of the worship of the golden calf (Ex. xxiv. 12-14; xxxii. 1-6, 15 seq.), were probably not incorporated till at least as late as Hezekiah's reign. Ex. xxxii. 7-14 and other additions in Ex. xix. 32-34 are later still." After such slashing work as this it is not surprising that he adds: "Here it may well be objected that criticism, so freely applied, positively eliminates the subject on which it is operating! What remains for the original narrative of E when all these additions are removed? Not much except xxxiii. 7-11, it must be confessed."

These two documents, after undergoing these modifications and recensions, were combined by the harmonist, JE, "after the year B.C. 621 (the date to which he assigns the main body of Deuteronomy), and before the beginning of the Babylonian captivity" (p. 249). The method which he pursued in effecting the combination "was highly intricate in its nature. The redaction was sometimes scrupulously conservative in regard to the documents, sometimes harmonizing, sometimes independent and free" (p. 161). A hypothetical personage, of whose existence we have no evidence but these inconsistencies which are attributed to him, produces no very decided impression of his reality.

Deut. iv. 45, xxvi., xxviii., and xxxi. 9-13 are by the same author, D1, and belong to the reign of Josiah (p. 269). And here it is admitted that Deut. x. 6, 7, which makes distinct mention of Aaron's priesthood and of Eleazar as his successor, are no interpolation, as has often been claimed, but "belong to vs. 8, 9, to which they are introductory" (p. 114). Deut. i. 1-iv. 40, xxxi. 1-8, xxix., xxx. were added to the preceding after the beginning of the Babylonish captivity. Deportation to a foreign land is to the author of ch xxviii., a simple possibility (p. 127), but the certainty with which it is foreseen in chs. xxix., xxx. is regarded as proof that it had already begun (p. 129). This work of "D1 and his followers" was next amalgamated with JE by a new redactor, who both added some fresh sections to D and made extensive changes in JE. Particularly the book of Joshua underwent "drastic treatment" at his hands (p. 258), and "he very considerably expanded the Sinaitic legislation, which embraced
nothing but the Decalogue in JE, by transposing both the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx. 22-ch. xxiii.) and the Words of the Covenant (Ex. xxxiv. 10-28) from the place which they occupied in JE [viz.: as he alleges, in the plains of Moab] to the account of the legislation of Sinai" (p. 258). This very remarkable discovery is entitled to about as much credence as like extravagances which abound elsewhere in the volume. Deut. xxvii. 11-26, a portion of Josh. viii. 30-35, and some other sections "which cannot be indicated with absolute certainty," are still later interpolations (p. 270). "When the Jewish exiles returned to their fatherland (536 B.C.) the deuteronomio-prophetic book (D + JE) may have existed in the same form in which it was united with the priestly codex some century later."

The Elohist document styled P by Kuenen, which was universally regarded by earlier critics as the oldest and most trustworthy portion of the Pentateuch, is by the recent critical school pronounced the latest and least reliable. Like the other documents, it has passed through various editions, and accordingly several successive strata are distinguished as P1, P', P", etc. It is claimed that the so-called holiness-laws of Lev. xvii.-xxvi. give evidence of being based on a prior legislation, P', which the critics undertake to restore by purging out the later elements, which have been mingled with it. All references to the tent of meeting (tabernacle of the congregation), the veil, the most holy place, the Aaronic priesthood, the priestly dress and anointing, are arbitrarily stricken out, though sometimes it is confessed that these are so inextricably blended with the whole texture of certain chapters that no separation is possible. There is no small divergence among the critics in this analysis, and also as to the question whether and how far P' can be traced beyond the limits of the chapters before mentioned. This earliest stratum, P', is said to be later than Deuteronomy, which he now alleges, contrary to his former belief, contains no allusion to the Levitical legislation. The arguments on which he once relied to sustain the positions which he at present controverts are to him now "a humiliating proof of the tyranny which the opinions we have once accepted often exercise over us" (p. xiv.), a tyranny from which possibly he has not even yet escaped. P' is, on the ground of the prediction in Lev. xxvi. 3-45, declared to have been written after the exile had begun, though before its termination. Kuenen concludes (p. 287) that P' was later even than Ezekiel, notwithstanding some very remarkable admissions, which vitiating, if they do not overturn, his entire argument. How insecure these conclusions are even in his own esteem will appear from his language on p. 273: "If Dillmann's assertion that 'a Sinaitic law book of hoary antiquity' underlies Lev. xvii.-xxvi. especially were accepted with the needful sobriety, and confined to such ordinances as are quoted above (i.e., ethical injunctions, including exhortations to observe the religious duties), it might at least be discussed. The priestly laws of this kind which are embodied in P might conceivably be as old, for instance, as the precepts of the Book of the Covenant.'" The discrimination here attempted between the ethical and the ritual, allowing a possible antiquity to the former and denying it to the latter, is contrary to the analogy of all ancient religions, and is based upon an interpretation of passages in the prophets which do not really sustain it, or upon arguments which he confesses are for the most part "negative and rest on the silence observed concerning the ritual legislation and the narratives associated with it" (p. 274).

P" contributes the Elohist portion of the narrative from Gen. i. onward, and the main body of the Levitical legislation. This compilation was made in Babylonia before Ezra came up to Judea, say between B.C. 500 and 475, and amalgamated with P' and a variety of other priestly toróth, either there or shortly after Ezra's arrival in Judea. This was Ezra's law-book brought forward by him
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B.C. 444; and to it further additions continued to be made as occasion required. Finally the Hexateuch was formed by combining P with JE + D about B.C. 400. This is slurred over as though it was a very simple and natural affair. "Probably," he says (p. 313), "the authors of P never intended to cancel or suppress the older laws or narratives." And yet we were told (p. 297) that the legislation of P "introduces and expresses a different fundamental conception;" so much so that he calls it "a complete revolution;" the narratives were reconstructed by P, being purged by him of all that he considered offensive and worked over from a different point of view. Ezra set aside the old and introduced the new as alone adapted to the existing state of things; and yet in forty years these two incompatible systems of legislation and bodies of narrative were welded into one, as though they were perfectly harmonious, and no one had ever suspected any variance between them.

Kuenen does not exclude the Day of Atonement and whatever appertained to it from Ezra's law-book, notwithstanding the notable demonstration, which it has been so loudly claimed, is deducible from Neh. viii. and ix., that the tenth day of the seventh month was not so observed; and it is quite as easy to find it compatible with Solomon's dedication of the temple, which has also been alleged to exclude it.

The work of supplementing and re-editing the Hexateuch, with more or less important changes, still went on, however, not only until the Septuagint Version was made, but for some time after, as Kuenen infers, with Popper, from Ex. xxxv.-xl., about which he argues in this shuffling manner (p. 79): "The difference between the text and the translation is evidence that the text was not fixed." "This argument partly falls to the ground, but only to make way for a more weighty one, if Ex. xxv.-xxxi. and xxxv.-xl. had different translators [which is clearly the case]. . . . Would the translator of ch. xxv. sqq. have left ch. xxxv. sqq. untranslated if he had found these latter chapters in his text?" Finally he adds that there may have been an accidental deficiency in the MS., "and in that case the confusion in the Greek text would, of course, prove nothing." Yet he holds fast to his conclusion, as though this argument confessedly built on the quicksand were irrefrangible, and he deduces further consequences from it.

A long series of redactors have besides been at work upon the text Rj, Rd, Rp, R', R'', R''', etc., whose office it is to account in the most multifarious manner for everything in the text which is contrary to the demands of the hypothesis.

Such "drastic treatment" as is exemplified on every page of this volume would be intolerable in application to any literary production of ancient or modern times. The same methods which rend the Hexateuch into fragments and destroy its credibility would accomplish the same result in any other conceivable case. If this be "scientific criticism," the less we have of it the better. It would seem as though the last extreme of critical insipidity and destructiveness must be nearly reached. The force of nature can no further go. Let us hope that the time is not far distant when Biblical studies shall no longer be disfigured by such enormities; when a race of critics shall arise of equal learning, ingenuity, and patient toil, who shall have some reverence for what is sacred, some respect for historical testimony, and some regard for the dictates of common sense. Then the field of Old Testament scholarship, so diligently cultivated, may be expected to bear a rich harvest, not of briers and thistles, but of noble, precious fruit. WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.
August Kayser was one of the ablest of the school of Reuss. He was for many years a pastor at Stossweier and Neuhof, in Alsatia. He began his work as Professor of Theology in the University of Strassburg in 1873, and after twelve years of service died June 17th, 1885. His literary activity has not been very great, but whatever he has produced has been worthy of attention. He resembles Reuss in his terse, clear, and charming style, and one sees at a glance that he has mastered his subject. He has the rare gifts of insight and grasp. His little book, "Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels und seine Erweiterungen," is a fine piece of critical workmanship. The present publication is posthumous, but we should hardly know it if the editor had not informed us of the fact.

Kayser adheres to the critical results of the school of Reuss, and his Biblical Theology is built upon these results. The little book will be welcomed on this account as the first Biblical Theology that gives the historical development of the Theology of the Old Testament in accordance with the literary development of Israel as taught by Reuss and his pupils. The historical method prevails over the exegetical in this book. The author states that he would have preferred to give his work the title of "The History of the Religion of the People of Israel." Accordingly he does not limit himself to the canonical books, but includes in his work the theology of the Apocryphal books, the Jewish Apocalypses, and even the most ancient parts of the Talmud. His historical divisions are: (1) The period of the origin of the Mosaic religion until the erection of the temple; (2) the period of the ideal elaboration of Mosaism by the prophets from Solomon till the return from the exile; (3) the period of the establishment of the Mosaic idea in fixed institutions from the restoration to the beginning of the Greek rule; (4) the period of the breaking up of Mosaism under foreign influences until the destruction of the second temple. These divisions seem to us rather unfortunate. The destruction of the first temple is a point of division no less than the destruction of the second temple; and if the history of the temple is to be the rule of division for the first and the last periods, we should expect it to mark the other periods also. Furthermore, the erection of the temple of Solomon does not constitute a suitable historical division either for the external history of Israel or for its religious history. David is the name about which the history of the second period gathers, as Moses is the name that dominates the first period. The destruction of the second temple is no proper close to the history of Jewish Literature or Jewish Theology. Some of the most important of the Jewish Apocalypses are later than the destruction of the second temple, such as Ezra and Baruch. The author is obliged to use them, although he rules them out. His apology for this is not satisfactory.

In the several periods the method of the author is, first, to briefly state the sources from whence he derives his material. In the first period he uses only a few of the ancient poems of the historical books and the Jahvist. He admits that some of the psalms were written by David, but he thinks that these can hardly be determined with certainty, and that the Psalter can only testify to the theology of those times in which it was compiled. The higher criticism of the Psalter is even more difficult than that of the Pentateuch and the Prophets. Nevertheless it is important that the historical origin of the psalms should be determined, for they have evidence to give for the theology of the earlier times no less than the ancient poems of the historical books. The Biblical Theology of the Old Testament remains defective until this task has been accomplished.
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Kayser rightly rejects the old-fashioned theory that the Shemites had a native bent to Monotheism, and shows that there was a strong Polytheistic tendency in Israel itself. There can be little doubt that the early Polytheism of the Hebrews has been too much overlooked, but it seems to us that Kayser makes so much of it that it is difficult to explain the advance of Monotheism. Certainly no natural development could overcome such a Polytheism as Kayser supposes to have been in Israel. A higher power than the prophet Moses was required to accomplish such a result.

The body of the work is taken up by the theology of the second period. This is so out of proportion with the other periods that it excites suspicions as to the correctness of the arrangement. We also notice that the doctrine of the Covenant now comes into consideration for the first time. The author admits that this is the central idea and dominant principle of the entire Old Testament Religion, as well as of the prophetic period. Why, then, treat it first in the second period? As a fundamental conception it belongs in the first period.

Another singular feature of the book is that Ezekiel first comes into consideration in the third period, and is thereby taken from his historical situation in the early part of the exile. The author does not doubt the date of Ezekiel, but it seems to him necessary to discuss him in connection with Ezra, Nehemiah, and the priest code. To our mind this is an evidence of the incorrectness of the separation of the period of the exile from the restoration. The exile goes with the Restoration rather than with the prophetic period.

The critical theories of the school of Reuss require that the priest code and the great institutions of the Pentateuch should be discussed in the third period rather than in the first or the second.

These points of criticism show that the Theology of the Old Testament is dependent upon the higher criticism of the Old Testament. The two disciplines go hand in hand. These failures in their Biblical Theology show that the literary theories of the school of Reuss are sadly defective. Biblical Theology is the best test of the correctness of theories of literature. There is great need of a large amount of fresh study in the whole field of the Old Testament before the literature and the Theology of the Old Testament can be given in their real historical development. In the meanwhile any fresh effort such as this is stimulating and helpful.

C. A. BRIGGS.


This book consists of a few preliminary pages, followed by about three hundred and fifty discussions of particular passages from the Bible, with reference to particular difficulties contained in the passages, something more than a page and a half being given, on an average, to each discussion. The book is divided into three sections, treating respectively of "Difficulties Relating to Moral Sentiments," "Difficulties Relating to Eastern Customs and Sentiments," and "Difficulties Relating to the Miraculous," while each section treats first of instances from the Old Testament, and then of instances from the New. In general, each discussion includes observations by Mr. Tuck, supplemented by quotations from various authors. The authorities most quoted are probably Dean Stanley, the Speaker's Commentary, Ewald, Wordsworth, Matthew Henry, Kitto, Thomson's "The Land and the Book," Geikie, F. W. Robertson, Lange, Rawlinson, Farrar, and Ellicott's Commentary. The mode of treat-
ment may be as well illustrated by the first instance treated as by any. Its title is "'God Represented as Employing a Lying Spirit.'" The title is followed by citing in full 1 Kings xxii. 22, 23. This is followed by the statement of the "difficulty," which is, "How can we conceive of God as using untruthful and evil agencies for carrying out of His purposes?" then comes the discussion.

The quality of the book is probably up to the average quality of the literature most consulted by Mr. Tuck in preparing it, and this literature is widely accepted as very good indeed. Perhaps the worst articles in the book are those on the idol "Groves" (pp. 244 and 335) and that on Jonah (p. 409); at all events, most of the book is better than these parts of it. The English of the book throughout is none the worse for being a little old-fashioned and ecclesiastical. In his laudable endeavor to be candid and liberal in dealing with different views Mr. Tuck sometimes fails of being as distinct in his explanations as would be desirable. For the use of most persons, he would improve his work if he would sharply determine what is the one salient point in each article, would put that point into a clear-cut statement of twenty or thirty words, and would then omit whatever in the article he had thus rendered superfluous.

Persons who desire a work of this sort will, on the whole, find Mr. Tuck's work to be good work, according to the standard of its class. But those who make or use books of this sort should keep in mind three or four simple principles. To say that God permits certain things, but does not directly order them, is poor apologetics in all cases in which it can fairly be reduced to the statement that God is not bad, but only sneaking. To speak of what God can do, or cannot do, or must do is poor apologetics in all cases in which it can fairly be reduced to the formula that God is not bad, but only weak. It is poor apologetics to assume that all ill consequence is of the nature of punishment, and then hunt for sins by which, personally or vicariously, to explain the punishment. And finally, the best apologetics, in the case of the Scriptures, is that which consists in getting men to study the Scriptures. As men appreciate their excellencies, their difficulties dwindle. Doubtless no one would be more hearty than Mr. Tuck in regarding work like his as simply subsidiary to this higher and necessary form of biblical apologetics.

WILLIS J. BEECHER.

THE BOOK OF JOB, WITH A NEW COMMENTARY. By BENJAMIN SZOLD, Rabbi of the Oheb-Shalom Congregation of Baltimore. Baltimore, 1886. (In Hebrew and with a Hebrew title-page in addition to the one in English; xxiv. and 498 pages, large octavo, with two illustrations printed in colors.)

This is the first example (so far as we are informed) of a commentary in Hebrew published in this country. It may be taken, therefore, as an indication of the growing importance of the Jewish community in the United States, and of the increasing attention given by scholars of this community to their own language and literature. As believers in the Old Testament revelation, we can only rejoice in the study bestowed upon it, especially where we have evidence that the study is conducted on sound hermeneutical principles. As a careful and sober study of the book of Job we welcome this commentary of Rabbi Szold.

The arrangement of the book is much what we expect in a commentary. After a brief preface we have an introduction of fourteen closely printed pages. The text is then taken up in paragraphs of from three to six verses. These verses are printed with the vowels and accents, and in the poetic portions each half of a verse has a line to itself. Each of the larger divisions of the book has an introduction rather closely printed in the ordinary Hebrew character. In the same type is given a summary or brief paraphrase of each section of the text. This comes below the text itself, and is followed by the commentary proper.
The commentary is printed in rabbinic characters, but within it words of the original and quotations from other parts of the Old Testament are distinguished by being printed in ordinary Hebrew type.

The introduction considers (1) the purpose of the book, (2) its matter, (3) its form, (4) its date and authorship. With regard to the purpose of the book, the commentator holds decidedly that it is not a theodicy; for it is not possible that men should comprehend the motives of the divine government, nor is it necessary. His own view we will give in his own words: "What appeared clearly to me after all my search was this: The book proposes as its end to show by an example the conduct of a man perfect and upright in view of this remarkable spectacle which appears in the world—that the lot of the sons of men is not apportioned according to their deeds." This we regard as correct, but not so new as the author supposes. From the third part of the introduction we learn that the authorities cited in the Talmud were divided on the question whether the book of Job is history (খেষ) or parable (খেষ). The commentator argues for the former. As to its literary form, he calls it a drama (খহা). He tells us further that the sages of the Talmud are divided on the date of Job’s life, some placing him as early as Abraham, and others as late as the time of Esther. A similar diversity exists as to the date of composition. Szold is inclined to make it the latest book in the Canon of the Old Testament, arguing from coincidences of language in which Job is evidently the borrower.

The commentary itself has one fault, in which, however, it is not alone among commentaries—it is entirely too diffuse. It would have been better had it been but half as large. The only authorities or predecessors quoted in it, so far as we have noticed, are Rashi and Ibn Ezra. The author’s Jewish standpoint is distinctly, though not offensively, manifest, as where he protests that there is a great difference between the Satan of the book of Job and the Satan of the New Testament (p. 9). Occasionally we find too great subtlety of argumentation, as where it is held that the construct form nkv (instead of nkv) shows these three friends to have been “unique in their love for him.” On the other hand, this subtlety sometimes discovers striking and interesting coincidences. For example, the author counts the seven afflictions of Job, and quotes immediately “seven times the righteous shall fall and rise again.”

In the main (as we have said) the exegesis is sober and sound. We can hardly agree with him in many matters of detail, as, for example, where he makes the Hophal of ḫn, or where, in the same verse (iii. 3), he extends the force of the verb in each member to the other member of the verse, so that he proposes the following as the real meaning of the verse:

\[ \text{יאר煉 ייו —泂ר וני} \]
\[ \text{ותלולא יאובר —Doctrine נולא} \]

The dependence of the language on other parts of the Scripture (as the author of the commentary supposes) is noticed in passing—as on iv. 4, where Hosea (vii. 15) and Isaiah (xxxv. 3) are both cited.

Dr. Szold is master of a clear Hebrew style, and the book would probably be useful to any one desiring an acquaintance with modern Hebrew. The printing is clear and correct; in fact, we have noticed but one typographical error.

H. P. Smith.

The following works in Exegetical Theology may be briefly mentioned:

*Biblische Chronologie und Zeitrechnung der Hebräer.* Von Dr. Eduard Mahler. Pp. xiv., 204. (Vienna: Carl Konegen, 1887.) The most entertaining part of this book is its attempt to base Old Testament Chronology on supposed Scriptural references to eclipses of the sun. The author is competent to make
astronomical calculations, and his lists of ancient eclipses may be of service in
many ways; some of his identifications are very plausible. But as the one
foundation for Biblical Chronology they are not trustworthy, as appears, e.g., by
the disagreement between his most important dates and, not merely the received
chronology, but also the Canons of Assyria and of Ptolemy. The latter part of
the book—on the Hebrew Calendar, with full and careful tables—is of more
permanent value.—*The Westminster Question Book for 1887*, Vol. XII.
(Presbyterian Board of Publication), is by no means what such a "Lesson Help"
should be. It is neither full enough nor accurate enough. Without dwelling
on defects which have been noticed in former years, it is right to point out that
the little, inch-square maps might better be omitted altogether. It is no "help"
to teacher or scholar to find, e.g., "Rameses" represented as a seaport at the
head of the Gulf of Suez, and "Goshen" as a region about where the Wady el-
Arish should be. Yet the map which gives this information is printed three
times, on pp. 58, 65, and 76.—*St. Paul the Author of the Last Twelve Verses
of the Second Gospel*. By Howard Heber Evans, B.A., late Vicar of Mapperley,
etc. Pp. x., 83. (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1886. 2s. 6d.) The author,
who has already published an extended treatise to show that Paul wrote the
Third Gospel and the Acts, pursues a similar line of argument here. It is not
lacking in ingenuity, but, taken as a whole, is utterly inconclusive.—*The
Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*. General Editor: J. J. S. Perowne,
D.D., Dean of Peterborough. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, with Introduction
and Notes, by the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, etc.
Pp. 175. (Cambridge: University Press, 1886.) The later Pauline Epistles,
though never neglected in the Christian Church, have been until recently too
much overshadowed by the earlier and fundamental ones. Mr. Moule, who has
already commented on Romans in this excellent series, appears to understand
the exalted position which the Epistle to the Ephesians ought to take in the
hearts of Christian people—at least if the quotations from Coleridge and Monod,
prefixed to his exposition, utter his own feelings. To bring out its peculiar
characteristics with precision and telling force is, however, very difficult within
the small compass of a popular commentary, and Mr. Moule has not altogether
succeeded in doing it. This is not to say that his work is not a careful, sober,
and useful one, but, even more than the Epistle to the Romans, that to the
Ephesians needs to be expounded by a man of genius.—The books that follow
are new editions of old works: *Hudson’s Greek and English Concordance of
208. $2.50.) The two noteworthy features of this new edition are the well-
deserved tribute paid in the preface to the late Dr. Ezra Abbot, one of its editors,
and the most fortunate disappearance of "Greenfield’s Lexicon," in its old
sight-destroying form. A revised lexicon in small but decent type, by the Rev.
Thomas Sheldon Green, takes the place of the old.—President Timothy
Dwight’s translation of *Godet’s Commentary on the Gospel of John*, Vol. II.
(New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1886. Pp. x., 551), contains 86 pages of
"Additional Notes by the American Editor," which decidedly enrich it. This
edition, now complete, is to be cordially recommended as the best issue of the
noble Swiss Commentary on the Fourth Gospel.—Three volumes of *Meyer’s Kommentar über des Neue Testament* appear in fresh editions.
1886.) Dr. Bernhard Weiss edits the commentary on *John’s Gospel* (7th
Aufl., 8 mks.; there is little change from the 6th ed.), and the most signifi-
cant thing is his remark in the Preface to the effect that the rapidly growing
literature of the Gospel makes it increasingly difficult to follow Meyer’s habit of
noting all views, and that much useless lumber is carried along from edition to
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He asks advice from New Testament scholars as to what shall be done.—Professor Friedrich Seiffert, of Erlangen, who has prepared the new edition (7te Aufl., 5 mks.) of the commentary on Galatians, as he did the last (1880), proposes to distinguish Meyer's language from that of Meyer's successors by quotation marks, though he does not carry out this suggestion. Clearly there should at least be some way of distinguishing Meyer's views from those of later men. Even this, however, would probably not satisfy Weiss. There is certainly no more propriety in calling Weiss's "John" or Seiffert's "Galatians" "Meyer's Commentary" than there would be in retaining Knobel's name for Dillmann's Commentary on the Hexateuch. One of two things should be done—either Meyer should be no more revised, or a new name should be adopted for the Commentary, and the last editions prepared by Meyer himself be always referred to for his opinions. This would be just to Meyer and would relieve editors from a vexatious responsibility.—Professor A. H. Franke, now of Kiel, appears for the first time in connection with this series as editor of the Commentary on Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon (5te Aufl., 6 mks., 60 Pf.), and his work is learned and conscientious. When the change referred to above is made, we hope that the provincialism will disappear, which, e.g., leads Weiss to disregard Godet's third edition because it is not translated into German, and Franke to pay so little attention to the thorough and brilliant work of Bishop Lightfoot.—Besides the foregoing, we have reissues of Dr. Charles Hodge's Commentary on Romans and Dr. William Hanna's Life of Christ (both by Robert Carter & Brothers, New York).

FRANCIS BROWN.

II.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.


It has been one of the difficulties of the study of the Apostolic Age that, until comparatively recently, there has existed nothing like a satisfactory, new book upon the period. The scant literature of the subject received an addition, a little more than a year ago, from the Conservative, indeed avowedly Apologetic, point of view, in the third edition of Lechler's "Das Apostolische und Nachapostolische Zeitalter" (originally written as a prize essay against the "Tübingen School"). Leipzig: Reuther, 1885; v. a notice, by Professor C. W. Hodge, of the English translation, in the last number of this Review, p. 752.

The book before us will be received with deepest interest as representing very fairly the critical position; as containing the new statement and discussion of the whole question from this point of view; as expressing the progress which has been made upon this side of the discussion since Baur and Zeller and Schwengler. Weizäcker is the successor of Baur as Professor of Church History in Tübingen, is, perhaps, the pupil of Baur and representative of the so-called Tübingen School, in so far as either of those expressions is applicable at all to any man now reading in Germany.

Just as even Lechler's book in the third edition has put off almost entirely the polemic form, so the author of this book has felt no necessity whatever to approach the problem in any other than a purely constructive, scientific way. We are far enough now from the great controversy of the third and fourth decades of this century quietly to seek its results.

The thesis of Baur unquestionably contained a great truth. Equally unquestionably was that truth greatly overworked, as has, indeed, usually been the fate
of great principles when first discovered. The construction of this earliest history became, from the exaggeration of his principle, in a measure even in his own hands, but still more in the hands of some of his followers, wholly artificial. Yet the great service which he did can never be denied. It is the task of just such a book as this—it is the task of the modern critical study of this Apostolic period—to save those results of the earlier work which were real and permanent, to bring some facts and principles which were there vindicated into adjustment with some facts and principles which were there overlooked and some which have since been learned. The whole question turns, of course, about Paul. Paul was the starting-point for the critique. For example, there can be no question that the gospel as preached by Paul differed very characteristically from the gospel as preached by other apostles. But it was a mistake to sharpen these differences into a contradiction, and make of this contradiction one of the strongest of motive forces in the history.

The other apostles also differed measurably among themselves. Peter and James are by no means to be assigned to the bigoted Jewish party, the "false brethren" whom Paul so vigorously opposes. There can be no talk of a substantial unity of the church upon the one side, as against Paul on the other. Unquestionably the Christian communities established by Paul among the Gentiles were of a very different type from those established by other apostles among the Jews, either in Jerusalem or in the Diaspora, lived a very different life, and had a very different development. But it was an exaggeration to make out of this difference of type always a conflict, and to elevate this conflict to the dignity of the greatest force in the whole history. A force it was, but not the only nor even the first in magnitude. Without doubt the Epistles of Paul are always to us the first in importance among the materials for the history. But the over-refined Tendenzkritik was wholly unnatural, and left to many other books of the New Testament, especially the book of the Acts, almost no historical worth whatever. The critique which conceded only four epistles as of indubitable Pauline origin has not sustained itself, even to the men of the most advanced critical position. Weizäcker rejects absolutely only the Pastoral Epistles and Ephesians, though he rejects in their present form, at any rate, also 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, and Philemon. The book of the Acts is treated, in the main, with fairness and at least in the historical spirit, though one of the unsolved problems, and, perhaps, the very greatest difficulty of the study of the history of the Apostolic Age, the question of the sources of the first twelve chapters of the Acts, is scarcely touched upon.

The whole discussion of the theology of the original Christian community is most admirable. The history of the Pauline mission with the critique of the Pauline Epistles is written with great vividness and spirit. The difficult question in regard to the Apostolic Council is extremely well handled from Weizäcker's point of view. The discussion of the origin and constitution of the parties within this period and of the position of Peter and James is characteristic for the whole book (v. esp. p. 358 f). The discussion of the relation of the Epistle of James to the synoptical gospels touches upon a point which has recently attracted much attention.

The chapter upon the gospel tradition and the origin of the synoptical gospels is most suggestive. The author returns to the hypothesis of the priority of Matthew (p. 414). The use of the historical material given in the Apocalypse and of hints from the synoptical gospels for the construction of the history of the latter part of the first century is very skilful. No very sympathetic critique of the Johannine literature, especially of the gospel, could have been expected. The discussion in this particular is disappointing, even when compared with that in the author's own earlier work ("Untersuchungen über die Evangelische
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Geschichte," u. s. w., 1864). The chapters upon Worship and Organization are capital, especially in illustration of different courses of development in organization in different Pauline churches.

It is a great pleasure to commend the book to the attention of critical students. In representation of the critical position, in modern German work, there is no book to be compared with it. EDWARD C. MOORE.


There is a growing desire among intelligent laymen, as well as ministers, to become better acquainted with the Patristic literature of the Christian Church. Heretofore restricted largely to the traditions of the Greek and Roman Churches, they seek direct access to the writings and teachings which truly represent the Christian doctrines and usages of the Ante and the Post-Nicene periods.

Unquestioned as is the historical value of the Patristic writings from the second to the ninth century, yet hitherto it has been impracticable to satisfy this just and increasing demand. Migne's 389 volumes of Patrology were in existence, but how many ministers and laymen could be expected to purchase and to read these 389 volumes?

In England an effort was made, in 1837, to relieve the difficulty, but this failed by the death of Dr. Keble and of Ur. Pusey, the chief editor and proprietor, and by the ill-advised and incomplete selection, which nevertheless reached a series of 48 volumes.

A second English attempt resulted in the publication of 24 volumes ("Ante-Nicene Christian Library"), and 15 volumes from St. Augustine's works alone, indicating an immense Post-Nicene Library. The latter failed for want of encouragement; the former 24 volumes have recently been replaced in 8 volumes by the practical wisdom of Bishop Coxe and The Christian Literature Company.

And now, by consent of the European publishers and by the active co-operation of Episcopal and Presbyterian divines in England and Scotland, the way is open for additional and laudable American enterprise—the publication of "A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church."

Circumstances have specially favored this undertaking—the large and increasing demand for it in our day; the leadership—scholarly, wise, experienced, earnest leadership—of Dr. Schaff as editor-in-chief, supported by eminent co-workers both in Europe and America; and the skill of The Christian Literature Company.

"The Nicene and Post-Nicene Library" follows in proper order, and, happily, from the same publishing house, upon the same liberal terms, and in the same excellent style. In the words of Dr. Schaff: "The Nicene and Post-Nicene Library will be more complete and more systematic, as well as much cheaper, than any which has yet appeared in the English language."

The general table of "Contents" is brief, but significant and full of promise:

I. St. Augustin's Life and Work, by Dr. Schaff.

II. The Confessions of St. Augustin, translated and arranged by Professor Pilkinton, M.A.

III. The Letters of St. Augustin, translated and arranged by Professor Cunningham, M.A.
Part I., by Dr. Schaff, presents the Literature on this whole subject. This is a model of compactness and comprehensiveness, clear, satisfactory, fascinating, and is, in itself, worth the price of the volume.

II. "The Confessions" fill nearly 200 pages of this volume. "They were written by St. Augustin in the forty-fourth year of his life, still burning in the first ardor of his love; and they are full of the fire and unction of the Holy Spirit."

Of their kind, these are pre-eminent in all the range of uninspired Christian literature. They are not only penitential "Confessions," like David's in the 51st Psalm, but also grateful "Confessions" of redeeming grace which redeemed him—grateful confessions of redeeming grace in answer to the faithful prayers and the long and anxious watching of his Christian mother, Monica. Thus these tender, truthful, tragic, triumphant Confessions combine the life-story of that remarkable mother and of that still more remarkable son.

By common consent of all Protestant and Papal churches, Augustine ranks among the foremost men of the world; with strength of mind and fervor of spirit, like that of the Apostle Paul; with a depth of experience commensurate with his great ability and with a tireless activity which fitted him "to toil terribly." He was as persuasive in preaching as he was effective in writing, so that, as Possidius testifies, wherever he went in Africa he was begged to preach the word of salvation. A profound philosopher, he was, at the same time, ever and everywhere a sincere and successful defender of the Christian Faith.

Though the Vandals ravaged the diocese and the city of Augustine and precipitated the total ruin of the Roman Empire of the West, the work of Augustine could not perish. His library, even, was preserved; "and his ideas fell like living seeds into the soil of Europe, and produced abundance" for all the time to come.

Of the "Confessions," Schönneman cites a multitude of separate editions in Latin, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, English, German. Dr. Schaff declares this "the most edifying book in all patristic literature. A more sincere and more earnest book was never written" (see p. 11).

III. "The Letters" fill 370 additional pages of this first volume. From among the letters of Augustine between 200 and 300 of the most noted appear in this volume of "The Select Library." These are letters to a great variety of the foremost persons of the Augustine period, and upon a still greater variety of subjects important for that and for all time. They are interspersed with letters to Augustine from such persons as Jerome, Evodius, Maximus, Paulinus and Theresia, and others. The epistolary correspondence is free and familiar, yet always courteous and careful—often condensed and cogent, sometimes pathetic and eloquent. As the editor justly remarks, "For biography, familiar letters are the most important material. In their function of appendices to history they are invaluable." And Lord Bacon declares, "Such as are written from wise men are, of all the words of man, in my judgment, the best."

Of Augustine's writings there are none which do not "receive some supplementary light from his letters." It is proper to state that most of the letters relating to Pelagianism, the Trinity, and the Donatist Schism are omitted from this first volume, since they are to appear in some of the forthcoming volumes of "The Select Library."

IV. "The Letters" are succeeded by 20 pages of INDEXES: (a) Of the subjects, (b) of the texts considered in "The Confessions;" (c) of the subjects; (d) of the texts referred to in "The Letters;" (e) by an Index of the Authors quoted in "The Letters;" and (f) by an Index of the Persons whose correspondence with Augustine is preserved—the whole constituting a magnificent volume of 620 pages.
This volume is a specimen and pledge of this "Select Library." Such a library thus placed within the easy reach of our ministers and intelligent laymen is worthy of our American enterprise and American patronage.

R. B. Welch.


This is a fresh instalment of a truly monumental work, to which attention has already been called in these pages. Just twenty years ago the learned author gave to the world the first volume, in the preparation of which he had been, as he told us, greatly assisted by the labors of a younger brother, who was snatched away by death at the very moment when the first sheets were coming from the press. It was a truly colossal undertaking which M. Herminjard had upon his hands. To the difficulties incident to its prosecution ought doubtless to be added a certain measure of discouragement that must have affected the patient toiler when he found that some of his most cherished documents, before he could reach the time for their proper insertion, were published in the successive volumes of another and somewhat similar collection, the magnificent edition of Calvin's complete works issued by Professors Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss. Let me hasten to say, however, lest it should be inferred that the last-named series of volumes has diminished the value of M. Herminjard's work, that, aside from affecting the novelty of certain letters of Calvin and some of his correspondents, the Swiss professor's researches are scarcely less indispensable to the student of the history of the Reformation in the French-speaking countries of Europe than if its rival had never appeared. The two collections are independent of each other, and fill up many a gap which perplexed, and at times confounded, earlier investigators.

The volume which has just appeared is not inferior to its predecessors. Of the one hundred and eighty-eight letters which it contains, seventy-four are documents previously inedited. They belong to the period of Calvin's stay at Strasbourg, of his return to Geneva, and of the adoption of the ecclesiastical ordinances by that republic. Among the most noteworthy papers are those that pertain to the famous effort made at Neuchâtel to drive away the intrepid William Farel because of his conscientious denunciation of sin in high places. In these times of prevalent laxity of church discipline it is strange, and not a little refreshing, to read in detail the account of a struggle fearlessly maintained in defence of good order and Christian law. William Farel was, indeed, not less courageous than John Knox, and if the little Swiss town was a more contracted stage of action than Edinburgh, his denunciation of the governor's daughter, who refused, in spite of all remonstrance, to return to her husband, was as heroic as any act in the life of the Scotch reformer.

Most readers will regard as most valuable and interesting five letters that are published in an appendix, because they belong to a date eight or nine years prior to the period covered by the main body of the book. These have to do with that painful episode, the persecution of the Waldenses of Mérindol and Cabrières, in ancient Provence. M. Henri Bordier, of the National Library of Paris, has made many discoveries among the priceless manuscripts of that institution, but we risk little in saying that he never made a more fortunate one than when he brought to the light of day these epistles relating to the exploits of the Inquisitor of the Faith, Jean de Roma. He, it will be remembered, was the worthy ecclesiastic who diverted himself with placing grease or pouring oil in the shoes
which he compelled his victims to put on, and then toasted the feet of those victims over a blazing fire. If space allowed it would not be without entertainment or profit to institute a comparison between the first of these documents, a brutal summons on the part of the inquisitor (February 1, 1533) addressed to the Waldenses of Cabrières, and the quiet, dignified, and impressive reply, written two days later, by the inhabitants of that little place. An unprejudiced reader would scarcely need any further proof than that which the two letters themselves afford to convince himself of the merits of the respective parties in the strife of words. But we pass over these, as well as the third document—a letter from King Francis the First appointing a commission to investigate the friar’s misdeeds—and the fourth—a detailed statement of those misdeeds made by the advocates of the Waldenses. The fifth and last paper of the series, however, must detain us a moment. It is the inquisitor’s deliberate defence of his conduct, and covers eleven closely printed pages. Never was the persecuting theory then current more clearly enunciated. “I find in the Sacred Scriptures,” says De Roma, “that charity should be so ordered that we must with a singular zeal love God and the conservation of the faith more than the lives of all the men and women in the world.” To the charge of the Waldenses “that he had tortured them, and in particular had warmed their feet for them,” he replies with perfect nonchalance, “I certainly have tortured them. However, out of one hundred and fifty that have been examined by me, I put but four to the torture. Moreover, I answer that it was my duty to do it, and that inquisitors have the power to put heretics to the torture, jactus sibi ordinaris, and that the law permits it. The reason is sufficiently clear. If one can put a simple robber to the torture, it follows that one can put it to a heretic, who is more criminal than all the robbers and murderers in the world. O true and omnipotent God! who is the man or woman that will not judge a heretic who speaks blasphemously against God, against the sacrament of the altar, against the Virgin Mary, against all the saints, against the church, to be deserving of being put to the torture, when there are witnesses and evidence against him?” As concerns the particular form of torture employed, the inquisitor seems inclined to look with complacency upon his course, and evidently regards himself as, upon the whole, a model of clemency. “Although,” he observes, “the torture of warming their feet is a terrible one, yet it is less injurious and more easy to be remedied than the common form of torture, administered to robbers and murderers, by racking and twisting their arms and legs; for it is with great difficulty that the victims ever use their limbs again.” The perusal of these precious documents will deepen the feeling of gratitude to God that we live in a more enlightened age.

HENRY M. BAIRD.

THE HUGUENOTS AND HENRY OF NAVARRE. By HENRY M. BAIRD, Professor in the University of the City of New York. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.

The author of these volumes a few years ago issued a work on the rise of the Huguenots. In clear and forcible narrative he recounted the events whereby, from a quiet persuasion of neighborhoods, the doctrine of the Reformed Church became a confederated conviction of multitudes, from the contact of which few provinces of France were entirely exempt. That history was one of persecution, and closed with the account of a massacre intended to extirpate Protestants from the kingdom. These last two volumes treat of the Huguenots in their reaction from the massacre.

The term Huguenot does not apply to all French Protestants, but only to those of the Reformed Church of France, corresponding in doctrine, government, and
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very nearly in worship to the Presbyterian Churches in the British Isles and America. They are a separate branch of the Reformation, not descended from Lutheranism, nor from the churches of Switzerland. In doctrine they are Calvinistic. But Calvin was a Frenchman. Such also was Farel, the Genevese reformer who preceded him. Before they carried the gospel to Geneva they had proclaimed it in their native land; and before both of them, as early as 1512, Lefèvre had published his commentaries on the Epistles of Paul, expounding the fundamental doctrines of the Reformation. Memorials of the Albigenses had been written deep in blood upon the heart of Southern France. Some of the great Gallic theologians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as Peter d'Ailly, with his pupils Gerson and Nicholas de Cleumanges, and others, by lecturing on the Bible and urging to it attention and reverence, had created a demand which in their day could not be all supplied. Reviving literature of antiquity quickened and guided the intellect, and multiplying editions of the Bible invited to the way of life. The great reforming council did not leave a more practical influence upon Basel than upon France. Decisions of that council adopted by the pragmatic sanction of Bourges and retained as French law until surrendered by Francis I., in his concordat with Leo X., kept alive suggestions of a reformation more vital than themselves. The keen perceptions of the French mind were stimulated to the greatest activity, and ere the beginning of the sixteenth century forewarnings appeared of the coming change. But for miserably bad government France must have been a reformed nation. Compulsion to submit to Rome overawed the timid and induced the worldly-minded to court the stronger violence, thereby depriving the Catholic Church of confidence in the truth of her subjects, while it diminished the numbers, but certified the faith of the persecuted.

With propriety is the name of Henry of Navarre annexed to that of Huguenot upon the title-page of these volumes, as of him who, in expectation or reality, was their hero during all the years they cover. Not that the Bearnese chief was a model among Huguenots; in some respects far otherwise before he yielded to abjure the profession of their faith. But he was the hereditary and always steadfast protector of French Protestants, and their most brilliant commander at the head of an army.

During three successive reigns did the principality of Bearn and the little kingdom of Navarre furnish a refuge for Protestants within their bounds. Margaret of Angoulême, sister of Francis I., admired her royal brother, but firmly differed from him in religion, and when, by marriage with Henry d'Albret, she became Queen of Navarre, many godly people enjoyed her protection whom he would have burned to death. Her only daughter, Jeanne d'Albret, inherited the regal honor, and evinced a high intelligence and heroic spirit in the Reformation cause. The truth and consistency of her court at Pau was maintained against theological assaults of Romanism and the yielding weakness of her husband, Antony de Bourbon. Her son Henry was educated in the faith and well-defined convictions of his mother, while inheriting her quick and penetrating intuition, unfortunately with too much of his father's self-indulgence. A watchful motherly care was exercised over him in his boyhood, which he mentioned with grateful remembrance in maturity years, and in his last, perhaps, with some regret.

The principality of which Pau was the capital and the kingdom of Navarre connected with it were thereby rendered conspicuous in the early wars of the Reformation, and that the more that the Huguenots were most numerous in the south. Henry of Navarre, alike by his birth in Pau and his Protestant education, was pointed out as their leader, and from early youth participated in their success and in their dangers. A treaty of peace with their oppressors was to be con-
firmed by his marriage, while yet a boy, to the sister of Charles IX. It was made occasion of the most enormous massacre that Europe has ever known in modern times. At Paris, a few weeks earlier, the Queen of Navarre died. Ten years before had seen the last days of her husband. Her son succeeded to her territory and honors, but was held in virtual imprisonment at the court of Paris, and under submission to Romish worship. After nearly four years, escaping from custody, he fled to his Huguenot friends beyond the Loire. Though still young, he was accepted as their commander-in-chief, and with them, through all their changing fortunes, he abode until he led them on the wings of victory to the gates of Paris.

The vacillating policy of Henry III., successor of Charles IX. on the national throne, provoked resistance among the more positive Catholics. The Duke of Guise put himself at their head, and was accepted with acclamation. A Catholic League was formed in opposition to the royal family. No longer feeling safe within his capital, the king fled beyond the walls, and with the forces adhering to him entered into reconciliation with the King of Navarre, and joined him in besieging the city. The Duke of Guise was murdered by order of Henry III., who soon afterward met the same fate from a partisan of the League, and the Huguenot Prince of Navarre was next heir to the throne of France.

But loyal Catholics, as well as the League, could not tolerate a Protestant succession. The old Cardinal de Bourbon was set up as their king, and the Duke of Mayenne, younger brother of the Duke of Guise, accepted as their military leader. The Huguenots, in the belief that by winning his rights for their king all the rights they demanded for themselves would be secured, now continued the war for his interest against the League. Notwithstanding their inferiority of numbers and occasional losses, the strategy of their general enabled them to inflict upon their enemy serious defeats, crowned by that of Ivry, on the 14th of March, 1590. Still, three years longer the question stood unsettled. The nation was exhausted with the prolonged conflict of arms. It seemed to Henry that the only way open to peace and to put himself in condition to secure for his Protestant people their civil rights and freedom for their religion was to make his own personal reconciliation with the Catholics. But greater difficulties encountered him than were anticipated. His abjuration took place in July, 1593, and his coronation in February of next year; but his favor to the Huguenots he was not able to accomplish until five years later. Not until 1598, by the Edict of Nantes, did he endeavor to secure them from persecution, by granting them the full privileges of French subjects. What they had reasonably demanded of other kings was thus conferred, not with the good-will of the priesthood, nor secure against the enmity of a succeeding monarch, but earnestly meant and truthfully observed to the last by him who granted it. Nor did his effort cease to hold the balance fairly between Catholic and Protestant until the dagger of Ravaillac deprived the nation of its benefactor.

Such is the field of events covered by Professor Baird's new volumes, extending from the death of Charles IX. to that of Henry IV., or, in respect to the Huguenots, from the reaction after the St. Bartholomew massacre to their settlement under the Edict of Nantes. It is not one of those histories which are said to read like a novel. Greatly superior. It is a work of careful research and fairly adjusted presentation of interests, yet far from being a mere classified list of events. It abounds in the attractions belonging to actual human life and human suffering and loyal attachment to divine truth. Its actors live through its pages awakening tenderness for the helpless under oppression, manly detestation of wrong, and sympathy for struggling heroism. It is to be hoped that the author will feel encouraged to prosecute his work; that, having followed the Reformed Church of France through her early struggles and to her hard-won
privileges, he will also recount the events of her long night of succeeding gloom—her desolation in the desert—until the cheering daylight of the present time.

JAMES C. MOFFAT.

SCOTLAND'S STRENGTH IN THE PAST AND SCOTLAND'S HOPE IN THE FUTURE.


Dr. Taylor is one of the oldest country ministers of the Free Church of Scotland, whose sons take so high a rank among the teachers and heroes of the Church in general. He is a man of the good old school, with a large share of Scotch genius and originality.

The object of the present writing is to keep his beloved Church through the future true to the great principle which has constituted her strength and glory in the past. His contention is that "all the great contendings which have signalized Scotland's national religious history have been conducted upon the great Gospel principle that in all things the Lord Jesus Christ should have the pre-eminence. This he illustrates with fulness of knowledge and force of logic in successive sections, headed respectively: The Reformation from Popery; The Times of James VI.; The Times of Charles I.; The Famous Glasgow Assembly; The Restoration of Charles II.; The Revolution of 1688; The Times of Queen Anne; the Reimposition of Patronage; The First Secession, 1733; The Second Secession, 1759; The Disruption, 1843. Then he proceeds, on the basis of this grand historical induction, to insist that "The faithful maintenance of Christ's pre-eminence in all things is the only ground of sure hope in the future."

No other Church in the entire history of Christendom possesses a record of faithfulness to high principle, in the face of persecution, of equal glory with that of the Church of Scotland, Free. The history of no other Church is so instructive. Let us all therefore prepare for our no less responsible and arduous future by reviewing the lessons and the encouragement to our faith afforded by her history, which by inheritance is also ours.

A. A. HODGE.


Parochial histories of separate churches are possessed of a twofold interest apart from any attractions in the manner of treatment. They contribute valuable material for the structure of general Church history; and they shed light, in a way that no other records can, upon the best moral elements of the nation. Dr. McClune's book treats of an historical part of the country in an attractive manner, including records of early Christian settlement and biographical accounts of gifted ministers whose names should not be overlooked among the fathers of the American Presbyterian Church.

JAMES C. MOFFAT.

We notice briefly the following:

The Jewish and the Christian Messiah: A Study in the Earliest History of Christianity. By V. H. Stanton. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.) This is a careful and thoughtful study of the Messiahship of Jesus in its relation to the origin of Christianity. It does not pretend to give a systematic treatise upon the Jewish and the Christian Messiah, as one would suppose from the first title. The Messianic Prophecy of the Old Testament is beyond its scope. Indeed, the author does not enter into a full development of the Messianic idea of the New Testament. His purpose seems to be rather apologetical than historical, as the book is summed up with a chapter upon Messianic Prophecy and the Mythical Theory. Accordingly, there is a disproportionate treatment of the Introductory
Part which takes up half the volume. The author here enters with sufficient fulness into the Messianic idea of the Jewish Apocalypses, showing a real interest in the subject, a familiarity with recent literature upon it, and an independent critical judgment. The great importance of this literature and its neglect until recent times justifies the space given to it. In the second part the author considers the attitude of Jesus to Messianic beliefs. This is stimulating, but unsatisfactory, on account of its lack of thoroughness and grasp of the entire subject. There is great need of a thorough exposition of all the passages of New Testament Prophecy which bear upon this subject. Until this has been done no one can give a satisfactory summary of the attitude of Jesus and his apostles to the Messianic idea. In the third part the author is at his best. Here he is really stimulating, and we cannot refrain from wishing that he had been fuller in his exposition. He sees clearly that the ideas of the Messianic prophet-priest and king first came together in the Church, and that the divine judgment of the Old Testament is first in the New Testament attributed to Christ; that the Millennium of the Apocalypse pointed to the present reign of Christ over the world; that the Gehenna of the New Testament is always to be understood of the place of punishment subsequent to the judgment day. The author goes out of his way to object to the Protestant distinction between an invisible and visible church, and makes other ill-advised statements to which we cannot give our consent. But, on the whole, the book is a valuable contribution to the history of New Testament times.

Urkundenfunde zur Geschichte des Christlichen Altertums. Von Dr. C. V. Lechler. (Leipzig: A. Edelmann.) This is a brief and excellent summary of the recent discoveries in the field of early Christian literature, for which we thank the venerable author. We unite with him in the hope that many precious documents of antiquity still remain awaiting the industry of Christian scholars, and that they will soon be brought to light.

The Ignatian Epistles Entirely Spurious. By W. D. Killen, D.D. The esteemed author makes a bold venture in this little tract. He aims to overthrow the conclusions reached by Bishop Lightfoot and stated in his massive volumes, which are a monument of learning. One cannot but admire the spirit of this piece of criticism, however much he may differ from the learned author in his methods and in his results. We have seen a considerable amount of Higher Criticism of the subjective and a priori kind as applied both to the Old Testament and the New Testament, but we have seen nothing more radical than Dr. Killen's criticism of the Ignatian epistles.

Zinzendorf im Verhältniss zu Philosophie und Kirchentum seiner Zeit. Von Bernhard Becker. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.) The author has done a work that was greatly needed, and he has done it well. It is one of the most satisfactory features of our times that so many students are devoting themselves to special theological studies. The discipline of symbolism has given us a large number of special studies of particular symbols, as well as the comparison of the symbols and their historical development. It has also been found important to give the distinguishing features of the theologies of the great masters and leaders in the church. We have the theology of Luther and Calvin, of Melanchthon and Zwingli, and now we have the theology of Zinzendorf. It is found that in every case these church leaders had peculiar views of theology and life that they did not succeed in impressing upon the churches of their time. The work of Becker is careful, elaborate, and detailed. It thereby becomes a very dry and uninteresting book; but it is a thesaurus of information as to the life and opinions of Zinzendorf. It is interesting to observe how hard he struggled against the Separatists of his time, and how earnestly he strove against the organization of a new sect. Like John Wesley, he was obliged against his will to become the father of a new church organization. Events are more powerful than the greatest of men.

C. A. BRIGGS.
III.—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.


This volume contains ten Lectures delivered in Union Theological Seminary on the Ely Foundation. Dr. Bruce is well known by his previous publications—particularly his Cunningham Lectures on the "Humiliation of Christ" and his "Parabolic Teaching of Christ." This new work exhibits the same learning, clearness, candor, and thoroughness that appear in them.

The author contends for the common faith of the Church respecting the miracles recorded in the four Gospels. He does this, however, as he remarks in the preface, "not from the view-point of a strict doctrine of inspiration, but from that of substantial historicity," adding that "it is not dogmatically the highest point of view, but it is that which is most germane to apologetic inquiries." Accordingly, the aim of the writer is to establish the credibility of the Gospel miracles as actual events, without affirming absolute inerrancy in every particular of the narrative. His object is to prove that the miracles described in the four Gospels as having been wrought in Palestine by Jesus Christ constitute a part of the sum total of events that have occurred on earth—as much so as the non-miraculous events described by Thucydides as occurring in Greece, or by Tacitus as occurring in Rome; in other words, that the supernaturalism of the New Testament is as historical as the naturalism of Caesar's commentaries, because it has the same kind of evidence to support it—namely, competent witnesses and their testimony.

The first two lectures are devoted to an introductory discussion of the relation of miracles (1) to the several theories of the universe, and (2) to the order of nature. The author shows that a sceptical bias lies under the various sceptical theories, briefly examining, among them, the recent theory of Evolution. He then passes to consider two views of miracles: first, as the product of a higher natural law, and second, of an accelerated natural process, both of which he rejects, contending that the miracle originates in a particular act of the Divine will. His statements on this important point are positive and convincing, and rest on the basis of a high supernaturalism. In connection with this subject, discriminating criticisms are made upon the views of Rothe, Baden Powell, Bushnell, and Drummond. Respecting the identification, by the last-mentioned author, of the worlds of nature and spirit, his remarks are just and timely. His criticism upon Bushnell's employment of the term "supernatural," to denote both the spiritual and the miraculous, is the common one. In this connection, he does not allude to the fertilizing source of Bushnell's views, in Coleridge's distinction between nature and spirit, which also must be carried back to Kant.

The third and fourth Lectures consider the miracles in relation to the Apostolic Witnesses, and the Evangelic Records. These two chapters, in apologetic respects, are as important as any in the volume, because the credibility of the miracles depends (1) upon the testimony to them, and (2) upon the record of that testimony. If the testimony is in any degree defective, the miracle is in so far invalidated. If the testimony was originally adequate, but the record of it is subsequently vitiated in any degree by legendary and erroneous matter, the miracle is in so far invalidated.

Dr. Bruce remarks that the question in regard to the Apostolic Witnesses has lost considerable of its interest, owing to the long-continued discussion respect-
ing the validity of testimony in the case of a miracle. He briefly examines and combats the views of Hume, Mill, Huxley, and the author of Supernatural Religion, on this point. He also acutely criticises the theory of fraud, Paulus's naturalistic explanation of miracles, and Strauss's and Baur's mythical explanation; closing with a notice of Keim's modification of the mythical theory in the direction of the catholic belief, and Weiss's yet closer approach to it. He then, in the fourth Lecture, raises the important inquiry, 'whether the testimony of the Twelve Apostles is available for the Gospel miracles' (80). This leads him to speak of the origin of the four Gospels, and upon this subject we do not find Dr. Bruce commanding our judgment as fully as he does in other parts of his volume.

There are now two general views of the origin of the Gospel narratives. The first, and the most universally received in all ages of Christendom, is that certain individual men were the inspired authors of the four Gospels as we now have them—namely, Matthew, Peter (Mark), Paul (Luke), and John. These four concurrent narratives derive both accuracy and infallibility from the authorship of these four persons, who had 'seen the Lord' (1 Cor. ix. 1), had ' companied with him all the time that he went in and out among men' (Acts i. 21), to whom he promised the Holy Spirit 'to teach all things, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them' (John xiv. 26). Though Paul did not 'accompany' Christ during the three and a half years, yet he claims as positively as any of them, and rather more so, that his knowledge of Christ and of the Gospel was 'not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead' (Gal. i. 1 compared with 1 Cor. ix. 1, xi. 23).

The second view—a modern one, and confined mostly to exegetical schools—is that the four Gospels, as we now have them, were a gradual formation, not referable solely and exclusively to four Apostles, but primarily to oral or written traditions concerning Christ that were current in the first Christian brotherhood, which were subsequently put into the form in which we now have them. Who did this latter work, and when it was done, is a question that has had many answers in the many exegetical schools that have adopted this general theory. Some of the answers make the Apostles more or less concerned in shaping the Logia; and some of them make them to have nothing to do with it. There are conservative and there are radical schemes under the general theory, but all agree in finding the fundamental base and rudimental matter of the Gospels in the uninspired circle of the primitive Christian brotherhood, and not in the inspired circle of the Twelve Apostles. The Church, not the Apostolic College, is the first author of the Life of Christ, and thereby of all that depends upon it.

Dr. Bruce prefers the second theory, and adopts the more conservative of the schemes under it. He does not think that the four Gospels are the sole and infallible work of the four inspired disciples of Christ to whom they have been ascribed in Christendom for nearly twenty centuries, but assumes their composite and gradual formation, in which the Apostles, indeed, have a part, but not such a part as to secure freedom from all error. Accordingly, while contending for the substantial historicity of the Gospel narrative, he asserts that there are mistakes and insoluble discrepancies in it, and that the attempt of the 'old Harmonists' to reconcile all discrepancies is necessarily a failure (136, 137). He 'suggests as the possible explanation of discrepancies, not floating traditions of evangelical incidents assuming different forms as they passed from mouth to mouth, but the somewhat uncritical use of written documents by honest but simple men unaccustomed to the art of constructing history as practised by a modern literary expert' (137). This method, he says, while establishing "the historical value of the record as a whole," yet "admits that real discrepancies are a priori pos-
sible and a posteriori probable, and that to all appearance some such do actually occur in the Gospels, and the miraculous narratives in particular" (137). This view of the origin of the Gospels permits him to speak of some portions as being less credible than others. The healing of the ear of Malchus is "a weakly accredited miracle" (149). "The very peculiar nature-miracle of the stater in the fish's mouth cannot be regarded as an absolute certainty, but at most a probability" (235). On p. 81 he asserts by implication that "no one of the four Gospels is as indubitably apostolic in its authorship, as the four Epistles to the Galatian, Corinthian, and Roman churches are indubitably Pauline."

The acceptance and employment of this view by the author, in the construction of his general argument in defence of the Gospel-miracles, weakens it in our opinion; for there are two strong objections to this way of explaining the origin of the Gospels.

1. First, it makes the documentary foundation of Christianity to rest on ecclesiastical tradition, instead of apostolic inspiration. The theory is Romish, not Protestant. Ecclesiastical tradition is prior and determining. The Church through its Logia instructs the Apostles in the Life of Christ, on which everything in Christianity depends, instead of the Apostles instructing the Church. The Apostles in this case are not the original source of the world's knowledge of Jesus Christ, nor is their testimony ultimate and controlling. The stories about Christ current in the primitive brotherhood determine the whole future of Christianity, by determining the substance of the biography of its Founder.

But the fact is, that the first Christian brotherhood obtained all the true knowledge it had of the life and teachings of Christ from its instructors and guides—the Twelve Apostles. The brotherhood itself came into existence, and increased in numbers and strength, only because the Apostles preached what they themselves had seen and heard during their discipleship with the Redeemer, and put the substance of their preaching into a written form. Without such an inspired and fixed apostolical account of the Life of Christ, the Primitive Church would have had a portraiture of Christ like that in the apocryphal Gospels—a portraiture that would have grown more and more fanciful and false—and would soon have been as full of vagaries and heresies as the later Gnostic communities, and, like them, would have vanished into oblivion. The Twelve, therefore, were expressly commissioned by their Master to prepare an account of his words and deeds, and were promised Divine guidance in doing it (Matt. x. 5-20; John xiv. 25, 26; xv. 13-16; xvi. 13, 14). This all-important work was not left to the random method of early ecclesiastical tradition—a method that inevitably mixes legendary matter with true history, as is seen in the apocryphal Gospels—but rested on the distinct recollections of the Apostles themselves, assisted and superintended by the Holy Spirit. To go back to an uninspired tradition of the Early Church for the Life of Christ is the same, in principle, with going back to an uninspired tradition of the Romish Church for doctrine and polity.

2. Secondly, the view in question is indefinite, unscientific, and liable to all kinds of subjective caprice. The element of ecclesiastical tradition may run up to a maximum, or down to a minimum; and so may the element of apostolicity and inspiration. Accordingly, under this theory both rationalistic and evangelical schools of exegesis are to be found. Strauss adopts it, and so does Weiss. The former handles it so as to expel the supernatural; the latter so as to retain it. This loose indefiniteness and lack of scientific precision and consistency in the theory shows itself in the struggles of the evangelical exegete not to be carried off by it. Dr. Bruce is continually fighting against its latitudinarian tendency. His devout and strong evangelical feeling frequently protests against the inferences not merely of Keim, but those of Weiss. Speaking of the constant alteration and modification characteristic of the exegesis founded on
this view of the origin of the Gospels, and with more particular allusion to Weiss, he says: "This change of opinion puts us on our guard against regarding such solutions as more than conjectures. I do not, therefore, make myself responsible for them. On the contrary, in these, as in many other instances, the critical handling of the Gospels by the author referred to appears to me too free, and I believe that, without regard to any theoretical claims based on inspiration, a much larger measure of historical accuracy may be ascribed to the evangelic narratives than he seems prepared to allow" (141). Yet he immediately adds: "Nevertheless, I plead for the legitimacy of such attempts at solving problems connected with discrepancies in parallel accounts, in their own place and for their own purpose. I depurate hasty condemnation of them or indignant interdict against them in the name of dogmatic theories of inspiration and a priori inferences of inerrancy" (141-2). This looks like saying both yes and no, which, according to King Lear, "is no good divinity." But why should Dr. Bruce claim that his restraint in the application of the theory under consideration is wiser and better than Weiss's non-restraint? Both hold a common view which excludes plenary inspiration and inerrancy, in the account of the Life of Christ. Who is to decide how much or how little of error there is in this account? When both parties surrender the primary point of infallibility, and concede that some legendary matter has crept into the true history and is mixed with it, why should a spectator of the dispute as to the amount of the legendary matter side with one rather than the other? The decision relates to a secondary point, and ultimately depends upon the private opinion and mere ipse dixit of one or the other party.

Our limits forbid a further examination of the remaining Lectures, which are among the most valuable in the volume. The analysis of the healing miracles and the nature-miracles is excellent. Here the thoroughness and carefulness of the author's method appear. The miracles as related to the Divine Worker of them, and to Revelation, evince the omnipotent power of their Author, and are not only signs and proofs of a communication from heaven, but an integral part of it. The ninth Lecture presents Christ as the Great Moral Miracle, and the tenth shows how empty are all the pretended forms of Christianity that deny the miraculous.

Though disagreeing with Dr. Bruce on a highly important point, we regard his volume, considered as a whole, as an instructive and valuable addition to the literature of Apologetics. It does what it proposes to do—namely, to establish the main truthfulness and credibility of the Gospel-miracles—with ability and fairness. It will strengthen faith in these miracles in the minds of some who, perhaps, would not be influenced by a different method. It is a substantial benefit, when a person is brought to believe in the historicity of the Gospels, even if he does not go any further than this. The book is strong and effective in this reference; only there is the danger that the pupil may not be as conservative as the teacher and stop where he is, but allow the looseness of the underlying theory ultimately to carry him over to rationalism. For this reason we think that these Lectures, considered as an Apologetic treatise, would be stronger and more effective, had the author employed his learning and logic in maintaining not only the historicity, but the infallibility of the Gospels. In that case, he would have made more use of the entire research and literature of Apologetics—Patristic, Reformation, and Later-Protestant—and been in closer sympathy with the belief of Christendom in all the ages. For it is a defect in the exegetical schools which advocate the ecclesiastical and gradual origin of the Gospels, that they move in a narrow circle. They are provincial, not catholic. They quote one another and repeat one another. One is struck with this, as he follows the fortunes of the Tübingen School, and the other Teutonic schools, whose name is
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. 167

legion. The adherents of each constitute a scholastic coterie that lasts for only a few years, and gives place to another, who spin out of their own bowels, and are either ignorant of or ignore the solid learning, lucid reasoning, and sound judgment of the earlier scholars. There is a singular undervaluation of historical opinions in this class.

It seems to us that Dr. Bruce has given something of this local and provincial tone to his volume, by referring so very much to the views of a few German authors. The discussion turns too frequently upon the opinions of German rationalists and evangelicals. He is too anxious sometimes to refute, and sometimes to corroborate them. Had he been more indifferent to the conjectures and schematizing of this class of investigators, and expended the full force of his own scholarship and insight upon the Gospel-problem itself, his service to the Church, we think, would have been greater and more influential. W. G. T. SHEDD.


The author of this work is one of the most distinguished divines of Germany of the conservative type. He handles this burning question of our times with thoroughness, freshness, and real insight into its difficult problems. After a brief introduction he divides his theme into two great parts, the Preparation for the End and the End itself. The Preparation for the End embraces the two themes, the preservation of the dead for the End and the signs of the End. The End itself embraces the two themes, the conclusion of Time, and Eternity. The author rightly places the whole subject of Eschatology under the point of view of redemption rather than of judgment and retribution. As soteriology treats of the appropriation of redemption, so eschatology treats of the completion in redemption, and thus constitutes the last division of Christian doctrine.

The author's views of the middle state are interesting. He rejects the sleep of the soul on the one hand and the active moral development of the soul on the other, and maintains that the disembodied spirit is in a timeless state where the mind is active in recollection of the life in this world, but is incapable of productive activity. It quietly waits the judgment, which has nothing to do with the experience of the middle state, but is strictly in accord with the deeds done in the body. So much for the condition of those who have been approached by the means of grace in this world. As regards others, he teaches two offers of redemption at the close of the two great dispensations. The dead, prior to the first advent, had the offer of redemption when Christ descended into the abode of the dead. These were all alike in sheol, and sheol was emptied of its inhabitants when Christ rose from the dead, some going with Him to heaven, others departing from Him to the place of punishment.

As regards the dead subsequent to the enthronement of Christ, he holds that those who have definitely accepted Him go at once to heaven at death, and those who have rejected Him go at death to the place of punishment. Sheol is for those who have never heard of Christ since His advent, and have had no opportunity of redemption. These remain in sheol until the second advent. Then Christ reveals Himself to them, and they have an opportunity of definite decision, and so determine by that momentary choice their everlasting weal or woe. This is the way of redemption for unbaptized children and the heathen.

Thus we have another added to the recent theories of the mode of salvation of infants and heathen. The Westminster divines represented that "elect infants" and "all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word" are "saved by Christ through the Spirit who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth;" but the modern church is not satisfied
to leave the mode of their salvation undetermined. It seeks to define it. The modern church has changed "elect infants" into "all infants," and has enlarged the "all other elect persons" until it comprehends a considerable number of the heathen. Some recent divines have claimed that these are justified without faith, and without the actual working of the Holy Spirit upon them; but this is clearly against the Scriptures and the Confession, which teacheth that "they are not justified until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them." There are three chief views as to the application of Christ by the Spirit to the unbaptized: (1) the application in the moment of death, prior to the entrance upon the middle state; (2) at some time during the abode in the middle state, and (3) at the close of the middle state in connection with the second advent. None of these views can claim to be orthodox. The Westminster Confession leaves the time, the place, and the mode of this application undetermined, and all such questions should be regarded as extra confessional and not contra confessional.

Dr. Kliefoth adheres to the old orthodox view of the signs of the End. He rejects the future millennium as against the orthodox faith of the Church and sound interpretation of the Scriptures. The symbols of the Reformation have no room for a millennium either before the advent or subsequent to the advent, and the Westminster symbols, in their definitions, refuse to accommodate themselves to the faith of the Premillenarians of our day, no less than to the faith of those who believe that a millennium is yet to come before the advent. Dr. Kliefoth uses strong language here. He says that the doctrine of a millennial reign has no support in New Testament Prophecy, and that it is a hypothesis that dishonors the fundamental principles of the Scriptures.

Dr. Kliefoth discusses very thoroughly all those questions that arise with reference to the End. He teaches the church doctrine of the resurrection of the body, adheres to the doctrine of eternal punishment, and maintains that the redeemed are to dwell on the new earth as an organized community forever.

No one can read this work without being stimulated by it to new inquiries, whether the author satisfies him or not. The Reformers and their successors rejected the ancient and mediaeval eschatology, which was bound up with the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, but they did not substitute a Protestant doctrine in its place. They left the whole doctrine of the Middle State undeveloped. The ethical tendencies of modern thought have compelled men to consider this subject. There is great variety of opinion, and there is likely to be a considerable amount of discussion and controversy. It is well that every man should take his bearings, distinguish carefully the scriptural and confessional statements from human speculations and conceits, and cultivate a generous and charitable temper toward those who differ from him in these matters where the Church has not spoken the last word.

C. A. BRIGGS.

We add a word regarding the following books:

Belief in God. By the Rev. A. W. Momerie, M.A., D.Sc. (Blackwood & Sons.) Professor Momerie is one of the most acute writers on religious philosophy in Great Britain. His little volume on Personality appeared a few years ago. The present is a fitting sequel to it. The chapters on Materialism, Agnosticism, and the Infinite Personality are very suggestive and well worth reading. By the same author, and published by the same house, we have also Preaching and Hearing, a volume of practical sermons, yet worthy of mention here on account of the closing paper on the Antagonism between Dogma and Philosophy, in which among some good and true things there are things neither good nor true. Professor Momerie, as he tells us, was trained in the Evangelical School; he seems to belong now to the Broad School, and shows some animus in his
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references to them from whom he has parted company.—The Conflict Ended; or, Evil forever Vanquished. By Rev. John Cooper. (Edinburgh: McNiven & Wallace.) This is a plea for a larger spirit of self-sacrifice on the part of Christians; a defence of the ethical side of salvation; and, like other books of its class, a disparagement or denial of the forensic side. We see nothing new in it that is true, and nothing true in it that is new. F. L. PATTON.

IV.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.


"The discussions contained in this volume," says the author, "are in great part re-published from various periodicals. They have been so greatly enlarged, however, that nearly one half of the material is new."

No apology is needed for bringing these scattered essays together, and giving them permanent form in a book. When a writer packs away so much thought, and in such clear, vigorous English, even in his fugitive pieces, the public will welcome their re-appearance in more formal dress; and many an admirer of Professor Phelps would have been glad to place these current discussions on the library shelf, even if they had not been enriched by "new material."

The first topic, "My Study," is discussed in three parts; of course the "Study" is simply used as a suggestion for retrospect and reminiscence. But Professor Phelps finds room to say that Dr. Griffin in the building of this study "had a magnificent ideal of a working-room for a studious recluse. It filled the southern wing of the house. The morning sun greeted its eastern windows; the noon-day sun gave it good cheer as he travelled southward; and the setting sun flooded it with golden glory, in which few horizons equal that of Andover. The glow which illuminated it from sun to sun was a fit emblem of the light which was to go from it around the world."

Such a study was worthy of the great ideas that there had their birth or there first took practical shape. One is amazed to read the roll of splendid enterprises that were either set on foot or had their course determined in that sunny room at Andover. There the project of American Missions to the heathen first took the visible and tangible form which gave rise to the American Board. There was originated the American Monthly Concert of Prayer for the Conversion of the World; also the Concert of Prayer for Colleges. There the idea had birth that grew to working shape in the New England Tract Society, which became the American Tract Society. In that prolific nest the first weekly religious newspaper was born, and the first total abstinence society, and the American Home Missionary Society. What a progeny from a single study! Surely, if association can stamp locality with interest and make it inspirational, that old room must be a marvellously fine place for a brain-worker.

The essays that follow "My Study" are varied and "to the times." Eight of them are on different phases of retribution. One is on "Scholastic Theories of Inspiration." Another answers the question, "Does the World Move?" Another faces us with the inquiry, "Is the Christian Life Worth Living?" There are two "Studies of the Episcopal Church." "Prayer" is discussed "As a State of Christian Living." And the author tells us in the last essay "why he believes Christianity to be a revelation from God."

Professor Phelps answers the question, "Does the world move?" in a way that
shows his serious spirit, as he steps toward the decline of life, is far from pessimistic. He holds that fundamental advances are being made in all realms. Everybody recognizes the material progress, as represented in improved machinery and the vast and varied results of productive labor. The author holds that there is equal evidence that "the world is moving to the conquest of great intellectual and moral improvements." He names as the formative ideas born of the recent centuries "human brotherhood," "individual liberty," "independence in religious belief," "the elevation of woman." Associated with these, or corollaries from them, are many others, such as the recognition of the freedom of the press and of public speech, of the sacredness of human life, of the criminality of war, etc., etc. Furthermore, the author distinctly attributes these creative thoughts to one source—the religion of Christ. And here he puts into terse phrase what our time needs to have emphasized. Duty, even in some religious circles, is coming to be tabooed and frowned on as a motive, in a wild gush of sentimentalism. Coming from such an atmosphere, what a tonic there is in words like the following: "Everything great springs from conscience;" "Never was a bill of human rights fought for with success which had not somewhere for its preamble a bill of human duties;" "The word 'ought' is the supreme word in all languages!" (p. 242.)

Passing to "A Study of the Episcopal Church," we here see how a man of the most intense and positive convictions may be possessed with a "sweet reasonableness." Generously, yet guardedly and balancedly, he holds up to view the dominant ideas in this Church of forms and order, to which all cherishers of Puritan traditions would do well to take heed. Wisely and warrantably he insists on the possibility of profit from a study of these dominant ideas, such as the dignity of worship—The Sacredness of the House of God; The Unity and the Consequent Moral Authority of the Christian Church. This essay, in its two parts, is a happy illustration of Professor Phelps's calm, judicial poise. There is no danger of its leading any weak souls into Episcopacy. The antidote to that is put here and there with a ringing, yet irenic, emphasis. In this respect it differs from a paper, read by Dr. Storrs at a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, on "The Attractive Features of the Roman Catholic Church to an Educated Mind," in which the features were so effectively and eloquently presented, that a good brother, stepping out of the church where it was read: said: "Dr. Storrs ought to have given us the other side. That paper isn't safe!"

But, doubtless, the chief interest in this volume will centre in the eight essays on different phases of retribution. The discussion is exceedingly timely and, in the main, exceedingly effective. The irenic spirit prevails here as elsewhere; but there is a distinctness and positiveness of statement, a steadfast trend of unalterable conviction, a clearness and tenacity of purpose, a breadth and depth of view, that show this is no surface nature touching the outer boundary of this mighty theme.

In "Oscillations of Faith in Future Retribution" we find the author eloquent with this burst of righteous indignation over the treatment of what he terms "that hideous mass of putrescent depravity"—Mormonism! "Has it come to this," he says, "that a defiant hierarchy of brothels must be welcomed to the fraternity of Christian States, trusting to the amorous cooing of politicians and preachers, to win the 'err ing sisters' hack to virtue?"

In the essay "Retribution in its Biblical Atmosphere," one sentence is enough to disclose the author's estimate of that atmosphere. "No nation or tribe of ancient times," he says, "possessed in their religion or their literature so intense and fearful a conception of the final abode of guilt as we have in the Christian revelation of an eternal hell;" and of this Christian revelation of retribution the author says: "Our Lord's absolute unconsciousness of having in
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these terrific disclosures uttered anything which a loyal conscience can recoil from is sublime beyond the reach of words."

All along these pages that deal with this profound question the author's clearness of thought and style, his sweep of vision, his grasp of fundamentals, his power of logic, dissipate the uncertainties that have been begotten of human speculation; place retribution where it eternally belongs—in the heart of divine love; break the support that have been constructed for "a second probation;" show the folly and the falsehood of an "Æolian" theology, and vindicate the government of God against the notion that it is "an asthenic non-descript, which would subject any human administration to contempt." The essay on "Sin under the Government of God" is strong, candid, and well weighed, and in some of its aspects tremendous.

The one weak thing in this effort to vindicate the Biblical doctrine of retribution is the emphasis laid upon endless guilt as the ground and cause of endless punishment. We object to both the rhetoric and the logic that finds the justification for eternal misery in any "climax of ripened evil" or "of finished and indurated character." The currents of depravity are set when we are born—just as unalterably set, save as God's sovereign grace shall change them, in the infant of days as in the soul ridged and seamed with life-long indulgence in every unhallowed passion. The young man of the Gospel story, whom Jesus "looked upon and loved" for his amiability of character and outward keeping of commandment, was as impotent to change his moral nature as Judas Iscariot was when he went out and hanged himself. It is not "finished and indurated character" that fixes us in our eternal state. It is the passing our period of probation, at what point soever in our life and with whatsoever degree of guilt, without a believing acceptance of Jesus Christ. Nor does God "pronounce the sentence of eternal death upon eternal guilt" (p. 106). There is not a shadow of scriptural warrant for this statement. The sentence of "eternal death" is pronounced by Jesus in the vivid judgment scene in Matthew (ch.xxv.), but there is not a trace of "eternal sin" as its cause. On the other hand, the ground is distinctly stated to be deeds already done, or left undone. That sin will continue, and continue to deserve punishment, and continue to bring increasing punishment, is indeed true, and as terrible as it is true; but all Scripture is one luminous and emphatic statement that withdrawal of God's overturing and restraining grace is doom of eternal death; and that this judicial infliction is solely because of present unbelief. When Professor Phelps says, "Ages of settled belief have fixed in the popular theology the end of life as synchronous with the end of moral trial" (p. 156), he virtually surrenders the position that "the sentence of eternal death is pronounced upon eternal sin."

Herrick Johnson.


There have been three distinguished Earls of Shaftesbury: the first, who founded the family, an eminent politician; the second, a free-thinking philosopher; the third, a Christian philanthropist. There can be no reasonable doubt to which of the three the world owes most. It is matter of thankfulness that so unique a life as that of the seventh earl has found in Mr. Hodder a successful biographer. Lord Shaftesbury, in his great modesty, would have preferred to pass away without any formal record of his life, but he knew that in spite of his wishes there would be Lives of him; and as these could not but be full of blunders, he concluded that it would be better to have a correct one. But no one could write his life save himself, and he had not time. Then he bethought
him of priming a friend; and a considerable part of his last year or two was spent in explaining matters to Mr. Hodder, and instructing him what use to make of copious diaries and notes which he had carefully written. Mr. Hodder has made a long story of it, but he has given an excellent portrait of the man. The book has a manifold interest: first, as a very remarkable development of character; second, as a record of hard but noble struggle against wrong, and on behalf of the poor and needy; third, as affording casual but very interesting glimpses of the leading public men of England with whom, one way or other, Lord Shaftesbury came into contact; and fourth, as evincing the practical power of evangelical Christianity, which was, beyond all doubt, the mainspring of a life unprecedented for its devotion to suffering humanity, the purity and perseverance of its aim, and the multitude of blessings which it was the means of securing.

We often remark how strange are the places where God finds his instruments for great works; and the remark is applicable to this case, though in a different sense from the common. Usually it is the obscurity of great men's birth that makes their achievements remarkable; as when the Reformer of Christendom was found in a miner's cottage, the pioneer of Indian missions on a shoemaker's bench, the explorer of Central Africa in a cotton mill. But in this case, it is high birth that seems to disqualify the instrument. Nothing seemed at first less likely than that Lord Shaftesbury should do the work he did. In the first place, he was brought up in a most godless atmosphere, among those to whom earnest religion was not only not an object of reverence, but of scorn and hatred. But there was a godly nurse in the family, a Maria Millis, who loved the boy and gained his affection, and by speaking and reading to him from the Bible, gave a right direction to his yearnings after God. She died when he was only seven, but he always thought and spoke of her as the person who had brought him to God; she bequeathed her watch to him, and he never wore any other, and when he showed it to his friends, he used to remark that he had got it from the best friend he ever had. In the second place, instead of the heart of the young philanthropist being warmed and expanded by love, it was chilled and contracted by the most distressing harshness. His parents belonged to the old order of martinetts, who believed that children were to be governed not by love, but by fear. The school of his childhood was compared by himself to Mr. Dickens's Dotheboys Hall. It is touching to find him saying that when a vacation began, he was seized by a great terror because he was going home, and when it ended, he was seized by another great terror because he was going back to school. Despite the influences that afterward counteracted this, its effect on his temperament and his temper never passed altogether away. In the third place, his family and other connections were steeped in the deepest Toryism. The people were hateful to them. For a member of the aristocracy to bother himself about them was to degrade himself and his family. This, too, left a certain permanent effect on Lord Shaftesbury, although he repudiated the sentiment with all his heart. In the fourth place, he had not even that advantage from high birth and connection which so often attends them—great wealth. From beginning to end he was comparatively a poor man. He was poor in the circumstances which make poverty most distressing, when one has to live among the rich and as the rich. His embarrassments began in his early youth with the expense of a county election amounting to £15,000, which was shamefully thrown on him, when it ought to have been borne by others. Sometimes he was in such straits that he knew not what to do. And all the time he was denying himself government office, with its comfortable salary, though often pressed on him, because he thought he could do more good in an independent capacity. This is one of his noblest features, and it cannot but deepen our respect for his memory and our admiration of his life.
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

How, then, did Shaftesbury become the great philanthropist? He had a tender heart, to begin with, that felt deeply for all sorrow and suffering. But undoubtedly it was his religion that moved him to devote his life to the alleviation of the miseries of the poor. The resolution to do so was taken in his fifteenth year, when he was at school at Harrow. As he was walking along the road one day, he observed some men carrying a pauper's coffin to the grave. They were drunk, and let their burden fall, so that the coffin tumbled on the ground. How came it that a fellow-creature was being buried as not even a dog should be buried? It was simply because he was poor. Such a thing ought not to be in a Christian country; and from that day Lord Ashley, as he was then called, devoted his life to mitigate the distresses of the poor. His own heart was stirred in sympathy with the heart of him who, though he was rich, for our sake became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich. The life sacrifice of the Son of God was never far from his thoughts; and ought the disciple to be above his Master, or the servant above his Lord? Religion became a very real thing with him. God was very really the Lord and Judge of all, and no project could truly succeed which he did not favor. Prayer was a very real intercourse with the Father of spirits and a blessed refuge in every time of trial. Firmness and thoroughness became features of his Christian life. Principle was everything—expediency as against principle contemptible. A measure of sternness associated itself in his case with his resolute and thorough maintenance of right. Geniality of manner was the one thing Lord Shaftesbury lacked. Once only had the present writer the opportunity of personal intercourse with him; it happened to be on a subject which was not agreeable to him, and he was at no pains to conceal his irritation and disgust. Had the bland manners of many an inferior man been added to his profound excellences, his popularity would have been unbounded.

Lord Shaftesbury, though his labors of love were almost numberless, was not a promiscuous philanthropist, but made a point of investigating every cause or movement with the utmost care and diligence before he committed himself to it. Before he took up the ten-hours' bill, he went to the manufacturing districts, entered the mills, examined the children, went to the hospitals where many a victim of the system was lying, and thoroughly satisfied himself that reform was needed. It was the same in the case of ragged schools and improved dwellings for the poor. Even professional thieves were not too disreputable for him to meet and confer with. On one occasion he met by appointment with some four hundred of the thieves of London. In such a presence and in such circumstances the men were not likely to maintain a defiant attitude; they frankly owned that their life was a wretched one, and the greater part of them availed themselves of a scheme of emigration which gave them a chance of starting life anew under more favorable conditions. If Lord Shaftesbury had been a man that took up things easily, he would have been liable to let them down also easily. But one of the most remarkable things about him was, that once he embarked on an enterprise, he never abandoned it. The discouragements might be overwhelming, but he had begun the enterprise in the assurance that it was right; God was with him, and he dared not draw back. "Vestigia nulla retrorsum" was his motto; and he hardly ever took up anything in which he did not succeed.

His first undertaking was the reform of the lunacy laws and of the shameful violent treatment to which lunatics had often been subjected. Here he did not encounter very much opposition, and he was entirely successful. Next, he took up the state of the factories, but here he was met by most bitter resistance. The hours of labor were far too long, especially for children, who were taken in at much too early an age, and whose education was entirely neglected. The
manufacturers met him in stern and deadly fight. Even men like Cobden and Bright opposed him vehemently as interfering with the rights of employers and the freedom of trade. The struggle lasted for years, but at length Lord Shaftesbury triumphed; and ultimately his opponents owned that he had done good. Before the factory question was settled, the state of mines and coal-pits was dragged into the light. The revelations here were very atrocious, especially as they bore on the case of women and children; and though opposition was threatened, the feeling of the public was so strong that it came to little or nothing. Then came the turn of the "climbing boys," as the apprentices of chimney-sweeps were called, who were often forced, under the most barbarous circumstances, to climb chimneys, their struggles involving cruel suffering, and often death. For them, too, Lord Shaftesbury obtained release. It was his purpose that no form of labor should be left without such supervision as would tend to obviate cruelty and injustice, and he succeeded. After these battles, he took up the cause of ragged schools and reformatories, shoeblack brigades, and other institutions for the improvement of street Arabs. Then the abuses prevalent in the lodging-houses of London engaged his attention, and they, too, were placed under supervision. But the necessity for improved dwellings for the poor became painfully apparent, and he placed himself at the head of several movements for this purpose. The "Shaftesbury Park"—a little workingman's town—was one of the results of this. He was placed at the head of a Board for public health; also at the head of a Sanitary Commission during the Crimean War, in which capacity, according to Miss Florence Nightingale, he saved the British Army from destruction.

His connection with religious movements was not less multifarious, although involving less personal effort. With the Bible Society, the London City Mission, the Jews' Conversion Society, the Pastoral Aid Society, the Church Missionary Society, he was in the most intimate connection, and usually presided at their meetings. As he said himself, he was an Evangelical of the Evangelicals, believing that that section of the church alone was faithful to the truth and efficient for real good. To the Church of England he was warmly attached, at first with an attachment which was almost exclusive, but in the later years of his life, especially after the outburst of Tractarianism, his sympathies were more cordial toward earnest Nonconformists. He was too busy to make himself acquainted with any of the movements of modern thought, and when he alluded to them the feeling he expressed was that they were only evil, and that continually.

It will be observed that to a great degree Lord Shaftesbury was what we may call an empirical philanthropist. He grappled one by one with the actual disorders that were preying on the body politic, and did his best to remove them. For elevating the condition of the people, the great agencies to which he looked were Christian preaching and Christian education. With social questions in their deeper aspects and bearings he had little sympathy. He long resisted the repeal of the corn laws, and he was no friend to the extension of the suffrage. It would be amusing, if the matter had not been so serious, to watch the battle between him and the champions of Free-trade. Mr. Bright insisted that he could be no friend to the people when he resisted so resolutely the movement for cheap food. Lord Shaftesbury wondered what kind of friend to the people Mr. Bright could be when he resisted so resolutely the ten-hours' bill. Nothing, in the course of his battles, surprised him more than the quarters from which he got help and hindrance, respectively. From the bishops and the comfortable clergy he seldom got anything but the cold shoulder. Then, as in the days of the Good Samaritan, the priest and the Levite passed by on the other side. Usually his Tory friends either voted against him, or left the House when the
vote was coming on. Sometimes he would own, rather to his mortification, that it was not the saints but the sinners that voted for him, radicals and chartists and the like. This seems to indicate a want of readiness to comprehend human nature, perhaps, too, the influence of prejudice in judging of men's character, the tendency to think worse of opponents and better of political friends than they deserved. Between his mortification at the opposition of friends and his embarrassment at the support of uncongenial opponents, he was in a somewhat sorry position.

Of the public and political men by whom he was surrounded he generally had an unfavorable opinion. Like other human beings, he was much influenced by personal kindness. In his early days he had much intercourse with the Duke of Wellington, whom he liked much, though he had to confess that he was "hard." The poet Southey was his frequent correspondent, and did much to confirm him in Toryism and churchism. Charles Dickens he found a true friend and earnest worker for the people's good. Sir Robert Peel he could not endure. He was a mere expediencymonger, and had no higher aim than to please men. In Mr. Disraeli he could find nothing to admire but his talents—the use he made of them was atrocious. Mr. Gladstone was fantastic, unstable, wholly unreliable. Strange to say, he drew very cordially to Lord Palmerston. His lordship was his wife's stepfather, and was extremely kind. While he was prime minister, he allowed Lord Shaftesbury to recommend bishops, and some highly evangelical men were thus placed on the bench. But it is strange that one who so distrusted Peel should have stood by Palmerston, who was certainly not a man of a higher moral stamp. It is uncomfortable to see how, when Palmerston lay dying, some slight sound in reply to a question was accepted by Lord Shaftesbury as clear evidence of his spiritual condition.

But take him all in all, we shall not soon look on his like again. In his sad, laborious, believing, struggling life he was an honor to his order and an honor to his race. No philanthropist that ever lived left behind him such a record of earnest and successful work. Even the names of Howard and Wilberforce pale before that of Shaftesbury. His personal character was unsullied and unimpeachable. His forty-one years of happy married life with one whom he loved and honored as the very best of wives is beautiful to behold. The sorrows connected with the deaths of half his children were profound, and chastened him greatly. His delight in the Word of God, his loyalty to his Lord and Saviour, and his willing consecration of his life for "the least of these my brethren" may well be a stimulus to the languid energies and self-indulging spirit so common in the professing church of our day.

W. G. BLAIKIE.


Dr. Behrend's volume consists substantially, with a modified division of its material, of a course of lectures delivered at the Hartford Theological Seminary by invitation of its Faculty. It embodies the result of broad and thoughtful study, general and special, and deals in a thorough, earnest, and judicious way with one of the gravest and most urgent problems of our time. Its historical survey is concise, but sufficient to show the chief phases of the problem, and the most important solutions that have been proposed from the time of the Jewish commonwealth and of Plato to the days of the International and Nihilism. In his dealing with modern Socialism the author shows a hearty appreciation of all
the real social evils which Socialism proposes to redress, while at the same time, with clear discrimination and a characterization which leaves no doubt as to his meaning, and whose correctness it will be hard to disprove, he exposes the false assumptions of the socialistic theories and the unsoundness and pernicious tendency of the socialistic proposals. Its materialistic philosophy, its unhistorical temper, its misrepresentation of the actual movement of society, its false conception of the true function of the State, and its economic fallacies are effectively dealt with, as a necessary preliminary to a proper treatment of labor and wealth in their various aspects, of pauperism and crime, of society and the family.

The well-known rhetorical ability and logical skill of Dr. Behrend increase the attractiveness as well as the convincing power of his masterly discussion. There are other books which on special points may claim superiority to this; there is none to which we should, on the whole, give the preference as a book for wide and prolonged usefulness. Anarchists and the like are beyond the sphere of its influence; its facts and reasonings carried home to our honest but sometimes bewildered artisan class would do much to save them and the society in which they are so important an element.

Pastor Maasz writes, not specifically of the social question, but of the proper place and influence of religion in the sphere of right and the State. The book is for Germans, and is written by an earnestly religious and Christian man, who is at the same time strongly conservative in all political and social matters. He believes, e.g., in hereditary sovereignty as involved in the true conception of the State, and would strongly emphasize the value of orders and classes.

Taking up successively rights of person, of property, of contract, of good name and honor, of personal liberty, of liberty and equality in the choice and exercise of one's calling, of utterance by tongue and pen, of respect for one's convictions, the right to protection for one's moral living, and to means for the attainment of culture and knowledge, the author shows the place of religion in each case in the foundation of each right, its true definition, its worthy exercise. While the book is specially adapted to the conditions of German thought and life, there are, of course, many things discussed which are of universal importance, and many positions taken which must command the assent of all who would see all thinking as well as all living brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.

MEMOIRS OF DORA GREENWELL. By WILLIAM DORLING. London : Clarke, 1885.

Mr. Dorling describes the subject of this memoir as "a noble Christian woman, possessed of remarkable genius." In this estimate of her we heartily agree from personal knowledge. It was Miss Greenwell's lot, however, to tread the dark valleys and troubled ways of life. First, there was poverty—the more trying to one who had been born and brought up in comfort and plenty. Next, as the close companion of her life, she had ill-health, with all its depressing influences, against which, however, she bore up wonderfully. Thirdly, in her literary work she wanted the knack, perhaps because she did not care, to meet the public taste, and her books were but moderately successful. Moreover, she had a somewhat freakish, though excellent mother, to whom she devoted herself with beautiful filial love. It seemed the appropriate termination of this life of trials that it was caused or hastened by an accident. To those who knew her, all these things increase the affectionate reverence in which they hold her memory. In a wintry climate she showed a sunny nature, on which all her difficulties seemed to lay no touch of sourness. Remarkable for intellect, imagination, and feeling, she was
still more remarkable for her faith. Yet her religious character was of no com-
mon type. Personally a Protestant of the Puritan school, she clung to our Lord’s
work of satisfaction and atonement as the very corner-stone of her salvation.
Yet in her admiration of the Church and regard for its sacraments, she touched
the Anglican, if not the Romanist. The biographer of Lacordaire, she had a
great admiration for devout Catholics of the higher order. And this was the
tendency that seemed to gain most strength in her latter years.

Her poetry grew out of her view of life. Saddened and perplexed very greatly
as she was by the sorrows of humanity and the discords of Providence, she
sought hard for a reconciling medium, but so far as philosophy was concerned,
she sought in vain. Practically, she found a reconciliation in the cross of Christ.
That satisfied her, as she believed it was adapted to satisfy all who accepted it,
as the divinely provided refuge for sinful and suffering man. There she rested
in peace, under the dew of heaven, soft and cool, breathing the untainted and
untroubled atmosphere of love divine. But theoretically the problem of the dis-
cord, the mystery, the tumult of the universe remained unsolved. Looking out
on the ways of God as they are seen in life, doubt, approaching to despair, in-
vaded her. And despair would have utterly overcome her but for her profound
faith that "in Christ Jesus all contradictions are reconciled."

Such were the things of which she sung in her poetry and wrote in her prose.
Full of the intuitions of genius, she touched many of the deepest thoughts of the
thoughtful, and she revealed beautifully the balm and the bliss that heaven
offers. Sometimes her poetry is simple as a hymn, and rich in the purest treas-
ure of evangelical truth.

Of the charm of her character and the interest of her conversation it is impos-
sible to speak too highly. Miss Ingelow, who had much intercourse with her,
calls her "the most remarkable woman she had known." Miss M. S. Talbot, of
Clifton, says: "Her writings are the unconscious unfoldings of a poet's heart in
suffering—to be read, therefore, as a revelation of one aspect of that highest
marvel, and one which we seldom see, the poet's heart under the influence of the
deepest and most mysterious doctrines of Christianity. . . . She was not a
Christian philosopher, but a poet with a heart that could not let her pass, as most
poets can, through this world, leaving Christ, wounded for man, on the other
side of the way."

Mr. Dorling's biography, though not artistically written, contains a large
amount of interesting material, the "recollections" of her most intimate friends.

W. G. Blaikie.

Books for Practical Edification:

From Westermann & Co. we have received, Monatschrift für Innere Mission,
October, 1885. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann.) This heft contains a lively ideal
sketch of what is required for a successful laborer in the domestic field, interest-
ing accounts of what is done for the Germans who resort to Holland for employ-
ment, and copious extracts from other journals on kindred themes. Also Mehr
Populärität in der Predigt, von F. Zippel, Pastor in Altenroda (ibid.), a
spirited pamphlet acknowledging the decline of attendance upon church, and
suggesting some of the ways in which the pulpit, without departing from its great
aim, may yet win more favor from the people at large.— Platform and Pulpit
Aids. (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.) This is the best volume of the
Clerical Library yet issued. It contains choice addresses on Home Work,
Foreign Missions, Bible Distribution, Temperance, etc., by distinguished British
speakers. They are fresh, vigorous, and full of suggestiveness.— Moments on
(ibid.) This seems to us the best thing Dr. Matheson has yet published.
What is said is true, is Scriptural, and stirs both thought and devotion.—*Forewarned—Forearmed.* By J. Thain Davidson, D.D. This volume is true to its title. It is a series of pungent addresses admirably adapted to engage the attention of young men and guard them against the dangers to which they are exposed. (*Ibid.*)—*First Healing and Then Service, and Other Sermons.* By C. H. Spurgeon. The Messrs. Carter continue to reproduce the pulpit utterances of this distinguished man. This volume, containing sermons delivered last year, is so like in character those previously noticed that we need not speak further of it now.—*Thoughts for Thought. Discussions of Timely Topics.* By W. F. Faber. (Westfield, N. Y.: A. E. Rose.) The title of this volume savors both of affectation and conceit. Its author is well-meaning and earnest, and utters many salutary truths, but has by no means solved the problems he has put forward.—*Christ as a Teacher.* By M. R. Vincent, D.D. (New York: Randolph & Co.) This little volume contains two lectures delivered before the New York Sunday-School Teachers' Association. They are marked by the author's usual incisiveness and scholarly discrimination, and it would repay any Sunday-school teacher to study them well. Yet we think Dr. Vincent sometimes sees more in the Scripture than it really contains, as in the analysis of the Parables and the Beatitudes (pp. 19–26).—*The Mystery of Pain.* By James Hinton, M.D. With an Introduction by J. R. Nichols, M.D. (Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co.) This little volume, a reprint from the English, contains much that is excellent on the uses of pain, the joy of self-sacrifice, and the ultimate issue of suffering, but is marred, first, by its assertion of the actual redemption of all men (p. 75), and then by its insisting that there is a real and certain connection, though unseen by us, between our miseries and the welfare of others far remote from us, a point for which no authority can be adduced. Indeed, the chief defect of the volume is the lack of Scripture support and illustration. Hence its uplifting thoughts prove of less value than many an humbler work which keeps close to the inspired Word. Dr. Hinton definitely rejects asceticism, yet it is hard to separate that from a pleasure in sacrifice while unaware of any profitable use of the sacrifice.—*Silent Times: A Book to Help in Reading the Bible into Life.* By the Rev. J. R. Miller, D.D. (Boston: T. Y. Crowell & Co.) The title is taken from the custom of a certain institution of indicating by a bell a brief period, morning and evening, called a silent time, when all are expected to be in their rooms and have leisure for meditation and devotion. Such periods are equally necessary in the bustle of daily life as the first essay in this volume shows. The articles that follow are all adapted to help the spiritual life. They are thoroughly Scriptural, edifying, and suggestive. The author knows how to write in an interesting way, shunning commonplace, yet not irritating by extravagance in thought or diction.—*Scenes from the Life of Jesus.* Lectures by E. Lehman. Translated by Sophia Taylor. (T. & T. Clark, from Scribner & Welford.) Lectures of a devotional character, alternately with scientific lectures, are delivered at the house of the Inner Mission at Leipzig by the Director of the Union. This volume contains those given in the winter of 1884–85. They are intended to set forth the gracious character of our Lord as shown in certain aspects of his course. Hence they take the form of a lively exposition of those passages in the gospels which depict him as a Home Friend, the Ruler of the Heart, the Controller of the Storm, the Physician, the Conqueror of Death. The two last treat of Gethsemane and Golgotha. They are full of pith and tenderness, and show no small skill in adapting these gracious scenes to the circumstances and needs of our day.—*The Marriage Ring.* A Series of Discourses in Brooklyn Tabernacle. By T. De Witt Talmage. (Funk & Wagnalls.) It is not necessary at this late day to set forth the peculiarities which have given Dr. Talmage as wide a reputation as any American has
ever secured by pulpit prelections. This volume abounds with his usual plain speaking, sharp hits, vivid illustrations, and, one must add, violations of taste; but it maintains and defends sound doctrine on the all-important subject of marriage, and wherever it goes and is read the influence must be healthful. And there is reason to believe that many will read this who would not open a book less vivid and startling.—*Wood, Hay, and Stubble.* By Kate W. Hamilton. (Presb. Bd. of Pub.) This is the title, more suggestive than pleasing, of a volume designed to show the different results of character-building, according to the materials employed, as given in the metaphor used by the Apostle in the third chapter of First Corinthians. This is done with insight and dexterity, and the book can hardly be read without profit. As it seems to be settled that for a large portion of the reading public fiction is the only attractive thing, it is well that some of it at least should be guided by a high moral purpose, and be in consonance with evangelical truth.—*The Simplicity that is in Christ.* Sermons to the Woodland Church, Philadelphia. By Leonard W. Bacon. (Funk & Wagnalls.) This volume contains thirty sermons; four entitled The Simplicity that is toward Christ; three, The Simplicity that is in Christ; seven, Christ Teaching by Miracles; three, Holiday Sermons; three, Of Natural Theology; one, On the Scriptures; three, Of Things to Come; four, Character Sermons; one, On the Indwelling God; and one, On the Church. The object of the publication is frankly stated in the Letter Dedicatory to be to give to persons who have found fault with his ministry "such as they would most enjoy being displeased with." The most censorious critic must admit that the author has succeeded. Dr. Bacon is a very clever preacher. He has a fresh and vigorous way of putting things, and he is master of a clear and incisive style, but he is not a theologian. He lacks the discrimination, the reflection, and the knowledge requisite for one who is to sit in judgment upon the system of revealed truth. For example, there is not a single good point made in either of his opening sermons on Repentance and on Faith that is not stated in the definitions of the Shorter Catechism, together with all that is needful for the full understanding of these graces. If this be so, how preposterous is the claim that Dr. Bacon's talk is a return to the simplicity that is in Christ! So of the claim that the variations in Greek manuscripts do not affect any important matter of instruction, we are told (p. 239) that it is "easy to say it, but not to maintain it." And he cites the spurious text on the Trinity in First John, the story of the woman taken in adultery in John's gospel, and the disputed portion of Mark's last chapter. But if these all be given up, and as much more as any respectable scholars reject, what is left is sufficient to substantiate any of the great creeds of the Reformation period. Certainly no one point of those creeds has ever been questioned on the ground that the true text of the New Testament did not support it. Dr. Bacon claims to settle the question of Inspiration and infallibility by the Scriptures themselves, citing differences in different accounts of the same thing (the histories, the gospels, etc.), and the like; but he never once touches the Bible's own testimony expressly on the point—*e.g.*, Paul's utterance, "Every scripture inspired of God is profitable," etc., or our Lord's references to the matter. And when he omits to consider this side of the subject, he is just as much guilty of "pettifogging" as any of those whom he so soundly berates. If God does really say that his word is divinely inspired, and therefore authoritative, the bulk of his people will believe him rather than Dr. Bacon. There are divine and human elements in the Bible. That some emphasize and exaggerate the divine till they reduce the human to a mere mechanical exercise is no excuse for Dr. Bacon's emphasizing the human till the divine is reduced to the shadow of a shade. He finds errors in the text of Scripture, in its account of the facts of nature and science, in its historical statements, in its predictions, and in its
moral judgments and sentiments! The last sermon in the volume contains the
author's reasons for declining to be installed pastor of a Presbyterian church.
First, installation adds nothing to one's ministry. That is, to be a yearly hire-
liness the same thing as being made officially a pastor. Second, it would indi-
cate alliance with a sect. But Christians to be effective must unite, and to unite
they must agree in the main things. Thus only can they do what God requires.
Free lances do not amount to much in sacred things or secular. Third, it
requires assent without qualification to a creed. But a "system of doctrine" is
now a well-understood phrase, and to object to subscribe to such a system, if
one really believes it, is mere affectation. But however worthless Dr. Bacon's
reasons, his conclusion was exactly right. The Presbyterian Church was no
place for him.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

V.—PHILOSOPHY.

TYPES OF ETHICAL THEORY. By JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D., LL.D., late Prin-
pp. 512, 596.

We are glad to see a second and cheaper edition of this remarkable book,
perhaps the greatest contribution of the century to the literature of English
ethics. In novelty of ethical theory it does not compare with Spencer's Data of
Ethics, and is therefore not epoch-making. In subtle psychological analysis it
is surpassed by Sidgwick, and apart from the appearance of profundity that all
Hegelian writing puts on, there is probably more really profound thinking in
Green's Prolegomena to English Ethics than in the volumes before us. Yet
when the learning, the sweep of historical exposition and criticism, the vigorous
polemic, and the charm of literary expression which characterize these volumes
are all taken into account, we are disposed to give them the first place. Dr.
Martineau's book is both historical and constructive, and he has accomplished
this double purpose by the very artistic manner in which he groups his materials.
All ethical systems are, according to him, unpsychological (terminating directly
upon one or the other of the two great entities, God and Nature, without us)
or psychological (centring in self and construing God and Nature according to
the analogy of self). Unpsychological ethics may be metaphysical or physical.
If the former they make God, if the latter Nature, the ethical-presupposition.
Metaphysical systems, again, may be transcendental or immanent according
as they do or do not recognize a distinction between God and the phenomenal
world. The first, as Martineau says, may be theistic; the latter cannot be.
Passing to the second main division, Martineau deals with psychological ethics,
observing that, admitting that ethical science is eminently a psychological
inquiry, there are two methods even here; for it may be found that moral
ideas have been developed out of non-moral elements. This is the view of the
hetero-psychological schools represented by Spencer, Clarke, Cudworth, Price,
Shaftesbury, and Hutcheson; or it may be found that these hetero-psychological
schemes all fail to explain the genesis of moral ideas, and in that case it might
be well to "invite the conscience itself to declare its own psychology." The
volumes before us consist of expositions of each of these systems, some repre-
sentative thinker being dealt with both biographically and critically under each
division and subdivision, except that of "idiopsychological ethics," and here the
author does constructive work and unfolds his own ethical theory. "Of the
three great divisions of method," he says, "it is the central one alone in which, instead of teaching by historical example, I have ventured to speak for myself; not that representative instances were wholly out of reach, but because I knew of none that traced the lines of procedure as far as I believed they might be legitimately carried."

It would, of course, be impossible to review a book of such scope within the limits allowed here, or, indeed, do more than call attention to a few matters that we noted as we read. Plato is taken as a type of the unpsychological ethical thinkers, a position for which the author has been criticised by Sidgwick, and as representing the transcendental, and so theistic, type of metaphysical moralists. This is what we all wish to believe, and Dr. Martineau has satisfied himself apparently without seeing what Teichmüller and Chiappelli have to say. Descartes, on the other hand, is put down as an immanent (and so a non-theistic) advocate of metaphysical ethics—a position that Mahaffy and probably Saisset would justify, but which it is hard to harmonize with the strong theistic positions taken in the "Method" and the "Meditations."

We have the same difficulty with the author's treatment of Malebranche, and notwithstanding all that Dr. Martineau has said we prefer to believe, with Bowen, that Malebranche was not a pantheist. Criticisms of Spinoza and Comte follow the discussion concerning Malebranche, completing the first volume.

The second volume opens and is largely occupied with the subject of Idiopsychological Ethics. We confess that our interest attaches itself to the portion of this discussion in which the author defends the intuitive character of moral obligation and the theistic implications, rather than to the subtle analysis of the springs of action, together with the resulting scale of motives which, we suppose, the author regards as his special contribution to moral science. The latter part of the volume deals with Hetero-psychological Ethics. The authors treated are all British, and the discussion is a contribution to the history of English Ethics that is exceedingly valuable. Here again our interest centres in the author's attack upon the ethics of evolution as represented in the pages of Spencer and Stephen. His treatment of this much-handled topic is characterized by his usual penetration and vivacity.

F. L. Patton.


The model which Dr. Falckenberg has kept before him in the composition of this volume has been, as he tells us in his preface, the Grundriss der Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie, by Dr. Eduard Zeller; for, while he pays a handsome tribute to those distinguished qualities which render the Berlin professor easily the first of living historians of philosophy, he has yet aimed to produce a history of modern thought which shall be worthy of a place beside the latter's work as far, at least, as regards "practical utility and careful consideration of the needs of learners." And the completed work brings evidence that its author possesses no mean fitness for his task. Not only does he add to a thorough acquaintance with his field and the gift of a singularly lucid German style the advantages derived from many years' experience in the class-room, but he also enjoys those indispensable prerequisites of the philosophical historian—an enthusiastic belief in philosophy itself and a high appreciation of historical study as a means to philosophical progress.

Between the two opposing methods of treating the history of philosophy—the
exclusively narrative and the predominantly critical—Dr. Falckenberg chooses a middle course, allowing himself only so detailed a statement of his own position as will enable him to exhibit more clearly the genetic relations of the various philosophical systems; and this feature constitutes one of the chief merits of his work. It may be doubted whether all his descriptions of transitional phases in the development of modern thought would bear the test of minute criticism; but they are certainly calculated, no less by their artistic statement than by their philosophic insight, to bring before the reader a vivid picture of the successive moments in the process by which that development has reached its present stage. After an introductory chapter on the period of unrest between the decline of the scholastic influence and the first systematic development of the new ideas by Descartes, the account of modern philosophy proper is divided into two main parts, the dividing line being determined by the culmination of the pre-Kantian philosophy in Hume and Leibnitz, and the dawn of the Kantian era with the publication of the *Critique of Pure Reason* in 1781. In both sections of the treatise the narrative is marked as well by faithful presentation of the systems described as by clearness and beauty in the descriptions themselves; but the second part betrays a strange want of proportion in the treatment of the Hegelian scheme. It would, perhaps, be difficult to name a better discussion of the development and influence of the Cartesian positions; of Locke's work and of most of the phases of British thought in the eighteenth century down to Hume and to the Scottish school; of Leibnitz, and of the *Aufklärung* in France and Germany alike; but when our author has finished with the immediate successors of Kant, the limits of his space seem to hamper the freedom of his touch. He devotes to Kant a sixth part of the whole work, while Hegel receives barely so much attention as is given to the introductory discussion of his great predecessor's labors; and this is the more to be regretted since Dr. Falckenberg ignores neither the true position of Hegelianism in the line of historic development, nor the extent of its influence on the intellectual movements of the age. In fact, many will be as grateful to him for his concluding pages on philosophy since Hegel's death as for any other portion of his whole work.

The bibliographical references in both divisions of the history are numerous and valuable. A brief but useful vocabulary of philosophical terms is appended, together with indexes of the philosophers whose systems are discussed and of authors quoted. A translation by a competent hand would be a welcome addition to our treatises in English on the modern period.

A. C. ARMSTRONG, JR.

We notice briefly the following: *The Logic of Introspection; or, Method in Mental Science*. By Rev. J. B. Wentworth, D.D. (New York: Phillips & Hunt.) Pp. 446. This is a vigorously written polemic, sometimes transgressing the bounds of good taste. Its object is to show that the Baconian philosophy of Induction is a false method, and is responsible for the materialism of Hobbes and of later writers; that Dr. McCosh is especially open to criticism for undertaking to defend the Intuitions by the Inductive method; and finally, that the true method in philosophy is what the writer calls the Consciential method. We do not sympathize with the author's arraignment of the Baconian method, nor do we think that he has proved his case against Dr. McCosh, though he has made some criticisms Dr. McCosh may think worthy of notice. We have no doubt that the Inductive method has been the subject of excessive praise, and that the word "Induction" has been used with a latitude of meaning that strict regard for the rights of language will not justify. But the author has said nothing to shake our belief in the general statement that the phenomena of mind may as properly be the subject of inductive inquiry.
as the phenomena of matter. Dr. McCosh, we suppose, means nothing more than this when he enters upon an inductive study of the Intuitions.

In giving account of his own psychologic method, the author avows his rejection of Kant's doctrine of relativity, and takes occasion to say most unwarrantably that Dr. McCosh "virtually declares, with Kant, that our most fundamental knowledge is only relative to the mind possessing it; that it is colored, and even created and fashioned, by the rational faculties of the soul; and that we have no guarantee whatever that it conforms to the actual truths of things." Dr. McCosh has never written a line that furnishes the slightest justification of this charge, and his whole philosophic career, as Dr. Wentworth ought to know, has been an emphatic protest against the doctrine imputed to him.

The author supposes that he has discovered a new method of psychological investigation, which he designates the "Consciential method." We do not see that this method differs much from that which the author has been antagonizing. It consists of the three stages of Observation, Analysis, and Abstraction—terms which do not differ much as to their import from the words Introspection, Analysis, and Generalization employed by Dr. McCosh (Intuitions, p. 3). As to the epithet "Consciential" concerning "the general adoption or rejection" of which the author dismisses "all concern," it is easy to predict its "fate." It will go to the rubbish-heap.—Grundriss der Religionsphilosophie. Von G. Chr. Bernhard Pünjer, D. theol et phil. Professor der Theologie zu Jena. (Braunschweig: 1886.) It was Professor Pünjer's intention, having completed his History of religious philosophy since the Reformation, to follow it by a third volume in which he would have given his own views on the philosophy of religion. The little volume before us is an outline of his undertaking.—Die Haupt-probleme der Philosophie und Religion. Von Dr. H. K. Hugo Delff. (Leipzig, 1886.)

F. L. PATTON.

VI.—GENERAL LITERATURE.


The presence of poetry in all literatures, its extraordinary power, when read or recited, to awaken profound or exalted feeling, and the longer and wider popularity of the poetic than of the prose product, are obvious facts. Most of us accept them as ultimate facts. Usually, we ask for no explanation, but surrender ourselves to the poem's influence, or, at most, content ourselves with the statement that the function of the poet is to give to thought or feeling its perfect, its final literary expression. And, indeed, this is about as far back as the literary critics are accustomed to go. Mr. Matthew Arnold, for example, in one of his later essays, writes quite in the tone of one who regards himself as saying a final word when he tells us that "poetry is nothing less than the most perfect speech of man, that in which he comes nearest to being able to utter the truth."

Of course he is dealing with poetry on the side of form, not on the side of substance. It should be added that, when writing in the same essay of the substance of poetry, he takes the lofty and true position that "the noble and profound application of ideas to life is the most essential part of poetic greatness." But his latest word on "Poetry as a Representative Art" is the sentence that we have quoted. The truth is that a real explanation, a true philosophy of poetry must follow and be founded on a true psychology. The psychologist is far more...
likely than the literary critic to be helpful to one who is seeking such an explanation. Dr. McCosh, for example, in a remark made in his fine account of the Cognitive powers, carries us much farther toward the secret of poetry as a literary form than does Mr. Arnold. He is discussing the laws of the association of ideas, and is unfolding the great law of "Correlation." "According to this law, when we have discovered a relation between things, the idea of one tends to bring up the others." It is in this law especially, Dr. McCosh tells us, that poetry as "a representative art" finds its ground. It "seeks to take advantage of all sorts of correlations, of sound and sense, of measured syllables, of rhymes, of metaphor, simile, contrast, and comparisons of every kind. Hence it is that poetry is more easily committed to memory than prose; we have not only the law of repetition to aid us, but the law of resemblance or correlation, the one strengthening the other, and the whole giving impetus to the stream." A remark like this of Dr. McCosh, unlike Mr. Arnold's, is really explanatory, and therefore fruitful. It would make a good point of departure for a work with an aim similar to the aim of the work before us.

For this reason it is, in our opinion, a great merit of Professor Raymond's work that it is written from the point of view of psychology. It is obvious that underneath his discussion, supporting it and determining its form, is a well elaborated and firmly held doctrine of man. His method of treatment is the psychological method. Beginning with the power and impulse to represent feelings and ideas, instinctively by association and imitatively by reflection, he carries us through all the elements of poetic expression, and is never content with an explanation that does not relate the element under discussion to a recognized human power or sensibility. He has thus wrought out, with great skill and with great care, and by the aid of a remarkable knowledge of the body of English poetry, a profound and, as nearly as may be, a satisfactory natural history of poetry itself. The reason of poetry, its right to be, and the sources of its power, will stand out clearly before the mind of the reader who will give the author attention as he exhibits the successive steps of its evolution. We have not sufficient space at command to refer to details. We can only indicate our satisfaction that the subject has been taken up and treated with such thoroughness.

The constructive portion of the volume is so good as to give one confidence in the criticisms of poetic expression which follow it. The four chapters on "Alloy in Representation" are striking and, we think, admirable. Professor Raymond is a kindly critic, more disposed to praise than blame; but he has as keen a sense for a false poetic element as a bank expert has for a counterfeit note or coin. By the abundance of its illustrations the book becomes incidentally almost an anthology. The author's selections are so many and so happy that no one can read them without adding valuably to his poetic treasures.

The question, "Who ought to read such a book?" is a pertinent one. We are not sure that it should be read by all who love poetry. Not every one who loves music should study music. Most men would do better simply to enjoy both music and poetry than curiously to search for the source of their power. They will be quite as likely, by means of such study, to diminish their joy through their new ability to criticise as to increase it through their wider culture. But we are quite sure that a book which so ably unfolds the laws of poetry, the consummate flower of literature, may well be read with care by all who are large literary producers, as all ministers are. The study of Professor Raymond's volume by the rising generation of preachers would go far toward endowing the sermon of the immediate future with a high and chaste literary quality.

JOHN DE WITT.
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Miss Isabella L. Bird (Mrs. Bishop), in her characteristically entertaining book, "The Golden Chersonese" (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1884), describes our friend the author in his life, of one year of which she had just been giving a bird's-eye view, as "a happy combination of American energy and Christian zeal." His contributions to our missionary periodicals, his "The Cross and the Dragon," which was noticed in our REVIEW (VI., 580), and the numerous addresses which he made during his recent visit to his native land, will not only illustrate and justify the English traveller's description, but prepare our public to welcome another volume from his pen. This second volume is issued in England, in view of the larger interest of commercial England in the Empire of China. This volume, while resulting from the observations of a tireless and eminently successful missionary, is mainly descriptive in its character. Two thirds of the volume are devoted to China "South of the Ridge" (Ling-Nam), while the latter part describes the island of Hainan, which was mainly an unknown land until explored thoroughly in 1882 by Mr. Jeremiassen and Mr. Henry for missionary purposes.

Mr. Henry's book is admirably judicious in its choice and treatment of its material, and full of information from an intelligent observer, who knows how to reproduce for others what he has seen. His tours, covering sometimes more than three thousand miles in a single year, have made him thoroughly acquainted with the country and the people—a result greatly promoted by his rare command of the dialects of Southern China.

Mr. Maclay's book traverses more familiar ground and adds less to our knowledge. It is based on his observations as a teacher during a residence of four years in different parts of the Empire of Japan. It is thrown into the epistolary form, which is not altogether to its advantage. It is less mature in thought and style, and has encountered some sharp criticism on this account. There are, however, few who are so familiar even with an empire about which so much has been written within the last thirty years, that they will not find something new in its pages. The very familiarities of its thought and style adapt it to the wants and moods of those hours when we are not seeking the most condensed and the most precise information, but are content with the statements of one who had his own point of view, and who used his opportunities diligently. While writing out the observations and experiences of a teacher he includes to some extent the conditions and results of missionary labor among that remarkable people, whose future is so full of promise.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.

THE SPARTAN AND THEBAN SUPREMACIES. By CHARLES SANKEY, M.A. With five maps. 16mo. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1886.

The object of the authors of the several volumes on the "Epochs of Ancient History" is not to treat their subject with that fulness of detail which would satisfy the professional scholar, but to present it in a shape to attract and instruct the general readers, and particularly the young. Hence there is an entire absence of marginal notes and of quotations, whether in ancient or in modern languages. The volume before us has a single period of Greek history for its theme—namely, the time of the hegemony of Sparta at the conclusion of the Peloponnesian War, and of the rise of Thebes to greatness in connection with the unprecedented success of Epaminondas and Pelopidas at Leuctra. Although
the volume covers little more than forty years (404 to 361 B.C.), and those years by no means among the most glorious in Greek annals, it deals with a critical movement in ancient civilization. The disastrous contentions between Sparta, Athens, and Thebes were necessary conditions to the rise of the Macedonian power; the failure of the citizens of the distinct republics of Hellas to recognize above their native cities the existence of a common fatherland to which their paramount allegiance was due became the occasion of the rise of that empire which, in God's providence, was destined to bring all the East, so far as India, under the influence of Hellenic language and culture, and prepare the way for the rapid dissemination of Christianity among peoples hitherto of different speech and manners. No matter, then, if the story of internecine conflict is painful and occasionally dreary. We read it in the light of the ulterior results, and can endure the chronicle of continual bloodshed in view of the coming triumph of the religion of peace to which it is introductory. Mr. Sankey writes calmly, without effort or parade of learning. Occasionally a little fondness for paradox exhibits itself, as when, on page 59, he repudiates Xenophon's indignant astonishment that the Athenians should have condemned to death so excellent a man as Socrates, and prefers to regard the fact that the sage's life was spared so many years as proof of Athenian toleration and liberality! "A Socrates in Sparta," he observes, "is absolutely inconceivable; were he to appear even in the England of our own day, society would not perhaps put him to death, but would hint to him in a thousand ways that it were better for him to hold his peace or be gone."

HENRY M. BAIRD.

DER GOLDBNE SCHNITT UND DESSEN ERScheinungsformen IN mathematik, natur und kunst. Von Dr. Fr. Xav. Pfeifer, k. Lycealprofessor in Dillingen. Augsburg [1885].

This book appears without date or index, and the pages are numbered consecutively at the bottom; but it is beautifully printed, contains enough mathematics to satisfy a moderate craving for that sort of food, and has at the end a number of good plates of leaves, plants, shells, and geometrical figures. The author no doubt took great pleasure in writing this treatise, which is designed to show that the proportion known to mathematicians as the sectio aurea, in which of the two unequal parts of a divided line the smaller part is to the larger part in the same proportion as the larger part to the whole, is found in nature and art. This proportion was observed by the Pyramid-builders, was known to Pythagoras, and finds a place in the Elements of Euclid. It is therefore by no means a new discovery. The chief value of Pfeifer's treatise we take to be its thorough handling, mathematically and historically, of the idea, and its contribution to be the demonstration that the proportion obtains in conch-shells. The human hand is also constructed on its lines. The practical value of the treatise is that it shows, as its motto reads, that "God has ordered all things according to measure, number, and weight" (Wisdom xi. 20). It is another of the innumerable proofs that God has made all things by rule, and that the more the works of God are studied the more are we called upon to admire the simplicity of the elements, the ingenuity of the principles, and the thoroughness of the processes out of which and by which he, the wise master-builder, has constructed the universe.

SAMUEL M. JACKSON.


This bulky octavo of over a thousand pages is the first part of an encyclopaedic report now issuing from our National Bureau of Education in regard to the
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progress and present condition of education in the industrial and fine arts in the United States. Its character is principally historical and descriptive, and incidentally theoretical.

Public interest in the arts has been awakened among us to an extraordinary degree within the last twenty years. Its beginnings date from the close of our civil war. These beginnings were quickened into positive activity by a variety of circumstances, chief among which was the International Exposition at Paris in 1867. Soon after this (about 1870) came the foundation of several important museums, and the whole movement received from the Centennial Exposition in 1876 an impulse which caused it to assume virtually national proportions. Thus far, and perhaps for three or four years later, we have the earlier period of art interest—a period of great vigor and also of great crudeness. Symptoms of both these elements were very abundant. There was a genuine interest in the arts and quite as genuine a popular inexperience. From this latter resulted a multitude of caprices and extravagances in attempted art products, as, for example, in the incongruous and glaring decorative work of those years.

A reaction was inevitable. The problem of art in a democracy carried with it the problem of art education, both as a means of diffusing a correcter taste and of perpetuating the arts themselves. In this way is to be discovered the best corrective of extravagance and the surest guarantee that art will exercise a wholesome and nominal influence. Accordingly the equipment of schools and creation of opportunities of study in the industrial and fine arts is the chief characteristic of the last few years, and promises to be so for some years to come. As a record of what has actually been done and as a prospectus showing whither we are going in all matters pertaining to art education, this report is invaluable. It is lucid and complete both in general range and in special details, and will undoubtedly take rank as the best repository of facts available on the subject.

ANDREW F. WEST.

ASSYRISCHE LESESTÜCKE. Von Dr. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH. 3te Aufl. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1885. Pp. xvi., 148. 30 mks.


BABYLONISCHE BUSSPALMEN. Von Dr. HEINRICH ZIMMERN. Leipzig : J. C. Hinrichs, 1885 (Assyriologische Bibliothek, VI.). Pp. x., 120.


Assyriologists have been prolific within the last two years. Delitzsch’s Lesestücke comes in a third edition (first, 1876; second, 1878), with various
improvements and additions. Among the new features are three (large folio pages of paradigms, a transliteration and translation, with brief notes, of Sennacherib's campaign in Palestine, a column in the Table of Signs containing many Babylonian characters, a page of numerals, and a "little dictionary" covering eleven pages. Of the new texts published the most noteworthy is the Flood-text entire. The Eponym Canon has been omitted, which some will regret; but, however valuable, it was not appropriate to a student's book. While it is not possible, at this distance from the originals, to have an independent judgment as to the accuracy of the details of new texts—a work requiring such minute care—the author's reputation justifies us in assuming correct transcription in the absence of evidence to the contrary. On the other hand, the total lack of references, for proof or illustration, in connection with the paradigms, the table of signs, and the dictionary, cannot be too severely criticised. It is a wrong to students and an injury to the science to deprive those who use this valuable book of all means of assuring themselves by actual observation of the correctness of statements made and values assigned. The difficulties attending the study are so great, and the possibilities of error so numerous, that a teacher is bound to furnish some reason for what he teaches. Instead of omitting the "Remarks on the Table of Signs" (2d ed.), the third edition should have expanded them (remarks of this kind are among the best features of Haupt's Akk. u. Sum. Keitschrifttexte, unfortunately not yet finished). The lack of proof passages is felt most keenly in the dictionary. To write a dictionary "entirely from memory" (see Preface) is undoubtedly a feat, but not a useful one. It would not have been too much to ask that the dictionary should explain, with references, the words of the accompanying texts, or of some definite part of these; all other words and definitions should be fortified by at least one or two citations. We regret to call attention to such grave defects in this indispensable book.

The Prolegomena, by the same author, though having a wide philological range, show the Assyriologist everywhere, and therefore are appropriately considered here. We desire to do full justice to the scientific character of this book and the breadth of view which frequently appears. It is put forward as an introduction to a Hebrew Lexicon announced as actually at hand, and represents the author's views on important lexicographical points. Among the external features recommended we cordially assent to the separation of the Biblical Aramaic from the Hebrew and to the arrangement by stems (cf. Presbyterian Review, January, 1885, p. 115 sq.). We accept the general statements as to the comparative closeness of the relationship between Hebrew and Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic, and Hebrew and Assyrian; welcome the discussion of the phonetic laws, and sympathize in the feeling and conviction that underlies the sharp rejection of the theory of "roots." The body of the book is occupied with the familiar thesis, "The Importance of the Assyrian for Hebrew Lexicography," and the treatment of this weighty topic is at once much fuller and much more thorough than we have had before. The avowed purpose of this chapter is the establishment of the thesis implied in the title, and the detailed exhibition of the value of the Assyrian for the Hebrew scholar goes beyond what one would look for in "Prolegomena;" but no one will find fault with this. On the contrary, the great number of Hebrew etymologies suggested by the aid of the cuneiform texts makes the book valuable to every Hebrew student, and the method, with its careful marshalling of proofs, points the way for further progress. We cannot go into particulars here; we simply repeat that no student of Hebrew words can afford to do without this book. The chapter on Hebrew proper names contains much that is suggestive and fresh, but to discuss it would require a treatise. Of other features we mention
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only the sound attitude with reference to explaining the Hebrew vocabulary as far as possible from Hebrew stems and Hebrew usage. The author's chief purpose was not to illustrate this. All the more is he to be commended for distinctly and emphatically declaring it.

Lyon's Assyrian Manual is one of those rare books whose modest pretensions are far surpassed by their actual value. After twelve pages of cuneiform signs there are twenty pages of grammar, fifty-two of transliterated and twelve of cuneiform texts, thirty pages of notes on these texts, and a glossary of forty-three pages, all marked by the unassuming scholarship to which the author's "Sargontexte" bore such abundant testimony. To begin at the end, the glossary exhibits all the words and forms used in the texts, with full references. Etymological hints are for the most part relegated to the notes, but as a complete list of words used in the book, the glossary demands recognition in its practical worth, and, for the most part, in its definitions. Of course unanimity is not yet possible, but no student could ask a fairer and sounder introduction to the Assyrian vocabulary than this glossary. The notes on the texts are brief. Some matters would be the better of fuller explanation. Still, what is given is to the point. It is a little inconvenient to have the references simply to pages and not at all to the different texts, but this is a mere external. Most of the texts are historical, and a large share of these from Assurbanipal. Selections from the Descent of Ishtar and from the accounts of the Creation and the Flood represent poetry and mythology. The amount and variety are ample for students in the earlier stages. The most characteristic feature of the book is the large space given to transliterated texts. Here, too, the author has been guided, not by theory, but by the aim at practical adaptation. It may, at all events, be said that his argument in favor of it is very plausible, and gains weight from the success attained by the method in his own hands. As to the real increment of advantage over older ways, we do not as yet venture to pronounce. At first glance it would appear that while the method is well suited to those who wish to gain the widest view of the linguistic facts in the smallest time, those who contemplate mastery by years of study gain by accustoming themselves from the start not to lean on transliterations. Most of those who among us study Assyrian belong to the former class, so that this method very likely meets the needs of the majority. The outline of grammar is excellent as far as it goes, and it leads the student securely and farther than any other existing grammatical work may be trusted to do. More syntax is a desideratum still.

A single remark on the phonology: we are interested to see how Dr. Lyon will succeed in the proof he half promises to furnish that ī and ī (ē?) do not differ in sound. The tables of signs are satisfactory as to contents; we question the wisdom of separating the ideograms from the "phonograms" (a good word for which we have to thank the author). All in all, however, American scholars may feel proud of this first Assyrian text-book published in America, and students, American and British, may well give thanks for it.

Bezold's descriptive catalogue of Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions is a work of prodigious labor, and does not pretend to be complete; but it is one to refresh the spirits of Assyriologists wearily searching for information hitherto not accessible, or accessible only in fragments. The brief space we here give to it is not a measure of its worth for specialists. Its execution is to all appearance of the first order.

Zimmern's Busspsalmen has philological importance and general interest as well. The latter is due to the many parallels in idea and expression between these religious songs and the Old Testament Psalms. Some of these parallels are suggested by the author, others will occur to the student. This phase of the subject is treated incidentally; the publication and explanation of a difficult
class of texts and words is the main purpose of the book. Friedrich Delitzsch has some notes in it, in which, among other things, he yields far too much to the few scholars who deny the existence of an Akkadian language.

The remaining books to be here noticed are historical. *The Story of Chaldea* is an attractively written, popular account of the early history, life, and religion of the ancient Babylonians. The author has made diligent use of the standard books on the subject, and presents a picture whose general features are doubtless nearly enough accurate to meet the needs of all who will depend upon what she gives. There is rather too much use of the French, as against the German, literature of Assyriology, but the book is readable to a degree not often found in a work showing like assiduity. The errors are largely the outcome of the brilliant guesses and theories of a master turned into dogmas by a pupil, and afford another illustration of the persistence of scientific sins.

Hommel sets out, in his history writing, as if space and time were of little account. A great amount of matter is given, there is interesting information—a good deal of pains has been taken with the account of the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions in its several stages—there are valuable illustrations, and the type is pleasant to read, but the style is diffuse to weariness, and the lack of firm grasp and critical judgment is painfully felt. Part II. (117) brings us to page 320, at which point the author is still wading along through a mass of conjectures about kings of the fourth millennium, B.C. How many volumes the book will consist of, if it is ever finished, we do not venture to guess.

Tiele's history is of a totally different stamp. It is compact, vigorous, accurate, and clear. Its author is one of the most learned and one of the keenest and brightest scholars of Europe. He is not hampered by the championship of theories. He has the materials well sifted and arranged, and applies to them a sound critical sense and a sober method of treatment which are satisfying and stimulating at the same time. His faithfulness in balancing arguments, the perspective of his pictures, the composure and lack of partisan zeal with which he discusses important questions, make his history a model. He commands the world of the classic historical literature, as well as the mass of facts due to the wedge-inscriptions. The reader is at every step put in a position to understand the reasons for the views taken, but this does not interfere with the general impression of the history, which goes on in numbered sections, the fuller discussions being appended in a slightly smaller type. Even if it were possible here to go into details, there is little that would challenge serious objection. The book is not only the best existing history of Babylonia and Assyria, it is one of the very best histories of any ancient land or people. Francis Brown.

We notice briefly the following works, some of which at least are worthy of more extended comment:

*Amiel's Journal.* The *Journal intime* of Henri-Frédéric Amiel, translated, with an Introduction and Notes, by Mrs. Humphry Ward. Pp. 487. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co, 1885.) This is a fascinating work, brilliant and beautiful in style, and full of suggestive and stimulating thought. It is, of course, fragmentary, but in this respect is unfortunately representative of the intellectual work of the accomplished scholar who with powers and a culture that were in some respects so rare, yet accomplished so little that even approached completeness. The mingling of the Swiss and French qualities that came to him by inheritance with those that came to him through a training so largely German, developed very unusual results, both in his views and in the expression of them. Many short paragraphs and even single sentences are diamond-like in their condensation and brilliancy. The book is one to be taken up for occasional refreshment and incitement rather than for study. It cannot
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tail to hold a place almost unique among works of its kind. It would be easy to fill pages with specimens justifying all that admiring friends and delighted readers have said in its praise.—Records of an Active Life. By Heman Dyer, D.D. 12mo, pp. 422. (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1886.) This entertaining recital is very colloquial in its style, gossiping in its selection and treatment of the incidents recorded, yet full of the proofs of an earnest, catholic, and evangelical activity. Its honored author has borne a useful part not only in much of the best Christian work of the church to which he belongs, but in many forms of co-operative Christian labor for the dissemination of Christian truth and the salvation of perishing men. His acquaintance has been very wide both in this country and in Great Britain, and many of the noblest and most useful Christian workers of many names and schools come to view in his pages. Vigorous and judicious pruning would, in our judgment, considerably increase the value of the volume.—The Irish Question. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. 12mo, pp. 57. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1886.) A vigorous re-statement and defence of the author’s well-known position on recent political issues in the United Kingdom, with especial reference to the phases and results of last year’s conflicts.—The Targums, or the Books of Ruth and Jonah. Literally translated from the Chaldee, by Oliver T. Crane, B.A. New York: Jenkins and McCowan. 12mo, pp. 24. This careful rendering of two Targums, which have not before appeared in an English dress, gives a fair idea of the general character of rabbinical exposition.—Bolingbroke, a Historical Study, and Voltaire in England. By John Churton Collins. 12mo, pp. 261. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1886.) These papers, originally contributed to the Quarterly Review and the Cornhill Magazine, deserve the careful elaboration and the separate publication which is here given them. They are brilliant in style, and evince prolonged and thorough study of their subjects. They contain facts to some extent new with reference to an important period, and to men whose influence was very wide and lasting in many directions. These essays are a contribution of permanent value to our means of understanding these men, their times, and the tendencies of thought which they represent.—Speculations: Solar Heat, Gravitation, and Sun Spots. By J. H. Kedzie. 12mo, pp. 304. (Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 1886.) The author’s appeal is “to the candid judgment of the learned public.” Discussions so profound in a department so strictly scientific we must refer to the specialists.—A Vital Question; or, What is to be Done? By N. G. Tcherniushevsky. Translated from the Russian. 12mo, pp. 462. (New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co.) A story, political and social, by a Russian revolutionist, growing out of and illustrating the ferment that will not be quiet in the Empire of the Czar. Contrary to the expectation of the translators, we have found it hard reading, unattractive in style, and unskillful in treatment. We had no difficulty in leaving it unfinished.—American Commonwealths: California from the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco. By Josiah Royce. 16mo, pp. 513. (New York and Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886.) This volume is the seventh issued in the valuable series to which it belongs. It discusses the ten years which were the critical and formative period in the history of the Golden State with great thoroughness and fairness, and in a very attractive way. He is un sparing in his exposure and condemnation of the intrigues by which the coveted possession was won, while ready to do equal justice to the instinct for self-government and the political skill by which order was at length established under peculiarly difficult conditions.—Das Leben der Mutter in Gebet und Lied. Von Gustav Leonhardt. 16mo, pp. 199. (Leipzig: Johann Lehmann.) This is mainly a compilation of prayer and song, for many phases and interests of mother life. Some choice things are included.
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COMPLETE GEOGRAPHY. By JAMES MONTEITH.
THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THAT the Lord's Supper is the perpetual memorial of the bitter yet victorious passion of the Son of God, once done that it might be thought of forever; * that it is one of the ordinances which God has committed to His visible Church for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life to the end of the world; that the words of the institution contain, together with the precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers; that it is an effectual means of salvation; † that its observance is the Ark of the Church's testimony; the inner Sanctuary, the Holy of Holies of all Christian worship, the foretaste on earth of the marriage supper of the Lamb in Heaven; that it "has ever lain in the golden morning light far out even in the Church's darkest night, not only the seal of Christ's presence and its pledge, but also the promise of the bright day of His coming" ‡— these are statements which so fully harmonize the teaching of all Christian creeds that any formal defence of them may seem to be superfluous. But the undisputed acceptance of a doctrine appears sometimes to make its impression less vivid. If theological controversy, like war with carnal weapons, has its lamentable evils, peace also has its insidious dangers. Not the least of these is the overshadowing of truth by extreme views begotten in times of strife. Men lean backward in order to strike hard at heresy, and when the contest is over they do not always regain their upright position.

* Bishop Hall.
† Westminster Confession, ch. 25.
In the Presbyterian Church of our day there is a widespread defection from the doctrine of our standards in regard to the Lord's Supper;* and this defection is largely due to the emphasis which is laid upon their controversial and negative statements to the neglect of their more positive teaching. This is the subject in which our candidates for the ministry are most frequently deficient. They are better prepared to tell what the Lord's Supper is not than to define what it is. The instruction our people receive consists too largely in warnings against expecting too much from the sacraments.† The human soul cannot live on negations. Faith may be defended, but cannot be nourished by protesting against the belief of others. The picket-fence may keep out wild beasts, but cannot make the garden grow. The purpose of this essay is not to revive old controversies, but to state clearly the doctrine of our standards and of the Scriptures in regard to the Design, the Necessity, and the Administration of the Lord's Supper.

We must encounter at the outset the prejudices of those who are averse from all discussion of the subject, insisting that we ought to celebrate the sacrament just as Christ has instituted it, and not to make what was designed to be a bond of union and an expression of love among His followers, an occasion for strife and division. This is plausible but shallow, and, on the part of many, more specious than honest. The peace for which they plead is conditioned either upon an utter indifference to the true meaning of the sacrament, or else upon the assumption that, for the sake of the harmony we all long for, all other Christians are bound to adopt their views.

In the height of the sacramental controversy among the English Reformers, Queen Elizabeth, who was theoretically a Lutheran, wrote the famous lines which are graven on a stone in the church at Walton-on-Thames:

"Christ was the Word and spake it;  
He took the bread and brake it;  
And what His word doth make it,  
That I believe and take it."

* "We believe there is scarcely any subject set forth in the confessions of the Reformed Churches that is less attended to and less understood than this of the sacraments; and that many even of those who have subscribed these confessions rest satisfied with some confused notions on baptism and the Lord's Supper, while they have scarcely even a fragment of an idea of a sacramental principle or of any general doctrine or theory on the subject." Cunningham's Reformers and Theology of the Reformation, p. 230.

† "The reason why believers receive so little by their attendance on this ordinance is that they expect so little. "They expect to have their affections somewhat stirred and their faith somewhat strengthened; but they, perhaps, rarely expect to receive Christ and to be filled with all the fulness of God. Yet Christ in offering Himself to us in this ordinance offers us all of God we are capable of receiving. For we are complete—i.e., filled with God, in Him (Col. ii. 10)." Hodge's Theology, vol. 3, p. 624.
Calvin had said the same thing in simpler and sweeter prose;* but both Elizabeth and Calvin had in mind a distinct apprehension of ’what His word doth make it.’ And so has every communicant who does not esteem ignorance the mother of devotion, and think God’s blessing is secured by the blind observance of outward forms. The indispensable qualification for a profitable use of the Lord’s Supper is faith, not only in Christ, but faith in the sacrament as His ordinance, and in the promise of special blessings contained in the very words of its institution. Such faith necessarily involves an intelligent answer to the questions, What is the Lord’s Supper, what is its design, and how does it accomplish the end for which it was instituted?

All Christian teaching as to the design of the Lord’s Supper and its corresponding efficacy may be classified under four theories—the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Zwinglian, and the Calvinistic. These titles are not sharply definitive. The four theories have points of contact where they shade into each other. They have a common centre in Christ. They all agree that the sacrament is His appointment; that its design is expressed in His own words of institution; that its subject is Christ and His atoning sacrifice; that its continued observance is obligatory upon all Christians; that He is present whenever it is rightfully celebrated. And, with the exception perhaps of the Zwinglian, they all agree that the Lord’s Supper is an effectual means of grace and salvation. But they differ very widely as to the interpretation of Christ’s words of institution, the mode of His presence in the sacrament, the ground of its obligation or necessity, and the process and extent of its efficacy. The terms Zwinglian and Calvinistic are specially indefinite as descriptive of the theories to which they are applied.† In regard to the Lord’s Supper, as well as other subjects, many things bear the venerable names of

---

* "I embrace without controversy the truth of God in which I may safely acquiesce. He promises His flesh for the food of my soul, His blood for the drink. I offer my soul to be fed with such aliments. In His sacred feast He bids me, under the symbols of bread and wine, to take His body and blood, to eat and to drink. I doubt not that He really offers, and that I receive. If any one ask me concerning the mode, I am not ashamed to confess the mystery to be more sublime than my intellect can grasp or than words can tell," Calvin’s Institutes, B. 4, ch. 17, sec. 32.

† Dr. Charles Hodge holds that "there were three distinct types of doctrine among the Reformed—the Zwinglian, the Calvinistic, and an intermediate form, which ultimately became symbolical, being adopted in the authoritative standards of the church." Theology, 3. 626. In this we venture to observe that Dr. Hodge differs from most orthodox writers upon the subject. But the question is one of classification and of names, and of no vital importance. We prefer to adhere to the common nomenclature. The doctrine of the Reformed confessions is, as most authorities agree, substantially that of Calvin, and not a compromise between his views and those of Zwingle.
Zwingle and Calvin which they never taught. Still, they stood as the representatives of two sacramental theories which differ from each other quite as much as they both differ from the teaching of Luther and from the Romish doctrine.

The controversy on this whole subject did not begin with the Reformation.* The Romish doctrine, which was first authoritatively formulated by the Council of Trent in 1551, cannot be defended upon the ground of Catholicity. Even before the Reformation it was never accepted *semper, ubique, ab omnibus.* It is not taught in any of the ancient creeds. It was not affirmed by any Ecumenical Council for fifteen centuries after the birth of Christ. The decrees of the Council of Trent are the ripe fruit of heresy and apostasy from the ancient Catholic faith. Into the question as to how far the Romish doctrine is sustained by the teaching of the Fathers of the first four or five centuries we need not enter at length. It is not easy to form a concensus of the Fathers upon this or any other subject. They contradict each other in the interpretation of Scripture quite as much as modern commentators and theologians; and if their rhetorical language is to be taken literally, they constantly contradict themselves in regard to the Lord's Supper. And yet there are points of agreement, both negative and positive, in their testimony, which are fatal to the modern claims of the Church of Rome as to the catholicity of her doctrine. Dr. Schaff affirms † that there is no trace in all the ancient liturgies of the adoration of the consecrated elements, which follows transubstantiation as a logical necessity, and that in the whole patristic literature there are only four passages from which this doctrine can be inferred.

Harold Browne, Bishop of Ely, in his admirable lectures on the Thirty-nine Articles, after showing conclusively that the whole Primitive Church believed in the *real* presence of Christ in the supper,

---

* Gieselers sums up the history of the mediæval controversy on this subject as follows: "The ecclesiastical mode of speaking, that bread and wine in the Lord's Supper became by consecration the body and blood of Christ, may have been frequently understood of a transformation of substance by the uneducated; but among the theologians of the West this misconception could not so readily find acceptance, in consequence of the clear explanations given by Augustin. When, therefore, Paschasius Radbert (in the beginning of the ninth century) expressly taught such a transformation, he met with considerable opposition. Still, the mystical and apparently pious doctrine, which was easier of apprehension and seemed to correspond better to the sacred words, obtained its advocates, too; and it was easy to see that it only needed times of darkness such as soon followed to become general." Gieselers Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2, p. 79. See also Freeman's Principles of Divine Service, vol. 2, p. 6; Schaff's History of Christian Church, vol. 4, 460; Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, vol. 2, 130; Neander's Church History, vol. 4, 335.

† History of Christian Church, vol. 3, 501.
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says, "If there were no alternative but that the fathers must have held either a carnal presence or none at all, then we must perforce believe that they were transubstantiationists." But he demonstrates another alternative which has been acknowledged as possible even by eminent Romanist divines. By a long catena of patristic authorities he proves that the Fathers held to the spiritual presence of Christ and to the spiritual feeding of the soul upon His body and blood, and that "their writings contain abundant evidence that the doctrine of transubstantiation had not risen in their day." He concludes his argument with the following passage from Bishop Gardiner in his controversy with Cranmer: "The Catholic teaching is that the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament is spiritual and supernatural, not corporal nor carnal, not sensible nor perceptible, but only spiritual, the how and manner whereof God knoweth." *

We are thoroughly Protestant in our rejection of transubstantiation as defined by the Council of Trent,† whether that doctrine was held by the Fathers or not. At the same time, we are not in sympathy with some of the Protestant arguments against it. Nothing is gained by our appeal to the Word of God from human authority embodied in ecclesiastical decrees, if in the contest between rival interpretations of Scripture we invoke that same authority expressed by individuals or by the masses of mankind. If we must submit to either, we prefer an organized court to a town meeting, or to the opinion of any number of individuals. Our Confession of Faith ‡ says "the doctrine which maintains a change in the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood is repugnant not to Scripture alone, but even to reason and common-sense." What is the force of even in this statement? Does it indicate an authority above that of Scripture? If so, the statement repudiates the fundamental principle of Protestantism. What do we mean by reason and common-sense? If we mean simply our own perceptions and the inferences we draw from them, the statement is only a roundabout declaration that we as individuals reject the doctrine in question. If we mean the reason and common-sense of mankind in general, the argument is manifestly based on false premises, in view of the fact that the majority of nominal Christians, including multitudes of the ablest and purest of mankind, sincerely

* Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 678–701.
† "By the consecration of the bread and wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into His blood, which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation." Council of Trent, Decrees, Session 13, ch. 4.
‡ Ch. 29. 6.
believe in transubstantiation. As to the vague proverb that a thing may be above reason and common-sense without being contrary to them, our opponents are as much entitled as we, under the storm and stress of the argument, to run into this refuge; for if a thing is above the apprehension of our senses and the grasp of our reason, how can we know whether it is contrary to them or not? It may, indeed, be assumed as a truism that the Word of God does not and cannot require us to believe anything which the constitution of our nature as God has given it to us forces us to reject as false or impossible. But the constitution of our nature is but another phrase for Reason and Common-Sense, and is equally indefinite. It may also be assumed that whatever God has revealed in His Word will be found ultimately to be in perfect harmony with all He has established in His works. But it does not follow from this that our present apprehensions, whether of sense or of reason, are the true measure of that final agreement. It is of the very essence of faith in the supernatural to admit that there are "more things in heaven and in earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy." The facts discoverable by our senses and the laws which are the generalized and scientific statement of these facts must be regarded as supreme in their own sphere; but when, in the attempt to apply natural law to the spiritual world or to the explanation of revealed mysteries, we go a step beyond the Word of God, we get beyond our depth, and are surrounded with the fogs of "philosophy and vain deceit." What do we know about substance in its last analysis?* Admitting that there are only two substances in the universe, matter and mind, and that these two are essentially and forever distinct, what do we know about the relations they may sustain to each other in a sphere beyond our observation, and how far in these unknown relations they may be assimilated to each other? What do we know about the capabilities of a celestial and spiritual body? The phrase is self-contradictory and repugnant to reason and common-sense. Yet "there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body" (1 Cor. xv. 44). What do we know about the capabilities of a body begotten by the Holy Ghost and filled with all the fulness of God? Even before He rose from the dead and was glorified, the body of Christ was exempted from the ordinary restrictions of flesh and blood. When, after His resurrection, He stood suddenly in the midst of the disciples, "the doors being shut" (John xxi. 26), and permitted Thomas to touch the wounds in His hands and side, could they or

* "Substance is nothing but the supposed but unknown support of those qualities which we find existing, which we imagine cannot subsist without something to support them." Locke, quoted in Worcester's Dictionary.
can we tell how He came in? To insist, with some commentators, that the doors must have opened of themselves, or that a keeper was appointed to open them to friends, is a presumptuous addition to the record, which explains away its chief point. The closed door is the definite and emphasized condition under which Christ came into the upper chamber. It was this that terrified the disciples, just as they had been alarmed before when they saw Him walking on the waters. Understanding no better than we do how a human body could pass through a closed door, they hastily concluded that He was only a spirit; but Christ, knowing their thoughts, showed them His hands and His feet. We believe this story because "it is written." And for the same reason, if the Scriptures declared that the bread and wine of the communion are changed into the flesh and blood of Christ, we would believe that also, however repugnant it might be to reason and common-sense. We, therefore, greatly prefer the statement of the Thirty-nine Articles on this subject to that of our Confession. "Transubstantiation cannot be proved by holy writ, but is repugnant to the plain meaning of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."† These four arguments are comprehensive and conclusive. Transubstantiation cannot be proved from holy writ, because the one passage adduced to support it admits of an easier interpretation, which brings this one passage into harmony with the admitted interpretation of many similar texts;‡ it is repugnant to the plain meaning of Scripture, because an inspired apostle, when repeating the words of the institution as he received them from the Lord, expressly declares that the sacred emblems, after consecration and at the very time when they are eaten and drunk by the communicant, are still bread and wine;§ it overthrows the nature of a

* "των θυρων κεκλεισμων, points to a miraculous appearance which did not require open doors, which took place while they were closed, how, it does not and cannot appear. In any case, however, the αφαντος ευημετο in Luke xxiv. 31 is the correlative of this immediate appearance in the closed place; and the constitution of His body, changed, brought nearer to the glorified state, although not immaterial, is the condition for such a liberation of the Risen One from the limitations of space which apply to ordinary corporeity." Meyer on John xxi. 26.

† Art. 28.

‡ Circumcision is the Lord's covenant, the Lamb is the Lord's passover, the ark of the covenant is the face of God, that rock was Christ, I am the true vine, I am the door of the sheep. All Christians understand these statements as figurative. Roman Catholics are obliged to give a figurative meaning to the words "this cup is the New Testament in my blood." There is no reason in the grammatical structure nor in the circumstances under which it was uttered to compel us to understand the words "this is my body" in its most literal sense.

§ Cardinal Wiseman, in his fifth Lecture on the Eucharist, contends that if our Lord had meant to teach that the bread represents His body He would have said, "This bread is
sacrament, even according to the Romish definition, by identifying the sign with the thing signified, thus destroying the sacramental relation between them;* it is the occasion of many superstitions, because it leads by logical necessity to the worship of the consecrated elements† and to the pretended repetition of Christ's offering‡ of Himself on the cross, and is, therefore, "most abominably injurious" to the one everlasting sacrifice for sins by which He has forever perfected them that are sanctified (Heb. x. 12–14).

We fully agree with Calvin that the doctrine of transubstantiation and the logical inferences from it which are embodied in the Romish Mass profane the sacrament. But we cannot accept the more sweeping declaration that the Lord's Supper is thereby annihiliated,

* "The most holy Eucharist hath this, in common with the rest of the sacraments, that it is the symbol of a sacred thing, a visible form of an invisible grace." Decrees of Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 3.
† "Wherefore there is no room left for doubt that all the faithful in Christ may, according to the custom ever received in the Catholic Church, render in veneration the worship in latria, which is due to the true God, to this most holy sacrament." Decrees of Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 5.
‡ "In the divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass the same Christ is contained and immolated, in an unbloody manner, who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross. For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner of offering alone being different. 'If any one saith that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but not a propitiatory sacrifice, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and for the dead, for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed.'" Ibid., Session 22, 2, 3. There is no valid objection to calling the Lord's Supper the "Eucharistic Sacrifice"—i.e., the sacrifice of thanksgiving. Whether in its literal or its historic sense, the phrase does not signify a repetition, but only "the commemoration of Christ's one offering up of Himself upon the cross once for all and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same." Westminster Confession, xxxix. 2. Very different, however, is the teaching of some of the Anglican High Churchmen. Take the latest exposition of their views: "The holy Eucharist is a perpetuation of our Lord's passion. . . . The holy words of our Lord (in the institution of the Supper) then had begun that work which was to be accomplished by the unholy hands of others. It was commenced in the upper chamber, but consummated on the cross. And that which our Lord began to do by His own words when He was upon the earth He still continues to do through the ministry of His servants now that He has ascended into heaven." Wilberforce's Doctrines of the Holy Eucharist, p. 44. We can see no difference between this and the Decree of the Council of Trent, except that it is more vaguely and feebly expressed.
because we do not dare to affirm that devout believers, of whom there are multitudes in the Romish Church, do not show forth Christ's death, and receive what He has promised to those who keep His ordinance. If we admit the validity of Romish baptism, as all the Reformers, including Calvin, did, we can see no reason why on the same grounds we should not admit the validity of the Lord's Supper, even under the corrupt and mutilated form in which it is administered by a Romish priest.

There was a remarkable agreement among all the Reformers as to the doctrines of grace. The theology of Melanchthon and of Calvin, of Knox and of Cranmer, was substantially the same. It was thoroughly Augustinian and Pauline. How unutterable is the pity that this harmony in fundamentals could not have embraced all questions of church government and worship. The bitter strife in regard to the sacraments, of which Luther and Zwingle were the recognized leaders, did more than all other causes to prevent the complete triumph of the Reformation. It is not for us to say which of them was most self-willed, or whether either is to be blamed for the evil results of the controversy. While neither can be properly called a theologian, they were both Christian heroes, having the courage of their convictions. But there is a real and profound difference in the views they adopted. For this reason all attempts to compromise their doctrines failed. The Reformed theologians labored hard to formulate a statement which both parties could adopt without a sacrifice of conscience. Calvin and Melanchthon exerted their utmost strength as peacemakers. Calvin especially, in his earnest desire to conciliate, went to the utmost verge of concession; so that while he is the most consistent of all the Reformed theologians, it is easy to quote fragments from his writings which make him appear at one time like a Lutheran, and at another like a Zwinglian. The Helvetic Confessions, the Formula of Concord, and the Consensus Tigurinus are among the fruits of this effort to compromise. But they were simply flags of truce, not standards of permanent peace. They are not to be compared in the explicitness of their teaching nor in their living authority with such symbols as the first Scotch Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and the Westminster Confession and Catechism, whose formative purpose was the positive statement of Scripture truth rather than the reconciliation of conflicting doctrines. Having failed in the attempt to compromise on the subject of the sacraments, the Lutherans and the Reformed separated permanently on this issue into two hostile camps; each retaining, however, in its own bosom some of the elements which it formally repudiated. In Germany the
outward agreement was effected on political grounds by the pressure of the civil government, rather than by ecclesiastical authority and the force of reasoning. The Reformed churches embraced and absorbed, but did not subdue, the Zwinglian element; and though there can be no question that the doctrine of the sacraments, taught in all the Reformed Confessions, whose influence has survived, is distinctively Augustinian and Calvinistic, the churches which adopt these Confessions have never been free from the prevalence of Zwinglian views. The Low and Broad Church parties in the Church of England are deeply imbued with them, and they have many advocates in the Presbyterian Church of Great Britain and America.

However the connection may be accounted for, it is a remarkable fact that the repudiation of the Reformed or Calvinistic doctrine of the sacraments is generally associated with a repudiation or a loose tenure of the doctrines of grace. The Remonstrants of Holland adopted Zwinglian views as by a theological instinct; and from the days of Laud to the present time the Anglican churchmen who have leaned backward toward Rome on the subject of the sacraments have been more bitter than Arminius himself in denouncing the Calvinism of the Thirty-nine Articles.

There is a popular impression that the Lutheran differs but little from the Romish doctrine of the sacraments. This impression is due either to ignorance or to prejudice. The Lutheran doctrine is essentially and explicitly protestant in its rejection of transubstantiation and the errors which logically flow from it. It repudiates and condemns the worship of the consecrated elements, and the idea of the repetition in any sense of Christ’s one everlasting sacrifice for sin. The term Consubstantiation, commonly applied to it, is a nickname, which is not found in any of the Lutheran symbols, and the ideas it conveys to ordinary readers are repudiated by Lutherans as strenuously as by ourselves. No intelligent Lutheran believes that the body and blood of Christ are literally mixed up, as Hooker says, with the bread and wine, or that they are locally confined to the elements in the sacrament, or that they are received and consumed with the mouth in the same way with the bread and wine. The Formula of Concord and many eminent Lutheran divines indig-}

the communicant—all of which gross conceptions are essential to the Romish doctrine—but it rejects also the Romish notion that the sacrament of itself contains the grace which it signifies, and that its saving effects are independent of the faith of the recipient. At this point the Lutheran doctrine is a strong protest against the errors of the Church of Rome. How could it be otherwise, since it is Luther's doctrine? The saving efficacy and the absolute necessity of a personal faith in Christ was with him the very centre and stronghold of Christianity. In the beginning of his conflict with Rome, he declared "whatever be the case with the sacrament, faith must maintain its rights and honors." From this point he never swerved. "Non sacramentum sed fides Sacramenti justificat," was one of his axioms. He also insisted that faith may receive apart from the sacrament the same thing as in the sacrament. "He never doubted, indeed, that the sacrament conveys a blessing, but he stands upon this, that the Almighty God Himself can work nothing good in a man unless he believes."* Here, then, in its application to the vital question of a sinner's justification before God, Lutheranism is forever divorced from Romanism. This alone is a sufficient answer to the flippant assertion that consubstantiation is the same thing as transubstantiation under another name.

The statements of the Augsburg Confession, † both as to the sacraments in general and the Lord's Supper in particular, are capable of an interpretation entirely consistent with the teaching of the Reformed Confessions. ‡

It is in the explanations of the Augsburg Confession, in subsequent and apologetic symbols, especially in the Formula of Concord and the Saxon Visitation Articles, that the differences between the Lutheran and Reformed doctrine distinctly appear. These differences all centre in the question, What do unbelievers receive in the Lord's Supper? The Lutheran doctrine maintains that they receive the same thing with believers, though it produces opposite effects in the two cases: to the one it is an effectual means of salvation, while to the other it is only a means of condemnation and spiritual death. According to the Reformed doctrine, unbelievers receive nothing but the outward and visible elements, while believers by faith receive

* Dorner's Hist. of Protestant Theology, vol. 1, 150.
† "Of the Lord's Supper they teach that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present under the form of bread and wine, and are communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper and received by them; and they disapprove those that teach otherwise. Wherefore also the opposite doctrine is rejected." Schaff's Creeds, vol. 3, 13.
‡ "The Lutheran definition of the sacraments agrees in all essential points with that of the Reformed churches." Hodge, Theology, vol. 3, 488.
and feed upon the body and blood of Christ. The Lutheran doctrine is stated with admirable clearness in the passage quoted below. *

While we greatly admire the breadth of his views and the catholicity of his spirit, we cannot agree with Dr. Candlish in passing over the difference between the Lutheran and Reformed doctrine so lightly. The doctrine that unbelievers receive the same thing with believers in the Lord's Supper cannot stand alone. It rests upon the assumption that the outward elements are so connected with the body and blood of Christ which they represent, that the reception of the one necessarily involves the reception of the other, whether the recipient have faith or not. When the Lutheran comes to explain the mode of this connection, it is not easy to understand him. When the Formula of Concord declares that the real presence of Christ's body and blood in, with, and under the bread and wine is not an impanation or local inclusion, nor a mixture of the two substances, nor a permanent conjunction between them, but only a sacramental union which is confined to the celebration of the Supper, we can see no difference between these statements and the Reformed doctrine of Christ's real presence. But the Lutheran symbols and theologians go further than this, and teach: (1) The local and material ubiquity of Christ's body, involving the communication of His divine attributes to His human nature; and (2) the efficacy of the sacraments aside from the work of the Holy Spirit and the exercise of faith by the communicant. On this point the Lutheran is careful to avoid the Romish doctrine that a divine efficacy is imparted to the elements in the Supper by priestly consecration, and that the consecrated elements produce the same effect in all who oppose no obstacle to their divine virtue. According to his view, there is the same divine power imparted by God directly to all the means of grace, to the Word as well as to the sacraments. The efficacy of the sacrament is due to this inherent virtue, independent both of the influences of the Holy Spirit and the faith of the communicant. Faith,

* "The Lutherans hold all that Calvin does, and something more; but that concerns almost entirely what unbelievers receive in the sacrament. In order to avoid the danger that seemed to them to lie in Zwingle's view, of making the blessing of the sacraments depend on our changing moods, they thought it necessary to maintain that the blessing was there, whether men believed it or not, and is really given even to unbelievers. Hence, since they have no faith, the consequence followed that Christ and His benefits must be given or received in or with the outward elements; and thus the Lutheran doctrine in appearance approximates to the Roman Catholic one, though it is really very different in nature and spirit, and much more truly akin to that of Calvin. Lutherans agree with Calvinists as to what believers receive in and through the sacraments; their chief if not only difference is as to what unbelievers receive in them, and that surely cannot be an essential part of the Christian doctrine on the subject." Dr. Candlish on the Sacraments, p. 40.
THE LORD’S SUPPER.

indeed, is the necessary condition for the improvement and beneficial effect of what is received; but it has nothing to do with the reception of all that is signified by the sacrament. Because it rests upon and involves these two dogmas, the ubiquity of Christ’s body and the inherent efficacy of the sacrament, the Reformed Confessions and theologians unanimously reject the doctrine that unbelievers receive the same thing as believers in the Lord’s Supper.

It is not easy to ascertain what were Zwingle’s views and to determine precisely what doctrine of the Lord’s Supper may fairly bear his name. He was a popular leader, not a profound theologian. He contributed very little to formulate the theology of the Reformation. His fame rests largely on his personal heroism and the tragic interest which gathers about his death in battle. His peculiar views of the Lord’s Supper were not embodied in any of the Reformed Confessions,* and are not recognized to-day in the standards of any Christian denomination known as evangelical, with the exception of the Reformed Episcopal Church.† How far his earlier teaching about the sacraments was simply the recoil and protest of his ardent mind against the errors of Romanism, and therefore not intended to be a full exposition of doctrine on the subject; and how far his earlier teaching was modified by the influence of the other Reformers or by his own more mature reflections, we cannot undertake to determine. The learned witnesses on these points contradict each other, and are not always consistent with themselves. Bishop Browne affirms that Zwingle was not satisfied to reject a material presence of Christ in the supper, but he denied a presence of any sort. With him the bread and wine were empty signs. Feeding on Christ was a figure for believing on Him. The communion was but a ceremony to remind us of Him.

“‘He probably may have modified these statements afterward, but they thoroughly belonged to his system.’‖ Dr. Bannerman says: ‘‘There is good reason to doubt whether Zwingle ever meant to deny that the Lord’s Supper is a seal as well as a sign of spiritual grace.’’§ Dr. Cunningham defends the Reformer against ‘‘the misstatements

* The doctrine that the Lord’s Supper is a sign or symbol, and nothing more, became the characteristic system of the Socinian party.” Bannerman’s Church of Christ, vol. 2, 137.

† “‘We feed on Christ only through His word, and only by faith and prayer; and we feed on Him whether at our private devotions, or in our meditations, or on any occasion of public worship, or in the memorial symbolism of the Supper.’” Ref. Epis. Articles of Religion, Schaff’s Creeds, vol. 3, 823. “‘By the word sacrament this church is to be understood as meaning only a symbol or sign divinely appointed.’” Ibid.

‖ Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 701.

of Mosheim and Milner," which he condemns as "second-hand opinions" and "remarkable specimens of the humanum est errare."

And yet when he comes to give positive testimony in Zwingle's favor, he seems virtually to admit what Mosheim and Milner had affirmed; for the most he can say is that, "in his last work, Expositio Fidei, Zwingle gave some indications, though perhaps not very explicit, of regarding the sacraments as not only signs but also seals; as signifying and confirming something then done by God through the Spirit, as well as something done by the believer through faith."* Dr. Hodge says: "According to the doctrine of Zwingle, afterward adopted by the Remonstrants, the sacraments are not properly means of grace. . . . They were not ordained to signify, seal, and apply to believers the benefits of Christ's redemption. . . . They were to Him no more means of grace than the rainbow or the heap of stones on the banks of the Jordan. By their significance and by their association they might suggest truth and awaken feeling, but they were not channels of divine communication."† And yet Dr. Hodge afterward says: "It should be remembered that Calvin avowed his agreement with Zwingle and Oecolampadius on all questions relating to the sacraments."‡

Of course these two statements can be reconciled only on the supposition that Zwingle before his death abandoned his earlier opinions, against which Calvin so earnestly contended; for no one can think that Calvin modified in any important particular the views so grandly set forth in his Institutes.

We need not undertake to define Zwingle's doctrine or to harmonize the testimony of the learned in regard to it. Admitting all that has been said in explanation and defence of his teaching, and recognizing much that claims his authority as exaggerated and unfair inferences from his views, it is still evident that his doctrine fell below the standard of the Reformed Confessions, and that there is historic justice in applying his name to such inadequate descriptions of the Lord's Supper as the following:

(1) That the bread and the wine of the holy communion are nothing but naked and bare signs, and that the ordinance itself is simply a commemoration of Christ's death, a badge of our Christian profession, and a pledge of mutual love among believers;

(2) That the Lord's Supper is only a sign and seal of pre-existing grace in the communicant, and not a means or instrument by which more grace is bestowed upon those who worthily partake of it;

* Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation, p. 228.
† Theology, vol. 3, 498.
‡ Ibid. p. 647.
That Christ is present and operative for our salvation in the sacrament only in His divine nature and in the apprehension of the believing communicant;

That the benefits received by the believer at the Lord’s table are nothing more than the sacrificial virtue of the Saviour’s death on the cross;

That the sacramental feeding of the believing soul on Christ, the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood in the holy Supper, is identical with any and every exercise of faith in Him, and therefore can be done as well elsewhere as at the Lord’s table.

That the believing participant in this sacrament of the New Testament receives nothing more than what the believer under the Old Testament received in the Passover, and nothing more than what he may ordinarily receive without the use of the sacrament; and therefore the necessity for the observance of the Lord’s Supper is simply a necessity of precept, and not a necessity of means. In other words, that we are obliged to keep the feast of the holy communion only because Christ has commanded it, and not because we are to expect any special benefit from its observance.

Each of these statements will be fully discussed as we proceed. Meantime we cannot forbear to observe that we reject them not only because of their inconsistency with our doctrinal standards and with the teaching of Scripture, but because of the spirit which pervades them and the underlying assumptions on which they are based. Zwinglianism is essentially rationalistic in the evil sense of the word. Its chief effort is to explain away or reduce to a minimum the mystery of the Lord’s Supper. It assumes that the theory which is most level to our comprehension, which brings the holy Supper nearest to a common meal, where Christians have sweet fellowship together, and makes it agree most with ordinary human experience, is for that reason nearest to the truth. We have heard Presbyterian ministers, in administering it, eulogizing the absolute simplicity not only of its symbols, but of its whole design and efficacy, comparing it to the monument which recalls the memory of some great man, as though that explained its whole meaning and effect; and dwelling with minute particularity upon Christ’s physical sufferings, as though our highest purpose in keeping the feast was to look on a pathetic picture and be moved by it. We grow weary in our reading on the subject of the reiterated assertion that this or that view is incomprehensible, unreasonable, or contrary to common-sense; and the more so, because the same writers who use such arguments in regard to the Lord’s Supper repudiate and denounce them when they are urged by others against the doctrine of
the Trinity, the sovereignty of God, the incarnation, the atonement, the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, the vital union of believers with His glorified person, and the wonder-working power of His Holy Spirit; all of which revealed mysteries pervade and are embodied in the transcendent mystery of the Holy Communion.

Perhaps the ripest and the bitterest fruit of this rationalizing about the Lord's Supper may be found in Dean Stanley's "Christian Institutions." Adopting the idea of Renan, he makes the "Last Supper a continuation of those earlier feasts in which Christ had blessed and broken the bread and distributed the fishes on the hills of Galilee."* He can see no higher character in the communion of the first and second centuries than in the festive dinner of "a Greek club, where each brought, as to a common meal, his own contribution in a basket, and each helped himself from a common table."† He identifies the Lord's Supper with the Love Feasts of the Early Church. He admits, indeed, that it was intended by its founder to be "a glorification of the power of memory;" but in his account of what is thus to be remembered, he is careful to avoid any reference to Christ's death as the sacrifice for sin, and insists only upon His example and teaching as inculcating human charity. In proportion as the observance of this ordinance enables us "to move in unison" with the parables of the Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan, and the Good Shepherd; with the Beatitudes on the Galilean mountains, the resignation in Gethsemane, and the courage on Calvary, he affirms that "it is a true partaking of what the gospels intended by the body of Christ."‡ He denies that the Lord's Supper is necessary for these ends, and insists that all who move in unison with these moral precepts and examples, "whether they be Christian in name or not, whether they have or have not partaken of the sacrament, have thus received Christ, because they have received that which was the essence of Christ, His spirit of mercy and toleration."§

There is nothing new in these sentiments. They are Socinianism in full bloom. But the strange thing is that a clergyman of high position in the Church of England, one accustomed to the public use of her solemn Liturgies, should advocate such opinions; that he should claim for them the authority of "the clear-headed and intrepid Zwingle,"∥ and attempt to reconcile them with the Articles and Formularies of the Episcopal Church, by the vague assertion that "since the days of Elizabeth a strong Zwinglian atmosphere has per-

---

* Christian Institutions, p. 41. † Ibid., p. 46. ‡ Ibid., p. 121. § Ibid., p. 42. ∥ Ibid., p. 106.
vaded the original theology of the Church of England, and been its prevailing hue."

The Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper is called Calvinistic, not because Calvin invented it, but because at the time of the Reformation he was its ablest and most influential expounder. He appealed from the teaching of Rome on the one hand, and from the doctrine of Zwingle on the other, not only to the Scriptures, but to the commentaries of the Fathers. In the chapter of the Institutes which treats of the Communion—one of the noblest pieces of writing in the records of the Reformation—he proves by quotations, especially from Augustine, that the Reformed doctrine is catholic and apostolic. He stands for the historic faith of the Church against both the inventions of Rome and the vagaries of those who broke away to an opposite extreme. There is no ground for doubting that the views he defended passed substantially into all the authoritative Confessions of the Reformation, and must be regarded as the orthodox doctrine of the Reformed.† That it is the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles and of the Westminster Confession, and that the standards of the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches are in perfect accord upon the whole subject of the sacraments, no candid student will deny.‡ If there is any difference, it is in the fact the latter teaches what are called "sacramentarian"§ views rather more explicitly and in stronger terms than the former.

The Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper as taught in the Thirty-nine Articles and in the Westminster Confession is intimately connected with the two great mysteries of the incarnation and the personal union of believers with Christ. The holy communion has

* Christian Institutions, p. 109.
† Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, t. 376.
‡ "The teaching of the Confession on the Lord's Supper is that of Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooker, Usher, and many others. . . . This teaching is as far removed from the bare remembrance theory, attributed to the early Swiss Reformers, as from the consubstantiation of Luther and the local or supra-local presence contended for by the Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics." Mitchell's Lectures on Westminster Assembly.

"The doctrine of the real spiritual presence is the doctrine of the English Church, and was the doctrine of Calvin and of many foreign Reformers." Browne on Thirty-nine Articles, p. 678.

"The peculiar views of Luther on the real presence and the ubiquity of Christ's body found no congenial soil in England. Cranmer abandoned them, and adopted, together with Ridley, the Calvinistic doctrine of a virtual presence and communication of Christ's body." Schaff's Creeds, t. 601.

§ "The name Sacramentarian was applied by Luther to Zwingle and his followers, to convey the idea that they explained away and reduced to nothing the value of the sacraments; while Zwingle, throwing back the nickname, protested that it might be applied with more propriety to those who made great mysteries of the sacraments." Cunningham's Reformers and Theology of the Reformation, p. 236.
its profound roots in the one mystery and its precious fruits in the other. Christ did not say, "This do in remembrance of My death." To make it simply a memorial of His sufferings on the cross is to belittle the ordinance and presumptuously to restrict the meaning of the words of institution. He said, "Do this in remembrance of Me." Christ Himself, and not any one part of His person or of His history, is the subject and the substance of the sacrament. His death as the sacrificial victim for sin, though it is the central point, is but a small part of the history of His relation to His redeemed people, and derives its importance and its efficacy from what precedes and follows it. The cross of Jesus would be nothing to us, if He were not the incarnate Son and Word of God, and if that cross were not inseparably connected with His resurrection and exaltation to Glory. The sacrament is founded upon and leads to His one indivisible person, which is the reservoir and the channel of all divine fulness for our salvation. He is not and cannot be divided. His human nature never had and never can have any existence separate from His Deity. His human soul and body were separated for three days when the one descended to Hades and the other lay in the tomb; but neither was parted for a moment from His divine nature. Moreover, since the incarnation Christ's divine nature does not exert any saving power or bestow any gracious gift upon men, except in and through His human nature. The efficacious manifestation of the Godhead in and through the humanity of Christ is as permanent as the incarnation. The Son of God was from the beginning the living Word of the Father, the fountain and origin of life; and now since the Word became flesh, it is the Son of Man who has power on earth to forgive sins, and is exalted a prince and Saviour to give repentance and remission. By its union with His divine nature the humanity of Christ is infinitely exalted. It was so even on earth. The touch of His finger was life-giving—there was virtue in the hem of His garment. The light of God which transfigured Him on the mount came from within. It follows from this that wherever Christ is, He is there in His human as well as in His divine nature. Not only in heaven, but in the midst of two or three met together in His name, He is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, because He was tempted in all points as we are. We cannot bring our minds to deny all distinctive meaning to the promises of His personal presence, by making them synonymous with the promised presence of the Holy Spirit. When He says, "I will come to you," "I am with you always," "there am I in the midst of them," He certainly does not mean the same thing as when He says, "I will send the Comforter;" and wherever He is, there is His theanthropic person. His
human nature is virtually omnipresent, because it is forever united to the divine.

The incarnation of the Son of God accomplishes its chief purpose in the personal union of the believer with Him. This union is a great mystery (Eph. vi. 32). But its mystery is no hindrance to our faith in the reality nor to our experimental knowledge of its blessedness. The Scriptures in which it is asserted are numerous, varied, and explicit. The sixth chapter of John, the farewell address of Christ, and the intercessory prayer are full of it. We are one with Him, even as He is one with the Father, as the branch is one with the vine, as the husband is one with the wife, as the members are one with the body. The union is not only legal, but vital. He dwells in us, and we in Him, and “when He who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in glory.” It is trifling to set aside these Scripture statements as mere figures of speech. The figures fall short of the profound reality which they illustrate. It is no less trifling to resolve the mystery of this personal union with Christ into the indwelling of His spirit in the souls of believers. It is accomplished by the indwelling of the spirit, and therefore additional to it and not identical with it. Our bodies as well as our souls are united to Christ—our whole nature to His one person. His saving work for us and in us will reach its consummation in the “redemption of our body.”* When the Christian dies he “sleeps in Jesus.” “The souls of believers at death, being made perfect in holiness, pass immediately into glory, and their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in the grave till the resurrection.”†

Now, both the everlasting unity of Christ’s person and our personal union with Him are signified, exhibited, and brought home to our experience in the Lord’s Supper. This is the chief end for which it was instituted. “It was designed to signify and effect our communion with Christ in His person, in His offices, and in their precious fruits.”‡

It is only by being made partakers of Christ Himself that we can partake of His benefits; and therefore the res sacramentis the thing signified, sealed, and applied in the Holy Supper, is not merely the sacrificial virtue of His death nor the benefits He procures for us by His sacrifice and intercession, but the personal Christ, once crucified, now risen and glorified forever. He plainly asserts the necessity of this personal union with Himself in words§ which, if they are not intended to describe the Lord’s Supper, are certainly

---

* Rom. viii. 23.
† Shorter Catechism.
‡ A. A. Hodge’s Commentary on the Confession, p. 484.
§ John vi. 53–57.
applicable to it; for Paul makes the application, (in 1 Cor. x. 16) when he declares that the bread we break and the cup of blessing we bless is the communion (the ξοινωαία, the actual participation) of the body and blood of Christ—i.e., of His divine yet human person. "This I say, then, that in the mystery of the supper, by the symbols of bread and wine, Christ, His body and blood, are truly exhibited to us; first, that we might become one body with Him, and, secondly, that, being made partakers of His substance, we might feel the results of this fact in the participation of all His blessings."* In his commentary on the eleventh chapter of First Corinthians, Calvin asserts the same great truth still more strongly.†

In the light of the incarnation and the personal union of believers with Christ we may undertake to answer certain questions which go to the root of the whole doctrine as to the design and efficacy of the Lord's Supper.

The first question relates to the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. In common language the idea of presence is usually restricted to local nearness and to discernment by the bodily senses. Yet even in common language a much wider conception of its meaning is often indicated. We say of another that he is present with us when we know that he is sitting behind a screen at the farther end of the same room, or in another room of the same house. Two hearers are present in the same audience without recognizing each other. We speak of the presence of the sun when it shines on us. A blind man would use the same language. Presence, therefore, even in common language, does not depend upon local nearness nor upon sense perception. One person is present with another wherever he reveals himself and makes his influence felt by the other; and even where such revelation is made and such influence exerted, though they are accepted and realized by some and not by others of the same company. On a bright day at a funeral the sun is as really present with the corpse as with the living mourners.

All Christians who believe in the Lord's Supper at all believe also that Christ is present in it. The whole contention is about the mode of that presence. Many who admit its reality virtually deny it in their attempts to explain it—those, for example, who make it a mere conception in the mind of believers. Our Confession and

* Calvin's Institutes, vol. 2, p. 564.
† "'Christ is obtained not only when we believe that He was made an offering for us, but when He dwells in us, when He is one with us, when we are members of His flesh (Eph. vi. 30), when, in fine, we are incorporated with Him, so to speak, into one life and substance. For He does not simply present to us the benefits of His death and resurrection, but the very body in which He suffered and rose again.'" Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24-26.
Catechisms assert that "Christ's body and blood are present to the faith of the receiver no less truly than the elements themselves are to their outward senses." Their bodily senses do not produce but only perceive the presence of the elements. They are present to a blind man, though he does not see them. And so Faith perceives, but does not create nor secure, the presence of Christ's body and blood. It is as real to those who do not discern the Lord's body as to those who do.* While we fully agree, with Hooker, that they who hold that Christ body and blood are "externally seated in the very consecrated elements themselves" are driven either to incorporate Him with the sacramental elements or to transubstantiate their substance into His, we cannot accept the inference that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament."† Surely there is a broad and tenable ground between seating Christ externally in the elements and confining Him to the thoughts and experiences of the communicants. The two extremes meet, and are equally objectionable in this point, that they limit and localize the Saviour's presence.‡ No less objectionable is the theory which identifies Christ's presence in the sacrament with the omnipresence of the divine nature. This, like the preceding notion, belongs to Zwinglianism in its lowest form, and cannot be reconciled to the Scripture doctrine of the person of Christ. The Romish Church is consistent with Scripture and with the teaching of all the Reformed Confessions, when she insists that Christ's presence in the sacrament includes His human as well as His divine nature, His body and blood as well as His deity. But when she insists that this personal and real presence involves the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into His deity and humanity, we deny and protest against the assumption. We reject also the theory of a local presence in, with, or under the sacred symbols. Presence, as applied in Scripture and in our theology to the theanthropic person of Christ, has nothing to do with locality or limitation of any kind.§ It refers

* "It seems impossible, with any show of reason, to assert that the discernment spoken of in I Cor. xi. 27-29 is the mere power of interpreting the signs as representatives of Christ's death, or that the guilt incurred is nothing more than the danger of abusing certain outward symbols. These expressions evidently point to a spiritual and awful sin, not of misusing and profaning outward symbols, but of misusing and profaning Christ actually present in them." Bannerman on the Church of Christ, vol. 2, 138.


‡ "The body of Christ in this holy sacrament is a thing external to ourselves and in nowise dependent upon our perception, knowledge, or belief." Scudamore's Notitia Eucharistien, p. 858.

§ "That participation in the body of Christ which I affirm does not require a local
only to influence and manifestation. His whole human nature, body and soul, being forever united to His divine nature, is virtually omnipresent—that is to say, its influence can be exerted and manifested anywhere according to His divine will. The ultimate source of such influence and manifestation, of course, is in His divine nature; but they are exerted and put forth in and through His human nature.

This use of the word presence is perfectly consistent, as already shown, with the popular use of language. It is consistent also with Christ's own promises—"Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world. Where two or three are met in My name, there am I in the midst of them." To resolve such promises into the presence of the Holy Spirit is to belittle and utterly to confuse them. Christ does not make a difference in His promises without a corresponding difference in the things to which they refer. His promised presence, though invisible and intangible, and in that sense spiritual, is nevertheless personal, real, and objective—that is, outside and independent of our apprehensions of it. This spiritual but real presence of Christ is specially promised and covenanted to us in the Lord's Supper. The consecrated bread and wine are not merely the symbols of His body and blood, but the divine seals of the covenant whereby Christ and all His benefits are not only represented but applied to us; and therefore their use is the συμβολή, the actual participation of Christ's body and blood by every believing communicant. "If they are 'seals' of the covenant they must, of course, as a legal form of investiture, actually convey the grace represented to those to whom it belongs; as a deed conveys an estate, or the key, handed over in the presence of witnesses, the possession of a house from the owner to the renter. Our confession is explicit and emphatic on this subject."* "It is the authoritative appointment of Christ that these signs, rightly used, shall truly represent and convey the grace they signify."† The grace signified is the fulness of the Godhead dwelling bodily in Christ (Col. ii. 9). His body and blood are specially mentioned and emphasized because it is through His humanity that the divine nature is brought into union with us and His divine power made efficacious for our salvation, and also because it is in regard to His coming in the flesh, His sacrificial presence, nor the descent of Christ, nor infinite extension, nor anything of that nature. His communicating Himself to us is effected through the secret virtue of the Holy Spirit, which cannot merely bring together, but join in one things which are separated by distance of place. In short, that He may be present with us He does not change His place, but communicates to us from heaven the virtue of His flesh as though it were present." Calvin's Commentary on 1 Cor. xi. 24-26.

* Dr. A. A. Hodge, Commentary on Westminster Confession, p. 451.
† Ibid., p. 448.
death, and His glorification as our representative that our faith most needs to be confirmed.

This will be more apparent in our answer to the second question, What does the believer receive in the Lord’s Supper? The unbeliever receives nothing but bread and wine. Here the Reformed doctrine differs radically from both the Romish and the Lutheran.* The unbelieving communicant is guilty of or concerning the body and blood of the Lord not because he eats and drinks them without faith, but because, having no true faith, he does not eat and drink them at all.† They are present and offered to him as truly as to the believer, but he neither discerns nor receives them. He is guilty not because he is personally unworthy, as all communicants are, but because he eats and drinks unworthily, in a way not suitable to the nature and design of the sacrament. The thing there signified Christ truly exhibits and offers to all who sit down at that spiritual feast.‡ But just as the rain falling on the hard rock runs away because it cannot penetrate, so the unbelieving repel the grace of God and prevent it from reaching them. "They bring death on themselves not by receiving Christ unworthily, but by rejecting Him." § But the believing communicant receives and appropriates that which the unbeliever ignores and rejects. The bread and wine are called Christ’s body and blood because our Lord, by holding forth these symbols, gives us at the same time that of which He has chosen them to be the signs and the seals; for Christ is not a deceiver, to mock us with empty representations. The reality is conjoined with the sign; or, in other words, we do not less truly become participants in Christ’s body and blood in respect of their spiritual efficacy than we partake of the bread and wine.

It should be remembered, however, that the body and blood of Christ cannot be separated from Christ Himself, and that no saving benefit can be received from Him unless we are vitally united to His person. His body and blood represent His whole person and offices, His merits, the sacrificial virtue of His death, and all His benefits,

---

* "Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby." Conf. of Faith, 29. 7.
† "The wicked and such as be void of lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing." Thirty-nine Articles, art. 29.
‡ Christ’s body and blood be offered by God unto all, yet they are received by such only as have the hand of faith to lay hold on Christ; and these with the bread and wine spiritually receive Christ, with all His saving graces. The wicked receive only the outward elements." Usher’s Body of Divinity, p. 399.
§ Calvin, Institutes, vol. 2, 590.
both of grace and of glory. This is evident from His own words in John vi. 51-57; and this mode of speaking is adopted especially with reference to the Lord's Supper, because we cannot be made partakers of His divine nature except in and through His humanity. "For the flesh of Christ is the conduit that conveys the graces of the Godhead and the graces of the Spirit of Christ into our souls, which otherwise than by His body we could not receive." * It is plainly the doctrine of our standards that the believing communicant receives not only the sacrificial virtue of Christ's death, but Christ Himself in all the fulness of His divine and human nature. "Sacraments are holy signs and seals to represent Christ and His benefits, and to confirm our interest in Him." † "Wherein Christ and the benefits of the New Covenant are represented sealed and applied to believers." ‡ In the Lord's Supper believers "are made partakers of His body and blood with all His benefits," § "feed upon His body and blood, and have their union and communion with Him confirmed," ¶ "receive and apply unto themselves Christ crucified and all the benefits of His death." ¶ Our singing is often more orthodox than our preaching. Many a Zwinglian sacramental address has been contradicted if not corrected by such a hymn as this:

"Together with these symbols, Lord,
Thy blessed self impart;
And let Thy holy flesh and blood
Feed the believing heart."

This leads us to a third question: as to the mode of feeding on Christ, eating His flesh and drinking His blood in the holy Supper. The great battle-ground of all sacramental discussions on this point is the discourse of Christ in the sixth chapter of John's Gospel. We cannot agree with those who deny all distinctive and transcendent meaning to that wonderful discourse, and make it only a highly figurative repetition of what Christ had already taught about the necessity of our believing in Him. The saying, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," ** so often dogmatically quoted to sustain this view, seems to us to point in the opposite direction, and to indicate that the theme of the discourse is not so much faith in Christ, which He had frequently described in far simpler words, but that vital union with Himself and that personal participation through His flesh in His eternal life, of which faith is only the instrumental cause. This is a mystery unspeakably greater than our exercise of

* Isaac Ambrose's Looking to Jesus, p. 298. † Conf. 27. 1. ‡ Short. Cat., 92. § Short Cat., 96. ¶ Larger Cat., 168. ¶ Larger Cat., 170. ** Verse 63.
faith. It is co-ordinate with the incarnation itself. Whether the
discourse refers directly and prophetically to the Lord's Supper or
not, it certainly treats of the subject which is the inmost core of the
holy sacrament—namely, the life which is hid with Christ in God
and nourished by feeding on Christ, which He declares to be the
same thing as eating His flesh and drinking His blood.*

How the soul feeds on Christ's body and blood is an open ques-
tion among the Reformed. It is agreed on all sides that the eating
or feeding is by faith; but whether faith and eating are the same
thing is a disputed point. Do we feed on Christ, eat His flesh and
drink His blood every time and wherever we believe on Him, or is
this language applicable only to a peculiar exercise of faith in con-
nection with the Lord's Supper? The Zurich and Helvetic Confes-
sions maintain that "eating is believing, and believing is eating," †
and that "this eating takes place as often and whenever a man be-
lieves in Christ." This is the Zwinglian doctrine. Calvin admits
that "eating is by faith, and that no other eating can be imagined.
But," he adds, "there is this difference between their mode of
speaking and mine: according to them to eat is merely to believe,
while I maintain that the flesh of Christ is eaten by believing, that
eating is the effect and fruit of faith. This difference is little in
words, but not in reality."

We fully agree with Calvin on this point. The distinction on
which he insists is very important, as indicating a correct use of lan-
guage. To say that because we eat by faith, therefore faith is eat-
ing, is about as logical as to maintain that whatever we do by our
hand is our hand. Christ dwells in our hearts by faith; is this
dwelling of Christ in us nothing more than our own faith? Doubt-
less faith itself is always and everywhere essentially the same. But
it does many and various things. We have a catalogue of its heroes

* John vi. 33-51. 56. "The mystery of our union with Christ, which in this dis-
course is expressed in words, is precisely the same which Jesus desired to express
by an act in the holy Supper." Godet on John vi. "It affords a key to interpret the
sacramental phraseology applied to the supper." Bannerman on Church of Christ,
2, 139. "Jesus purposely framed His words so skilfully that they would apply in
their strict literal sense to the enjoyment of Himself, and yet that afterward the same
words should by consequence be appropriate to express the most august mystery of the
holy Supper when that should be instituted." Bengel, Commentary on John vi.

"We are not at liberty to say that the discussion in John vi. was intended to be a
commentary on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. But the ordinance, for all that is
blessed and real in its observance, refers us to that sermon. The essential point in the
sermon which we transfer to the Eucharist is that in it we are called in a true though
spiritual sense to eat and drink the body and blood of the Son of God." Marshall Lang
on the Last Supper of our Lord, p. 92.

† Institutes, 2. 563.
and a record of its achievements in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. Does every Christian, as often as he believes, do all that was achieved by these ancient worthies? But Calvin's distinction between faith and the results achieved by it is still more important in its special application to the Lord's Supper. The doctrine that "faith is eating and eating is faith" is the very essence of the Zwinglian theory. If "this eating takes place as often and whenever a man believes in Christ," then it follows necessarily that the Lord's Supper is simply a sign and remembrancer to assist our faith. A vine, or a door, or a flower of the field, when they remind us of the Saviour and quicken our faith in Him, are just as truly the communion of His body and blood as the bread we break and the cup of blessing we bless in the holy Supper. According to this theory logically carried out, we have not seven, but seventy times seven sacraments, and the Lord's Supper is no more sacred and has no more efficacy as a means of grace than a thousand natural objects around us. We shrink back from such conclusions, and therefore reject the premises on which they rest. We believe there is a peculiar exercise of faith, suitable to the occasion and to the special manifestations of Christ in the Holy Sacrament, by which the believing soul feeds on Him. The teaching of the Zurich and Helvetic Confessions on this subject is peculiar to themselves. It is not found in any other of the Reformed Confessions. The Westminster Standards give no sanction to it. The Earlier Scotch Confession and Catechism, which were superseded by those of the Westminster Assembly, are very explicit in repudiating the whole Zwinglian theory, including the point we are now considering. The views of the Westminster divines on all questions relating to the sacraments were thoroughly Calvinistic.

John Owen, the prince of all the Puritan theologians, strongly insists that both the manifestation of Christ and our participation of Him in the Lord's Supper "are expressed in such manner as to demonstrate them to be peculiar—such as are not to be obtained in any other way." "There is in it an eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, with a spiritual incorporation thence ensuing, which are peculiar to this ordinance. Herein is a peculiar exercise of faith and a peculiar participation of Christ."*

The necessity and obligation for observing the Lord's Supper, the mode of its administration, and the elements to be used in it, especially the question concerning communion wine, are reserved for discussion in a second article.

HENRY J. VAN DYKE, SR.

* Owen's Works, vol. 8, 560.
A POET laureate rightly characterized man's first great gift,—
"the vital soul." This, indeed, constitutes and keeps us men. Only this can authorize or give significance to the modern scientific phrase,—"the improvableness of man."

But the poet laureate of to-day with equal truth suggests the challenge and the need that ever press upon us, in his poetic answer to the question, What am I?

"An infant crying in the night;
An infant crying for the light;
And with no language but a cry."

The challenge as well as the need in our life-course is that we be constant learners, undergoing constant discipline. Learners we are, however dull; disciplined, whether we will or no. Following the routine of the Schools or not, we assuredly advance from lower into higher training, yet never wholly escaping from the lower. At each advance we meet with enlarged opportunities, and are confronted with corresponding obligations.

In this life-course our teaching, comprehensively stated, is threefold,—Natural, Human, Divine; and this because there are three great realities by which we are environed,—the Universe, Man, and God. Around us is the universe. With us and around us is man. Above us, with us, and around us is God. These three great realities differ in kind, and differ immeasurably in degree, rising from finite, impersonal matter to infinite and personal spirit.

The threefold instruction is addressed to our threefold capacity,—body, soul, and spirit; to develop our threefold powers,—physical, mental, moral; to strengthen each, and thus equip for life in our highest duty and best service, toward an ideal in accord with this inspired prayer, "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Each challenges our attentive study and becomes our teacher, whether we will or no. We are to study the Universe, to know its nature, its laws, its purpose in this great environment. We are to
study man that we may know his powers, his duties, his destiny. We are especially to study God that we may know his being, his attributes, his works of creation, providence, and redemption.

Nature is around us from our childhood. From the very first it challenges our attention—eye, ear, touch, every sense—surrounding us with object-lessons, constantly tasking our mental powers, training our sensibilities, stimulating our endeavor. Nature woos and warns in many and mysterious ways, with sympathy and severity, light and darkness, beauty and sublimity, gladness and sadness, calm and storm. At once the capacities of the human soul begin to manifest themselves. Who can limit the possibilities of human progress? The work of education goes on and onward. Fundamental truths appear,—the consciousness of self as real, of the external world as real, of each as distinct and different from the other, yet both as realities.

"The infant grows and gathers much,
    And learns the use of ' I ' and ' me,,'
    And finds ' I am not what I see,,'
    And other than the things I touch."

Rapidly we are taught that Nature has laws—wise but inexorable—which we should know, and knowing should obey; that we are ignorant or disobedient here at our peril; that it is only by knowing and obeying natural laws that we can be safe, not to say happy. Here at once is a line of thought which has no limit but the physical Universe, for these physical laws penetrate the Universe from the centre to the circumference; and the challenge comes from all Nature to the soul to trace them, and to find them out, if may be, unto perfection.

Rapidly we are taught that there are moral laws—no less wise, no less inexorable—which we should know, and knowing should obey; that we are ignorant or disobedient here at the peril of soul and body; that to be carnally-minded is death, to be spiritually-minded is life and peace; that there are other persons like ourselves, with reason, conscience, and will; like ourselves superior to material nature, persons and not things; like ourselves subject to moral law and held accountable each to each and each to all—moral law which cannot be violated with impunity. Here at once is another line of thought to which there is no limit but the moral universe, for these moral laws pervade all mind and penetrate the moral universe from centre to circumference. From the soul itself and from all the moral world the challenge comes to the human soul to observe and obey. Nature steadily and sternly teaches its great lessons, with reward for obedience and penalty for disobedience or neglect. Con-
science steadily and sternly teaches its great lessons, with rewards for obedience and penalty for disobedience or neglect.

Rapidly we are taught the supreme truth that there are divine laws—holy, just, and good—which we should know, and knowing should obey; that we are ignorant or disobedient here at the peril of spirit, soul, and body; that the supreme Lawgiver cannot be mocked, for "according to what a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

The soul is impressed by its great environment, and challenged every day to larger acquaintance with Nature, Man, and God; schooled daily in the knowledge of law and liberty and religion, with threefold teaching—natural, human, divine. These unite with constant accord in this threefold climax,—"If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." If man would withdraw himself from his environment he cannot; and he would not, for all that a man hath he give for his life. If he debase himself to the condition of a brute, still he is accountable as a man. Conscience, his fellow-men, and God hold him accountable. If, on the other hand, he advances in moral character toward the likeness of the Saviour, "Verily, he shall in nowise lose his reward." The threefold promise from earth is confirmed from heaven—"If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." Knowledge, obedience, happiness, go hand-in-hand. The challenge to know is crowned with the call to obedience, and both are vitalized by the promise of reward.

There is, then, an environment of threefold reality—the Universe, Man, and God. There is a threefold teaching—natural, human, divine; and a threefold issue—knowledge, obedience, happiness; or, knowledge, disobedience, misery.

The environment rises from the lowest level to the supremest height. The teaching progresses from first principles toward perfection. The end sought is eternal life—"To know God and enjoy him forever." We do not go backward in our life-course; we should not, in our knowledge and character and conduct; but leaving the rudiments, we (like the teaching) are to go on unto perfection.

"Higher still and higher
Should the immortal soul aspire,
To the heights by angels trod,
Toward the glorious throne of God."

This threefold view condemns as partial and paltry the materialistic theory eagerly taught in some places to-day,—that Nature is all, and all is material; and that our study should be confined to phenomena—to classify them, if we can, and tabulate them as antecedent and subsequent, like a row of pins. This would result in a knowledge
fictitious and fleeting, like the stuff that dreams are made of; and would leave the student where he began—a know-nothing, or, worse still, a confirmed know-nothing, tossed to and fro, and driven, it may be, as was Auguste Comte, to the grossest superstition.

This threefold view condemns as partial and defective the humanitarian theory—that "the highest study of mankind is man;" that humanity is the only and consummate reality—in magniloquent French phrase, "Le grand être"—supremely to be known and honored. Not this was the truthful thought of Socrates when he taught in the School of Athens—"Know Thyself," but the false, flattering answer of the Delphic Oracle to Chilon—"The best of all things is to know thyself." This theory is no less false and flattering as it reappeared in the rhythmic rule of Alexander Pope, or as it reappears to-day in the facile logic of Frederic Harrison.

The true view of our threefold environment would not exclude, but would include (as already shown) the earnest study of Nature and of Man.

It would not, on the other hand, confine all study even to Theology; but it would discriminate both as to rank and authority, with Kepler that we should study to interpret the thoughts of God in Nature, with Moses study self-respect and respect for Man as made in the image of God to have dominion over Nature; with the author of "The Organon," it would style "Theology, the Queen of the Sciences," and with the author of "The Novum Organum" picture "Theology as the haven and Sabbath of all Man's contemplation."

But especially it would group those three great realities in their order and rank as does Paul with inspired brevity and beauty in this sublime verse: "For the invisible things of God since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being (understood) perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity."

It is noticeable that as we go higher in the scale of results, a higher agency is required—material, intellectual, spiritual. So in the material, the intellectual, and the spiritual spheres of action, the higher agency may employ the lower, although the lower may not be able to employ the higher. Human intelligence may use material and brute forces because it is superior; while the Spirit of the Lord of Hosts, which is the supreme agency, may employ all these in its service.

So, especially, advancing knowledge requires superior teaching; and all teaching should be subservient to the supreme. Evermore the higher can utilize and supplement the lower. And this, not to undo the work of the lower; not to contradict or violate the proper function of the inferior; not to annul fact and truth already found,
but to enlarge the range of study; to strengthen and stimulate the receptivity of the learner; to present advanced but accordant facts; to reveal advanced but accordant truths; to employ advanced but accordant reasoning; to produce advanced but accordant conviction. In a word, to lead the soul forward from first principles or rudiments on toward perfection (Heb. vi. 1). Not by any means to abandon or discard the first principles or rudiments, but with wise master-building to employ and apply them in edification and growth unto perfection—"to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

We are thus led to the Great Teacher who as the incarnate one—the only incarnate one—combines in himself the knowledge of the divine, the human, the physical; who "in the fulness of time" coming into the world as the world's great teacher is "the true light which lighteth every man." As the incarnate one he doth combine in his teaching the divine, the human, the natural. All are tributary to him. All things are now ordained in the hands of the Mediator. The Scriptures testify of him. Of him the Spirit beareth witness. And in the great commission (Matt. xxviii.) he sendeth them forth to make disciples among all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded.

As we cannot understand Nature apart from Man, so, especially, we cannot understand Nature and Man apart from God. Science is most scientific when it knows effects in their causes. Philosophy cannot be profound without leading us to theology, and can be at rest only in the supreme. Theology, however old, if true, is ever new; and, if new, it can be true only as it is old.

Science, if it err from the way, Philosophy, if it err from the truth, Theology, if it err from the life, but "lead to bewilder and dazzle to blind." Christ's teaching is the standard and the test for other teaching. "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." He is "the way, and the truth, and the life." In the light of revelation, the old pagan proverb, "Omnia exeunt philosophiam" (all things issue in philosophy), is changed into the Christian maxim, "Omnia exeunt in Theologiam." Of all knowledge (not as exclusive, but as inclusive), here is at once the centre and circumference:

"The new is old, the old is new; The cycle of a change sublime Still sweeping through. For life shall on and upward go: The eternal step of progress beats To that great anthem, calm and slow, Which God repeats."
III.

REFORMATION THEOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN KNOWLEDGE.

One of the most interesting and important questions of the present day—a question, indeed, of vital moment for evangelical religion—is how far the theology that has been generally received in the Protestant churches requires to be altered or modified in consequence of the vast progress in all departments of knowledge that has been made since the time when that theology took shape, in the great mental and spiritual awakening of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. What is commonly known as Evangelical theology is in substance just the sum of doctrinal views on which the Reformers, though differing much in their temperaments and opinions on many points, were agreed, as opposed to the Roman Catholic system on the one hand and to that of the Socinians on the other. The best expressions of this doctrine may probably be found in the Augsburg Confession, the most generally approved of all the Protestant Confessions of Faith. This body of doctrine was elaborated into more precise and systematic forms in the seventeenth century, and became somewhat different in details in the Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Arminian systems; but when all of these were assailed by the rationalism of the eighteenth century, what was most strenuously and successfully defended by each section of Protestant Christendom was what had been originally common to them all. This is in substance what is meant here by Reformation theology. Now there are some who think that in the light of the science and culture of the present day this theology is entirely obsolete, and that we need an entirely new theology, if we are to have any at all that can hold its place in the minds of intelligent and educated men. I propose to consider how far this is true, and how the old faith is affected by modern knowledge. I purposely say "knowledge," not "thought," or "speculation," or "feeling;" for its relation to these raises wider questions than could be discussed within moderate limits; and I wish to confine myself to what is a more vital and primary question—how our theology stands
the test of what is not merely thought or felt, but really ascertained as true. With a view to answer this question, let us consider in detail the principal departments in which knowledge has made progress since the Reformation.

I. In Biblical criticism and interpretation the advance of knowledge has been enormous. It was just on the eve of the Reformation that the Greek New Testament was first printed, and the manuscripts then known and used were few and inferior. Hebrew, too, was then just beginning to be studied by Christians. Since then a great number of manuscripts of the Bible have been discovered and collated, ancient versions have been studied and compared, and the quotations of Scripture by early writers examined. By the study of these, criticism has been made a science, and a very much nearer approach has been made to ascertaining the original text of the sacred books. Along with this there has been a marvellous advance in scholarship. The ancient languages have become much better known, as their stores of literature have been more carefully and minutely scrutinized, and cognate languages compared. Rules and usages of grammar and idiom have been ascertained, so that the interpretation of ancient Greek and Hebrew writings is no longer so uncertain as it was in many passages in the sixteenth century, and their meaning is far more clearly, accurately, and certainly known. This advance in scholarship has changed considerably our understanding of many passages of Scripture. The text of the New Testament, as we now read it in the best critical editions, varies considerably from that of Stephens, which obtained the name of the Received text, and in many places interpretations formerly accepted and defended have with general consent given place to others more grammatical and natural. The difference between the Authorized Version of the Bible (1611) and the Revised one (1881, 1885) may be taken as an index of the progress that has been made in this department. This has necessarily affected the details of the Scriptural proof of some of the doctrines of theology. Of the passages formerly relied on as testimonies, some have been proved by critical evidence to be wrong readings, and others have been shown by more exact knowledge of the idioms and usage of the language to be incapable of the sense formerly put on them. This, however, does not mean that the doctrines themselves, when evidence has been thus affected, have been made uncertain. On the whole, they are left much in the same position as before. Modern criticism and exegesis have replaced by others the proofs they have taken away; and if in many pages of Scripture doctrinal statements have been expunged by careful editors or explained differently by accurate interpreters,
there are about as many places where the discovery of the best text or translation has brought to light proofs of theological doctrines that were unknown before. Apart, too, from these details, the general effect of modern scholarship has been to confirm the views of the Reformers as to the great leading doctrines of the Bible. The doctrines of the Deity of Christ, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Justification by faith, the corruption of man's nature, and his renewal by the Holy Spirit, are, in the light of modern Biblical knowledge, as certainly taught in Scripture as they seemed to the Reformers to be. The attempts that have been made to prove that the Protestant theology was fundamentally mistaken in its understanding of the teaching of Christ and his apostles cannot be regarded as successful in the field of New Testament exegesis.

Yet while the great principles of the Reformation theology have been unaffected, or only more firmly established, by the advance of knowledge in this department, there are some modifications which this advance requires in the body of that theology as a whole. One effect of the greater exactness of modern scholarship has been to bring out more clearly than before the characteristic peculiarities of different writers, and to distinguish not only their various literary styles, but also their diverse ways of looking at Christian truth. Modern theology has learned to do more justice to the historical character of Scripture, to recognize successive stages of development in the revelation of truth, and to look for the evidence of Christian doctrines, not so much in a collection of proof texts drawn indiscriminately from all parts of the Bible, as in a consideration of the general teaching of the Bible as a whole, and the appearance of the doctrines at successive stages of revelation in forms gradually becoming more clear and definite. The recognition in modern times of the study of Biblical Theology as a distinct department of inquiry, intermediate between Exegesis and Systematic Theology, affords the clearest indication of this change in the method of Scriptural proof by which doctrines are established.

But this involves also another modification of the old theology. In the light of modern critical knowledge there must be less reliance on particular words and expressions in Scripture, and a less confident use of inferences from its statements. The unhistorical method of using proof texts led to a pressing out of them all that they could be made to yield, so that a doctrine might be founded on a single clause or word, even though it was but incidental to the main purpose of the inspired writer, or upon what might be deduced inferentially from such words or expressions; and doctrines thus established were laid down as confidently as those directly taught. Thus
the question whether the imputation of Adam’s sin was immediate or mediate was made to depend on the precise turn of expression used by Paul in a single passage, or the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* rested on what is implied in a few texts. But when it is recognized that each of the writers of the New Testament has his own way of looking at the same great truths, much stress cannot be laid on the particular form in which they are put by any one of them, and great caution must be used in drawing inferences from statements that are isolated and peculiar to any one writer or book of Scripture. We cannot, indeed, as some would, forbid Scripture consequences entirely; for if we are to make any attempt at all to grasp the principles of Christianity as an organic whole, we must go beyond the express statements of the inspired writers; and we may do this safely as long as we take only the necessary consequences of statements in which two or more of them are at one; but when we draw doctrinal inferences from incidental expressions used only in one place of Scripture, and perhaps not meant to be strictly taken, we are on very unsafe ground. This is an error from which modern theologians are not more safe than those of former days, though they have less excuse for it. Thus the modern theory of a probation after death, based on a single and very difficult passage (1 Pet. iii. 18–20), and the doctrine of a millennial reign of Christ on earth, founded on one passage in the Apocalypse, seem as precarious, to say the least, as the Scripture consequences insisted on by the older divines. For it must be admitted that the old theology, in some of its more minute determinations, was too confident, and that we cannot be certain of some of the positions laid down in the dogmatics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, though their leading principles have been confirmed by modern scholarship. We must distinguish more than they did between what is clearly and of set purpose taught in Scripture and what may be suggested by some of its modes of presenting that teaching; the former being what properly belongs to the faith of the Church, while the latter, too, is not without its value as theological speculation, that may be legitimate and useful if reverently and cautiously pursued, though it is wrong and dangerous to attribute to it the certainty of faith.

II. In the field of history there has also been a vast increase of knowledge since the Reformation. The classics of Greece and Rome had then been quite recently brought once more to light after having been buried in the ignorance of the dark ages, and the Reformers were quite abreast of the learning of their time; but the literature of these nations has since been much more fully and exactly studied, so that a great deal more is now known of their his-
That history, too, has been investigated in a far more critical way than before; what is authentic in it has been distinguished from what is legendary, and the real events and movements of the earliest times have been sifted out with wonderful success from a mass of mythical matter. Then, too, in recent times other historical sources have been opened up and the ancient records of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon have been disentombed and deciphered, the Sanscrit and Zend languages, and the old religious books in these and other Eastern tongues, have been studied, and the researches of palæontology and archaeology have thrown a flood of light even on the very earliest history of mankind. Thus the knowledge of history now possessed is very different indeed from that of three centuries ago, vastly greater in extent, more various in its range, and more accurate in its character. Now this enlarged knowledge of history has an important bearing on theology; for our religion is a historical one, based upon actual events that took place at a time when we have many contemporary documents, and connected with a long course of preparation stretching through many ages and coming into contact with many different nations. The Bible is largely composed of historical narratives, and touches at many points the history of those peoples on whose rise and progress our knowledge has been greatly increased.

What effect, then, has this great enlargement of historical knowledge had on theology as based on the historical revelation in the Bible? In the main it may be said that this, like the progress of scholarship, has tended to confirm the views of the teaching of Scripture formerly held. In all the parts in which the Biblical narratives can be compared with a large amount of external information, its historical truthfulness and accuracy have been put beyond question by modern research. The time of Christ and his apostles especially, of which the history is of most vital importance for religion, is one on which we have from contemporary sources a full blaze of light; and the more minutely the New Testament books have been examined in the light of that increased and abundant knowledge, the more has their historical truthfulness been made apparent. The narrative of the Book of Acts, for instance, contains a great number of points at which it may be tested by our modern acquaintance with the circumstances of the times, references to cities and provinces, travels and voyages, persons and events, otherwise known; and the general result of the most minute comparison on these points has been to show it to be the work of one who knew what he was writing about, and described it honestly and intelligently. The same thing may be said in regard to the gospels, though
in them the points of contact with external history are not so many. Still, their references to persons, places, and occurrences known from other sources are numerous and correct enough to confirm their historical truth. So also it is with those portions of the Old Testament where a comparison with really historical records of other countries is possible. Modern discoveries in Egypt and the East have shown that the Biblical narrative of the times of the kings in Israel and Judah fits in with the precision of truth to the contemporary annals of other nations so wonderfully brought to light in recent times; and that even the earlier stories of the patriarchs are consistent with what is known of these remote periods and of the geography and customs of the countries in which they lived. On the whole it must be said that the immense progress made since the Reformation in historical knowledge has tended to establish the accuracy and truth of the Bible; and as the Bible was for the Reformers the only source of doctrine, this so far confirms their theology.

Yet here, too, as in the region of scholarship, it is only in general that the old view of the Bible has been unchanged and confirmed by modern knowledge. That is the most important thing, but it is quite consistent with that to recognize that in many minute particulars modern historical knowledge requires us to admit the possibility of inaccuracies in the sacred narratives. Luke's writings, for example, have stood in the most wonderful way the test of comparison at a hundred points with contemporary authorities; yet it is possible he may have fallen into an anachronism about the census of Cyrenius or the rebellion of Theudas; the gospels, the more they are examined, show more distinct evidence of being trustworthy records, and yet it becomes more manifest at the same time that no system of harmony can remove slight discrepancies, which must imply unimportant mistakes in one or other. In the Old Testament we have to recognize similar phenomena and a freer use of the ancient literary device of bringing out the meaning of events by speeches of historical personages, than used to be thought consistent with an inspired history. Criticism may possibly go the length of requiring us to bring down to a later date some of the legislation hitherto supposed to be Mosaic; but even so, it recognizes and confirms the historical character of what is essential in the record of God's dealing with his people. Modern historical criticism is able to discern with considerable certainty between what is trustworthy history and what is mere traditional or mythical legend; and it confirms the credibility of the more important parts of the contents of Scripture. But we must also in fairness admit that it has shown, on
the other hand, that some of the earlier records of the Bible are not properly historical, nor meant to be taken as literally true, but analogous to the myths of other nations, though differing from them in their pure theistic and moral character in a way quite worthy of divine guidance and inspiration. Their substantial religious teaching and use remain unaffected, though we can no longer draw, for example, chronological conclusions from the genealogies in Genesis in the way in which Archbishop Ussher and others did.

Now the results of modern historical investigation require that the doctrine of mechanical verbal inspiration, as equivalent to dictation and implying perfect and literal accuracy in every detail, must be modified. That doctrine was not indeed held by the Reformers, who were much more unfettered in their Biblical criticism and interpretation than their successors; but it was held in the seventeenth century, and practically influenced Apologetic and Systematic Theology down to recent times. It justified and fostered that isolated use of Biblical texts that led to such over-definition of doctrines as has been above mentioned as corrected by modern scholarship; and thus the results of the progress of knowledge in the critical and historical departments point in the same direction. They do not lead us to abandon the doctrine of inspiration any more than the general system of doctrine that has been drawn from the Bible; they do not require us to limit inspiration to certain parts of Scripture to the exclusion of others; but they teach us that what inspiration gave to the writers of the sacred books may not have been minute or literal exactness on points not essential for their main purpose, but perfect truth and soundness in the great religious lessons that they teach, and in the record of the historical events in which God's revelation of himself is conveyed. We may use the Scriptures with as much confidence as ever both for theological and practical purposes if we always bear in mind their great end, and do not unnaturally and unhistorically emphasize mere incidental expressions and allusions.

III. But by far the greatest increase in knowledge since the Reformation has been in the field of science. When Luther and his associates arose to purify the teaching and worship of the Church, the science of nature was in a very rudimentary state indeed. The Ptolemaic system of astronomy was still accepted; the telescope, which has so enlarged our knowledge of the heavenly bodies, was not yet invented; the circulation of the blood in animals was first suggested by Servetus; and in place of the scientific knowledge now possessed, there was, in almost every department of nature, either utter ignorance or a mass of unfounded and fanciful theories. Since
that time there has been a gradual, ever increasing, and rapidly ac-
celerating progress of knowledge. Old errors have been exploded;
order and regularity have been discovered in phenomena that seemed
to be entirely anomalous; new sciences have been begun and car-
rried to a high degree of perfection; and great light has been thrown
on the history and law of every part of the natural world. The suc-
cessive discoveries by which the present wonderful advance of science
has been attained have seemed when first made in many cases to
conflict with the doctrines of theology or the teaching of Scripture;
and have therefore been sometimes keenly and obstinately opposed,
as is seen in the persecution of Galileo by the Inquisition and in the
alarm aroused, even among Protestant theologians, by the discoveries
of geology, and by Darwin's theory of the origin of species. But
clearly no such opposition could arrest the progress of science or pre-
vent the acceptance by all intelligent men of facts and laws based on
sufficient evidence. These must be accepted whatever may become
of theological doctrines; and if any theology comes in collision with
ascertained facts, so much the worse for the theology. In most of
these cases, however, it came to be seen that what science contra-
dicted was some of these theories founded on a too literal interpreta-
tion of Scripture, or pressing its statements too far, which, as we
have seen, modern scholarship disallows, and that an adjustment of
the contradiction was possible. Often, indeed, this was sought at
first merely by the substitution for the discredited theory of another
based on a similar use of Scripture; and thus methods of reconciling
the Bible and science were attempted which could not be perma-
nently satisfactory. The general principle on which we must
ultimately fall back in all cases is, that the Bible contains a revela-
tion of religious truth and not of science at all, and in all its
references to the physical world speaks according to the appearances
of things and the current ideas of the times. This principle, if fully
admitted and applied, involves just the same modification of the
doctrine of verbal inspiration which we have seen to be required by
the progress of historical knowledge. We must abstain from press-
ing the incidental references of Scriptures to natural things as
grounds of theological doctrines.

But more particularly the results of modern scientific knowledge
modify our conception of some of the doctrines themselves. Science
has shown that in regard to the genesis of some things what seems
to be described in Scripture as a sudden act of divine power has
really been a long and gradual process, as, for example, the separation
of the dry land from the seas (Gen. 1:9). This does not affect the
substantial doctrine that these changes are due to the will of God,
the Creator, which is the essential religious teaching of the passage; but it alters somewhat the form in which this doctrine has been represented. It shows us, too, that when the Bible ascribes certain things to God's action, and suggests the idea of that action being immediate and instantaneous, it does not necessarily imply that there has been a creative interposition, but means to teach that the result, by whatever means brought about, is really the work of God's power. Science teaches us to recognize God as working by physical causes and gradual processes in many cases where the old theology, on the ground of a literal interpretation of Scripture, saw direct creative interpositions; but this does not make the fact of the divine agency less real and certain.

Now this principle may apply not only to the facts of natural history, but to those of moral and religious history as well, at least in its remoter periods. God's calls and commands to the patriarchs may possibly not have been single instantaneous utterances, as the first reading of the narratives might suggest; it is enough to vindicate their substantial truth that in some way or other God's will was personally and unmistakably conveyed to the recipients of his revelation. Such theological notions as divine legislation, covenants, judgments, and the like may be not the less real and important, though they may not be regarded as denoting express and definite transactions occurring at certain particular epochs, but rather certain relations or states brought about or brought into consciousness by slow and gradual processes. The idea of evolution has in modern thought come to supersede that of creation in many cases; but if the power at work in it is believed to be that of a supreme, wise, and beneficent Mind, evolution is, for all practical purposes, the same to the theologian as creation. We are taught in Scripture to recognize God as the Creator of our bodies, though his direct agency in giving us being is at least as far back as Adam; and if science shows that it must be put still farther back, it makes no essential difference; it is still true that God is our maker, and we are the sheep of his pasture and the people of his hand. The notion of a gradual development instead of a sudden, abrupt act gives a different form to some doctrines, but does not alter their essential meaning; and to many minds makes them more easy of acceptance. Dorner especially has made much use of the notion of a gradual process to explain some of the hard problems of theology, such as original sin, the Incarnation, and others; and indeed this may be said to be the chief feature of the doctrinal system of that great theologian. Now, though there may be different opinions as to the success of this solution in the several cases in which he has applied it, there can be no doubt that
his theology as a whole is in substance that of the Reformation, though in the form of conceiving and presenting some doctrines it has been affected by the results of modern science. In a similar way Newman Smyth, in his "Old Faiths in New Light," has treated many of the doctrines of evangelical theology.

Science has shown that in the field of nature God has been working by slower processes than men were aware of before, and that the pictures of some of these in Scripture are, as it were, pre-shortened, the development of ages being sometimes compressed into a word; and the application of this principle to the mental and spiritual world is felt by many to be an aid to faith and a way of overcoming difficulties. So if science suggests a number of objections to the older forms of theological statements, it also suggests modifications by which the essential truths may be maintained in more adequate forms. In some respects, too, the discoveries of modern science remarkably confirm the doctrines of Reformation theology. The fact of heredity is a striking analogy to the doctrine of original sin; that of biogenesis to the doctrine of regeneration; that of degeneracy to the principle expressed by our Lord in the parable of the talents, and so on. Professor Drummond's book on "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" at least shows a very remarkable analogy between the principles of science and the doctrines of Christianity, and makes out, I think, a strong case even for the author's contention that the laws of the natural and spiritual world are not merely like, but actually the same. It proves that in some cases at least the study of science tends not to drive men away, but to bring them nearer to the theology of the Reformation.

But we cannot overlook the fact that in many other cases unhappily it has the effect of alienating men, not only from a particular system of doctrine, but from all Christian belief. The conception of the uniformity of nature, which all science hitherto has tended to confirm and illustrate by new and more comprehensive instances, that conception on which all scientific inquirers presume as certain, seems to exclude the idea of any divine interference or even of any divine agency in the phenomena of the universe, and so to render incredible the belief of miracles, revelation, Incarnation, or even of creation, providence, and prayer. Now, without the former of these beliefs there can be no Christianity; without the latter, no religion at all worthy of the name. If science really precludes these beliefs, it is no friend but a deadly foe to Christian theology. It is, therefore, a vital question whether it does preclude them.

But in regard to the doctrines of creation, providence, and prayer, it is not the ascertained facts of science that raise objections against
them, but metaphysical theories built upon these facts. The proof that in the phenomena of nature the reign of law is found to be unbroken, and is ever being made evident in new directions, only shows that the sequences of phenomena are uniform, but discloses nothing as to the power by which they are produced; and the more widely we can trace order and law in the universe, the more incredible does it seem that all this should exist without an originating and presiding Mind. Science may boast of tracing all things back to matter and force, or ultimately to force alone; but this explains nothing; for the only notion of force that physical science can furnish is that of invariable antecedence; our only positive notion of power is derived from the action of our own wills; and if that be implied in the force to which all phenomena are traceable, we are at once led to Theistic belief. It is only by the fallacy of ascribing real efficiency to what are really mere abstractions, forces, and laws of nature that science can be thought to be opposed to Theism.

The difficulty that many modern students of science feel in accepting the miraculous elements in Christianity proceeds from a nearer and less illegitimate inference from ascertained facts. Looking merely at the physical world, we may say that since its laws have been found to be so uniform and universal, the improbability of miracles is greater than it was felt to be before. But these laws which science traces are not powers, but merely sequences, or the order of phenomena; and the only form which an objection to miracles can take is not that they are impossible, but that it is inconsistent with the perfect wisdom of the Author of nature to deviate from the uniform order of his working. This objection is met by taking into account the moral and spiritual reasons that may exist for occasional departures from the ordinary course of phenomena, and these cannot be affected by any results of chance. After all, the question is one of fact, and the evidence for the central miracles of the sinless life and glorious resurrection of Jesus is as strong as it ever was; no discoveries of science have even approached to explaining away the facts; and it is not the progress of knowledge, but a priori theories or hasty generalizations, opposed to the spirit of true science, that have led many to reject them. On this point we dare not make any compromise; if we are to maintain Christianity itself, not to speak of any theology, we must maintain that our faith is in harmony with true science, and can stand all appropriate tests of truth.

There is another way in which the results of modern science have been thought by some to make the Reformation theology untenable, by enlarging so vastly our conceptions of the extent of the universe. Thus Mr. Beard, in his Hibbert Lectures on the Reformation, after
illustrating the way in which science has expanded our view of the universe, asks, "Did, then, God, and such a God as the all of things prove he must be, die for us? I say it with the deepest respect for the religious feelings of others, but I cannot but think that the whole system of atonement, of which Anselm is the author, shrivels into inanity amid the light, the space, the silence of the stellar worlds" (p. 389). This is the same objection to our doctrine that Dr. Chalmers, in his "Astronomical Discourses," dealt with as urged against Christianity in general; and it seems to me that if it is not allowed to have force as against the Christian revelation as a whole, it has no strength as against any particular doctrine. If it be admitted that God has provided for the recovery from sin of so insignificant a portion of the universe as mankind are, there seems no further difficulty in believing that he has done all that was needful for that purpose; and if an Incarnation and an atonement were needful, then we may believe that God did even these things. The question is one of fact, and the extent of the universe cannot affect the evidence of the fact. If Jesus declared himself to be truly God, and to have come to die for sinful men, and if we have reason, because of his sinless life and resurrection from the dead, to believe him, the vastness of the universe would just lead us to admire the more the love of that great Shepherd who, having a hundred sheep, went after the one that was lost, and gave his life for it. On the other hand, it is worthy of notice that the fact of the vast extent of the universe was used by Leibnitz to diminish the pressure of the mystery of the evil in this world, and to a certain extent it is available in that way; so that it does not seem to be on the whole adverse to the Reformation theology.

IV. It thus appears that the difficulties felt in modern times in accepting that theology do not arise so much from new discoveries in science as from philosophy, on which scientific discoveries have had great effect. It is doubtful, however, whether we can speak of a progress of knowledge in philosophy. That there have been great changes in philosophical beliefs since the sixteenth century is certain, and that various opinions then held have been disproved and a number of points established by evidence that has been generally accepted is equally true; but in the system of philosophy as a whole there is as much division of different schools as ever; and while many would claim that solid progress has been made, some would consider the goal to be Comte and Mill, others Herbert Spencer, others Hegel, and others, perhaps, Kant and Hamilton. According as a man follows one or other of these schools, his judgment will be very different as to the bearing of philosophy on theology. To discuss
these is beyond the scope of this paper; but there is one question that has an important bearing on theological doctrine—that of free will—the relation of which to modern philosophical thought seems to call for some remark.

The question so long discussed between freedom and determinism does not seem any nearer a settlement now than in the earliest days of philosophy; but the position of parties is worthy of observation. The empirical school of sensationalists and materialists is strongly in favor of determinism, while those who maintain a spiritual, intuitional, or idealistic philosophy generally assert the freedom of the will. Now the former system, thoroughly carried out, is decidedly hostile to some of the principles of Christianity; and yet the doctrine of determinism, or philosophical necessity, has been often used within the last two centuries as a support to Calvinistic theology. It has always been a dangerous ally, because it has tended to give the doctrines of grace a metaphysical rather than a religious character; and it is all the more dangerous now when it is generally associated with a materialistic philosophy. On the other hand, those who have labored to defend Christianity from the assaults of that philosophy have been inclined to favor the philosophical doctrine of free will, and to let that influence their theology. Thus the modern evangelical divines of Germany, even of the Reformed Church, have nearly all modified or abandoned the Calvinism of the older theology, and adopted a Synergistic or Arminian type of doctrine. Now even if this modification of the Reformation theology be right, it can hardly be said to be due to progress in knowledge, both because the philosophical question is not conclusively settled, and more especially because the theological question is independent of it. Calvinistic doctrine will be all the better of being freed from its alliance with philosophical necessity, as it can be much better defended in connection with the opposite theory of freedom. There are, however, various tendencies in the present day, some of them great and noble, that incline evangelical divines in the direction of a modified Calvinism or Arminianism. This is a point on which believing students of Scripture differ very much more than they did in the sixteenth century; and there seems to be no immediate prospect of their being agreed either on one side or the other. Hence, though seeing no reason for myself to change the Calvinistic system of theology, and therefore not desiring that others should depart from it, I cannot but think that the Presbyterian churches ought to consider seriously whether they should exclude from their ministry men who honestly ascribe conversion to the influence of the Spirit of God, though they do not accept the Calvinistic doctrines of invincible grace and absolute election.
On the whole, then, looking at the results of modern progress in scholarship, history, science, and philosophy, we do not seem to be required to make such changes in the teaching of the Reformers as can properly be called a new theology. The substance of all the leading doctrines, such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Sin, Regeneration, Justification, and Eternal Life is unaffected by any knowledge really acquired, though the form of statement may have in some cases to be changed, and some of the more particular parts of the old systems may have to be modified or given up. There has been progress in the understanding of the Bible and of the history of salvation which it records; and the recognition of the gradual progress of revelation, of the central importance of the person of Christ in theology, and of Christianity as being a spiritual life, having laws analogous to those of life in general, may serve to indicate how theology has been enriched by modern knowledge, and may be so still more. But the progress that is really justifiable by knowledge has not altered the essential character of the Reformation theology, but tended to confirm its fundamental beliefs.

The theology of the Reformers stands the test of modern knowledge better than that of their successors in the seventeenth century. The reason of this is that the Reformers were specially characterized by two things not always found in later divines: one was intensity of personal religious feeling, and the other was sympathy with the best learning of their day. The former enabled them to draw from Scripture and embody in their doctrines that which is truly religious, and therefore independent of science; and the latter made them willing to acknowledge the claims of science in its own province, and to accept its results as far as then known. Their successors often put into their systems not only the religious truth but the temporary and unessential form in which it appears in some parts of Scripture, and were too anxious to maintain a scholastic body of doctrine to be always open to new light. In proportion as we cultivate these great outstanding qualities of the Reformers, we may hope to be able to maintain the substance of their theology in the light of modern knowledge, and to enrich it with all the real and valuable results of that knowledge.

J. S. CANDLISH.
IV.

WERE THE APOSTLES PRELATES?

It would powerfully aid to the understanding of the answer to this question if every reader of this article were, before entering on its perusal, to read over and mark in his Greek Testament every passage in which the word ἀπόστολος, usually translated apostle, occurs. He would note how, in its literal and general sense, it signifies a messenger—that is, one sent forth, without giving any idea of the authority which sends or of the message that is carried (John xiii. 16). In this sense it is applied to the Lord Himself—"the apostle of our confession," in reference to His being sent forth by the Father on His mission to the world. In a similar manner it designates the deputies chosen and sent forth by the churches to be Paul's companions in travel, and to carry to him their contributions for the saints; they are "the messengers of the churches, they are the glory of Christ." Epaphroditus in a similar sense was "the apostle" of the Philippians, commissioned by them to bear the gift which they sent to Paul. In a sense precisely the same the word is applied to Barnabas and Saul, because, under direction of the Holy Spirit, they were sent forth by the prophets and teachers of Antioch to carry the Gospel to the Gentiles. No doubt Saul soon afterwards was an apostle in a higher sense, but it is only in the non-official and literal sense of messenger that it could be applied to Barnabas in common with him.

In the official and limited sense, the word in the New Testament is applied exclusively to those selected by the Lord for the special work of preaching the Gospel to the world, administering the ordinances, and organizing the Church. The original number, although replenished once or twice until the object of their appointment was attained, does not appear to have been ever exceeded. After the death of Judas, Matthias was put in his place; and after the martyrdom of James, the brother of John, the number was kept up by the addition of Paul, who had been already converted, and who was then in training for the work. The language in which he speaks of himself—"one born out of due time"—is suggestive not
only of the lateness of his appointment, but also that the act was not to be repeated. Notwithstanding the dull apprehension, the moral weakness, the mistakes and errors exhibited by them in the days of their pupillage, these twelve men, ever after the great Pentecost, are richly endowed with supernatural gifts, and take the lead in the affairs of the kingdom. Henceforth they occupy the first rank in the Church; all the other living stones in the Christian temple rest upon them as the foundation, and they rest upon Christ.

The apostleship includes all minor church offices within itself. In discharge of their Divine commission, they preached Christianity to Jew and Gentile, planted churches, and guided and governed the churches which they set up. In doing so they discharged the duties which ordinary ministers perform. They preached the Gospel, taught disciples, prayed, baptized, administered the Lord’s Supper, admitted to church membership, rebuked offenders, excluded the unworthy, laid on hands in appointing to office, and before deacons were set apart to the special purpose, they served tables. Their ordinary duty, in common with that of every minister of the Gospel, was to give themselves "to prayer and to the ministry of the Word."

In order to understand what was peculiar to the apostleship, we must, however, leave out of account all that they possessed in common with ordinary church officers, and to which ordinary church officers are equal. When this is done, it will be found that they had special qualifications, special functions, and special signs or manifestations which accompanied their ministry and distinguished their office.

SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS.

The apostle was distinguished from every other minister by the following characteristics:

1. Each of them was personally chosen by the Lord. That He selected the original twelve during His earthly ministry is universally admitted. By the disposing of the lot, He showed in answer to prayer that it was His will that Matthias should fill the post from which Judas by transgression fell. When Ananias was sent to baptize Saul, the reason assigned by the Lord was—"for he is a chosen vessel unto Me, to bear My name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel." Paul himself affirms that he was an apostle "not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father." None of them—not even he who was "one born out of due time"—took the honor upon himself, but waited till the office was conferred by the Lord.

2. Each of them had seen Christ after He rose from the dead.
The reason that all required this qualification was that they might be able, from their own personal knowledge, to bear witness to Christ's resurrection. But the identification would not have been complete nor the testimony decisive if they had not been familiar with the Lord's person and presence during His life. This was an essential preliminary of the selection of Matthias; for, as stated by Peter, "Of the men therefore which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, of these must one become a witness with us of His resurrection." Previous acquaintanceship with Jesus during His earthly life had to precede the sight of Him after His resurrection in order to identification, and to make the testimony sure. Paul's acquaintanceship with Jesus prior to the crucifixion is not indeed recorded, but several circumstances induce us to believe in it as a fact. The youth of Saul of Tarsus was spent at Jerusalem, waiting on the instructions of Gamaliel, the most noted Rabbi of the time. Is it likely that a young lad of keen intelligence, aware that the Prophet of Nazareth, about whose speeches and miracles every one was speaking, had come to the city, would neglect the opportunity to see and to hear Him? Afterward, when Jesus appears to him in the way to Damascus, he needs no farther identification than the mere announcement of the name; he immediately addresses Him as "Lord." Long after, when he alludes to the carnal notions which he once entertained of the Messiah during his unconverted life, he uses a form of expression which he could scarcely have used if he had not seen the Lord before the crucifixion—"even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more." Paul's late conversion put him to some disadvantage, yet in order to his apostleship, the Lord specially appeared to him, that he too, like the others, might be able to say that he had seen the risen Christ.

3. There was no limit to their sphere of action; their commission was to all nations. The ordinary church officers, bishops, elders, pastors, teachers, deacons—all discharged their office in a sphere local and limited; but the commission to the apostles was universal—"Disciple all nations," "Preach the Gospel to every creature." This implied authority not merely to preach and instruct, but to gather disciples into churches, and to organize and govern the churches which they formed. They were not tied down to a congregation, or to a city, or even to a nation; the sphere of an apostle was the world.

4. Christ "breathed" upon them and imparted the Holy Ghost. They were forbidden to leave Jerusalem until they had actually received the fulfilment of the Divine promise. The fulfilment came
at the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit fell upon them and endowed them with an abundance of gifts, and more especially with the gift of tongues, so much so that in that great multitude of people assembled together from so many different places every man "heard them speaking in his own language." No analogous experience is recorded in the case of Paul; yet that he was gifted with the same supernatural endowments is evident from what he said to the Corinthians: "I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all." This abundant supply of the Spirit in his miraculous energy was essential to the success of their mission. It strengthened their memories, taught them what they needed to know of the past and future, struck terror to their foes, arrested the attention of the careless, and to themselves communicated power.

5. They were the subjects of special Divine revelations. To them in a special manner God communicated the truth which they orally and by writing were to convey to others. To Peter it was thus revealed, that henceforth he "should not call any man common or unclean." Paul was not present at the institution of the Lord’s Supper, but at a later date it was expressly revealed to him by the Lord what he taught the Corinthians: "I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all." This abundant supply of the Spirit in his miraculous energy was essential to the success of their mission. It strengthened their memories, taught them what they needed to know of the past and future, struck terror to their foes, arrested the attention of the careless, and to themselves communicated power.

In saying that these special qualifications were essential characteristics of the apostolic office, it is not meant to convey that no others but apostles had any such qualifications. That would not be the fact. Five hundred brethren at once saw the risen Saviour. Cornelius and his friends, no less than Peter and the apostles, received the Holy Ghost. Ananias, and, indeed, every true prophet was the subject of a special revelation. Various public teachers and private Christians possessed one or more of these qualifications; but it was only an apostle who possessed them all, and usually possessed each of them in a higher degree than any one else.* But two of

* This was Tertullian’s view of the case, for in his Exhortation to Chastity, ch. 4, he says:

"For the apostles have the Holy Ghost properly, who have him fully, in the operations of prophecy, and the efficacy of virtues, and the evidence of tongues; not partially, as all others have."
them were so eminently special that in them no others shared. Every apostle was the subject of the Lord's personal choice, and each of them, in virtue of a universal commission and direct inspiration, had a right to exercise spiritual authority over all Christians. The precepts and truths announced by any of them were binding upon all churches.

SPECIAL FUNCTIONS.

The qualifications thus stated were bestowed upon the twelve, that they might be able with more effect to discharge their special functions. What were these functions?

1. To bear witness to the Lord's resurrection. This is, in fact, the foundation truth of our religion. If Christ died and rose again, Christianity is a fact; if Christ did not die and rise again, Christianity is a fable. It was so ordered, not without Divine prearrangement, that all the apostles had the testimony of their senses to this grand truth. They either saw and heard Him, or they touched and handled Him, or they ate and drank with Him after He rose from the dead. Others in after ages might repeat the testimony, but the original eye and ear witnesses could bear witness as no others were fit to do. Other disciples, indeed, who had seen the risen Lord could also supply primary evidence of the fact; but even from these the apostles stood forth pre-eminently, inasmuch as they alone were the "witnesses chosen before of God."

2. They preached the Gospel to the nations, everywhere gathering their converts into congregations for worship, teaching them the doctrines and duties of the faith, administering rites, appointing officers, and perfecting the organization of the churches. They put these small Christian societies in a position to exercise the duties of self-government by ordaining church officers, bestowing spiritual gifts, communicating necessary advice, and supporting all by their own holy example.

3. They exercised spiritual jurisdiction over the congregations which they planted; and one did not think that he travelled beyond his sphere when he issued a written address to churches which another had gathered and instructed. They often revisited the churches which they had formed; the weight of responsibility for these churches pressed upon them; they addressed to them epistles of instruction or reproof or comfort according to circumstances; and they legislated for them by enjoining precepts, defining doctrine, and settling controversies, while they issued authoritative commands on discipline and other subjects. As the Church spread
over the Empire, and the number of the apostles thinned, their superintendence was only occasional and general; so that in one or two well-known cases they delegated their powers to fellow-laborers, who acted for a time in their place.

4. They communicated inspired instruction to the Church of their time and to all the ages since. They had the mind of Christ. The words which fell from their lips were "traditions"—that is, deliverances on religious subjects, which came to the people not as the word of man only, but as the Word of God. When committed to writing, their words take rank with the Scriptures, produced by holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Other men can at best repeat and expound, or, much more likely, misinterpret and misapply Divine truth; but the apostles brought into existence the holy text on which the wisest among men can only write the comment. One grand aim characterized them all—the conversion of sinners, the spiritual training of souls, the good of the world, and the glory of God.

THE SPECIAL SIGNS.

The signs which followed the preaching of the apostles did more than anything else to arrest the popular attention and to convince many that the apostles were teachers sent from God. "Many signs and wonders," says the inspired historian, "were done by the apostles." They conferred the gifts of the Holy Ghost with the laying on of hands. They performed miracles almost without number. After giving a specimen, the historian sums them up thus: "By the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people;" and the impression thus made upon the populace is conveyed in the words: "They even carried out the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that as Peter came by, at least his shadow might overshadow some one of them." Similar things are recorded of Paul at Ephesus; for we read how "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, insomuch that unto the sick were carried away from his body handkerchiefs and aprons; and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out." That God wrought in this miraculous way along with the apostles confirmed the truth of the message which they carried, and accounts to a large extent for the rapidity with which the Gospel spread from city to city and from province to province in the apostolic age. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, alludes to this when he says: "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience by signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds;" and the
author of the Epistle to the Hebrews notes in a similar way the distinctive marks by which the ministry of the apostles was followed and attested, "God bearing witness unto them both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His will."

From such representations of the Divine Word, it is obvious that the apostles among Christian ministers stand in a class by themselves. Their office was unique. They shine out in solitary dignity as the chosen companions of the Lord and the commissioned founders of the Christian Church. When the last survivor of them died, about the close of the first century, he left behind him in the world no man exactly like himself. No man then alive had these special qualifications; no man then remained who was invested with or who attempted to exercise these special powers; no man ever after could confirm the message with these special signs. The Church, as if reluctant to part with its miraculous power, laid claim to the possession of it after the apostles had passed away; but for two centuries after, the claim was feebly urged and the few examples of it ill authenticated. It was not till centuries after, amid a growing ignorance which covered everything with mist and made it easy for honest men to be the victims of imposture, that sham miracles were proclaimed with shameless tongue and brazen face, and found men credulous enough to believe them. But the real miracle passed away with the twelve. When the last of them fell asleep, their writings and their work remained, but the office which they filled had vanished like a dream. The Church had no command to continue it; there is no record of its continuation; the assertion of its perpetuation in another class of officers is only an afterthought of subsequent ages.

Tertullian, at the commencement of the third century, gave them their true position as the teachers of the Church in all ages, and spoke of them exactly as we would speak of them now, when he said:

"In the Lord's apostles we possess our authority; for even they did not of themselves choose to introduce anything, but faithfully delivered to the nations the doctrine which they had received from Christ. If, therefore, 'even an angel from heaven should preach any other Gospel,' he would be called accursed by us."* 

Happy had it been for Christians had they never recognized any other authority in religion than that of the apostles. Unfortunately they took another course. But the statement of Tertullian shows this at least, that even a hundred years after the last of these holy

---

* Prescription against Heretics, ch. 6.
inspired men died, their words were the standard of authority to the Christians of the time.

THE EPISCOPAL ARGUMENT.

To persons familiar with the facts now stated and derived from the Word of God, it must always seem strange to find some modern Christians who believe that the apostleship is a permanent institution; that the apostles were bishops in the modern sense of the word; that the present episcopate is only the continuation of the apostolate in its permanent elements, and that the modern bishop or prelate is the successor of the apostles, each of whom had prelatical authority in his own person.

We find, for example, Dr. Brett, an able defender of the Prelatic system, using these words:

"The apostolical or highest order, which was appointed to supply the place of Christ Himself after His ascension, was intended by Him not for a temporary but a perpetual institution." \*  

Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, speaks to the same effect:

"We do not deny that in the apostolic age the names Episcopi and Presbyteri were applied to the same persons; but then there were at that time bishops also in our sense of the word—namely, the holy apostles themselves." \†

Mr. Haddan uses similar language:

"The episcopate is historically the continuation in its permanent elements of the apostolate." \‡

Bishop Charles Wordsworth, of St. Andrews, thinks that he has shown conclusively:

"That the apostles formed a distinct body, having prelatical authority each in his own person; that they severally made provision for a successorship to themselves in all the ordinary functions of their prelatical office; and that their successors from the first were, and have been ever since, known by the name of bishops, having presbyters and deacons under them as necessary to complete the clerical ministry." \§

ANSWER TO THIS ARGUMENT.

No man who understands thoroughly the qualifications, functions, and signs of the apostleship is in much danger of mistaking a prel-

\* Brett's Divine Right of Episcopacy, § 9.
\† Theophilus Anglicanus, Part I., ch. 10.
\‡ In Smith and Cheetham, vol. i., p. 212.
\§ Outlines, Lect. II., p. 127.
ate for an apostle. Nevertheless, the reasons for rejecting this notion require fuller elucidation.

I. The apostleship is an institution that stands entirely alone. There is nothing at all like it to be met with in any other period of Church history. No other church ruler has presented the same peculiarities. The apostle, as we have seen, was specially selected by the Lord; his commission was to the world; he had seen the risen Redeemer, and was thus qualified to be a witness of His resurrection; and in a degree more than common he was the possessor of supernatural gifts—the gift of tongues, the gift of prophecy, the gift of miracles, the gift of inspiration, and what seems to have been the rarest endowment of all—the power of conferring upon others the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. What modern bishop can show a rôle of qualifications like these? Then look at the apostle’s functions. His commission being universal, he preached the Gospel in many countries; he supplied the credentials of his mission by the exercise of miraculous powers; he gathered and organized churches; he instituted church offices and ordinances; he exercised a general care over all the churches, and supplied inspired instruction for the guidance of all ages. What prelate of this country or of any other country is equal to this? Where he introduced the Gospel, the apostle gave evidence of his office by signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. But where is the bishop now who can exhibit the signs of an apostle? None that we know or have read about. We conclude that the office filled by the twelve is an office filled by no man now, for this reason, that no man now living possesses the same qualifications, discharges the same functions, or can give proof of wielding the same miraculous powers.

These qualifications, functions, and signs are the very things that distinguish the apostleship, and without which there is nothing to mark out an apostle from any ordinary minister. A diocesan bishop may profess if he chooses to be an apostle or the successor of apostles; but he cannot say of himself what a true apostle could—'Have not I seen Jesus Christ the Lord?'' Nor can he describe himself as ‘an apostle, not from man, neither through men;’ nor would he venture to say, even to the most credulous admirers, ‘Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience by signs, and wonders, and mighty works.’ If the original qualifications of an apostle have not been transmitted down the line, the functions cannot now be performed; and if the functions are not performed, in vain we look for the signs. The qualifications, the functions, and the signs are the very essentials of the office, and if signs, functions, and qualifications are all absent, in what rational
sense can it be said that the office is continued? As has been well said by a friend of their own, "If we are to be ruled by those who are miraculously gifted, we must first bring back the apostolic gifts."* This is exactly what we say. If we are to be ruled by prelates professing to be apostles, they must first bring back the apostolic gifts. This cannot be done. We conclude, therefore, that the apostle is not continued in the prelate.

2. The apostolate was a unity. Every one of the twelve was sent by the Lord in person to discharge the varied functions already described. The spiritual duties performed in the discharge of these functions constitute the peculiar work belonging to their office. But diocesan bishops do not undertake to perform all the functions of the office to which they profess to have succeeded. "Bishops," says one of themselves, "succeed the apostles in their ordinary, not in their extraordinary offices;" † "except in their miraculous gifts," says The Tracts for the Times.‡ That is, the modern bishop succeeds the apostles in preaching and baptizing, in superintending and governing, but not in possessing supernatural endowments, or in bearing personal testimony to His resurrection, or in the exercise of miraculous power.

But is an office originally one and undivided to be cut up into two parts, an ordinary and an extraordinary? Is a person who admittedly performs only part of the work entitled to claim either the name or the office of him who did the whole? If Scripture authority could be produced, this of course would end all objection; but in absence of scriptural warrant, what right have we to cleave the office and divide it into two? Moreover, if everything distinctive of the office is dropped, the man who discharges only the ordinary and common duties is surely not entitled to say that he has succeeded to the office. If an apostle preached and baptized, he did so in common with the presbyters; if he ordained, he ordained in common with the presbyters; if he ruled, he ruled in common with the presbyters (Acts viii. 35-38; ix. 19; xiii. 1-3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 17). All these duties he performed in common with ministers of lower rank; but the apostle's wealth of miraculous power, his abundance of supernatural gifts, his peculiar testimony to the Lord's resurrection, and his personal appointment by Christ, were entirely his own, and the possession of these was what made him an apostle. When these die out the apostle dies out. Without these men may continue to preach and to rule, to baptize and to ordain; but call them what we may, they are not apostles—they are only ministers of a

* Haddan on Apostolical Succession, p. 82, note.
† Theophilus Anglicanus, ch. xi., p. 102.
‡ Tract, No. 74.
very common order. A minister may imitate Paul and Peter in ordaining church officers or in superintending churches; but if he limit himself to such work, and refuse what the Bishop of Lincoln calls the "extraordinary offices," then he is a superintendent, a diocesan bishop, a prelate, or whatever other name denotes a man whose work is jurisdiction merely, but he is not an apostle. It is not competent for a man to undertake one third or one fourth the duties, and on this ground to claim the office. The apostleship is a unity; it is a combination of gifts and functions and duties; we are not free to cut it up and divide it at our pleasure, and if we do so, we have no right to call the half of it by the name of the whole. The apostleship must be handed down entire, or else it ceases to exist.

3. The distinctive work of an apostle and that of a modern bishop differ widely from each other. The commission of the apostle, as we have seen, was to disciple all nations, to preach the Gospel to every creature, to be Christ's witnesses not only to Palestine, but to the uttermost part of the earth. The distinctive work of a prelate is to govern a defined district, containing various churches and pastors, to ordain clergy, to confirm, and to consecrate. The special work of each is so dissimilar that it is hard to believe that the office of the one is continued in the other.

4. Special significance attaches to the number of the apostles. The twelve corresponded to the twelve tribes. Though the vacancies in the apostleship were for some time regularly filled, at no time were more apostles living than twelve. Matthias succeeded Judas, and Paul falls into line after James, the brother of John, is put to death. The Apostle of the Gentiles then enters on the work to which he had been specially appointed of God (Acts xxvi. 16-18). The well-known statement of the Apocalypse, "The walls of the city had twelve foundations, and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb," implies that the number is permanent, and that it was not intended that it should be exceeded.

Tertullian saw in the facts of the Old Testament a type of the number of the apostles:

"Why was it that He chose twelve apostles, and not some other number? In truth, I might from this very point conclude of my Christ that He was foretold not only by the words of prophets, but by the indication of facts. For of this number I find figurative hints up and down the Creator's dispensation; in the springs of Elim, in the twelve gems of Aaron's priestly vestment, and in the twelve stones appointed by Joshua to be taken out of the Jordan and set up for the ark of the covenant.*

Whether the fountains, and the gems, and the stones of Jordan

* Against Marcion, iv., 13.
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were in reality types of the apostles it is not necessary for us to offer an opinion; it is sufficient to observe that an intelligent Christian writer who lived in the end of the second century, and who could judge for himself whether the apostle was perpetuated in the bishop, considered the persons entitled to rank as apostles to be twelve and no more. By what authority has this number ever been exceeded? If we are to have successors, why should the number be more than twelve?

5. An apostle in every church where he was present performed the duties of any church office inferior to his own, if there was need for him to do so. Where presbyters were not yet appointed, he ruled with diligence and labored in word and doctrine. Where deacons were not yet chosen, he served tables. Not confined, like a modern bishop, to diocesan limits, he exercised a general superintendence and care over many churches. But if his functions are split up into sections, the claims of presbyter and deacon, or, indeed, of any officer now doing work once done by an apostle, are as valid to be his successor as those of a prelate. The prelate claims to succeed because he, like an apostle, superintends pastors and churches; but the claims of the presbyter are equally valid because he teaches, and baptizes, and rules, while the deacon may put in a similar claim, because he, like an apostle, attends to the necessities of the poor. We thus reach the conclusion that the whole Christian ministry, each order doing a portion of the work that apostles once did, are in this modified sense their successors; but still they are not apostles. The claim of each is valid so far as each does now a portion of the work that an apostle once performed; but none of them all, whether deacon, presbyter, or prelate succeeds to the apostolic office.* If any did, it is not the diocesan bishop who would have the strongest claim. An apostle calls himself πρεσβύτερος, an elder (1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John 1), and a deacon or minister, διάκονος (Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 17); but though he might have done so in the sense that the word was then used, he never by any chance calls himself an ἐπίσκοπος, a bishop. Had he only so designated himself on one solitary occasion, as he has styled himself elder and deacon, many a modern, fond to believe on the most slender evidence what he wishes to be true, would have deemed such a statement conclusive. But the fact is, no inferior officer can

* The Tractarians at least ought not to dispute this, for we find them saying:

"The apostles and their successors have in every age committed portions of their authority and power to others, who thus become their delegates, and in a measure their representatives, and are called priests and deacons."—Tracts for the Times, No. 7.

If the apostles have thus committed a portion of their authority to priests and deacons, are not priests and deacons their successors as much as prelates?
hold apostolic office, except he is lawfully appointed thereto. The successor of an apostle must be an apostle; he cannot be a diocesan or a pastor. The successor of a king must be a king; he cannot be a justice of the peace or a parish constable.

6. The apostles, as prelatical writers allege, "marked out for themselves distinct provinces, so that each had his own diocese as it were, his own peculiar sphere of duty and authority." The "diocese," as the name of an ecclesiastical district, was unknown till the fourth century, so that it would be difficult to find in Scripture any warrant for saying that each had his own diocese. The most which can be fairly claimed in this direction is, that there are slight indications of a division of labor among them—Paul went to the Gentiles, Peter to the circumcision; so that the diocese of each, if such a division can be so called, was somewhat large. Paul labored in Syria, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, and Italy. Peter labored in Judea and Samaria, in Antioch and Babylon, and addressed an apostolic letter to the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. If these were dioceses, the dioceses must have overlapped a little. The traditions of a later age assign dioceses to the others, exactly as they assign bishops, "in our sense of the word," to every city and town of the second century; but there is no scriptural or historical authority to support the tradition. This unfounded assertion is the result of a style of reasoning which is as common now as it was in the fourth century. "The Church has this or the other custom now, therefore she had this custom from the first; bishops are found to govern dioceses in the fourth and fifth centuries, therefore bishops of the same kind existed in the first century; these bishops were the apostles, therefore the apostles must have had dioceses too." The reasoning might be conclusive were it true that the Church never suffers from the touch of time; if the human elements of which she is composed never altered; if the opinions of her rulers and members never shifted; if her practices and forms never varied; if she herself during her sojourn in the world was, like her King and Head, "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." But all know that these suppositions are not true.

For seven years after the resurrection the apostles remained at Jerusalem. If they were prelates there were no less than twelve of them all that time laboring in a single congregation; but it is a maxim with the Fathers, and indeed with the moderns also, that in one church there ought to be only one bishop, and that more than one in the same church is a scandal.* The explanation is that an

* "When a bishop is once made and appointed by the testimony and judgment of his colleagues and the people, another can by no means be appointed."—Cyprian, Epistle, xl. 2.
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apostle is one thing and a prelate is another. The more apostles in
a church, the church is all the stronger and better; but there can-
not be two prelates in the same congregation, for the man-made
officer stands upon his dignity, and can "bear no brother near the
throne."

7. There is nothing in Scripture, rightly interpreted, which requires
us to believe that after the twelve had passed away the apostolic
office was to be continued in the episcopate. The commission in
Matt. xxviii. 16-20, and the statement in Eph. iv. 11-13, have, in-
deed, been quoted to the contrary; but we do not think that the
testimony of either of these passages is conclusive.

The force of the first argument depends on the supposition that
the words of the commission were addressed to the apostles only.
But this is doubtful. The words were spoken on a mountain of
Galilee—the place appointed for a general meeting of the disciples,
and where He was seen "by five hundred brethren at once." Of
those to whom Christ appeared on this occasion we are told "some
doubted," which no doubt was true of some imperfectly acquainted
with His person, and who now saw the risen Lord for the first time,
but could scarcely be true of the "eleven," who within the last few
weeks had repeated proofs of His resurrection. The words, as we
hold, were addressed to the eleven and to the other disciples present
on the occasion, representative of the general body of the Church
till the end of time. No doubt the promise, "Lo, I am with you
alway, even to the end of the world," is perpetual; but we cannot
necessarily infer from that that the apostolic office is perpetual. To
make the promise good it is enough that the work of making dis-
ciples and baptizing is perpetual, and that the Church through its
ministers shall continue to do this work in the world till the end of
the world. All agree that the promise was not to the apostles per-
sonally and exclusively, for they did not live till the end of the world
to claim and enjoy the promise. But if we say that the promise was
to them and their successors, this raises some knotty questions.
Had the apostles as such any successors in their apostolic office?
If so, who were their successors? Were they modern bishops, to
the exclusion of presbyters and deacons, both of whom now dis-
charge part of the functions which apostles once discharged? If we
say that "the apostles whom He had chosen" were succeeded in
their office by prelates whom He has not chosen, that were a de-
scent indeed.

Moreover, the promise of the commission is made to persons
whose special work is to disciple all nations by teaching all that
Christ has commanded, and by baptizing them. Can any class of
persons legitimately claim the promise who do not attempt the work? What lawful claim to the promise can be put forward by a man who may indeed preach and baptize occasionally, but whose special work—the very work for which he exists as a prelate—is not evangelization and baptism, but jurisdiction and ordination, confirmation and consecration. If, as Dr. Stillingfleet asserts, the promise is to the apostles and "to all that succeed them in the office of teaching and baptizing to the world's end," * the claim of presbyter and pastor is as strong as that of the prelate, and that of the evangelist or missionary a little stronger than either.

There is nothing inconsistent with the inspired narrative in our view of the subject. The words in question were spoken on a mountain in Galilee in presence of five hundred disciples. They were addressed primarily to the eleven, but secondarily to the brethren—the nucleus of the new spiritual kingdom now to appear. It sets before them and before all Christians the grand work for which they are to labor—"Make disciples of all nations"—the evangelization of the world; it sets before them the instrumentality that the Church corporate is to use—baptizing and instruction; it states the blessing in which all who aid in the work have an interest—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." All is stated in a general way, for the time is not yet come when it shall be revealed what are the various agencies to be employed, the ministers to fill offices and administer rites, or the special methods in which the nations are to be reached; but the grand object at which they are to aim, the moral means to be employed, and the persons responsible for the work—namely, Christian ministers and Christian people—all this is clear as the sun. But we cannot see in the words of the Lord any intimation that when the apostles die prelates alone are to succeed them, and that prelates alone are the heirs of the promise, whether they do the work or do it not.

The passage in Ephesians is not more satisfactory for the purpose for which it is cited. In this application it proves a little too much. The argument of the text is as strong for the perpetuity of prophets as for that of apostles. If the argument is sound, it proves prophets a permanent order in the church; and if that is so, no doubt a specimen can be easily produced. To the man who uses the argument we say, Produce your apostle and exhibit his credentials. Let us see his qualifications, ascertain his functions, witness his signs, and examine his work. Show us how he looks alongside Peter and Paul. The text in Ephesians, as we understand it, teaches simply that the Christian ministry, of whatever elements it is composed,

* Irenicum, p. 164.
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shall continue in the Church until the purposes for which it was originally given are completed; but it does not decide which class of church officers is temporary, and which is permanent. That point is determined by other passages and by other considerations. We feel justified, therefore, in saying that no passage in the Scriptures holds out the hope of the apostleship being an abiding and ever-present possession of the Church.

8. The rank of an apostle in a secondary degree has been claimed for some persons named in the New Testament who are not of the twelve. But there is no foundation for this, except the insufficient fact that the word is occasionally used in the non-official or figurative sense. It is in the literal sense of messenger that it is applied to Epaphroditus, sent forth by the church of Philippi, and to Barnabas and Saul, sent forth by the prophets and teachers at Antioch. We are scarcely entitled, on the mere ground that the word in peculiar circumstances is applied to these laborers, to raise them to the rank of the twelve. Timothy and Titus could not have been apostles owing to the fact that their late conversion made it impossible for them to have seen the risen Lord; while it would be without precedent for one apostle to address two others in the style in which Paul writes to them in the Pastoral Epistles. Besides Timothy and Sosthenes, whose names Paul joins with his own in writing some of his epistles, are expressly excluded by the terms employed (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1, and Col. i. 1). Andronicus and Junias may have been "of note among the apostles," without themselves being apostles; from such a remark it is unwarranted to infer apostolic rank. In writing to the Thessalonians, Paul connects the name of Silvanus or Silas with his own; but that no more proves Silas to be an apostle than the expression of the "apostles and elder-brethren" in the letter of the apostolic council would prove that the two orders there named were co-ordinate in rank. Instead of making out a claim of apostleship for these, some of whom appear to be rather commonplace persons, it would be far more plausible for Bishop Wordsworth to say candidly with Dr. Newman: "While the apostles were on earth there was need neither for bishop nor pope."

It has been alleged that the extension of the apostleship beyond the twelve is the only ground on which the false apostles mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 13 could rest their pretensions. So long as there is good money, we may always expect counterfeit coin. There have indeed in every age been pretenders to the apostolic office—men of whom Paul in his day spoke as "false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ." But the inference sought to be drawn from this is more than balanced
by the fact that if the number of apostles had not been restricted to twelve, and if the apostles had been perpetuated in prelates, or in what are now called "secondary" apostles, it would have been more than absurd in the Judaizing teachers to deny the apostleship of Paul. Their denial of his apostolic rank was simply an appeal to the deep-rooted conviction in the Christian mind of the first century that the original twelve were alone entitled to the name; while the notion of any continuation of the apostleship is entirely overthrown by the fact that in answer to these errorists he argued that his was an exceptional case, that he had received special qualifications and a Divine call, and that he was "one born out of due time."

The Bishop of St. Andrews attempts to strengthen his argument on this subject by alleging that "the ancient Fathers not only call the apostles bishops," but they "have also called bishops apostles."* That may weigh something with those who put the writings of the Fathers on a par with the rule of faith, but it does not go for much with any who know what they are, and estimate them at their real worth. After the Church, in the fourth century, was taken into alliance with the State, and Christian bishops began to assume the airs of greatness, we do not doubt that some of them claimed to fill the place of apostles, and accepted the title when flat-tery ascribed it to them. But the instances of the application of the epithet before the time of Constantine are not numerous, and can all be explained on the principle that the word apostle has not only an official, but also a literal and figurative sense. When Epaphroditus is called "the apostle" of the Philippians, because he was sent to carry their contributions to Paul, or when Patrick is called "the apostle of Ireland," or Columba "the apostle of the Picts," there is no mistaking of the literal application of the word in the former occurrence, and the figurative application in the latter.

The Fathers of the second century understood clearly that the apostles passed out of the world with the last of the twelve. This is evident from a statement of Hegesippus, who wrote about 180 A.D.

The passage is worthy of attention for various reasons:

"The same author [Hegesippus], relating the events of the times, says that the Church continued until then a pure and uncorrupt Virgin, while, if there were any at all that attempted to corrupt the sound rule of the preaching of salvation, they were still skulking in dark retreats. But as soon as the choir of apostles died a happy death, and the generation which had been counted worthy to hear their words of Divine wisdom passed away, the constitution received the beginning of atheistic error through the deception of false teachers. They also, when there was none of the apostles left, afterward barefacedly undertook to preach the knowledge falsely so called [he refers here to the Gnostics] in opposition to the Gospel of truth."†

† Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, Book III., ch. 32.
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This important passage marks two things very distinctly: first, that the loss of purity and the rise of error date from the time of Hegesippus, in the end of the second century—the point from which we date the rise of prelacy in the Church; and, second, that it is the absence of apostles which clears the ground for errorists to appear. If when the twelve died they had left any true apostles behind them in the world, false doctrine would have had as little chance in the second century as in the first.

9. The Bishop of St. Andrews regards it to be what he calls "τὸ πρῶτον φεύγος"—that is, "the first lie," that the Westminster divines speak of apostles, prophets, and evangelists as extraordinary church officers, "who are ceased," and classes pastors, other church governors, and deacons as "ordinary and perpetual."* We are not sure that this is a lie of any kind; but if it is an error, either unintentional or designed, Dr. Wordsworth can easily correct it by showing that apostles and prophets are still in existence. Let him produce his apostle. Let him show his prophet. Till he himself, or somebody on his behalf, has done this it must be forgiven us that we prefer the guidance of the Westminster divines to that of the Bishop of St. Andrews.

Before fixing on the Westminster Assembly the stigma of falsehood, the Bishop should have told his readers that the distinction between extraordinary and ordinary ministers is much older than 1643, and has been taught by some of the ablest Anglican theologians.

The Second Book of Discipline, adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1578—a time when the oldest members of the Westminster Assembly were yet in their cradles—makes this very distinction:

"There be three extraordinary functions—the office of the apostle, of the evangelist, and of the prophet—which are not perpetual, and now have ceased in the kirk of God, except when it pleased God extraordinarily to steir [raise] some of them up again. There are four ordinary functions or offices in the kirk of God: the office of the pastor, minister, or bishop; the doctor; the presbyter or elder, and the deacon."†

Bishop Barrow and Archbishop Potter, neither of whom can be supposed to be much influenced by the Westminster Assembly, drew a similar distinction. The latter says:

"It is plain through the Acts and Epistles that prophets and pastors were of a higher order than evangelists and teachers; so that by this interpretation there were two distinct orders of a different kind, and a third order of apostles superior to them both. But, then, it is not easy to give a distinct and certain account what were the particular offices of these persons, and which of them were extraordinary and temporary, and

which designed for the constant and lasting use of the Church, since the Scriptures do not speak clearly, and learned men have differed in their judgment about them." *

From this extract it is obvious that Archbishop Potter drew the distinction which Dr. Wordsworth calls "the first lie," although he found it difficult to say which offices were the "extraordinary and temporary," and which were the "constant and lasting;" nor does he see any magic in the "threesome" ministry, for in his enumeration he finds three orders, without adding the deacons, which would constitute a fourth.

Bishop Lightfoot also sanctions "the first lie," when he classes apostles, prophets, and evangelists under one head, and places under another "the permanent ministry," which he explains to mean pastors, teachers, helps, governments.†

These facts are sufficient to show that the Assembly of Divines are not so very guilty as Bishop Wordsworth supposes. The same "fundamental mistake," if it be a mistake, has been committed by some who preceded and by others who followed them.

10. The statement already quoted from Dr. Wordsworth, that the Fathers "have called the bishops apostles," deserves a little farther notice, not that it matters anything to the real question what they call the bishops, but with the view of showing how little ground the Ante-Nicene literature supplies for the statement. After the Council of Nice and the union of Church and State, the development of the pastor or bishop of the congregation into a prelate made it necessary to support his assumption of supremacy by every possible means. But before 325 A.D. the Fathers gave very little countenance to the statement of Bishop Wordsworth, as the following extracts show:

The DIDACHE (about 90 A.D.):

"Now with regard to the apostles and prophets, according to the decree of the Gospel, so do ye. Let every apostle that cometh to you be received as the Lord. But he shall not remain longer than one day; and if need be, another day also; but if he remain three days, he is a false prophet. And when the apostle departeth, let him take nothing except bread till he reach his lodging. But if he ask for money, he is a false prophet." †

In this passage the word ἀπόστολος is used in its literal sense, as in Acts xiv. 4 and Phil. ii. 25, and is applied not to the twelve, but to evangelists or other itinerating ministers sent forth to preach the Gospel. These men were not to make a long stay in one place, or to ask for money on pain of being counted impostors. Missionaries

* Discourse of Church Government, III., 3.
† Commentary on Philippians, p. 183.
‡ Chap. xi., 3-6.
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forbidden to spend three days in one place, and constantly moving on in discharge of their mission, were not prelates nor bishops in any sense of the word.

Clement of Rome (96 A.D.):

"Christ therefore was sent forth by God, and the apostles by Christ. Both these appointments, then, were made in an orderly way, according to the will of God. Having therefore received, and being fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and established in the Word of God, with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth proclaiming that the kingdom of God was at hand. And thus preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the firstfruits, having first proved them by the Spirit to be bishops and deacons of those who should afterward believe." *

According to this testimony, the officers appointed by the apostles in every city were "bishops and deacons," as we know from the testimony of Paul (Phil. i. i) was the case in the first century; but Clement does not hint that the bishops so appointed were themselves apostles.

Barnabas (119 A.D.):

"The boys that sprinkle are those that have proclaimed to us the remission of sins and purification of the heart. To these He gave authority to preach the Gospel, being twelve in number, corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel." †

The writer, who goes by the name of Barnabas, is explaining the type of the red heifer. The boys, he says, who sprinkle the ashes correspond to the apostles; he mentions that they were twelve in number, that Christ gave them authority to preach the Gospel, and that in substance this Gospel is remission of sin and purification of the heart. He limits the name to the twelve, and does not extend it to ordinary ministers.

The Author of the Epistle to Diognetus (about 130 A.D.) speaks of himself not as an apostle, but as their disciple. "Having been a disciple of the apostles, I am become a teacher of the Gentiles." ‡ We know too little of this modest and excellent writer to say much of him; but this much is plain, that he does not claim the apostleship either for himself or for any of his contemporaries.

Hermas (150) does not use the term apostle with much precision, but there is nothing in the pastor to indicate that he means by it the stationary ministers of the Church.§

Irenæus (182-85) and Tertullian (190-220) both use the term occasionally in the literal sense, and apply it to the Seventy no less than to the Twelve. Irenæus says, "After the twelve apostles, our Lord is found to have sent forth seventy others before Him;" and

---

* Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. 42.
† Epistle, chs. 8 and 5.
‡ See ch. 11.
§ Som. ix. 17 and 25.
Tertullian says, "He chose seventy other apostles beside the Twelve." * Irenaeus correctly distinguishes Matthew and John from Mark and Luke. The two former are apostles, but Mark is described as "the disciple of Peter," and Luke as "the companion of Paul." He does not elevate either to the rank of a "secondary." Tertullian, indeed, calls Barnabas an apostle, as he was justified in doing so by Acts xiv. 4. But in his work, Against Marcion, he draws a sharp contrast between the apostles and those who came after them; "Luke," he says, "was not an apostle, but only an apostolic man." †

Clement of Alexandria (190–220) calls his namesake, Clement of Rome, "an apostle;" ‡ but that worthy pastor neither assumes it himself nor applies it to any man not directly sent forth by the Lord. This is the first known instance of the word being applied to an ordinary minister. The name is applied by Alexandrinus, not in the exact manner of preceding writers, but in that loose and figurative way in which it may be applied to eminent pastors who were successful in their work and associated with the Twelve. He thought by the title to show his respect for a venerable pastor long dead—a fellow-worker of whom it is understood that Paul said his name is in the book of life (Phil. iv. 3).

Eusebius of Caesarea (313–340), the celebrated historian and the friend of the Emperor Constantine, after referring to various persons whom tradition in his time placed among the Seventy, says:

"Besides these there were still a considerable number who were apostles in imitation of the Twelve." §

That he uses the word here not in the sense of prelates or even of pastors of churches, but in the sense of evangelists or travelling preachers, as it is used in the Didache, is apparent from the explanation which he gives in another part of his History. Speaking of the reign of Trajan (98–117), Eusebius says:

"There were many others also noted in these times who held the first rank of the succession of the apostles. These, as the holy disciples of such men, also built up the churches, where foundations had been previously laid in every place by the apostles. They augmented the means of promulgating the Gospel more and more, and spread the seeds of salvation and of the heavenly kingdom throughout the world far and wide. For the most part of the disciples at that time, animated with a more ardent love of the Divine Word, had first fulfilled the Saviour's precept by distributing their substance to the needy. Afterward, leaving their country, they performed the office of evangelists to those who had not yet heard the faith, while with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the books of the Holy Gospels. After laying the foundation of the faith in foreign parts as the particular object of their mission, and after appoint-

† Against Marcion, iv., 2. ‡ Stromata, iv., 17. § Ecc. Hist., i., 12.
ing others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations with the grace and co-operation of God."

By the "first rank of the succession of the apostles," we understand Eusebius to mean the first generation of preachers who in point of time followed the apostles; and this beautiful extract indicates what he meant when he spoke of "a considerable number who were apostles in imitation of the Twelve." They were not apostles in the sense in which Andrew and Thomas were apostles, nor pastors of churches, nor prelates—that is, pastors of pastors in districts already evangelized; but they were itinerating ministers or evangelists, who, imitating the apostles now dead, preached the Gospel to the Heathen, planted churches, and appointed, in every little congregation of converts, bishops and deacons.

Authors who wrote after Christianity was recognized as the religion of the State come too late to be cited as witnesses of facts said to have occurred in the second century or earlier; but the opinions of some of them are worth quoting in order to show that they well knew the difference between the apostles of Christ and the prelates of their own time.

HILARY, the deacon (354), usually spoken of by the old Divines as Ambrosiaster, commenting on Eph. iv. 11, says, "The apostles are bishops."† This is true in the sense that the apostleship includes every inferior office which Christ has placed in the church, and in the same sense he might have said with equal truth that the apostles are deacons, or evangelists, or prophets. But what does he mean by the term "bishop"? Is it the bishop of a single church or the bishop of a diocese containing many churches? Besides, there is all the difference in the world between saying that "the apostles are bishops" and saying that the bishops are apostles. Every judge is presumed to be a lawyer, but it does not follow that every lawyer is a judge.

CHRYSOSTOM (380–420), himself a diocesan bishop, speaking of the seven deacons in the church at Jerusalem, says: "As yet there were no bishops, but apostles only."‡ He did not commit the error of identifying two offices so radically distinct.

JEROME (380–420) gives a definition of apostles which excludes bishops. "All who had seen the Lord and afterward preached Him were called apostles."§

THEODORET (387–450), in his comment on 1 Tim. iii. 1, makes a remark which has been often quoted by prelatic writers, and which

---

we suspect to be the source of Dr. Wordsworth's allegation, that the Fathers were accustomed to call the diocesan bishops of their age apostles:

"Those now called bishops they named apostles; but in the succeeding times they left the name of the apostleship to those who were apostles in truth; but that of the episcopate they put on those who were formerly called apostles."  

Bishop Lightfoot states that this idea of Theodoret is borrowed from Theodore of Mopsuestia, the father of the Nestorian heresy, and he proceeds to demolish it in the following words:

"That the same officers in the Church," says Lightfoot, "who were first designated apostles came afterward to be designated bishops is baseless. If the two names had been identical, the substitution of the one name for the other would have required some explanation. But, in fact, the functions of the apostle and the bishop differed widely. The apostle, like the prophet or the evangelist, held no local office. He was essentially, as his name denotes, a missionary, moving about from place to place, founding and confirming new brotherhoods. The only ground on which Theodoret builds his theory is a false interpretation of a passage in St. Paul."  

11. Bishop Lightfoot has advanced strong reasons for believing, not that the apostle of the first century 'broadened down into the congregational bishop of the second century and the prelate of the fourth, but that the prelate gradually rose and developed out of the presiding presbyter. This is the Presbyterian view of the case. By various steps the elder or bishop who in the first century presided among his equals became, in the latter part of the second century, the bishop of the local church; and when the local church, toward the end of the third century, was supplemented by smaller congregations, he remained at the head of these congregations and presbyters. The congregational bishop thus developed into a prelate, and the primitive parish became a diocese. This latest development began in all the large cities in the third century, but was not complete till the fifth. But an improvement of the fifth century comes a little too late to receive the stamp of Divine authority. It is the approved practice of the first century, when the inspired apostles lived among men, which is to be the guide of all after ages.

Dr. Lightfoot's view of the case is confirmed by the fact that the Christian literature of the first two centuries, inspired and uninspired, has no name for what is now called a prelate or diocesan bishop—that is, a church officer in charge of a defined district, with pastors and churches under his jurisdiction, inferior in rank to an apostle, but superior to the ordinary pastors or elders of a congregation. Able defenders of the prelatic system, like Mr. Haddan, admit this. "St. Clement," says he, "has naturally no term at hand whereby to ex-

* Commentary on Philippians, p. 193.
press the specially episcopal office."* Had the "specially episcopal office" been in existence when he wrote, Clement would have been at no loss for a word. The statement of Mr. Haddan is a clear admission that the prelatical office is not named in the New Testament. No institution exists a day until some name is found to distinguish it by those who are familiar with it. The fact that no distinctive name is known for the office so early as the time of Clement is strong evidence, all the stronger because undesigned, that the office itself did not exist at that time. It is not till we pass the year 150 A.D. that genuine Christian writers begin to speak of "the bishop" in order to mark off the presiding presbyter from the ordinary presbyters or bishops of the congregation in which he presides. The Ignatian Epistles, indeed, speak of "the bishop" often enough; but after reading through Dr. Lightfoot on the subject, we are still not satisfied that those trashy productions were written by the martyr Ignatius, and that they were not forged at a later date and published in the martyr's name for the very purpose of aiding "the bishop" to make good his supremacy over his colleagues.† The term "the bishop," as distinguishing the president from the other presbyters in charge of the flock, is not used in the Didache, nor in Clement of Rome, Hermas, Justin, Polycarp, or, indeed, in any genuine writer before the middle of the second century. It first makes its appearance in Irenaeus and Tertullian, after which it is common enough. When it so appears, the new name, or, as it is in this case, an old name with a new and more definite application, indicates that a new office has come into existence.

The bishop of the third century was still a very humble and modest church officer; but after the union of Church and State he grew into the full-blown prelate. By the fifth and sixth centuries the Hierarchy was fully developed, and from the end of the sixth century we may regard the apex of the ecclesiastical pyramid completed by the Popedom.

Thomas Witherow.

Londonderry, Ireland.

* Haddan's Apostolical Succession, p. 105.
† See Dr. Killen's Ignatian Epistles entirely Spurious, and Harnack's contribution to the Expositor, 1885.
SOCIAL DISCONTENT.

IT may be accepted as a fact sufficiently emphasized by the daily press and current literature that social discontent, in one form or another, exists everywhere. It affects the civilized and nominally Christian nations of the world, and has spread among all classes—the rich, the poor, the ignorant and learned. Its undeniable prevalence in Christian lands is specially worthy of consideration. For the last half century the evil has grown with accelerated vigor, and has overleaped national boundary lines, and is now keenly felt in both hemispheres. In 1847 the cry was uttered in London by certain German Communists, led by Karl Marx, "Proletarians of all countries, unite," and it has since been responded to with disastrous results to themselves and others. Nor has the movement been limited to the commonalty, to those occupying the lower strata of society. Persons of exalted position and commanding influence in Church and State—persons skilled in political intrigue and statecraft, holding the reins of ecclesiastical power, and occupying chairs in leading Universities of the Old and New World, have taken part in its discussion. Prince Bismarck, Bishop Kettler, of Mayence, and learned professors in Berlin, Halle, Tübingen, and elsewhere, have contributed to its literature. Multitudinous organizations with queer and startling names and constitutions have been formed, and courses of action have been adopted of a varied, contradictory, and, in many instances, dangerous nature. The work proposed by extremists among them is stupendous, and to be pressed to an immediate issue. The world is to be turned upside down. The present order of things is to be abolished, and the new heavens and the new earth are to be speedily established. In the accomplishment of this gigantic task instrumentalities of all sorts are to be used—the press, the platform, the halls of legislation, trades-unions, co-operative associations, strikes, mobs, and dynamite. If what are deemed manifest disabilities and wrongs cannot be removed by peaceful and ordinary means, then revolutionary and murderous measures may be
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pursued. Bakunin, the originator of Russian Nihilism, may be cited as the propagator of this doctrine in many parts of Europe. In the Congress of Bâle, in 1869, he declared, "I call for the destruction of all national and territorial States, and, upon their ruins, the foundation of an international State composed of the millions of workers. This presupposes a reorganization of society from top to bottom." According to Émile De Laveleye, the execution of Bakunin's programme means that "there are to be no more nations, no more States, no more political or judicial institutions, no more private property, no God, no religious worship, not even any free and independent individuals. Total destruction to all that exists, and, in the new world, as the organic cell and primordial element of reconstruction, not, as before, the human personality, but the amorphous (shapeless) Commune, and thus humanity is to be rendered like a confused mass of conferva, or a nebula in process of formation."

Happily for the peace and safety of society, in the mean time, all are not agreed to go this length. The house is divided against itself, and hence there are conservative, radical, democratic, scientific, atheistic, and evangelical socialists. In one thing they all agree—namely, in demanding what they allege to be the rights of the working classes; and while there may be ground for this demand in many respects, we are bound to say that the interests of workingmen have been seriously damaged by being mixed with the movements of vicious Nihilists and Communists who deserve the severest condemnation. The strife with which we propose chiefly to deal is really one between master and servant, capital and labor. It has grown to vast dimensions, millions of the world's honest toilers with muscle and brain being enlisted in the various brigades of the vast army of malcontents. In itself this is nothing new, but with our advanced and complicated civilization, containing many new factors and forces, and with our scientific knowledge and Christian light clearer and more widespread than ever before, it demands fresh consideration at the hands of statesmen, political economists, philanthropists, and religious teachers. Is there something fundamentally wrong in our forms and methods of government, education, and religious culture? Are our laws, municipal, civil, and criminal, greatly at fault and urgently needing reform? Are our literature, philosophy, science, and theology impregnated with poison, and thus the fruitful source of social discontent? Are the foundations of business out of course? Why are the workers or producers of the world, as they like to style themselves, restless and discontented? If we can discover the causes of this unhappy turbulence we may in some degree be able to indicate the remedy. Hasty reformers may be
content to solve the problem by simply asserting that human depravity is to blame for it all, and that is undoubtedly the source from which it springs. We are told on the highest authority that wars and fightings among men come of their pleasures that war in their members. They lust, and have not; they kill, and covet, and cannot obtain; but, by patient observation of the evolution of events, we shall find that many concurrent forces combine to produce the one deplorable result.

It cannot be doubted that the undue concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few, or in the hands of great corporations, breeds discontent, and is unfavorable to a healthy social condition. These vast corporations are heartless. Being artificial persons created by law, they are destitute of the finer sensibilities of humanity, but prodigiously capable of bitter mutual jealousies and strifes. They manifest their heartlessness by directing their mighty energies against each other as well as in the treatment of their dependents. Usually they are far from being at peace among themselves, and from being fountains of peace and good-will to men generally. As a rule, the doctrine they emphasize is Mammonism. Their consciousness of strength, their excessive lust of gain, and their unbounded confidence in the truth of the maxim that "money answereth all things," often urge them on with relentless fury to bite and devour one another; and in these wars of the giants the destruction of resources is not to be considered. Were it a matter of disseminating truth, or of pure benevolence in any form, the utmost parsimony would be insisted upon; but seeing personal aggrandizement and the overthrow of a hated rival is the business in hand, expenditure is not to be thought of for a moment. It is a notorious fact that powerful competing railway companies, insurance and telegraph companies, manufacturing and mercantile firms, conspire against each other, and frequently consume millions in the strife—just as they sometimes combine for selfish ends and to the utter detriment of public interests. This has happened on both sides of the Atlantic. America furnishes numerous examples, and is in this respect only repeating the history of the Old World. Not long ago Herr Ludwig Bamberger asserted in the German Parliament that his country was the "typical ground" of the war of classes, specially in the form of capital attacking capital—rich men, nobles, scholars, and ecclesiastics being carried away in the tumult by the pernicious efforts of fanatical demagogues. These collisions among the plutocracy, these wholesale monetary strifes, are truly deplorable, and call into fierce play the basest passions and practices of men—avarice, deceit, lying, bribery and corruption in every form deemed likely to accomplish
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the desired ends of the respective combatants. Through the work-
ings of the law of compensation in the social fabric they are not
wholly without advantage to the public. They serve in some degree
to check the cruel absolutism of modern monopolies. But it is a sad
fact that in these terrible struggles fortunes are sacrificed, reputa-
tions blasted, and hearts broken—social order is widely and seri-
ously disturbed, and intense misery inflicted on those who are
suddenly dashed down from positions of luxury and power into pov-
erty and shame.

But we have hinted that the conduct of these great corporate
bodies breeds discontent beyond themselves. How so? Their very
magnitude and success provoke envy and ill-will. We do not justify
or defend this, we merely state the fact. Artisans rightly claim that
their skill and toil are necessary to the achievement of this success;
and they are well aware that in many cases pure selfishness is the
dominant principle of the directors of such concerns—that their
supreme aim is to make money and make it as fast as possible, while
the circumstances, prospects, education, health, and moral condition
of the operatives and their households are very secondary consider-
ations. They see that when times are good and profits excessive
they belong to the employer. Their position is not improved, but
the reverse. The day's work is not shortened or lightened, and,
although it is much more than ordinarily productive, there is no
proportionate increase of wages; but when depression in trade occurs
wages are reduced, or workingmen are put upon short time, which
comes to the same thing. Good times are to them rather calamitous
than helpful, because, while their incomes remain stationary, the rise
in the market price of the necessaries of life, and the general ten-
dency to extravagance induced by prosperity, increase the cost of
living. To the wage-worker national prosperity seems to mean per-
sonal hardship. This view is borne out, so far as Britain is con-
cerned, by a statement, not of economic theory but of matter of fact,
by Mr. Gladstone on the floor of Parliament, in 1863, to the effect
that during the preceding twenty years the growth of national wealth
from trade and commerce had been unprecedented, the exports
having been multiplied threefold; and yet the condition of the
workingman remained not merely unimproved, but the struggle for
existence had become even more difficult. According to C. D.
Wright, an American statistician, wages increased in the United
States from 1860 to 1881 about thirty-one per cent, and prices about
forty-one per cent, thus leaving the workingman worse off at the
latter date than at the former, while it is estimated that during the
same period national wealth increased one hundred and seventy per
cent. In these circumstances it is too much to expect that among intelligent workingmen there should be a universal reign of peace and contentment. They are perfectly competent to understand and discuss social questions; and as education advances among them the disposition to do so grows stronger. They figure out the problem for themselves, and discover injustice as somehow resulting from the unequal distribution of the fruit of their toils. They cannot shut their eyes to the announcements of the millions upon millions annually realized by railway kings and other employers of labor. The pomp and luxury of such people are too obtrusive to be overlooked by the dullest observers. Moreover, workingmen are painfully conscious of the fact that periodical and disastrous crises in trade are not brought on through their instrumentality. Such may occur through war, through widespread desolating epidemics, or the providential blighting of successive harvests, but they are more frequently the outcome of inordinate haste to be rich and unprincipled speculation and competition—forcing of business—among manufacturers and traders. Artisans understand all this, and their irritation over it is deepened by seeing governments foster the great monopolies of modern times by enacting laws to suit their purposes and, in many instances, directly or indirectly granting them subsidies. Rulers find it convenient to favor the affluent. Money and influence are frequently required for political ends which need not here be defined, and both are readily given in exchange for class legislation. This is so well known that it destroys the reverence due to rulers, and excites contempt in the minds of the toiling masses for law and law-makers. They have learned, too, by observation and painful experience that it is in the very nature of powerful corporations, plethoric in wealth and supported by government, to become tyrannical. Have they not, specially in the case of railway companies, trampled under foot the rights of men and the law of God touching Sabbath rest, which is so essential to physical, intellectual, and spiritual well-being? And has it not been found necessary, by statutory enactments, to seek to prevent their oppression of women and children by the exacting of unreasonably long hours, severe service, and otherwise? Yet in spite of these restraints, and all that Christian philanthropy has done to ameliorate the condition of the millions, in factories, mines, and such like, it is still precarious and unsatisfactory enough. They may, for example, be notified at any moment by their employers that, owing to a glut of the market, caused by over-production or otherwise, the price of goods has fallen, and, therefore, their wages, already at the minimum required for the support of their families, must be proportionately diminished. The alternative is obvious.
They must either accept the terms offered or strike and starve. And seeing this state of things comes upon them not by their own management or mismanagement, but chiefly by the doings of others, is it not natural for them to blame those who exercise control and who continue to live in luxury when times are hard as well as prosperous? Here we do not take sides with the servant against his master—we do not justify contempt and hatred of the rich as such—neither do we palliate the improvidence and want of forethought of the poor, which so aggravate the hardships of their lot. Our wish is to state facts as they are, that we may judge wisely between the two classes. There is little doubt that in their distress, and under the influence of able demagogues like Marx, Lassalle, Bakunin, and others, working-men have borrowed from capitalists themselves the central principle of strikes, societies of Knights of Labor, and so forth—societies whose history is so graphically given by M. De Laveleye in his Socialism of To-day. We all copy from those above us. Example descends from master to servant, from prince to peasant; and, therefore, workingmen reason in this way. If persons holding capital in the form of money, bonds, and stocks can unite to great advantage and so secure power, honor, and enormous fortunes—and all this without straining or overtaxing their energies—if this is right, what ought to be, and what certainly is sanctioned and sustained by law—why should not muscle and brain, skill and capacity for work, unite for the same ends? The thing is obvious. In commercial pursuits men who are esteemed good, who are members and officers of the Church, combine to control the market and crush out weak concerns. They gain supremacy, and as the result distribute among themselves large dividends, build magnificent mansions, live luxuriously, become idle and arrogant, and despise their poor neighbors or painfully patronize them, and, when tired of doing so, or when they cannot draw from them the homage they crave, become permanent absentees from the city and country which gave them the financial ability to do as they please. Workingmen witnessing such conduct naturally say among themselves, Why should not we follow this example, and combine the kind of capital we possess, and achieve our freedom and fortunes? This is precisely what is aimed at in the many societies which have been organized. And it is not surprising that unions formed on the foundation of labor regarded as capital do not display more wisdom, justice, and benevolence than when money is the basis. The principle at bottom is the same in both cases—self-interest. The members of both sorts of organizations are creatures characterized by the same frailties and passions, and may therefore be expected to behave alike, with this difference, that while the
moral instincts and perceptions of laborers are probably as correct, if not more so, than those of the moneyed aristocracy, they have had fewer opportunities of intellectual and social culture, and have been forced by hard work and plain living to develop more robust frames and greater animal vigor, and hence when roused by provocation, real or imaginary, they naturally resort to more outrageous violence; and yet it is difficult to determine which, in the long run, is really the more dangerous to the peace and true interests of society—a combination of unprincipled capitalists or a combination of reckless socialistic laborers.

Let us now look at another class of facts which help to explain the matter in hand. The pernicious work of socialists is greatly facilitated by the aggregation in cities of vast masses of people many of them of very limited means, or even poverty-stricken. Every one knows that the rise of new cities of enormous size and the rapid growth of old ones in both hemispheres, during the present century, has been truly phenomenal. As illustrative of this we instance San Francisco, St. Louis, Chicago, New York, London, Liverpool, and Glasgow. Men have been attracted by thousands and millions into these and other great centres. This is partly due to the necessities of trade and to the intense mental activity in literary, scientific, and economic directions created at focal points. Everything exists there at its best or its worst. But there are other reasons for the prevalence of what we believe to be an injurious tendency to forsake country life and to concentrate in cities. Men were always gregarious as well as profoundly curious to see the wonders and taste the enjoyments of city life. The unsophisticated "homely swain" is eager to set his eyes upon them. The virtuous and exceptionally intelligent, conscious of native power, justly aspire to enter into the stirring movements of the highest forms of civilization. The vicious and debased crave a deeper acquaintance with evil in its strongest developments—they would fain see the devil enthroned. Cities are ready to satisfy the desires of both classes, and thus exert an irresistible centripetal power over them. They gratify the longing for fellowship with the godly, with true manhood of exalted type and noble Christian spirit; and they provide, in melancholy abundance, the fruit of the forbidden tree, which is always fatally attractive to many of the sons and daughters of Eve. This has been the case in all ages. Lot and his family were drawn into Sodom. They must enjoy city life, and were well-nigh engulfed in the vortex of its business, fashion, and moral pollutions; and countless multitudes have since followed their example. At present the inducements to this concentration in cities are advertised as never before in the history
of the world. There is no place so quiet and secluded as not to be reached by the glaring placards or secretly disseminated advertisements of vice. The press and postal service are burdened with this business, and in this way temptations to become dissatisfied with the monotonous routine of rural life are multiplied and intensified an hundredfold, while facilities to gratify the feverish wish to enter the rendezvous of vice are vastly increased. The cheapest rates possible and the quickest transit are offered by competing railways, and hence millions, who generations ago would never have been a hundred miles from their rustic homes, travel thousands of miles sightseeing. They pass from city to city spending their little patrimony looking for a fortune and finding none; but once under the spell of city life, the majority of them prefer to enjoy it permanently. This is true of men and women. It is a lamentable fact that neither money nor moral suasion can induce servant girls to remain in quiet and respectable country homes. They will face all the peculiar dangers of yielding to the strange fascination of living in the basements and garrets of city mansions. And strong men, perfectly capable of following agricultural pursuits, will not go out to plough, and sow, and reap, and be healthy and sober. They choose rather to be huddled together in tenements reeking with impurity, physical and moral, destitute of ventilation, drainage, and every approved sanitary appliance. Amid such environment they eke out a precarious existence, sometimes working and sometimes begging from door to door, and usually patronizing low theatres, rum-holes, billiard saloons, and infidel clubs. They are soon bankrupt in character and estate—own nothing but rags and vices, and are ready to shout boisterously for justice and freedom, and the instant overthrow of the robbery and tyranny perpetrated by the rich. Among dense masses of this description it is easy to hatch mischief of any sort. By the steady and increasing stream of human creatures flowing from all quarters into such corrupting centres and the rapid normal growth of population under these conditions the utmost scope is given to the most dire and potent forces in preparing abundant material for the inflammatory efforts of villainous socialists and nihilists. Can we arrest the process? That is the question, and without venturing here to answer it, let us consider other causes which promote social discontent.

The belief among workingmen that they are greatly underpaid for their services is a fruitful source of turbulence. It is contended that in every department of handicraft wages are so low as to make it barely possible for those entirely dependent on this source of income to maintain themselves and families. They cannot save any-
thing for emergencies that may come through sickness or otherwise. The greater part of the proceeds of their labor goes into the pockets of employers and others who are in the conspiracy to defraud them. As Mr. J. Willett, of Michigan, one of their number, expressed it in a letter to the Christian Union in 1885: "The Government rings, the bank rings, the Board of Trade rings, the railroad rings, the whiskey rings, the manufacturing rings, the mercantile rings, the professional rings, the mine-owners' rings, the religious rings, and the political rings live on the workingman, all and each of them; and all and each return, in many cases, but little as an equivalent for what they receive." This is putting the matter mildly. Many go much further, and declare that according to Adam Smith, Ricardo, J. S. Mill, and other eminent economists, labor is the source of all wealth. Therefore, "to the laborer all wealth justly belongs;" but, as things go, he is defrauded of, at least, half his rightful possessions. How so? Karl Marx has shown, to his own satisfaction and that of his followers, that "in six hours per day the laborer produces the equivalent of his subsistence; during the remaining six hours he produces surplus value to the profit of his employer. From this surplus, pocketed by the employer, capital comes into being." This has gone on for centuries, and classes of aristocratic idlers have arisen of which society should rid itself, because capital is manifestly the fruit of robbery committed on honest laborers. Hence millionaires, men of wealth and idle possessors of hereditary estates are criminals, and should be treated as such along with all others, whether working people, lawyers, ministers, or rulers, who defend their position. These conclusions are eagerly taken up by multitudes too ignorant or unjust to detect the fallacies which lurk under them, and thus they are carried away by a spirit of anarchy and violence. More intelligent workingmen, however, acknowledge these views to be revolutionary and self-destructive, and grant that the employer should receive a fair return for the capital he invests in machinery and raw material, the risks he incurs through competition and the fluctuations of trade, and the superior skill and business aptitude which he brings to the enterprise. But, after making these allowances, it is still maintained that there is a measure of injustice inflicted on the laborer in the distribution of profits.

We are not prepared to say that there is no truth in this position. It is more than probable that the strong may take advantage of the weak; and, besides, the processes of production and methods of distribution are so interwoven and complicated that, with the very best intentions, it may be impossible to arrive at perfect equity. But how is the specific evil of inadequate remuneration brought
about? By the natural and inevitable action, Lassalle thinks, of Ricardo's "iron law of wages," which fixes the figure at the minimum required by the laborer for subsistence. The working of this law is easily understood. Employers seek labor in the cheapest market, just as they sell their goods at the highest possible prices. This may be called ungenerous or unjust, but as society is now constituted—with its present ethical convictions—it is deemed the correct thing to do in business, and no legislation has been attempted to prevent it. Laborers, on the other hand, do not hesitate to compete with one another, and to offer their services at the very lowest figure that will yield them subsistence. They are driven to do so chiefly by pressure of two sorts. Improvidence, intemperance, indolence, sickness, and kindred causes bring many of them into such straits that they are obliged to work for what will feed and clothe them. Then the crowding of population at certain points, more than meeting the demand for labor in every line of industry, leads to the same result. How is the alleged injustice arising under these conditions to be abolished? The removal of the surplus population to new countries of abundant natural resources will give temporary relief, but only temporary, as shown by the fact that the cry of injustice in this respect is becoming as loud and violent in America as in any part of the world. Is the effectual remedy to be sought in the Malthusian principle of preventing early marriages, thus checking the growth of population and diminishing the keenest of competition? Or shall we, with J. S. Mill, in his later economic speculations, look for the remedy in "a common ownership in the raw material of the globe, and an equal participation in all the benefits of combined labor"? Without venturing an opinion upon the practicability of these suggestions, let us look at one more cause of the evil.

We are persuaded that the fundamental cause of social discontent is the unsatisfactory nature and results of secular and religious education in our day. We do not deny that the work of education has been systematized and in many respects improved. Its range of subjects has been greatly enlarged, its advantages extended to all classes, and therefore more widely diffused in this century than ever heretofore. But in elementary schools as well as in colleges it is intensely secular, and thus thoroughly one-sided and dangerous. The time and effort devoted to the development of the intellect is wholly out of proportion to the care given to moral and religious culture. The Word of God is virtually ignored in many schools, and a keen struggle is in progress over this American Continent to exclude it altogether. This is urged with resolute purpose, secretly and openly,
by Romanism and infidelity of every form. Christians are far from being agreed among themselves on this question. Those who desire to be distinguished for liberality and progressive scientific aspirations would exclude the book. Politicians and legislators, on the whole, are glad when they can avoid having anything to do with distinctive religious belief and instruction. The daily press, a powerful educating force for the masses, serves chiefly to give publicity to the sensational and offensive occurrences of society, to discuss politics, to teach utilitarian ethics, and to deepen in every way the secular spirit of the age. In the higher institutions of learning pagan philosophy and ethics, which have held sway in the leading universities of the world for centuries, still continue to be taught. Of late, too, the natural sciences, so materialistic in their tendencies and so fruitful in unverified and unsettling speculations, have gained great prominence. Enthusiastic physicists have rashly obtruded their theories and conclusions into every department of ethics and theology. Men are being gravely assured in the sacred name of science that their progenitor was not created in the image of God, with divine-like intelligence and integrity—that they are mere animals, all body and no soul—in fact, perfected or fully-developed apes, descended from a primordial germ or germs, destined to no hereafter and responsible to no Being higher than themselves. It is undeniable that these degrading ethical conceptions have permeated our literature and every department of educational work. The very textbooks and lessons of elementary schools are colored with the doctrines of evolution as well as the elaborate articles of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. We know schoolmasters who would feel ashamed to mention to their pupils the name of Jesus, or to teach them the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, who grow enthusiastic and never weary in illustrating and enforcing the Darwinian theory of the "struggle for existence and survival of the fittest." And we know learned professors who toil daily, with consummate skill and indefatigable energy, in expounding the views of Socrates, Plato, Hegel, Comte, Fichte, and Kant, who would count their time worse than wasted in teaching the ethics of Christ and His Apostles. The outcome of all this, which is not local but found everywhere, is obvious. We cannot "gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles." Hegelianism, Materialism, Agnosticism, Utilitarianism in Ethics, and, in a word, Atheism, in its many forms, are all hostile to social order and human progress. Nor can we say less of certain corrupt forms of Christianity in which dogma and practice are determined not by the Word, but by the fancies and superstitions of men, and in which the spirit of deceit, greed, and intolerance is dominant. Even Protest-
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Ant churches are found sluggish, worldly, and powerless in their testimony against sin and their efforts to teach and purify the masses, to say nothing of going into all the world to preach the Gospel to every creature. They are strong enough financially, for it must be confessed that the rich coalesce in religion as they do in business. We know large and wealthy congregations who are able to say that they have no poor among them except two or three servant girls, who manage to be invisible and unknown to all but the pastor. How is this? Is it because they are exceedingly Christ-like in spirit and activity? No, but they have become so aesthetic in all their superb appointments, and are managed on such rigid business principles as to social distinctions, high pew-rents, etc., that the poor can scarcely be tolerated in their membership—their presence would be anomalous, if not repulsive to some leading parishioners. Besides, the poor have certain feelings of self-respect, and an instinct which tells them where they are not welcome, and they keep away from such places. Then these high-toned and select religious corporations quietly move "up-town"—away from the ignorance and squalor of our great cities. Thus the gulf of separation is effectually established between the two classes; and it is possible in New York and Chicago to find wards with a population of from twenty to thirty thousand having scarcely any means of religious culture, while in other parts churches are inconveniently adjacent to one another. In Montreal twelve large Protestant churches are grouped together in an area of a few square acres. So far as gospel ordinances are concerned our cities seem to be like Ephraim—"A cake not turned"—the one side overdone and the other underdone. Wealthy saints and sinners are cared for to excess, and the poor left to shift for themselves, until they become vicious and turbulent, until they learn to despise churches, and refuse to attend them, even when brought to their doors by the efforts of City Missions. The British Weekly, a paper of Christian tone, recently published a census of attendance at all the London churches on the 24th of October last, showing, out of a population of nearly five millions, only 479,731 present in the morning and 496,561 in the evening. Probably similar figures might be furnished in very many large cities of Christendom. We say these things not in any pessimistic spirit. We recognize with gratitude a vast amount of good in the world, more than ever before, and we see definite progress being made toward still higher things. We fully believe that the gospel is the power of God to save men and to renovate society. But we cannot conceal from ourselves such facts as these—that the population of the world is now enormously larger than at any period in the past; that evil has assumed corre-
sponding proportions; that men are becoming more and more inven-
tive in wickedness, and that the father of lies finds them more apt
pupils as ages roll on. By the great formative forces at work among
them they are being educated away from God and truth and recti-
tude. Even the godly in many instances are yielding to the seduc-
tive plea that it is necessary to mingle with the world, to enter into
its society and take on its customs, in order to do good—necessary
to conciliate sin and the devil in order to overcome them. This is a
ruinous delusion and snare. We do not reclaim the abandoned and
elevate the fallen by accommodating ourselves to their maxims and
doings. Very likely "righteous Lot" may have entered Sodom
with such good intentions, but he failed to make even ten converts
during a residence of twenty years amid its abominations. The
Church's strength is in separation from the world, in listening to the
voice of God—"Come ye out from among them, and be ye sepa-
rate." But alas! in many quarters she has grown tolerant of gar-
nished vice and gloried in being liberal and fashionable, and has
thus been shorn of the consistency and the spiritual power needed to
resist the malignant forces arrayed against her mission, and, there-
fore, practical heathenism abounds within her pale and around her
to an extent sufficient of itself to account for the prevalence of social
discontent. Truth demands that we should thus place blame where
it belongs.

It is time, however, to ask the question, What is to be done in
view of this state of things? We are persuaded that nearly all the
remedies proposed or attempted by those who deem themselves suf-
ferers are unwise and destined to be unsuccessful. What are they?
Leaving out of accountsuch as avowedly breathe the spirit of de-
terminated anarchy and slaughter, we have, as underlying them all,
the proposal to place all men on an equality. This was the dream of
Aristotle. He regarded "inequality as the cause of all revolution." Hence the remedy is "absolute equality," to be secured somehow.
Grant men anything less than this, and they deem themselves cheated
of their rights and rise in rebellion. The same notion, modified and
dressed up to please themselves, appears in the writings of Montes-
quieu, Meyer, and many socialists. This theory, so grateful to vis-
ionary and vicious idlers, is embarrassed by two insuperable diffi-
culties—namely, how, consistently with principles of common
equity, to bring about this equality, and then to render it stable and
permanent. In the matter of property, were it possible to estab-
lish it to-day, it would disappear to-morrow through intemper-
ance, indolence, and folly in many forms. It is equally absurd to
look for "absolute equality" in other respects. As long as humah
depravity lasts society will contain wise men and men of every
degree of imperfect intelligence down to congenital idiots, and will
continue to be made up of rich and poor, educated and ignorant,
eminently virtuous and profoundly profligate members. It is vain
to plead Scripture in support of the levelling theory. The distinc-
tions between master and servant, ruler and subject, parent and
child, are divinely established. So far from contemplating the dis-
appearance of the two classes—the rich and the poor—the Word of
God has very specific directions for both. The former are not to be
high-minded or to trust in uncertain riches, and the latter are to
seek to be rich in faith and heirs of His kingdom. The Primitive
Church, while granting to all its members spiritual parity, was not
a "Communism" or "social democracy" in the sense of ignoring
these facts. It is true that for some time and for certain purposes
the Church in Jerusalem had a common purse, the members were of
"one heart and one soul, and had all things common." But even
then the right of private property was fully recognized, for Peter
said to Ananias touching his lies and fraud in connection with the
sale of his "possession"—"While it remained, was it not thine
own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" And
in the administration of the common fund the principle of equality
was not the ruling one, for we read that "distribution was made
unto each according as any one had need." Where no "need"
existed, of course no distribution was made.

Springing out of the false notion of securing equality there are
several proposals which may be grouped together, such as the over-
throw of titles to hereditary estates and property otherwise acquired,
the repudiation of public debts on the ground that one generation
may not bind another, the total abolition of landlordism, and the
nationalization of all property. These sweeping changes, varied, of
course, as to details according to each one's personal predilections,
have been advocated by Lassalle, Saint-Simon, Mr. A. R. Wallace,
the celebrated naturalist, Mr. Henry George, the San Francisco lec-
turer, and many others. The keen discussions which they have
provoked have elicited much truth, and cannot fail in this way to do
good, but the schemes themselves are certainly not destined to take
effect as the panacea of social discontent, because they are chiefly the
offspring of greed, irreligion, lack of reverence for God and man,
and, in many respects, even in their mildest and most carefully elab-
orated forms, visionary, unjust, and utterly impracticable. We
place in the same category strikes and all attempts to proscribe sci-
entific progress and the use of machinery. Strikes can, of course,
inconvenience the public, derange trade, and involve employers in
heavy losses, but they are boomerangs that recoil on the heads of their users with redoubled force; and all who oppose the beneficent mission of true science in dissipating superstition, elevating mankind, and adding to the sum of human happiness may expect to be frowned upon by the intelligence and Christian enterprise of the world. The grievances complained of by workingmen are not to be removed in these ways. They seriously damage their own cause by all such measures. What is needed is honesty all round, with employers and employés, rulers and subjects, and effectual checks upon the inordinate love of wealth. This may never be fully attained. The ideal may always be greatly in advance of the actual, but to look for a decided improvement is not chimerical. No sudden remedy, however, can accomplish the end desired. Since many forms of the evils in question are the growth of centuries, their mitigation or removal must be a gradual process and be brought about by a variety of agencies. The arbitrariness and injustice of powerful corporations of all sorts can only be dealt with by the concerted and persistent efforts of the people chiefly through the press and the halls of legislation. It will not do to make the foolish and revolutionary demand that they should be abolished altogether, because many of the large and most useful enterprises of modern times, such as transcontinental railway and submarine telegraph lines, can only be undertaken and operated by the combination of capital. What is required is to place them all under such restraint and control that the general interests of morality and the rights of all classes of citizens may be reasonably guarded. Surely this much is possible. Useful laws in this behalf are already in force, and recent movements, such as the demand for an Inter-State Commercial Bill, give promise of still better things. Time is requisite to mature the details of such legislation, but the principle is just, and its adoption is a decisive blow at the tyranny of privileged monopolists. It is a reproach to the civilization of the nineteenth century to say that it is impossible to get legislatures and cabinets of sufficient integrity and courage to decline bribes, and show their independence by compelling corporate bodies, as well as individuals, to have respect to principles of common equity. The matter is one for the people to settle; they are the prompters and guides of legislators. Modern rulers reflect with considerable fidelity the views of those who place them in power. Few of them assume the rôle of leaders in great moral reforms; but they are willing to give effect to the wishes of the people, good or bad. Our great desideratum, therefore, is the formation of a sound public opinion. As soon as this is done, and a decided majority unite with resolute purpose to send men of tried
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Christian character and integrity to our legislatures, we can secure all the aid that civil enactments can give in righting the gigantic wrongs that now agitate society. But law, however necessary and good, is only one agency, and quite insufficient to solve the problem. We have already hinted that the most dangerous and corrupting centres of vice are in our great cities. Active practical measures should, therefore, be taken to discourage the further aggregation of millions in these, and to ameliorate the condition of those already crowded together. It would pay the nations a thousandfold to lay out the price of a few of their ships of war upon the humane and Christian work of breaking up these huge training schools of immorality and anarchy. The people should be as speedily as possible lifted out of them, and encouraged and trained to follow agricultural pursuits. Government agencies, as well as railway companies, colonization societies, and philanthropic workers of all classes should unite their efforts to this end. There should be a dispersion of the people over the unlimited arable territories of North and South America, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. This remedial movement has already been initiated, and should be greatly extended. Many of the street arabs and idlers of London, and much of the scum of Europe, have been dumped upon our shores. We on this side of the Atlantic have not found this to be an unmingled blessing to ourselves, but to them, in the majority of cases, it has been such, and not a few of their descendants in the second and third generation have become citizens of marked respectability and affluence. But emigration and dispersion, so beneficial to many, cannot bring relief to all. There must always be factory lords with millions of laborers under them. These cannot be scattered, or, if they were, others would at once take their places. The true solution of the problem at this point is not to dissolve the relation between servant and master, but to get both to do right—the master to give fair wages and the servant to do honest work and to practise frugality, that by his savings he may become the owner of property or a shareholder in some of the companies he once thought should be destroyed. This has a wonderful quieting influence, and, so far as the efforts of different organizations of workingmen tend in this direction, it cannot be denied that they are useful. But we do not anticipate a permanent adjustment of conflicting interests by the agency of co-operative societies. Their history is by no means encouraging. As commercial enterprises they have failed, again and again, through mismanagement and dishonesty. They have been characterized by the very evils they were intended to cure. Hence we need a remedy for the faults common to both—to unions formed by laborers and by capitalists; and this is to
be found only in thorough Christian education. It is not our present business to say how such can be secured, if at all, under our so-called national systems. We wish rather to indicate what we mean by such an education, and then it may be seen how far these systems serve our purpose. We mean, generally, that from first to last the Christ of the Gospels, the Christ of history, shall have His rightful place in the work of the educator. We wish the Word of God, and especially the Incarnate Word, to be properly recognized. In order to this we do not propose to cease teaching secular branches, but only to have them taught in a Christian spirit. We do not call for less of the truth of mathematics, geography, natural science, history, and philosophy, but for more of the revealed truth of God, because while the former sharpens the faculties of the intellect, the latter alone purifies the heart. The Saviour's prayer is, "Sanctify them in the truth; Thy Word is truth." We cannot make men just, and pure, and truthful by teaching them geometry and algebra, making them experts in the calculus and astronomy. We do not thus prepare them to sustain successfully the great essential relations of life, because human society is not founded on mathematics. Neither are the moral slums of London, Paris, and New York cleansed by such agencies. A knowledge of chemistry may enable the depraved denizens of these regions to prepare and use dynamite bombs, but it will not prevent them forming murderous plots, riots, and strikes, nor persuade them to fear God and love their neighbors as themselves. Ethical teaching of a higher order than is generally imparted is required for these purposes. God's remedy must be employed if we are to lift men up out of the horrible pit and the miry clay. Not that we wish the schoolmaster to become a professor of dogmatic theology to the neglect of his present lessons, or that we would relegate this work to the officers of instruction in Arts faculties. Possibly many of them would find the task uncongenial, and their qualifications for it imperfect. What we deprecate is the very subordinate place now given to moral training, and the systematic way in which in this department the lessons of the greatest Teacher the world ever saw are ignored. The complacency with which our age is settling down in the belief that secular education, mere scientific culture, with perhaps now and then a vague allusion to God under the pagan name of Nature, supplies all that the world needs, is truly alarming. One cannot help feeling that this is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. What men need most is not greater facilities in developing the physical resources of the world, but what they have instinctively craved for in all ages—a perfect and universal
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standard of conduct. They have accordingly set up for themselves many standards, and all of them undeniably imperfect. They have longed for something better, something to come nearer their hearts, with more warmth and power, than abstract law possesses, and, as the expression of this natural wish, they have in various ways incarnated their own chosen standards. To the child the parent, for a certain number of years, is this incarnation. To his thinking right and wrong are determined by the model thus furnished. The untutored pagan clothes his imaginary god with the same character; and cultured pagans in Christian lands, who despise Him who is the Truth, look up to Voltaire, Hegel, Strauss, Darwin, or Spencer as this incarnation. The conduct and utterances of these oracles are by them invested with supreme moral authority. It is plain, therefore, that while the desire for a standard of right is universal, those selected are all imperfect, and the moral systems built upon them are an utter failure. In the person of Jesus Christ alone we have the embodiment of all moral excellence, and in His career a perfect example, which should be followed by all. He, by His own life and teachings, furnished men an absolutely infallible standard of conduct. He did more. The virtues which are specially essential to the peace, purity, and safety of society and nations were emphasized by the Incarnate God as never before. He brought into unmistakable prominence the traits of character and forms of right-doing that are commonly neglected and despised of men; and He taught with a new power, never before felt by the human heart, the virtues which antagonize and overcome the vices that pre-eminently mar society. What are these vices? Pride is one of them. It is found everywhere. The world is full of it, and it poisons all the relations of life. It embitters the relations between master and servant, rich and poor, and does its deadly work in rending asunder the bond of universal brotherhood, and dividing men into detestable castes and coteries in Church and State. And we can only oppose this vile passion successfully and heal the breaches which it makes by teaching and following the humility of Jesus Christ as exhibited in the fact—which is the great fact of history and the fundamental miracle of Christianity—that, as the Eternal Son of God, He became man, became the child not of the palace but of the manger, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and stooped to wash His disciples' feet. Let the lordly owners of the world's wealth and the employers of laborers to-day show the same spirit, and the strife between them will be greatly abated.

Another cardinal vice which, as we have seen, is most disturbing in its influence, is selfishness, usually allied with greed and injustice.
It has been well observed by Sir James Macintosh that selfishness is a vice utterly at variance with the true happiness of him who harbors it. Thomas Hobbes has gone further, and maintained that it is the dominant principle of human nature, hence every one claims an equal right to everything regardless of the interests of others, and thus the natural state of society becomes one of chronic warfare. Let this pass for what it is worth. Certain it is that many of the hardships and forms of injustice of which workingmen complain fairly enough come from gross selfishness on the part of employers; while, on the other hand, the perfunctory service often rendered by laborers and the coercive measures they adopt in relation to their superiors must be traced to the same origin.

Now where do we find the virtue of pure benevolence, consideration for the interests of others, regard not only to justice but true kindness, placed in most direct antithesis to this odious vice of selfishness? In the mission and teachings of the Son of God. His whole career among men was an emphatic rebuke of selfishness. He was constantly thinking and acting not for Himself merely, but for others. His life, as well as His death, was vicarious, a sacrifice for others, for the undeserving—for His avowed enemies. The question with Him was not the one so often asked by dispensers of alms in our day, Is the recipient worthy? but rather is he worthless, helpless, lost—the chief of sinners? Then all the more should he be treated with infinite compassion and kindness. Again we say, let employers of all grades, from our railway kings and manufacturing princes down to the master and mistress of a French flat in New York, show this spirit in some good degree, and let it be emphasized from the pulpit, and the causes of complaint, which, we grant, are frequently exaggerated by laborers, and the pernicious passions which rankle in their hearts, will greatly disappear.

Thus we might pass over the whole field of ethics, showing how the vices, secret and open, which prey upon society are antagonized and condemned by the life and lessons of Jesus, and the opposite virtues made to stand out, under the strongest light, in bold relief. We know that to be a distinguished Teacher, in the Socinian sense, was not the sole or even chief end of Christ’s mission. He came to redeem, to give His life a ransom for many, and He sends His spirit into the world to convince of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and to give spiritual life to His people. We know, too, that nothing short of the whole doctrine of Christ will suffice. The Socinian, the Romish, the Ritualistic, the Sacramentarian, the Rationalistic or highly Æsthetic version of it, is not fit to master the evil we have in hand. All such misrepresentations of the Gospel do
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not help but hinder the solution of our problem. To restore order and establish it on a firm basis what we require is that masters and servants should be good men—men of God—whose hearts and lives are ruled by the truth and the Spirit of God; and there is only one way of reaching this end, and that is by redoubling our efforts for the moral and spiritual education of the world. Let it be prosecuted with diligence and vigor in all Christian homes. Let our educational activity everywhere, from the elementary lessons of the primary school to the most profound and erudite investigations of university professors, be permeated by the ethical principles of Jesus Christ. Let us cast the salt of Divine truth into these fountains, and thus cleanse them from the filth of heathenism by which they have been so long defiled both in classical and philosophical studies. Let the Church bestir herself, and project missions at home and abroad on a scale yet scarcely thought of; and let her not fear to tell the rich and the lofty, as well as the humble and obscure, that the countless millions now spent in strong drink and other hurtful stimulants and narcotics, while a few thousands are given to the cause of God, are a standing disgrace to Christianity. Let her cease putting on airs and courting the smiles of the worshippers of mammon, and let her come down to the lapsed masses, and make her presence and power felt among them. In one word, let all the resources and redeemed energies of God's people and the manifold agencies—including the press, pulpit, and platform—at the command of Christendom be used a thousandfold more than at present in disseminating truth; and let the thinking of our age draw its inspiration from Him who wields all power in heaven and in earth, and we shall thus employ the best possible means to end all forms of social discontent.

D. H. MACVICAR.

Montreal.
VI.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH: A REPLY TO DR. CRAVEN.

A N Overture contemplating an amendment of the Confession of Faith is before the Presbyteries for their consideration. It concerns the relatively unimportant matter of marriages of affinity; but it necessarily raises the very grave question, How may the Confession of Faith be amended? There is not a syllable in answer to this question in any of the formularies which together make up the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. The only provision for an amendment of the Constitution is embodied in the following action of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1788:

"The Synod having fully considered the draught of the Form of Government and Discipline, did, on review of the whole, and hereby do ratify and adopt the same as now altered and amended, as the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America, and order the same to be considered and strictly observed as the rule of their proceedings by all the inferior judicatories belonging to the body. And they order that a correct copy be printed, and that the Westminster Confession of Faith, as now altered, be printed along with it, as making a part of the Constitution.

"Resolved, That the true intent and meaning of the above ratification by the Synod is, that the Form of Government and Discipline and the Confession of Faith, as now ratified, is to continue to be our constitution and the confession of our faith and practice unalterable, unless two thirds of the Presbyteries under the care of the Assembly shall propose alterations or amendments, and such alterations and amendments shall be agreed to and enacted by the General Assembly."

The meaning of this language is unmistakable. Yet Dr. Craven maintains* that the constitutional method of amending the Confession of Faith is by an Overture submitted by the General Assembly to the Presbyteries, and approved by a majority of them. He therefore holds that the Adopting Act, with what he calls "the supplementary resolution," quoted above, is not of binding force: his reasons being (1) that the Adopting Act is not part of the Constitution; (2) that it is in conflict with the Constitution; and (3) that its authority has not been recognized by the General Assembly. These reasons, however, are very inadequate.

*Presbyterian Review, January, 1887.
i. Says Dr. Craven: "It seems to be unquestionable, it must be acknowledged, that it was the intent of the majority of the Synod that framed and adopted 'The Constitution' to establish as the rule of its amendment the resolution supplementary to the Adopting Act. If such was their intent, however, their mistake was in not making it a part of the Constitution itself." There is no good reason for making such a distinction between the Adopting Act and "the supplementary resolution" as would imply that the latter is possessed of less authority than the former. If the Synod, in adopting certain formularies, as the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, proceeded then to say what the intent and meaning of that adoption was, the resolution setting forth that intent and meaning must have as much authority as the resolution adopting the formularies. There is nothing to justify the sharp distinction which Dr. Craven makes between the Adopting Act and the supplementary resolution, and there is certainly no reason for treating one with greater consideration than the other. Throughout this article the entire action of the Synod quoted above will be spoken of as the Adopting Act.

It cannot be maintained that the Adopting Act is invalidated because it does not happen to be a part of the Constitution. Let it be remembered that the word "Constitution," as Dr. Craven is at such pains to show, was not employed then with the fixed meaning that it has now, and that the members of the Synod of 1788 were not as familiar as we have since become with chapters in written instruments on the mode of amending the Constitution. Dr. Craven says that "the records of no deliberative body of acknowledged intellectual power can show a similar indeterminateness in the use of an important word." It need not surprise us, therefore, that, instead of amending the Form of Government by inserting a section providing for a mode of changing the Constitution, and then adopting the Form of Government thus amended as part of the Constitution, the Synod simply tied up the Form of Government, Book of Discipline, and Confession of Faith in one bundle, and, as it were, wrote upon the cover: Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, unalterable except by consent of two-thirds of the Presbyteries and a subsequent vote of the General Assembly. It is "unquestionable" that the Synod meant to determine the mode of amending the Constitution. It has expressed its intention clearly. It could easily have incorporated this in the text of the Form of Government. Had this been done Dr. Craven would have recognized the rule as binding until repealed. Granting that it were a "mistake" for the Synod not to embody its intention in the Constitution, what is to govern us?—the Synod's "mistake," or the Synod's intention? It is very clear that Dr.
Craven cannot consistently deny the binding force of the Adopting Act, for in the first part of his article he is careful to show that the Form of Government, Book of Discipline, and Confession of Faith are all subject to the same rule regarding constitutional amendments, being all alike parts of the Constitution. His only authority for this is the Adopting Act of 1788. If, however, the Adopting Act is good authority for saying what the Constitution is, it is good authority for saying how it ought to be amended. Dr. Craven’s objection seems to assume that nothing can be binding upon the Church outside of the written instruments which make up the Constitution. But this is a mistake; for if the action adopting the Constitution be not binding, how can the Constitution itself be binding? How indeed does it continue to be the Constitution, except through the continued operation of the Act adopting it as such?

2. Dr. Craven says that the failure of the Synod of 1788 to put into the Constitution the provisions of the Adopting Act regarding amendments is more especially a mistake “in view of the fact that apparently another and an inconsistent rule was set forth in the Form of Government, ch. xii. [xi.], § 6.” Speaking of the Assembly of 1799, he says: “It is impossible to suppose that the Assembly acted in ignorance or oversight of the resolution of 1788. The only tenable hypothesis of its course seems to be that its members regarded the two provisions concerning amendments as in conflict, and that as the one was in the Constitution itself, it should prevail over the other.” He repeats the same idea when speaking of the Assembly of 1800, and explains their action by supposing that “the majority regarded the provisions of the supplementary resolution and that of the Form of Government as in conflict, and that as the latter was a provision of the Constitution itself, it should prevail.” How far Dr. Craven holds the view imputed to the two Assemblies here referred to does not appear, though from the first of the passages just quoted it is fair to suppose that he regards the Form of Government and the Adopting Act as presenting conflicting methods of amending the Constitution. A very slight consideration will show, however, that there is no conflict whatever between the Adopting Act and the Form of Government.

It is fair to suppose that the Synod of 1788 which adopted the Constitution would not be likely to pass a resolution conflicting with one of the fundamental principles of the Constitution. But it is not improbable, on the other hand, that men who were afterward accustomed to read the Form of Government, and who were not in the habit of reading the ecclesiastical records of former years, might lose sight of the Adopting Act and interpret chap. xii. [xi.], § 6, of the
Form of Government as a provision for effecting constitutional amendments. Taking this view of the rule in the Form of Government just referred to, and not inquiring into the history of it, it would be very easy for the men who sat in the Assembly of 1800 to suppose, when their attention was turned to the Adopting Act, that the two were incompatible. It is certainly far easier, at all events, to see how the Assembly of 1800 might erroneously infer that the Adopting Act and the Form of Government were incompatible, than to imagine that the Synod of 1788 passed a resolution that was actually incompatible with the Form of Government which in its amended form they had just adopted. Nothing but absolute necessity should lead us to say, with the Assembly of 1800, that the Synod of 1788 is chargeable with such a blunder.

There is, however, no reason whatever for saying this; for a consideration of the historical conditions under which the rule referred to entered into the Form of Government removes all difficulty. The rule is simply the Barrier Act of the Church of Scotland. Upon the principle ejus est interpretari cujus est condere, it is fair to assume that the true interpretation of chap. xii. [xi.], § 6, of our Form of Government, is to be found in the history of the Scotch Barrier Act. The rule, as adopted by the Synod of 1788, read as follows:

"Before any overtures or regulations proposed to the Council [Assembly] to be established as standing rules shall be obligatory on the churches, it shall be necessary to transmit them to all the Presbyteries, and to receive the returns of at least a majority of the Presbyteries in writing, approving of them."

The Scotch Barrier Act reads thus:

"That before a General Assembly of this Church pass any acts which are to be binding rules and constitutions to the churches, the same acts be first proposed as Overtures to the Assembly, and being by them passed as such be remitted to the consideration of the several Presbyteries of this Church, and their opinion and consent reported by their commissioners to the next General Assembly following; who may then pass the same into acts if the more general opinion of the Church thus had agree thereunto."

The Barrier Act was intended to prevent hasty legislation and the usurpation of power on the part of the General Assembly. From 1560 until after the Revolution (1688), says Principal Hill, the General Assembly was in the habit of exercising legislative authority, but after 1697 this Barrier Act prevented such legislation. The fair presumption is that when the framers of our formularies put the Scotch Barrier Act into the Form of Government, they put it there to serve the purpose which the same act served in Scotland. In other words, they meant it to be a check upon the legislative powers of the Assembly. This presumption is supported by the fact that the
Barrier Act in our Form of Government is part of a chapter that defines the powers of the General Assembly.

"To the General Assembly also belongs the power of deciding in all controversies respecting doctrine or discipline; of reproving, warning, or bearing testimony against error in doctrine, or immorality in practice, in any church, presbytery, or synod; of creating new synods when it may be judged necessary; of superintending the concerns of the whole Church; of corresponding with foreign churches in such terms as may be agreed upon by the General Assembly and the corresponding body; of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations; and, in general, of recommending and attempting reformation of manners and the promotion of charity, truth, and holiness through all the churches under their care."

The revision of the standards is not embraced in the powers of the General Assembly; yet it is clear from the position which the Barrier Act occupies in the Form of Government, as the section immediately following the passage just quoted, that it has reference to the legislative powers of the Assembly and to nothing else. The view has been advanced lately by a prominent writer in our Church that, while a revision of the Constitution requires, according to the Adopting Act, the approval of two-thirds of the Presbyteries, additions can be made to it by a vote of a majority. The provision in chap. xii. [xi.], §6, of the Form of Government is thus held to apply to "additions" but not to "alterations" of the Constitution. But obviously this view is wrong; for an addition is an alteration, and the Adopting Act declares that the Constitution is "unalterable" unless two-thirds of the Presbyteries, etc. And there is no reason why the process of addition should be made easier than that of subtraction. The faith of the Church could be quite as much imperilled by the one method as the other. But this view of the meaning of chap. xii. [xi.], §6, of the Form of Government is unhistorical, and therefore wrong. The key to the interpretation of this passage is, as has been already said, the Barrier Act of the Church of Scotland. Taking this view of its meaning, it is easy to show its entire harmony with the Adopting Act. It is true that the Adopting Act regards the Presbyteries, and that chap. xii. [xi.], §6, of the Form of Government (or, in other words, the Barrier Act), regards the Assembly as taking the initiative. The Adopting Act requires two-thirds, and the Barrier Act only a majority, as the measure of Presbyterial approval necessary to legislation; and these positions are in conflict if the two rules refer to the same thing. But they refer to entirely different things. The two-thirds rule of the Adopting Act has exclusive reference to constitutional amendments; the majority rule in the Barrier Act has no reference to constitutional amendments whatever. The Adopting Act provides the mode of amending certain formularies which together make up the Constitution; the Barrier
Act is meant to cover matters of legislation outside of the Constitution altogether. The supposition that there is any conflict between the two is utterly needless.

3. Dr. Craven says that the Adopting Act (meaning that part of it which he calls the "supplementary resolution") has not been recognized by the General Assembly. "So far from acting thereon, the united Church from the beginning, even when prominent members of the Synod of 1788 were in her Assemblies, has always acted on the rule contained in the Form of Government. . . . So far from changing (amending) the supplementary resolution of 1788, she has unvaryingly treated it as of no authority, and has acted on the provision of the Form of Government, chap. xii. [xi.], § 6, as though it alone touched the matter of constitutional amendments, and also covered the entire field thereof. Not only has every amendment been adopted, but every proposition for amendment (including one for the amendment of the Confession) has been made on the basis of the provision in the Form of Government." This is by far the most important reason assigned by Dr. Craven in support of his contention. His plea is plausible, but not invulnerable. The citations from Dr. Craven's article made above raise two questions, one of fact, the other of inference from the fact. How far is it true that the Assembly has ignored the Adopting Act? and how far does the practice of the General Assembly settle the question respecting the binding force of the Adopting Act of 1788?

Let it be observed, then, in answer to the first question, that it is only in a very qualified way that it can be justly said that the Assembly has treated the Adopting Act as of no authority. For, in the first place, no amendment of the Confession of Faith has been made since 1788. There is no precedent, therefore, in support of Dr. Craven's position, so far as the Confession is concerned. Dr. Craven, of course, may say that since the Form of Government and the Confession are both parts of the Constitution, the rule for amending the two is the same. But the question now under discussion is not how the Assembly ought to act, but how it has acted; and it must not be forgotten that Dr. Craven cannot say that the Assembly ought to act regarding the Confession of Faith as it has acted regarding the Form of Government without falling back upon the very Adopting Act whose binding force he is seeking to invalidate through the help of the Assembly's precedents. But, in the second place, there is good reason to believe that the General Assembly did not intend to include the Confession of Faith in what it called the Constitution. The Assembly of 1799, in reply to a memorial from the Presbytery of New York, interpreted the expression "standing rules" in Form
of Government, chap. xii. [xi.], § 6, to mean "articles of the constitution." Dr. Craven assumes that they used the word "constitution" with the same breadth of meaning as that given it in the Adopting Act, and that therefore by the interpretation of this Assembly of "standing rules," and by the subsequent change of "standing rules" into "constitutional rules," warrant is given for amending the Confession of Faith according to the provision of Form of Government, chap. xii. [xi.], § 6. But if we read the action of the Assembly of 1799, and particularly that portion of it that Dr. Craven prints in italics, it will appear that the Assembly was not using the word "constitution" with as much amplitude as Dr. Craven supposes. "The minute of the Overture is as follows (italics mine)"

"The respective Presbyteries were and they hereby are required to send up to the next Assembly their opinion on the section of the Constitution referred to, and if they think proper to advise and empower said Assembly to make the alteration therein proposed in the phraseology of this section, according to the mode pointed out in the Constitution for effecting any alteration in that instrument."

"That instrument" (italics mine). What instrument? The Constitution is here identified with "that instrument" which contained the section that the Assembly was proposing to amend; that is to say, the Form of Government and Discipline. The Confession of Faith formed no part of "that instrument." Dr. Craven seems to assume that when the Assembly of 1799 speaks of the Constitution it had the Adopting Act in mind, and intended to include the Confession of Faith, whereas it is almost certain that it had in view only those formularies that refer to the administration of government. There is no evidence that the Assemblies of 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, and 1803 had any intention of including the doctrinal standards in what they called "constitutional rules." It is true that the Assembly of 1804 said that "no amendments can be made in our Standards till a majority of the Presbyteries shall have expressed their approbation thereof in writing;" but this is the only instance in which a General Assembly can be said to have explicitly sanctioned the idea that the Confession of Faith may be amended by vote of a majority of the Presbyteries. The action of the Assemblies of 1826 and 1827, so far as it has any weight, favors Dr. Craven's view. But that of 1826 has as little weight as the action of the Assembly of 1886, in the case of the overture now pending. The probability is that it was sent down to the Presbyteries as the present overture was sent down, without any consideration of the question how the Confession may be amended, and being a case of coram non judice, does not deserve much consideration. The testimony of the Assem-
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bly of 1827 is even of still less importance, for it is simply the tacit acceptance of a Report to the effect that the consent of forty-five Presbyteries is necessary "to make any alteration in the Constitution of the Church;" "that fifty of them had voted against the erasure, and eighteen in favor of it," and that "the section, therefore, is not to be erased." It is possible that if the overture had received the approval of forty-five Presbyteries, the Assembly of 1827 would have ordered the section referred to to be erased; but it is more than probable that the attention of the Assembly would have been called to the provisions of the Adopting Act by some one opposed to the amendment, and it is not unlikely that the defenders of the Adopting Act would have come out of the debate with flying colors. As the Overture was overwhelmingly defeated, however, no one took the trouble to raise the abstract question as to the mode of making constitutional amendments; and the result is that the unchallenged Report of a Committee that was never formally adopted comes now to be cited as a precedent in support of Dr. Craven's position. But Dr. Craven would probably admit that the precedents of 1826 and 1827 are very greatly diminished in value by the considerations just named. It is plain, in fact, that while Dr. Craven cites the precedents of 1826 and 1827 in behalf of his contention, they do not constitute his main support. The strength of his case is not what the Assembly has done, but what in his judgment it might, could, would, and should do. It is only in the very partial and relatively unimportant way implied in the action of the Assembly in 1826, 1827 and 1886 that he can show that the Adopting Act has been ignored by the Assembly so far as it applies to the Confession of Faith. But the revision of the Form of Government having been effected by the provisions of the Barrier Act, it may be said that there is no reason why the revision of the Confession may not be effected in the same way. "It is vain to object," says Dr. Craven, "that all the proposed amendments, save one in 1826, respected books other than the Confession. This, indeed, is true; but the object of amendment mentioned in the deliverances of the Assemblies is the CONSTITUTION, and of this the Confession forms a part." Herein, however, Dr. Craven reveals his fallacy. He does not follow the Assembly in distinguishing, as the Assembly of 1799 evidently did, between the Confession of Faith and "articles of the constitution;" nor does he follow the Adopting Act in maintaining the necessity of a two-thirds vote as the condition of constitutional amendment. His position is a singular one,—being in fact based in part upon the action of Assemblies whose decisions he does not accept, and in part on provisions of the Adopting Act whose binding force he is so anxious to set aside.
He takes the Adopting Act as his authority for what makes the Constitution, and so contradicts the Assembly of 1799; and he takes the Assembly as his authority for amending the Constitution by a majority vote, and so contradicts the Adopting Act of 1788. This, however, by the way. It is more important to remember just now that the Adopting Act has never been set aside by any Assembly before whom the subject of constitutional amendments was discussed, to any extent beyond the application of the rule of the Adopting Act to the Form of Government and Discipline; and that while it is true that the Assemblies of 1799 and 1803 supposed that the provisions of chap. xii.[xi.], §6, of the Form of Government, were applicable to the formularies just mentioned, there is no evidence that they regarded them as applicable to the Confession of Faith; but, on the contrary, strong reasons for supposing that they did not.

But though it were possible to show that the General Assembly has invariably used the word "Constitution" in the sense defined by the Adopting Act, and though it were proper to argue, as Dr. Craven does, that the General Assembly's precedents for amending the Form of Government may be fairly regarded as expressing the view of the General Assembly respecting amendments of the Confession, it would by no means follow that Dr. Craven's conclusion is correct. His position is that since the Form of Government, being part of the Constitution, is amended by a majority vote of the Presbyteries, therefore the Confession, being also part of the Constitution, may be amended in the same way. It does not occur to Dr. Craven apparently that one may also argue that since the Confession of Faith, being part of the Constitution, can be amended only by a two-thirds vote of the Presbyteries, therefore the Form of Government and Book of Discipline, being also parts of the Constitution, must be amended in the same way. To reason in that way would, of course, call in question the legality of many changes that have been made in the Form of Government and Book of Discipline; and it would raise the inquiry how far the practice of the Assembly is conclusive in respect to what is the law of the Presbyterian Church. Dr. Craven closes his article with a sentence which does not indeed avow any dogmatic conviction on the part of the author regarding the latter point, though it clearly implies that Dr. Craven is of the opinion that it would be a bold thing for any one to call in question the "unvarying judgment" of the General Assembly on a point of ecclesiastical law. "If there be any force," he says, "in the unvarying judgment of the Supreme Court of the united Church as to the interpretation of its Constitution, then it is manifest that the rule for the amendment of all portions of the Constitution is the one
The mention of the "Supreme Court of the united Church" very naturally suggests the analogy of the Supreme Court of the United States. But it must be remembered that the General Assembly is a legislative as well as a judicial body, and that the question here under discussion has never in a single instance been presented to the General Assembly when sitting in a judicial capacity, and under the formalities and restrictions of judicial action. The General Assembly has dealt with the question only as a legislative body, and then in serious consideration of its merits only in a very few instances. The analogy just referred to is therefore seriously disabled by this consideration; and the force of Dr. Craven's argument is still further diminished when, as has been shown, it is impossible, even on the legislative side of Assembly action, to appeal to an "unvarying judgment" in support of the position for which Dr. Craven contends.

If, however, it were true that the General Assembly had by "unvarying judgment" interpreted the Constitution in accordance with Dr. Craven's views, it would not follow that either Dr. Craven or the Assembly would be right; for no one would deny that the General Assembly might err, and that successive Assemblies might fall into the same mistake. So that, though it were shown that a certain position represented the unvarying judgment of the Assembly, it would not necessarily follow that the position is right. It is safe to say, then, that Dr. Craven's third reason for denying the binding force of the Adopting Act is inadequate. And here this discussion might properly end; for the language of the Adopting Act is so plain and its place in Presbyterian history so fundamental that it may be fairly regarded as binding until the opposite is proven. This much, however, may be conceded to Dr. Craven,—that since the Assembly has ignored the Adopting Act so far as the Form of Government is concerned, and since there is a presumption always in favor of the Assembly's wisdom, it is but fair that, having shown the inadequacy of Dr. Craven's reasons for denying the binding force of the Adopting Act, something further should be said in support of the position advocated in this article.

The Adopting Act may be called the condition precedent of the organization of the Presbyterian Church, and on that account occupies a position of peculiar importance. To make the matter clearer, let the principle involved here be considered from a point of view nearer the present time. The Reunion of the Old and New School branches of the Presbyterian Church was effected in 1859 in accord-
ance with a certain Basis of Union. Will any one deny that that Basis of Union is still binding? Suppose that, contrary to the terms of that Basis, the precedents of either branch during the period of separation were made the basis of ecclesiastical decisions; or that the General Assembly were to decide that the Confession of Faith is no longer a symbol of the Church's Faith, contrary to the stipulation that it "shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted"—would not such action be wrong, and unconstitutional? Yet the Basis of Union is not a part of the Constitution; and it seems, therefore, that the violation of an extra-constitutional rule may be an unconstitutional act. Suppose now that successive Assemblies should continue, without protest from any quarter, to violate the Basis of Union. Would not these acts still be unconstitutional? Would wrong ever become right by repetition? Would the "unvarying judgment" of a hundred Assemblies legalize an inherently unconstitutional procedure? Clearly the united Church owes its existence to this Basis of Union, and a violation of this Basis is a violation of contract. Let us go back, then, to the period prior to 1837, remembering that the present united Church is the legal successor of the respective Old and New School Presbyterian Churches, and so of the undivided Church prior to 1837. The Church prior to 1837 sustained a relation to the Adopting Act somewhat analogous to that which the Church to-day sustains to the Basis of Union. The Synod of New York and Philadelphia was the Presbyterian Church, and had full power to make and adopt rules for its own government. That Synod decided that the time had come to complete the organization of the Presbyterian Church by constituting a General Assembly. Preparatory to this step it adopted the formularies known as the Constitution, and having adopted them in 1788, it organized four Synods and arranged for the meeting of the General Assembly. The adoption of the Constitution and the organization of the General Assembly were the result of the action of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1788. The Assembly being created by the act of the Synod, it must be bound by it. By that act the Synod adopted a Constitution and provided the terms according to which it may be amended. Will any one deny that if the Assembly of 1789 or 1790 had repudiated the Confession of Faith, and had adopted the Racovian catechism instead, it would have acted unconstitutionally; and that the party remaining faithful to the Adopting Act, however small it might have been, would have been the true successor, in equity at least, of the Synod that constituted the Assembly? At what period, then, in the history of the succeeding Assemblies did the Adopting Act cease to be binding, if, indeed, it be not binding?
The Adopting Act provides that the Constitution may be amended by vote of two-thirds of the Presbyteries. Suppose that this provision had been placed in the Constitution. Then two-thirds of the Presbyteries might have overthrown the Assembly to change the provision requiring two-thirds by substituting a smaller fraction.

Dr. Craven thinks that if the Synod meant to require a two-thirds vote as the condition of constitutional amendment, they ought to have put this provision in the Constitution. But the Synod's plan gives greater security against change. For if the mode of amending the Constitution be part of the Constitution, it is conceivable that two-thirds of the Presbyteries might recommend the Assembly to change the Constitution by substituting the word "majority" for "two-thirds." But suppose that it is thought desirable to change the Adopting Act, how is it to be done? Can the General Assembly, by a vote of a majority, set it aside? They have no such authority. Can the Presbyteries, by a two-thirds vote, overture the Assembly, and in this way legalize the repeal? That is a provision, however, that is found only in the Adopting Act itself, and has application only to the Constitution. The attempt to repeal it by means of its own provisions would be an admission that it is still binding; and the application to it of provisions which it makes with exclusive reference to other formulas would be without warrant. So far, then, from wishing that the mode of amending the Constitution had been made a part of the Constitution, or believing that its binding force is lessened through lack of this, it is safe to say that it is better where it is; and that, standing where it does, it must always be the rule whereby constitutional amendments are to be effected.

It may be said, however, that since the General Assembly is the highest judicatory in the Church, there is no appeal from its decisions, even though they may be wrong. This is only saying that there is no remedy for the wrong that would be done if the highest judicatory of the Church should persistently override its written law. This, however, introduces a more serious phase of the question. The Presbyterian Church sustains fiduciary relations to large property interests which have been acquired under a Constitution that contemplates the conservation and perpetuation of a definite system of doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, and that can be legally changed only under the operation of a very definite rule. This rule protects the rights of every minority exceeding one-third of the Presbyteries. If now the rights of this minority were to be disregarded, and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church radically changed by a vote of a bare majority of the Presbyteries, it is not difficult to
conceive that schism might occur, and a suit be instituted to secure these property rights and determine the question of legal succession between rival Assemblies. It would be alleged, on the authority of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of the Walnut Street Church in Louisville,* perhaps, that the civil courts could not go behind the decisions of the highest courts of the Church in the interpretation of the Constitution of the Church. But it is difficult to believe that this position would be maintained: for while it is true that the decisions of ecclesiastical courts must be conclusive in certain matters of ecclesiastical discipline, even though they involve questions concerning the rights of property, provided that these decisions are made in a constitutional way,—it does not follow that the civil court can decline the burden of determining whether the decision has been made in a constitutional way.† If a bequest or devise in trust were given to a Theological Seminary, or to any of the Boards or other institutions of the Church, upon condition that, should the General Assembly ever amend the Confession of Faith in an unconstitutional manner, the property should revert to the testator's heirs, and the heirs should bring suit for its recovery on the ground just referred to, it seems reasonable to suppose that the courts would be compelled to inquire into the constitutionality of the Assembly's proceedings. If now the General Assembly were called upon to defend an action involving the unconstitutionality of its proceedings, it would hardly do to say that the Assembly's action is sufficient evidence of constitutionality; for that would be equivalent to saying that the Assembly is not bound by the provisions of its own Constitution. Nor would it do to say that an act that was unconstitutional at first became constitutional by repetition; for usage has not yet become a good plea for breach of faith. In the event of a suit of the kind imagined, there can hardly be a doubt that the courts would hold that the Adopting Act of 1788 is the rule according to which all amendments of the Constitution are to be effected.

The Adopting Act and the Barrier Act are the two fundamental principles controlling the legislation of the Presbyterian Church. The first has reference to the mode of amending the Constitution.

† The case of Watson v. Jones does not precisely correspond to the one supposed here; but it seems not to have governed the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in the case of the Second Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia; for Mr. Justice Gordon, in delivering the opinion in that case, said: "We confine ourselves to the single question of the regularity of the Synodical decree dissolving the Second Congregation," etc. Kerr's Appeal, 89 Pa. St. Rep. 97.
Dr. Craven is quite correct in saying that there is only one rule for amending the Constitution, and that it is applicable alike to the Confession of Faith, the Form of Government, and Book of Discipline. He is wrong, however, in supposing that that rule is found in the Form of Government, chap. xii. [xi.], § 6. That rule is given in the Adopting Act. It follows, therefore, that all changes that have been made in the Form of Government and Book of Discipline without the consent of two-thirds of the Presbyteries and a subsequent enactment of the Assembly have been unconstitutional.

The Barrier Act, however, is intended to serve a different purpose. The Presbyteries of New York were right when they said to the General Assembly of 1799 that the rule enacted by a previous Assembly "for the government of Presbyteries in the reception of foreign ministers" was unconstitutional, because it had not been submitted to the Presbyteries as required in Form of Government, chap. xii. [xi.], § 6; and the General Assembly of 1799 were wrong when they interpreted "standing rules" in the article just referred to as applying to "articles of the constitution," and as intended to provide a mode of amending the Form of Government. The error respecting the import of the Barrier Act crept into the Church in 1799, and has kept its place there ever since. More than once since then the General Assembly has adopted rules and made them obligatory upon the churches without first submitting them to the Presbyteries; but in doing this the Assembly has acted ultra vires and in violation of a specific provision of the Form of Government. Through a misinterpretation of chap. xii. [xi.], § 6, of the Form of Government, the Church has been led into errors of two descriptions. In applying it unwarrantably to changes in the Constitution, it has failed to apply it to legislation outside of the Constitution. Many of the difficulties which now beset the Church, some hasty and ill-advised legislation, and much of the existing difference of opinion respecting the legislative powers of the Assembly, would have been avoided if the Assembly had paid strict regard to the difference between the Adopting Act and the Barrier Act, refusing to amend the Constitution without the approval of two-thirds of the Presbyteries, and refusing also to make any rules intended to bind the churches until the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries had been secured.

There is no reason, however, for the continued repetition of these mistakes, but very strong reasons for avoiding them. There is needed:

1. A return to the Adopting Act as the law governing all changes in the Constitution.
2. A more formal recognition of the legislative powers of the Assembly, qualified as to matters intended to be obligatory upon the churches, by the provisions of the Barrier Act.

The advantage of this is obvious. There is a fixed and a variable element in the Church's life. This fixed element is represented in the Constitution, changes in which should be few and made with great deliberation. There is very properly great sensitiveness throughout the Church respecting frequent propositions to change the Constitution. On the other hand there is a variable element; new exigencies demand new legislation, which should be provided for by enactments of the Assembly. If legislation did not mean, as under existing practice it so commonly does, a change in the Form of Government—the addition of a chapter or the erasure of a section—there would be no reason why Presbyteries should be inhospitable to overtures submitted to them by the Assembly. It would be flexible, and a law could be amended or repealed as circumstances might suggest. The Acts of the Assembly, like those of any other legislative body, should be drawn carefully, discussed deliberately, and recorded according to a system that would make reference to them easy. Those intended to be obligatory on the churches should be sent down to the Presbyteries, as required in Form of Government, chap. xii. [xi.], § 6, and should become law only when approved by a majority of them, and enacted by a subsequent Assembly.

The present method of the Assembly is open to serious criticism. Legislative enactments without approval of Presbyteries; in thesi deliverances which, however valuable, are not obligatory; and judgments in appellate cases, which alone are authoritative as precedents to the inferior judicatories, are very apt to be quoted without much discrimination,—the result being, that while some are willing to treat every decision of the Assembly that they may find in the "Minutes" as law, others are beginning to treat all the decisions of the Assembly as having little or no binding force. This state of things must continue until it is made clear that there is a great distinction to be observed between the opinions of the Assembly sometimes called "deliverances," which have only moral weight, but are not laws; its judgments rendered in appellate cases, which alone should be cited as decisions of the Supreme Court of the Church; and its legislative enactments, which, if intended to be obligatory upon the churches, must be made in accordance with the provisions of the Barrier Act.

FRANCIS L. PATTON.
THE WORK OF JOHN DURIE IN BEHALF OF CHRISTIAN UNION IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

John Durie was the great peacemaker of the seventeenth century. He did a noble work in behalf of Christian union during the evil times of the thirty years' war on the Continent of Europe, and the great civil wars of Great Britain. He persevered in his peacemaking notwithstanding every obstacle for half a century. He first appears as a peacemaker in 1628 at Elbing, a city of Prussia, where he was ministering to a congregation of British merchants residing there. Dr. Godeman, a civil judge and privy counsellor of Gustavus Adolphus, the great King of Sweden, invited him to co-operate in an effort for ecclesiastical peace among Protestants. The King of Sweden gave his sanction to the enterprise. Soon afterward Sir Thomas Roe came into those parts as an ambassador of the King of England to seek a reconciliation between the Swedes and the Poles, which was happily accomplished. He also entered heartily into the scheme and gained the Lord Chancellor Oxenstiern of Sweden to lend his assistance and use his great influence with the Lutheran clergy. The pastors of the neighboring city of Danzig gave in their adhesion to the plan. It was deemed best that Durie should go to England and secure the aid of the English prelates. Accordingly he went to England in 1630 with letters from the divines of Prussia and was recommended to King Charles I. by Sir Thomas Roe, who also influenced Archbishop Abbot and Bishop Laud to give him a favorable reception. These prelates authorized him to write to the divines of Prussia and to the Lord Chancellor Oxenstiern of Sweden, and testify to the readiness of the English clergy to co-operate in so good a work. They recommended that all parties should abstain from disputes in the pulpit, from calling of hard names, and from disturbing the legal ceremonies of worship. In the mean while the Protestant divines of the Lutheran and the Reformed Confessions had held a friendly conference at Leipzig, and it was thought best that Durie should visit the German divines and present to them the advice of the English prelates with regard to Peace and Unity.

We publish for the first time a narrative of this visit of Durie to the continent during 1631–33 from a manuscript of Durie himself, which it was my good fortune to discover in London in December last.

This narrative gives us a vivid picture of the disorders of the Thirty Years'
War. We see Gustavus Adolphus as the great patron of this movement for peace among Protestants, if not its real initiator. It was a sad blow to Protestantism when he was slain on the battle-field of Lützen. No one was so well fitted to combine the forces of Protestantism as the heroic Swede. We see that there was a general disposition to aid Durie in his efforts for the union of Protestants, but the peacemakers did not seem to see clearly the way in which it could be brought about. There was a great deal of correspondence and conference, but very little practical result. It is interesting to observe William Laud, then Bishop of London, afterward Archbishop of Canterbury, uniting with the Puritan Archbishop, George Abbot, in the promotion of this great cause. Doubtless this great man had at heart the reunion of Christendom, and probably he thought his way the true path toward its accomplishment. He encouraged the schemes of Durie, however impracticable he may have deemed them. He was looking toward the reunion of Christendom, which was a much grander scheme than Durie had in mind.

Durie on his return to England made this report and presented the letters from the churches and divines of the Protestant churches of the continent to Archbishop Laud, who had taken the place of the Puritan Archbishop Abbot but a few weeks before his arrival. He did not find the same sympathy with the Presbyterian churches of the continent in Archbishop Laud that he had found in Archbishop Abbot. It was made evident to him that he must accept episcopal ordination if he was to carry on his work of pacification as a representative of the English Church. Accordingly he was ordained February 24th, 1634, in the cathedral of Exeter by Bishop Hall, "with the imposition of hands of several other presbyters together with himself." He did not renounce his previous ordination, but he seems to have had some scruples about it on account of some irregularities in connection with it. And then he viewed his reordination as giving him an office in the Church of England, holding very much the views of his friend Richard Baxter on this subject. The work that he had done on the continent attracted the attention of many English divines. Bishops Davenant, Morton, and Hall gave him a statement of their views as to Christian Union which were published in 1634. The statement of Bishop Davenant was enlarged in 1641 and published under the title "An Exhortation to Brotherly Communion Betwixt the Protestant Churches." This is one of the most valuable contributions to Christian Union ever published. It contains the following noble sentence:

"True and genuine charity is no less necessary to salvation for all churches and members of Christian churches than the true and entire profession of sound and saving faith."

Among the letters that Durie brought with him from the continent was a letter dated Hanau, February 24th, 1633, signed by a considerable number of German divines, requesting the English divines to prepare a body of Practical Divinity. This they thought would be more profitable and have a better tendency to Christian unity than the scholastic and controversial divinity that prevailed on the continent. They recognized that "in the churches of Great
Britain the doctrine of Practical Divinity, by the publique writings of many godly, wise ministers of your churches, is brought to a great perfection, and that it is excellently fitted for the use of the common people, but yet is kept up as a hidden treasure from the eyes of the forreine nations, within the bounds of your own language alone.'

The London ministers William Gouge, George Walker, Adoniram Byfield, Sidrach Simpson, Obadiah Sedgwick, and others wrote to Archbishop Ussher requesting him to undertake such a work. The archbishop tells us: "I was very glad of the motion, and laid it very seriously to heart, and conferred with some of my brethren about it that we might bring the work to some perfection." It was prevented by the outbreak of the civil wars. The Puritan divines John White of Dorchester, Richard Sibbes, and John Cotton also gave Durie encouragement in his work.

Accordingly he made a second journey in the interest of Protestant union in 1634, armed with letters from the British prelates and other divines. He visited the ministers of Hamburg, and then went with the English ambassador to the meeting of the Protestant States at Frankfort. These, September 14th, 1634, passed an act in his favor: "They did judge his work most laudable, most acceptable to God, and most necessary and useful to the Church." He returned to England for further instructions, and then undertook a third journey in 1635, and prosecuted it until 1640, visiting Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and the cities of North Germany. He found much to encourage him in all these places. But he also met with considerable secret opposition, and after a while not a little open resistance. He did not find it practicable to press matters to an issue. In 1639 he visited Helmstadt, where he found a kindred spirit in George Calixtus, who, by order of his prince, undertook the work of peace among the Lutheran churches.

In 1640 he returned to England and found the nation in confusion and everything most unfavorable to his work. Nevertheless he presented a petition to the House of Commons, urging "that the blessed and long-sorthe desire of Protestant churches might be recommended unto the publick prayers of the church," and "that his majesty with your honours advice and counsell might be moved to call a general Synod of Protestants in due time for the better settling of weighty matters in the church which now trouble not only the conscience of most men, but disturb the tranquility of publick states, and divide the churches one from another, to the great hindrance of Christianity and the dishonour of Religion." He also sent a memorial concerning "Peace Ecclesiastical to the King of England and the pastors and elders of the Kirk of Scotland meeting at St. Andrews."

Finding it impossible to do anything in these times of confusion, he accepted a call to be chaplain to the English Princess at the Hague.

He remained in Holland until 1645, when he returned to England to become a member of the Westminster Assembly, and took part in the composition of the Westminster symbols. Here he continued his efforts for Christian Union, uniting with Richard Baxter and other kindred spirits in earnest efforts to
combine moderate men of all parties in doing good and in removing differences.

He was charged by that bitter partisan, William Prynne, with being "The time-serving Proteus and ambidexter divine;" but he defended himself as "The unchanged, constant, and single-hearted peacemaker." He said: "I have ever endeavoured and professed myself to be extra partes; and accordingly have maintained the practice of rules and principles which I made usefull alike towards all, to serve all in the best things according to emergencies."

His leading principles were such as these:

"(1) A full body of practical divinity, which, instead of the ordinary philosophical jangling school divinity, might be proposed to all those that seeke the truth, which is after godliness.

"(2) To abolish the names of parties, as presbyterial, prelatical, congregational, etc., and to be called Reformed Christians of England, Scotland, France, Germany, etc.

"(3) To discountenance controversial writing by private persons.

"(4) It is the mind of Christ that his servants in all matters merely circumstantial by him not determined, should be left free to follow their own light, as it may be offered, or arise unto them, from the general rules of edification and not constrained by an implicit faith to follow the dictates of other men."

He undertook a fourth journey in the interests of Protestant union in 1654-57, working chiefly among the Reformed in Switzerland, Germany, and Holland. He took with him a letter from Oliver Cromwell and resolutions of endorsement from the heads of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Congregational and Presbyterian ministers of London. This journey was encouraging, but whatever fruit there may have been was nipped in the bud by the death of Cromwell in 1658.

At the Restoration, Durie endeavored to reorganize his work, and appealed to Charles II. and the Lord Chancellor Hyde for encouragement. But he had been too closely connected with Cromwell to be forgiven. He retired to the continent and took up his abode in Hesse-Cassel, where he carried on his peacemaking under the protection of the Princess Hedwig Sophie until his death in 1680.

John Durie died without seeing the fruit of his lifelong labors, but he did not live and work in vain. Like Richard Baxter, James Ussher, and John Davenant, he was a prophet of a better age of the world. He was sowing the seed and preparing the germs of Christian toleration, liberty, and union that have unfolded in later times and are still unfolding with rich blessings for our time and richer promises for the future.

These are the men of the seventeenth century who have the most to say to the men of the nineteenth century who are preparing to enter the twentieth century. The disunion of Protestantism has continued long enough. It is high time that we should set our faces toward a realization of that ideal of Christian Union for which these heroes of the seventeenth century labored so faithfully and so well.

C. A. BRIGGS.
A Summarie Relation of that which John Durie hath Prosecuted in the Workes of Ecclesiastical Pacification in Germanie since ye Latter End of Julie 1631 till 26 September 1633.

In the yeare 1631 after I had obtained permission from my Lords grace of Canter-burie who then was, and hime also that nowe is, who was then Bishopp of London to goo over into Germanie to trie by way of private negotiation howe farre in the worke of Ecclesiastical Pacification matters might be ripened and broughte aboute to a sett-led correspondencie and consultation in that matter betwixt the churches: and hav-inge to that affect gotten leave to take from certaine divines in England whom I should thinkke good to make choice of a testimonie subscribed by their hands to witnesse for them in private that they desired not onely for their owne parte to further so good and holie a purpose; but also entreated others to joyne with them in it, I went from hence aboute the latter end of Julie with a letter of Recommendations from Sir Thomas Roe unto the Lord Chaunceller Oxenstiern who a yeare before had undertaken and promised both to Sir Thomas Roe and to myself to further and promote with all his might so pious and godlie a worke. Being paste Holland, Hamburg, and Lubeck to goo towards Stetin in Pomeraina where I hoped to find the Ld Chaunceller Oxenstiern or his majestie of Sweden at Werben not farre from thence, but was disappoynted and found neyther the one nor other, for the King was gone from thence towards Saxonic and the Lord Chaunceller was not yet come out of Prussia towards Stettin, and was daylie expected; therefore I staid for his arriuall from the first to the 14 day of September, but heareinge then that his cominge was uncertayne, and knowinge that my Lord Spense was with the King, and had given him Information of myne Intentions, which his majestie testified to like very well; I resolued to followe the Kinge, and tooke the first opportunity of some souldiers thence goinge that way to whome I was recommended by a Coronell a countreyman of myne. With much difficultie and toyle wee came to Wittenberg in Saxonic, but the Kinge had fought the bataille at Leipsick, and was gone towards Erford therefore I made haste to followe him with ye firste companie that went but before I could overtake him hee was come to Wirtzberg and had taken the Castle thereof by assault. There I was admitted to him aboute the latter end of October, and presentinge my letter I told him from whom it was and to what purpose it was written, he asked mee if I was hee of whome my Lord Spense had told him of and when hee understood that I was the man hee sayde hee would be glad to heare the state of the business which I did prosecute. Two dayes after hee gave mee audience, and hauinge understood and approoved both the scope (which was to seeke concord by way of familiar correspondency and deliberacon without all disputaton of poynsts controverted) and the meanes (which were private and publicke exhortations to prepare and dispose the mynds nowe somewhat alienated obligatorie promises of mutuall undertakinge the worke to bind the consciences: aimable treaties and deliberacons to seeke and finde out the best meanes: and forraine intercessions and mediatiions to take up and conclude the buisines, whereof alreadie a foundation was laid at Leipsicke in a conference holden ye same yeare in March betwixt the Lutheran and reformed divines.) had prom-ised to give mee Promotoriall letters to further this end and meanes towards all the Evangelicall States and princes of the Empire to testifie unto them his earnest desire to set forward so good a purpose and to entreate them to set a worke their ablest Divines to joyne with mee in it. These letters I did not crave then because I was not yet readie to make use of them, it beeing then towards winder a tyme unseasonable to trauaille in, and I haveing resolved first to visite the cheiffe Diuines of the reformed Churches to knowe their resolution before I would undergoe the worke in a way of a publicke recommendacon. So I staid with my Cozen Coronell Ramsey at wirtzberge and whiles the Kinge remained there I conuersed with his two chaplains Dr. Fabritius and Mr. Jno Matbey whome I founde ready to second all my desires, and willinge to
take pains to dispose the rest of their brethren to peaceable assertions: They went
with the King from thence, but I followed not till the middle of Januarie A. 1632
neither did I stir from thence all that while but once only, I went to Nurnberg to
meet with the exiled preachers of the upper Palatinate to have conference with them
about that business, they resolved to join in endeavours with mee and to write to
their brethren in other places that some determinate course might be followed by
common consent in the business.

Being come from thence backe to Wirtzberge and hearing that the King had pos-
sest himself of all the towns on the maine, gotten passage over ye Rhyne, taken in
Mentz and was to reside awhile at Frankefurt on the Mayne when the Lord Chaunceller
Oxenstiern and my Lord Spence were to be with him, I went thither and found by the
way at Hanau Dr. Tossanus with whom I made acquaintance and at Frankefurt the
Ld Chaunceller very forward to profess his love to mee, and express his desire to
further myne intention of seeking peace and unity, but because the K and hee were
both overladen with affairs of state, with treaties and visits of ambassadors from all
parties both farre and neare, he willed mee to stay till the most pressing businesses
should be dispatched, and then hee would give mee all possible furtherance and as-
sistance.

I waited on till the K. broke up suddenly and went towards Bamberg to assist G. Horn
against Tillie. Then the Lord Chaunceller sone after went to Mentz and gave mee
audience, wherein I related what had bin done in the business since hee and I had
spoken last together in Prussia, and yt nowe I purposed to see howe farre ye reformed
Divines would goe, and what way they would resolve to followe to prosecute the worke
joyntlie: desiring him withall to fullfill the effects of his promises towards those of his
owne side amongst whom his authority was much esteemed: to which hee answered,
yt being new come out of those parts, hee had little acquaintance and small authoritie
amongst the Germanies of his religion but that hee would lay a foundation of the worke
amongst the Preachers of the armie and to that effect would deal with Dr. John
Bodvidius whom the K had made Praesidem consistorij castrensis, and that hee
would cause him and mee to mee to meete together, in the meantime hee thought the best
course would be when things should be more ripe to procure a meetinge of some fewe
eminent divines of both sides, to whom might be ioyned some Councillers of State
wherein they should conclude by what meanes the matter might be compassed and
brought to a generall agreeem by consent of all ye churches.

I left him there and expected what hee would doe with Dr. Boduidius, whom a pretty
while afterward being at Frankefurt hee appoynted to speake with mee, wee mett but
could not agree upon any course because hee said ye matter could not be taken up
without disputacion and a decision of the Controversie wherein neyther side would
yield to another and although I doe alledge ye example of Polonia, Bohemia and the
late conference at Leipsicke, wherein without dispute matters had bin brought further
then euer before, yet he thought that the rest of the church on both sides would not
bee brought to agree unto their conclusions, so wee parted promisinge neuer-the-les
one to another to take all occasions whereby the scope of peace as farre as possible it
could bee might bee advanced.

The Lord Chaunceller after that tyme being againe at Mentz spoke with mee and sayd
hee was not altogether of Dr. Boduidius his mynde, for although he supposed the worke
hardly bee brought to passe without disputacion yet he thought it was not impossible to
contrive such away and find out such men as should be able to eschew that rocke of
offence, and yet give satisfaccon to both parties, cheiflie if authoritie did supporte
their agreement therefore hee thought good yt I should goe on and trie what blessing
god would give to myne endeavours.

Aboute this time when ye Spaniards whom the K. had put out of the Lower Pala-
тинate made an attempt under the Command of the Earle of Embden to recouer it, I
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resolved to goe towards Cassell to meet with ye Diuines of the Landgrafe of Hessen who had bin at ye conference of Leipsicke, Dr. Tossanus wrote letters with mee unto them desiringe them to take some effectuall resolucon to prosecute the worke to a further period. I came thither in June, and after severall meetings with Dr. Crocius and Mr Newberger ye resolucon was taken that they should moue their prince to procure with consent of the Kinge of Bohemia who was then in Germanie, and of the Elector of Brandeberg a meetinge of the reformed Divines one out of euery Province, wherein they should consider and conclude how they should carrie the busines joyntlie in the tyme to come, and what to write in the name of all unto my Lorde Grace of Canterbury and the Bishop of London whose pious affection I did testifie was ready bent to further in due time and lead so holie and blessed a worke unto a hopefull issue. To this effect wee wrote joyntlie Letters unto Dr. Bergius ye Elector of Brandeberg chief Divine to require his assistance towards his prince in this resolution; see I returned againe to Frankfurt and waited for the intended meetinge till the latter end of September, when the Kinge of Bohemia was comminge backe from Nurnberg to Frankfurt then findinge that that purpose was quite failed because of the extreme difficulties of warre on all sides, and like to take effect in respect of the absence of ye Elector of Brandeburg into Prussia, and of the contynuall incursions of Papenheime into Hassia, I resolwe to followe another course in prosecuting the matter, and trie whether that which joyntlie could not bee obtained might not bee done to as good purpose by euery one aparte for I found none other way but this if I would not altogether discontinue, now to leaue was to loose my former labors and the hope of all succes in future times, therefore I resolwe rather to try the utmost, for this cause I went to Hanau and consulted with ye Diuines of that place upon the matter they did encourage mee to perseuer and offered all the assistance that they could give so I desired them, (hauinge first asked leaue and pmision from their magistrate ye Earle of Hanau) to write by comon consent unto ye rulers of ye Church of england to desire them to direct and undertake so good a worke unto the glory of god and the good of all the churches this they promise to doe ; Thereupon I wrote largely to Cassell in Hassia desiringe them to doe the like ; shewing that although ye purpose of a general meetinge had failed by reason of the invincible difficulties and straits of the tymes yet neuer the les we sought not to leve undone yt which may bee done in priuate, and will phaps serue for a good preparatiue, for ye worke against a better and more happy season. They promised in like manner to write into England letters of like tenour.

The Kinge of Bohemia was then at Mentz thither I went by the advise of Dr. Tossanus to give him Information of the state of the busines, and withall I procured from him a commision for Dr. Tossanus to write also in the name of the Palatine churches as others had promised to doe, In the meane tyme I gott acquaintance with the Earle of Isenberg's chaplain at offenbach by his meanes the Earle got information of my purpose and would heare mee himself, being come to him hee shewed mee a great deale of favor, and embraced the worke with great zeale commanding by letters written to all the preachers of his Dominions that they should glue in their advisys by a certaine tyme in writinge concerninge this matter to shew so good a worke ought to be promoted and carried, and what to write to the Divines of England upon that subject while this was in agitation, and I was bethinkinge myself how to extend the worke further towards all the the Earles of the Wetlerau, and afterwards how to goe to the King of Sweden for his Promotoriall Letters towards ye Lutheran princes, the dolefull newes of his death afflicted us all which affliccon was redoubled by a second blowe in the Losse of the Kinge of Bohemia.

These great chaunges brought a great stop to all deliberacons, yet the worke being god's rather then mans, wee trusted to him, and confirmed one another in ye firste purposes not to leve of so longe as any thinge could bee attempted seasonably or hopefullie. There was a diet appoynted at Frideburg of all the Earls of ye Wetlerau settling
affaires of State belonging to their confederation thither I went the 20th of December thither the Count of Isenburg brought John Hartungiuh his chief Diwine to whome all the rest of the preachers of his and their brethren their counts had sent their advises and Judgements hee gathered the some of all and wrote Letters by his Earles direction unto ye englise Praelats. At this diet findinge all the rest of the Earls of the Wetlerau together, I spoke unto them and to their Counsellrs to move their Divines to ye same resolution which the Earle of Isenburg had taken, this they promised to doe and afterwards performed. So I returned to Frankfurt and about the begininge of January 1633 I went to Lauteren where the administrator of the Palatinate did reside, to entreat him to renewe the Letters which his brother the Late King of Bohemia had commanded to be written, this hee did and I went towards the Duke of Deux pont to obtaine the like intent which hee granted. I beinge come backe from thence towards Frankfurt Sir Robert Anstruder came thither also, to him I laid open the state of my busines, and desired his assistaunce in it. I told him that the cheif poynct of the worke was yet undone which was to gaine the Lutheran Side wherewith I had not as yet medled to any purpose hee thought good to defere that buisnies till the diet at Heilbron which was then appoynted should bee held. I staid till hee went thither, and then went alonge in his companie, at the Diet the matter of agreement in Religion was proposed by the States themselves and so farre agreed unto that from that tyme forth the conclusion was enacted, that the reformed Protestants should be holden as Evangelicall churches and partakers of those priviledges which were granted in the Empire unto the Confession of Ausburge this good begininge gaue mee some boldnes to entreate more freely the Lord Chaunceller to performe now that which hee often had promised unto mee. But hee beinge then more theneuer before busy to frame a new state which was afterwards called the Evangelicall League could not intend my requests, but referred mee to one of the Counsellrs Sir N Rasch by whom hee woulde receive Information of my paticuler desires, to him I gave up in write some few poyncts containynge my whole desire, and because the mayne scope of the worke which I did intend was not knowne unto him and was requisite to be intimated unto the Lutheran side. I gave him a shorthe Draught of it.

The affaires of State were so many and so pressinge yt hee could not intend my desires as otherwise hee woulde haue done, yet partly by his addresse, partly by ye recomendacons of my Lord Ambassador Sir Robert Anstruder I gott acquaintance with the cheif States men of the Lutheran side, who very gladlie entertained my proposition, and promised to move their chief Divines to answere unto it. Coronel Bunichausen a counsellor of State of the D. of Wirtenberg, Dr Richler Ambassadeur of the citie of Nuremberg unto the Diett and Mr Glaser generall Emmissarie for the Elsax and Ambassadour for the Crowne of Sweden residing at Strasberg and some others, euery one undertooke for their severall quarters and promised to procure mee an answere that I mighte knowe what to trust to from their parts. While the diet yet lasted I wrote to Forraine churches Sedan, Parish, Metz, Basell, Zurick, Bern, and Geneva, to let them knowe of the matter in agitation and to desirrie them to joyn with others in it. There I sent to Frankfultz that they might bee joyntlie sent away with Mr Duboys the French Preacher of Hanau his Letters which hee had promised to write to ye same effect to all the fore-named places which beinge come at the risinge of the Diet, I went backe to Frankfurt and because both the chief Secretaries of State Mr Sadler and Sir N Rasch had bid mee without scruple to breake the matter to any Lutheran dyuine of note whom I should thinke good I watched the best opportunities I could find to gaine some fit introduction towards thesuperintendent of Mentz, the superintendent of Dermstat and some others of chief eminence, which soone after was afforded, for the generall Auditor of the Swedish Armie made a way for mee towards Dr Dunner the Superintendent of Mentz, the Landgrawe of Dermstat his cheife phisitian prepared the superintendent of Dermstat Dr Leisering for mee and with Dr Tettlebach, and Mr Eberard Kleyn the
cheif men of Frankfurt I was acquainted not longe afterwards; all these when I had conferred, seriously with them upon the matter of Ecclesiastical unitie, professed an earnest desire to further it, and promised to ioyne in the worke with mee, towards their brethren. Their advise was different. Doctor Dunner thought thus,

Seeinge all the cheif controversie consisted in certaine phrases and speeches concerning the poynets of Doctrine that theis were to bee interpreted, explained, and limited, on both sides, to shew the truth of our agreement together, and then that orders should bee established by common consent like unto those of the Church of Poland that the mutuall agreement might bee entertained in the uniformitie and correspondencie of the Gouernem\(^1\) and wishes that the Anathemas of the Synode of Dordreck had nouer beene heard of which had of late dayes made the breach greater then euer before, yet he hoped (that if the Church of England which had great credit with both partes and which they thought the soundest of all others would mediate in so good a cause) that the difference might bee composed. Dr Tettelbach professed that his Judgement had alwayes been addicted to moderation and had nouer agreed with those y\(^4\) were so extrauagant as to maintaine it unlawfull for Lutherans to enter into anie ciuill League with Caluinists but had sustained the contrary against Doctor Heilbroner in a consultation whereof hee did shew mee the Original manuscript, that hee moreover nouer had opposed the Caluinists nor laboured to hinder them from the libertie of publicke exercise of religion in Frankfurt, but could for his parte suffer y\(^1\) to bee granted, if order were taken y\(^1\) by that meanes noe great bitternes, scandals, and offences should arise betwixt the pties. That although hee thought hardly all paticuler differences might so farre bee taken away and were at this late conference at Leipsicke so well in his Judgement composed, that the rest deserued not anie schisme, but y\(^1\) not with standing all the differences a true Senexatism might bee erected and confirmed betwixt the churches and that in due time, if his counsell should bee required, he would not fayle to declare his mynd to this effect.

Dr. Leiseringe shewed a greatedeale of true loue to ye worke, he told mee that his owne practise in his ministerie and accordinglie his exhortaconto all preachers under his charge was this, that they should not insiste upon psonall accusations nor matters of subtile disputaconts and controvercie, but rather leauethosethingsuntothe schooles to bee debated, and in stead thereof that all fundamentall truthes and all duties of christian practise were onely to bee brought into ye pulpit and fit for publicke edification, as for universitie poynets Doctors might without breach of loue and brotherhood differ in Judgment concerninge suche misteries of fayth as are debated nowadays betwixt the Lutherans and Caluinists y\(^1\) in his Judgement ye cheif cause of the lamentable schisme was the want of some ecclesiastical discipline which he wished might be restored amongst them to ye ancient integritie, and to that rigour which it hath in some of the reformed churches; that this would prowe the most expedient way to gaine and preserue unitie, to which effect hee offred all his industrie, and comended to mee for this worke, ye settinge forward of all other meanes of Pacification amongst ye Lutherans, the learninge and authoritie of his reuerend Mr. Dr Gerard of Jena, who was of latetimes wont to sayd that from henceforth he loued to reade no bookes but onely of englise or spanish authours, and would beginne to learne englise y\(^1\) he might benifit himself by the bookes of our Language, which hee heard contained exceedinge good matters, to him sayd hee (if you intend to goe) I will write knowinge y\(^1\) your proposition will be gladlie entertained, by him. I told him I was minded to see him, and desired him to doe as hee had sayd which hee fayled not to doe, promisinge in due tyme all manner of further help with permission of his superiours, others promised the like assistance for Dr Tettelbach promised to write to Dr Hoe into Saxonie and to Doctour Dorscheus of Strasburg, and Doctour Dunerer promised to drawe in those of Tübengen, and Marpurg, so I thought those quarters well enough provided and that it would bee most expedient for mee to goe alonge with Sir Robert Anstruder towards Saxonie to lay the cheif founda-
tion of the worke there because I found ye all the rest of the Lutheran churches looked moste upon ye Church to conforme themselues to it, therefore when hee went I was readie to goe along with him, and did goe as farre as Fridberg, but upon better deliberacon I returned backe againe, for Mr Johnson my Lord Ambas. Chaplaine did undertake for Saxonie and I beganne to consider ye I could doe more with ye Lord Chaunceller and the new confederates then anywhere else, so I came backe towards Frankfurt, there I understood ye Mr. Glaser had written to mee from Strasberg and sent a letter from one of the divines of ye universitie to mee that ye marchaunt who had receiued it had sent it after mee into Saxonie towards Mr. Curtius his Majesties Agent then residing at Dresden. I countermaundted that letter, and for feare it might bee delayed or miscarrie, I wrote to Mr Glaser to have it renewed, this was done, and I found it to bee a letter from Dr Dorscheus who did communicate to Mr Glaser his Judgement concerning certaine meanes of Pacification, and objects of deliberation which I had imparted to him at Heilbron, this letter being answered, I insisted with Sir N Rasch, and the Earle of Solms president of the Counsell of warre to have some assistance from the Lord Chaunceller to prosecute the worke shewing them how farre the chief divines of those quarters were disposed, they counselled mee to see if I could bringe the divines to a further and more effectual resolucyon thus I tried but found after much sollicitacon ye noe more could be done without some speciall warrant and recomendacon from superior authoritie, for they pretended that it was not lawfull for them to presume and ingage themselves further in the worke, except they were charged to so doe by their Magistrate, therefore I entreated ye some course might bee taken to free them from ye scruple, and moue them effectually to some reall endauers, and undertakings. Sir N Rasch thought it would be moste expedient to cause the Lord Chaunceller to give mee a letter Patent of Recommendation in the worke whereby all godlie divines should bee entreated to ioyne with mee, and professe openlie their willingnes to prosecute such a worke. This letter Patent was sued for till the Lord Chaunceller went towards Heidleburg, which was about the 6 of June thither I was advisd to goe in hope that at ye meeting of the princes appoynted to be held there for the resignation of the Towne of Heydleburg unto the administrator of the Pallatinate; that Patente woulde be granted: there was with the administrator and the Lord Chauncellor, ye Duke of Deux pont, ye duke of Wirtenberg, ye Marquesse of Baden, and ye Duke of Waymar with all theis I dealt to moue them to recomend so good a worke both to ye Lord Chauncellor and to the churches of their owne dominions which they promised to porme; neuer the les ye Patente was not obtained by reason of other more pressinge affaires which were then to be dispatched, wee returned from thence to Frankfurt there at last Sir N Rasch put the Lord Chauncellor to it, and as hee said moued him to give a comand to Mr Camerarius his secretarie to drawe it. But Camerarius said to mee ye there was no comand expressly gyuen, onely a speech there had bin concerning such a thing as a matter fittinge to bee done, and ye he would upon that ground bee bold anie forme which I would draw, and thinke good to be subscribed. I made a draught and gaued it to him, hee shewed it unto ye Lord Chauncellor, who read it and approuing of it said, hee would take time to consider of it, and alter some expressions before hee would subscribe it, thus hee delayed the matter so long ye I was wearely and out of hope to obtaine it, yet before I would desist whole from ye purpose I used means to speake with the Lord Chaunceller myselfe to knowe wherefore the promise was delayed, and to shew how much harm that dilation did unto the cause; hee gaued mee large audience, and pretended many causes why he was scrupulous to undertake the worke soe publickly, whereof the chief was ye he feared his owne countrey clergie who would misinterpret this action as a thing disadvantagiosous to their religion secondlly that alreadie the Saxon Court havinge heard of this Intention was jealous of him, as if hee would presume to rule all affaires as well in religion as State, and ye hee would make himself unfitt to doe anie good in the business if hee did not goe warilie to worke, nevertheless
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hee assured mee of his true affection to doe all y^t could be done without inconueniencie, and y^t hee might bee ye more encouraged and better knowe whereto to put to his hand and help in due time, hee willed mee to drawe up some generall delineations of such means as I thought might bee moste convenientlie used and set a worke. This I did, and to take awaye the enuie of malicious spirits from him I presented it loyntlie unto ye Consilium formatum, and himself not long after this was done Dr Dorscheus sent a replie unto my answere of his first letter, whereunto I made a second answere (which as Mr Glaser told mee by word of mouth a little before I came away from Mentz) hath made him acquiesce and condiscend to my desire, promisinge to write to all his acquaintance in all the universities and eminent Churches in Germanie, to cause them ioyne and undertake, and profess a readiness to coopate in this worke with him and mee: Aboute this time also I gott a letter from Dr Valentinus Andreas of Wirtenberg sent by Coronel Bunickhausen to testify his resolution to loyne with mee in the worke, and another from Mr. Saubertus of Nuringberg sent unto Mr Tetsell one of the Consilium formatum, and not long after the answers of the universitie and churches of Sedan and Parish were delivered to Mr Duboys and mee, wherein they testified their desire and earnest affection unto ye worke, and gaue counsell how they thought it should bee followed. Now ye Diet of Frankefurt was drawinge neere, and I found that the matter which I did prosecute was exceedinglie bruited and spoken of abroad partlie by Mr Johnson his negotiacion in Saxonie, partly by the manifold speeches which the Lord Chaunceller held of it in publick discourses recommending it ordinarily to all princes, cheif men and ambassadours y^t came for other affairs unto him therefore I thought it necessarie to put the matter to some poynit at that diet, least if nothing were then done to some purpose, ye whole busines should be thought to be a matter of discourse without any realitie, so I tooke advise of freindis what to doe and bow y^t I might not let the diet slipp without anie speciall benift unto the cause I had in hand; To make short they allowed of my resolution to petition the States, and to present them with some preparatine questions fittied for the Lutheran divines, to cause them partlie by authoritie partlie by conscience and reason to engage themselves in some consultacon and resolution concerninge the worke. But before I presented this petition to the diet I thought good to shew it to the Ld Chaunceller first to know his pleasure whither hee thought it fitt to bee gien up yea or noe, and whither he himself would not be pleased to recommend it amongst other propositions of his owne unto the States. The propositions hee would not haue presented as from himself, but gaue mee permission to doe as I intended, promising to second it with his best recommendacons toward the States. So ye Petition was gien in well accepted of, and communicated to all the foure chambers of the assembly whose seuerall members I saluted afterwards in priuate to give them Information at large how the case stood, how farre matters were prepared on the reformed side, and what the cheif of their owne diuines were bent unto and would undertake if their publicke recommendacon were not wantinge to stirre them up.

The effect of this was that by generall consent they granted my desire, and promised to recommend it to the Diuines of their Generall Provinces, as appeareth by an act made concerninge this matter conteyned in the second article of their last resolutions which were presented unto the Ld Chaunceller whereof a coppie was gien unto mee by their secretarie Mr Faber of this tenour.

Secondlie Mr John Durie an English Divine hath desired and soughte (as appeareth by the annexed Coppie) permission to treate with the cheif diuines and Prelats of the confederate States, concerninge the means how Ecclesiasticall unitie might bee established betwixt the Evangelical Churches.

Now although the deputed Ambassadorees have gotten no ticular instruction concerning this busines yet they conceive yt if the Ld Chaunceller Excellencie would be pleased to further by his eminent authoritie this matter, that their moste gracious and favourable Lord principalls and masters, as from their hearts wishing for such an agree-
ment will be so much the more bent to do all what can be done on their parts to set forward such work as according to the preparation made at the conference at Leipsicke, whereunto also the states at this time nowe present doe offer and profess themselves noe lesse every way willinglie disposed.

This being thus granted I was allowed & counselled to write unto all their universities letters to give their diuines information of the State of this business and to move them to give some answere unto the propositions which were given up wch they promised to urge and press home unto them. Their letters being dispatched I wrote also unto the Lowe Countries to the diuines of mine acquaintance in the universities of Leyden, Franeker, and Groenygen, which letters the agent of ye united Provinces did undertake to addresse.

After all which yet one thing remained to provide how the business should be followed in time to come when I should be absent, for I was resolved to come ouer hither while the Lutheran diuines should take leisure to beethinke themselves what to answer unto my letters, and what to resolve upon the questions presented at the Diett. There was a speech of another diett to bee called at Erford towards ye begininge of the next yeare, I dealt therefore with the ambassadors of the reformed Princes, Palatin, Deux pont, Hessen, and cheiflie with the Chaunceller of the Elector of Brandeburg, that they would resolve upon some course amongst themselves wch might bee followed in myne absence, the Chaunceller of Brandeburg told mee that his master had given him speciall commission to treate with the Ld Chaunceller Oxenstiehn concerning the worke of Ecclesiastical Pacification hee, as I had done to him, had also related to mee from time to time howe hee found the Ld Chaunceller Oxenstiehn disposed; at last findinge him indifferentlie well affected to anie faire course wherein hee should not bee too much engaged; I procured a private meetinge of the rest of the Ambassadours at his house where they concluded to pswade their masters and other reformed States and princes unanimously to procure one of theis two things.

First if the diet of Erford should be held to cause in the letters of Citation this to bee inserted amongst other things, That every Princes ambassadour should bee pleased to bringe a diuine a longe with him instructed to consult upon the matter of Ecclesiastical Pacification.

Secondlie if it should not be held neuer the les to appoynt at some place and time conuenient a speciall assemblie of their owne divines, wherein they should consult I whether ye acts of ye last conference of Leipsicke, so farre as there is an agreement betwixt the pies should not be ratified & received by all. 2 whether the poynets remaininge in difference may not be reconciled yea or not? if yea: then how, if not, then the question should bee whither not their remaininge differences bee of so great moment that a schisme ought to bee mayntained for their cause in the church of god!

To prosecute all this the Chaunceller of Brandeburg a very understandinge and learned man did oblige himself, assuringe mee yt hee woulde cause his master neuer to leaue to stirre in this business.

So havinge once more saluted the Ld Chaunceller of Sweden and gotten assurance from him, yt although hee could not undertake the worke in publicke as yet, that neuer the les he would giue all ye privat assistance he could I came away from Frankfurt the 26 Septemb, and arrived at Utrecht the 11th of October, thence I made acquaintance by addresse of the Swedish agent yt came alonge in companie with Mr Buschouen his old freind and cheif preacher of that place, and a man of great counsell and credit with the prince of Orange, I laid open the State of ye Ecclesiastical busines in Germanie unto him, and asked what assistance hee thought I could expect from their quarters of the Lowe Countries, hee sayd hee could not yet tell, but suspected yt some factious spirits would be averse from it, neuer the les hee made no doubt of many well affected, wth whom in due time hee for his parte would labour to concurre & contribute such talents as god had giuen him, and because I had no leisure then to comunicate certaine writes
fit for his owne and others Informations in the busines bee desired mee to send them afterwards unto him wch I did from Rotterdam. I stailed but a short while in Holland but if I should haue followed the pswasions of some freinds at Amsterdam Leyden, and Rotterdam I coulde have found occasion abundantlie to haue spent the whole winter, for after I had bin wth Doctour Pollander and Dr. Riuet who a little afore receiuied the letters I wrote to them from Frankfurt, and then told mee that they should answer them wth commen consent, I came to Rotterdam where I was made acquainted with the Burgermaster of ye towne my Ld Berbell the cheif of all those that followe and aduance moderate counsells and courses against the remonstrants, hee did pswade mee to stay a while in those quarters, shewinge what goode could bee done, but I had settled my resolucon otherwise, therefore I went on toward Zealand and after I had there conferred with Mr Borell a man wholly set of his owne Inclinations upon this studie and labouringe in it affectianately, I tooke shippinge at Flushinge, and arrived here prosperouslie at London the 8th of this month of November for which I praise the Lord to whom bee all thankes and glorie for euer and euer Amen.
VIII.

CRITICAL NOTE.

SHUR AND THE "EGYPTIAN WALL."

The Biblical record tells us that when the children of Israel had crossed the Red Sea they wandered for three days in the Desert or Wilderness of Shur (Ex. xv. 22), or the Wilderness of Etham (Num. xxxiii. 8). This expression, Shur ('אש, "wall"), has been interpreted in two ways. Professor Palmer says (Desert of the Exodus, I. 38, 39) that when standing at the wells of Moses and looking at the hills we at once appreciate the fact that these long, wall-like escarpments are the chief, if not the only prominent characteristics of this portion of the wilderness, and we need not wonder that the Israelites should have named this memorable spot, after its most salient feature, the wilderness of Shur, or the wall." This is the earlier view. A later one is represented in its most completely elaborated form by Dr. Trumbull (Kadesh-Barnea, p. 46).

"A 'wall' better meeting the requirements of the text than this mountain range is to be looked for; nor will a search for it be in vain. Inasmuch as there was a great defensive Wall built across the eastern frontier of Egypt, 'as thou goest toward Assyria; ' a Wall that was hardly less prominent in the history of Egypt than has been the Great Wall of China in the history of the 'Middle Kingdom,' it would seem the most natural thing in the world to suppose that the Biblical mention of the Wall 'that is before Egypt' had reference to—the Wall that was before Egypt.'

This is a question not of opinion, but of fact. If there were really a wall that extended in solid and continuous form across the stretches of sand and waste from a point near Pelusium southward to Suez, and thence to Heliopolis, a constant menace and barrier to invading enemies and a shield and protection to the fertile plains of lower Egypt, it is a most important fact, and the name of the desert of the "Wall" would have been exceedingly appropriate. The question, however, is as to its actual existence. Such a structure must have left its marks scattered upon the page of Egyptian literature so that there should be no question.

The word 'אש occurs in other connections. Hagar was found by the angel of the Lord by a fountain in the "way to Shur" (Gen. xvi. 7). Abraham dwelt "between Kadesh and Shur" (Gen. xx. 1). The descendants of Ishmael "dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest toward Assyria" (Gen. xxv. 18). "Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah as thou goest to Shur, that is before Egypt" (1 Sam. xv. 7). David "made a raid upon the Geshurites," etc. [nations], that inhabited "the land . . . as thou goest to Shur, even unto the land of Egypt" (1 Sam. xxvii. 8).

So far as these texts are concerned, we are by no means shut up to the idea
that their proper interpretation requires the supposition of a "wall" to which reference is thus made. Should it be found that Shur was the name of a city, every requirement of the text would be satisfied. Dr. Trumbull refers to this method of explaining the name in a note (p. 46), where he says: "Others, again, have counted Shur as the name of a town on the Egyptian borders, toward Arabia," with references to Ewald, Kurtz, and R. S. Poole.

But the first matter to be considered is as to the existence of a "wall." Chaba is cited in support, "And Ebers coincides fully with Chaba in this understanding (Aegypten und die Bücher Mose's, pp. 78-85"), p. 47. These citations we have examined carefully. Chaba makes merely a bald assertion of the existence of a wall without proof, while Ebers goes into the matter quite at length, and evidently desires to establish his point. The facts upon which reliance is based are the following: A papyrus (Berlin I.) tells of the journey of an Egyptian, in which he passed the "wall" and arrived in the country of Atum or Atema. Diodorus (I. 57) speaks of a "wall" which extended from Pelusium to Heliopolis, built by Sesostris, 1500 stadia in length. The ascription of it to Sesostris is explained by the supposition that he repaired it, its first mention having come from the twelfth dynasty. The third proof is drawn from the supposed identification of T'ar, a fort on the road eastward, with Heroopolis, for which all ground is lacking in the light of later discoveries. The existence of fortifications about Pelusium has been long known, and for various reasons it is believed that the Egyptian Maktal (which Brugsch identified with the Hebrew Migdol, "watch tower," the Magdolo of the Itinerary, 12 miles south of Pelusium) was a fortified place on the line of eastern defences. Thus three points are fixed (?) along the line—Pelusium, Migdol, and Heroopolis (Mugfar (?), now known to be at Abu Kesheyd-Tell-el-Maskhutah and back from the line laid down by Ebers). Upon these facts the theory of a continuous wall was built, supported only by the evidence of Diodorus as to its continuity. The evidence of Lepsius, quoted by Ebers, can scarcely be considered as sufficiently definite and decisive. But even Ebers weakens his case when he tries to minimize the immensity of the undertaking by saying that where the lakes or swamps extended, there was no need of a wall; and here he mentions particularly the "swamps of the so-called Bitter Lakes" (Aegypten und die Bücher Mose's, p. 82). At such points as these isolated fortifications sufficed. It is further worthy of remark that the argument based upon the statement of Diodorus is weak when used as a main proof. As corroborative evidence it may be good, but as proof, in the first instance it is a broken reed on which to lean. His word is εἰπείχσε in connection with the expression τὸ μῖκρὸς ἐκτι σταδίων χλιόνως καὶ πεντακοσίων. This sentence is translated by Dr. Trumbull (p. 49) thus: "The king walled the side of Egypt that inclines eastward against Syria and Arabia, from Pelusium to Heliopolis, the length being about fifteen hundred stadia." An examination of the verb τείχιζω will show that the reference is not necessarily to a walling, but that a fortifying of the border will answer every requirement of exegesis and sense, as it did every requirement of Egypt and its people.
The view that has long obtained is different. A glance at the map shows that the isthmus contains a series of lakes—Menzaleh, Ballah, Timsah, and the Bitter Lakes. While most of these are shallow, they do not afford means by which land communication can be had. The roads ran between the bodies of water named, and on these roads were the necessary means of protection.

The latest book on Egypt which makes mention of these defences is that of Johannes Dümichen, professor at Strassburg; the “Einleitung” to Edouard Meyer’s “Geschichte des Alten Aegyptens.” This book is not mentioned by Dr. Trumbull. On pages 238–66 the geography of the Delta is treated. In the introductory remarks on page 242 he refers to this “wall,” and says that one coming into the Delta from Asia in early Egyptian times found before him a “series of well-fortified places,” which were intended as a protection against incursions of Asiatics. “These evidently are the ‘walls of the ruler, built for the repulse of the Asiatics.’” Thus the latest expression of opinion is in line with the view which has generally obtained. At all events, the only proof of a continuous wall comes from a doubtful interpretation of Diodorus, and not from the Egyptian records. Any statements of Abulfeda as to the “wall” can scarcely be seriously intended as proofs, coming, as they do, from the XIV. century A.D.

The length and extent of this alleged “wall” is also a matter of importance. By express admission, Ebers says that it was not needed along the extent of the Bitter Lakes. Diodorus gives its length, between Pelusium and Heliopolis, at 1500 stadia, or, counting the stadium at 606½ feet (cf. Thayer, N. T. Lexicon, and Liddell and Scott, Greek Lex. in loc.), 172½ miles (not 184 miles), a distance, says Dr. Trumbull (p. 51), which “is great enough to admit of a wall . . . from Pelusium to Heliopolis, by way of the Gulf” (of Suez). This is a most remarkable, a bald assumption, and yet upon it rests the strength of the argument against the view that Moses led Israel across the Red Sea a long way north of Suez; that is, in the region of the Bitter Lakes, because, forsooth, there was this solid wall on the other side! On page 425 we find a heading, “The great wall flanked,” and on page 429, “A prominent feature of the Bible narrative is the Great Wall of Egypt . . . from the Mediterranean Sea to the modern Gulf of Suez. The existence of that Wall is established beyond all fair questioning.” These statements at once preclude agreement between Dr. Trumbull and Professor Ebers, and place all those who question the view of the author of “Kadesh-Barnea” in the list of those who are not “fair.” Nevertheless, even running the risk of such judgment, we consider the matter as one open to very serious question, if not absolute disproof.

But, it may be asked, what shall we substitute for this explanation? It must be borne in mind that we are dealing with the name of a desert situated to the eastward of Egypt. The Biblical usage of the name allows us to infer the existence of a city after which the region was named. The expression, “the way to Shur,” applies better to a city than to a “wall,” and “between Kadesh and Shur” puts these two names in the same category. The use of the name as the limit of territory is equally applicable to region or city. We can-
not see, therefore, that the "Wall of Egypt" is such a prominent feature in the Bible narrative as has been claimed.

Mention has been made already of a fortress on the east of the Delta region called T'ar or T'al, where a foreign people lived called the T'aru, or T'alu; the city or citadel taking its name from the name of the people. The nature of the population is indicated by the peculiar writing of the names of both land and city, each being "determinated" by the sign of "foreign land" and "foreign people." This "determinating symbol," representing a range of mountains surmounted by a bent staff, occurs for people and regions which were adjacent to Egypt as well as for those situated at a considerable distance. The same signs occur in connection with the district called Theku or Succoth, which was a corporate part of Egypt at the time of the Exodus.

In 1855 Brugsch published his "Reiseberichte aus Aegypten," in which T'ar (T'eli) is identified with Pelusium (p. 166). In 1857 his "Geographie des alten Aegyptens" appeared, in which he identified this place with Heropolis (pp. 260–65), and then, on the ground that the Coptic version substitutes Pithom for the Herōōnopolis of the LXX, he identified T'ar (T'al) with Herōōpolis and Pithom, and, following Lepsius, placed the site at Mugfar, a little east of the true situation, Tell-el-Maskhutah. Later, in his "Dictionnaire Geographique" (1879), he changed his view again, and referred T'ar to a more northerly position, and asserted that the name is the Egyptian form of Tanis (cf. pp. 986, 992). In the second view Ebers followed Brugsch (cf. Aegypten und die Bücher Moses, 1869, p. 80). In this passage Ebers sought to prove the existence of the "Egyptian Wall," but the ignorance of certain exact locations, unavoidable when he wrote, led to a mistake. This difficulty has been now set aside, and T'ar is not Heroopolis-Pithom, despite the long argument of Dümichen (pp. 257–61), in which he rejects the identification with Tanis, and pronounces, though somewhat doubtfully, in favor of Heroopolis. He remarks, page 258, that the name seems to have been in some degree retained in the name of a place, Sile, mentioned by the geographers and the itinerary as situated twenty-four miles from Pelusium and on the shores of Lake Ballah (cf. Wesseling, Vetra Romanorum Itineraria, p. 171).

What we know of this place may be summed up as follows: Egypt was divided into districts or νόμοι, the number of which varied at various times. The different lists also vary, some containing more and some less. That of Edfu is the longest, containing twenty-two for Upper Egypt and twenty for the Delta. This list is taken by Brugsch as the standard. In it the names of the nomes are given, and with each the name of its principal place, or administrative and religious centre. The excavations carried on in 1883 by the Egypt Exploration Fund, which resulted in Naville's finding of Pithom, have settled incidentally several questions, and the one under consideration among the rest. T'ar is not Heroopolis, and this for several reasons. The identifications of Pithom and Succoth and Heroopolis and Hero Castra upon approximately the same site is now historical. The Edfu list of nomes gives Theku-Succoth as the chief city of the eighth nome, ro-ḥb, "entrance of the East," and hence
its position is fixed at the eastern end of the Wadi Tumilat. The city T'ar, on the contrary, is the chief city of the sixteenth nome, chent-âbî, or "eastern frontier." Hence, while we have to look to the eastern part of the Delta for both regions, they are by no means identical. The mention of T'ar is quite frequent in the inscriptions, but its location is not fixed in any way except that it was on the military road to Palestine and the East. Dümichen seems to waver between a northern and a southern site, the latter on account of the requirements of a mythological papyrus which demands the near presence of mountains. But a text of such a sort certainly cannot have the same amount of authority as a record in stone which gives the route traversed by the armies of the Pharaohs. To reconcile the two would require us to suppose that the Pharaohs marched their forces far to the south, almost via the modern Suez. But this is opposed to all history and reason. The routes lay farther to the north. We know that one went from Tanis and Pelusium along the shore of the Mediterranean. There is good reason to suppose that there was a second route a little to the south, passing perhaps between Timsah and Ballah, approximating to what Dr. Trumbull calls the "Wall Road." The place is mentioned in the Karnak inscriptions (cf. Lepsius, Denkmäler, III. 31, b., at the beginning, immediately after the date; Brugsch, Reiseberichte, p. 166) in connection with the route of Thothmes III. to Palestine. Later Seti I. marched against the "Shasu, who dwelt between T'ar and Kanana" (Lepsius, Denkm. III. 126, a.), while on his return he was welcomed by princes and priests at the "fortress of T'ar" (do. 128 a. b.; Brügsch, Geogr. Inschr. I., 260 ff.). The place is also mentioned in several papyri; once as the residence of a governor of the eastern provinces (XIX Dynasty), and again as the residence of a nomarch (XXX Dynasty), who had charge of three nomes. It was thus of continued importance. The bas-reliefs at Karnak represent the place as situated on both sides of a canal that abounded in fish and crocodiles.

A papyrus, quoted by Brugsch, speaks of fish taken at T'ar. These facts point to a locality on the extreme east of the Delta, and at a distance from Tanis, with which it can scarcely be identified. Furthermore, the site must lie somewhere north of the centre of the isthmus, and on a military road which was well fortified by a stronghold named Chetem.

With regard to the bearing of this place upon the question of the Biblical Shur, it may be added that the letters composing the two names can be made to correspond. The writing of the Egyptian name is double, T'ar and T'al. The difference in early times between the letters r and l was not as marked as now. A curious instance of their interchange is seen to-day in the case of the Chinese in America. The character in the hieroglyphic writing with which the initial letter is written corresponds mainly to the Coptic janjia (Boheiric), and this in turn corresponds sometimes with the Sahidic schima (sh) (cf. Stern, Koptische Grammatik, p. 23). It should be further remarked that the character which is conventionally transcribed by l is not a l. When the Copts adopted the Greek alphabet for the writing of their language, they did not find a letter which corresponded to this Egyptian symbol. Hence, to keep the
sound, a special character had to be invented or adapted from the demotic writing. This was done, and the two signs of this peculiar sound resemble one another as nearly as the style of the Greek uncial script would allow. The fact, then, that janjia is the lineal descendant of the character indicating the sound represented by /', and that this letter in the second Coptic dialect became schima (sh), must be allowed some weight in tracing out a correspondence between the sound of /' and the Hebrew shin. We do not attempt to prove that the letters have interchanged thus, so much as to establish the fact of the possibility of a transition.

It is a remarkable fact that the Alexandrine codex at Gen. xxv. 18 reads Σουρά instead of Σουρο. Here we may perhaps see a reminiscence of the double writing of the hieroglyphics. A further parallel between T'ar and Shur is seen in the statement of a papyrus that the "Shasu (nomads of the desert) dwelt in the land between T'ar and Kanana" (cf. Lepsius, Denkmäler, III., 126, a.; Brugsch, Geogr. Insch. I., 260 ff.). This is strikingly similar to the statement of the Old Testament, where the limits of the Amalekites are set between "Havilah and Shur." The proposal of Dümichen, that the Roman Sile may be the ancient T'ar-T'al, fits in well with the requirements of the army route and geographical position. Wherever the sixteenth nome was, its capital must have been far east in the Delta, and it would thus agree in general position with the "Shur that is before Egypt," an important stronghold on one of the main routes to the East, perhaps the very "way of Shur."

In the attempt to account for the name Shur, we have seen, first, that there is a going outside of the historical records to make it refer to a continuous "Wall" from Pelusium to the modern Suez; second, that the name of a city will agree with the Biblical record as fully and well as a "Wall;" third, that there was actually a city T'ar on the north-eastern frontier of Egypt, situated in a land which bore the same name; fourth, that this city is mentioned in Egyptian documents as the south-western limit of the country occupied by nomad tribes, in exact parallelism with the use of Shur at Gen. xxv. 18; fifth, that the Alex. Codex gives two readings for the name Shur which correspond exactly with the variation in the hieroglyphic writing; sixth, that the place was situated on an important road to the East, and was a fortified stronghold; seventh, that the district in which the city was situated bore the same name, T'ar, which would correspond with the Hebrew "Desert of Shur"; and, finally, that the phonetic interchange between the letters composing the two words is quite within the bounds of possibility.

The amount of material for a discussion like the present is, of necessity, limited. The evidence that can be brought forward is small, and not by any means as direct as is desirable, but rather circumstantial. To show a possibility or a probability is about as much as can be expected, and one must be content to stop short of a complete demonstration because the links in the chain of evidence have dropped beyond human ken, lying, possibly, buried beneath the shifting sands of the desert.

C. R. Gillett.
EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE WESTMINSTER DOCTRINE OF THE SALVATION OF INFANTS.

The Westminster doctrine of the salvation of infants is stated in the Westminster Confession. Chap. x. 3, "Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word." In this clause the Westminster divines recognize that salvation is not confined to those who are outwardly called by the ministry of the word. Some who never hear the gospel of redemption in this world are saved by Jesus Christ. Furthermore redemption is not confined to those who have been baptized.

"Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized, are undoubtedly regenerated" (xxviii. 5). Thus the Westminster divines take the position of the Reformed Churches, that the divine electing grace is not confined to external means; that the ordinary means of grace are not essential to salvation, and that there are some elect persons who are saved without them.

These persons saved without baptism and the outward ministry of the word are not "infants" and "other persons," or "all infants" and "all other persons;" but "elect infants" and "all other elect persons;" and the latter not "all other elect persons who have not been outwardly called," but "all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word." It seems plain that the adjective "elect" limits "infants" as it does "all other persons;" and that the Westminster Confession teaches that there are some elect persons among infants and incapables, who cannot hear the gospel, as well as among those who hear the gospel and enjoy the sacraments. That this is the meaning of the Confession was not doubted till recent times. But in the present century evangelical opinion has settled to the theory that all infants dying in infancy are saved, and many Presbyterians endeavor to interpret the Confession of Faith to conform with the modern theory. There can be no doubt that the Confession means by "all other elect persons" incapables—that is, those who have not their normal faculties of
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mind, and so, like infants, are "incapable" of hearing the outward call of the gospel and of responding to it. The authors of the Confession had no thought of including the heathen in this class. Those who seek to find a basis for the salvation of elect heathen must look for it elsewhere. For the heathen are not "incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word." They are entirely capable of being called, and that is the reason why we are to preach the gospel to them. The incapacity here is not in the heathen or in the Saviour and his salvation, but in the Church and the ministry of the word.

The original phrase as reported to the Westminster Assembly by the third Grand Committee, November 13th, 1645, was "elect of infants." This Committee consisted of Arthur Salway, Sidrach Simpson, Anthony Burgess, Richard Vines, William Greenhill, Thomas Temple, Simeon Ashe, Thomas Gataker, William Spurstow, Francis Cheynell, John de la March, Matthew Newcomen, Thomas Carter, Thomas Hodges, Andrew Perne, Nicholas Proffet, Peter Sterry, John Gibbon, Thomas Micklethwait, John Whincop, William Price, Henry Wilkinson, Francis Woodcock, Samuel de la Place, John Maynard, Henry Paynter, William Goode, Humphrey Hardwick, twenty-eight in all. This Committee comprised a third of the Assembly. Their phrase makes their opinion sufficiently evident. We shall give an extract from one of them, Anthony Burgess, who lectured against the Antinomians early in the year 1646 at the request of the President and Fellows of Sion College, London. He published his book, Vindicæ Legis, at their request. He was regarded as expressing the views of the Presbyterians at this time in this controversy. He says:

"The third Question concerning this naturall light is, Whether it be sufficient for salvation? For, there are some that hold, If any man, of whatsoever Nation be be, worship God according to the light of Nature, and so serve him, he may be saved. Hence they have coined a distinction of a three-fold piety: judica, Christiana, and Ethnica. Therefore say they, What Moses was to the Jewes, and Christ to the Christians; the same is Philosophy, or the knowledge of God by nature, to Heathens. But this opinion is derogatory to the Lord Christ; for onely by faith in his Name can we be saved, as the Scripture speaketh. And, certainly, if the Apostle argued that Christ died in vain, if workes were joyned to him; how much more if he be totally excluded? It is true, it seemeth a very hard thing to mans reason, that the greater part of the world, being Pagans and Heathens, with all their infants, should be excluded from heaven. Hence, because Vedelius, a learned man, did make it an aggravation of Gods grace to him, to chuse and call him, when so many thousand thousands of pagan-infants are damned: this speech, as being full of horridnesse, a scoffing Remonstrant takes, and sets it forth odiously in the Frontispice of his Book. But, though our reason is offended, yet we must judge according to the way of the Scripture; which makes Christ the only way for salvation. If so it could be proved, as Zwinglius held, that Christ did communicate himself to some Heathens, then it were another matter. I will not bring all the places they stand upon, that which is mainly urged is Act 10. of Cornelius; his prayers were accepted, and, saith Peter, now I perceive, &c. But this proceedeth from a meere mistake; For Cornelius had the implicite knowledge and faith of Christ and had received the doctrine of the Messias, though he was ignorant of Christ, that individual Person."
"And as for that worshipping of him in every Nation, that is not to be understood of men abiding so, but whereas before it was limited to the Jewes, now God would receive all that should come to him, of what Nation soeuer." (Vindiciae Legis, 1647, pp. 80, 81.)

The minutes of the Westminster Assembly show that there was "a debate about elect of infants;" but inasmuch as there is no report of the debate and no indication of points of difference, such as we find in the minutes when important differences were developed, the debate was doubtless upon the mode of expression. The phrase seems not to have been changed by vote of the Assembly, for there is no record of such a vote. It was probably changed as a matter of style either by the Committee that had charge of "the wording of the Confession of Faith," or by Dr. Cornelius Burgess, who had charge of the final transcription of the Confession before it was taken up to Parliament.

The Committee on "the wording of the Confession" consisted of Edward Reynolds, Charles Herle, Matthew Newcommen, John Arrowsmith, and the Commissioners of the Church of Scotland. We shall give the testimony of two of them.

Robert Baylie, one of the Scottish commissioners, excludes the infants of the heathen from the salvation enjoyed by the infants of believers in the following terse form of catechism.


Samuel Rutherford, another of the Scotch commissioners, puts the doctrine in a rhetorical form, thus:

"Suppose wee saw with our eyes, for twenty or thirty yeers together, a great furnace of fire, of the quantity of the whole earth, & saw there Cain, Judas, Ahiophel, Saul, and all the damned as lumps of red fire, and they boyling and louping for pain in a dungeon of everlasting brimstone, and the black and terrible devils with long & sharp-tooth'd whips of Scorpions, lashing out scourges on them ; and if we saw there our Neighbours, Brethren, Sisters, yea our dear Children, Wives, Fathers, and Mothers, swimming and sinking in that black Lake, and heard the yelling, shouting, crying of our yong ones and fathers, blaspheming the spotlesse Justice of God ; if wee saw this while we are living here on Earth, we should not dare to offend the Majesty of God, but should hear, come to Christ, and beleive and be saved. But the truth is, If wee beleive not Moses and the Prophets, neither should wee beleive for this." (Trypt and Triumph of Faith. London, 1645, p. 36.)

We have examined the writings of the other members of the committee and have failed to find any evidence that these differed from Baylie, Rutherford, or their brethren of the third Grand Committee on this subject.

Dr. Burgess, through whose hands the Confession went in its final transcription, was the author of the book entitled Baptismal Regeneration of Elect Infants, Oxford, 1629. There can be no doubt of his use of the term "elect infants." It is altogether likely that in the final transcription of the Confession, he made the change from "elect of infants" to "elect infants" as meaning the same thing. He takes the following position in his book:
"It is most agreeable to the Institution of Christ, that All Elect Infants that are baptized (unless in some extraordinary cases) do, ordinarily, receive, from Christ, the Spirit in Baptism, for their first solemn initiation into Christ, and for their future actual renovation, in God's good time, if they live to years of discretion, and enjoy the other ordinary means of Grace appointed of God to this end" (p. 21).

He also quotes the following extract from Dr. Thomas Taylor's *Commentary on Titus* with entire approval:

"let us first Distinguish of Infants; of whom some be elected, and some belong not to the election of grace. These latter receive only the outward element, and are inwardly washed: The Former receive, in the right use of the Sacrament, the Inward Grace; not that hereby we ty the Majesty of God to any time or meanes, whose spirit bloweth when & where he listeth; on some before baptism, who are sanctified from the womb; on some after: but because the Lord Delighteth to Present Himselfe Gracious in his owne Ordinance; we may conceive that in the right use of this Sacrament, He Ordinarily Accompanieth It With his Grace: Here, according to his Promise, we may expect it, and Here we May and Ought end out the prayer of Faith for it" (p. 33).

It is evident that the change from "elect of infants" to "elect infants" was not occasioned by any differences of opinion as to the salvation of infants in these committees as distinguished from the Grand Committee.

We shall give a few additional witnesses from leading divines who were not members of these committees, and who may therefore be regarded as representing the other sections of the Westminster Assembly. We shall begin with the Prolocutor.

William Twisse, defending the doctrine of reprobation against Mr. Heard, says:

"If many thousands, even all the infants of Turkes and Sarazens dying in originall sinne, are tormented by him in Hell fire, is he to be accounted the father of cruelties for this? And I professe I cannot devise a greater shew and appearance of cruelty, than in this. Now I beseech you consider the spirit that breatheth in this man (Heard); dares he censure God, as a Father of cruelties for executing eternall death upon them that are guilty of it?" (The Riches of God's Love unto the Vessells of Mercy. Oxford, 1653, p. 135.)

One of the most influential divines in the Westminster Assembly was Stephen Marshall, the great preacher of the Civil Wars. Marshall preached a *Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants* in Westminster Abbey at a morning lecture in 1645. In this sermon he makes the following objection against the views of those who reject infant baptism:

"This opinion puts all Infants of all Believers into the self-same condition with the Infants of Turks and Indians, which they all readily acknowledge; and from thence, unavoidably, one of three things must follow—1. Either all of them are damned who die in their Infancy, being without the Covenant of Grace, having no part in Christ. Or, 2. All of them saved, as having no original Sinne, and consequently needing no Saviour; which most of the Anabaptists in the world doe own, and therefore bring in all Pelagianism, Universal Grace, Free-Will, etc. Or, 3. That although they bee tainted with Original corruption, and so need a Saviour, Christ doth pro beneficicio, save some of the Infants of Indians and Turks, dying in their Infancy, as well as some of the In-
fantsof Christians, and so carry salvation by Christ out of the Church, beyond the Covenant of Grace, where God never made any promise.

"That God hath made a promise to be the God of Believers, and of their Seed, we all know; but where the promise is to be found, that he will be the God of the seed of such parents who live and die his enemies, and their seed, not so much as called by the preaching of the Gospel, I know not.

"These men say the Covenant of Grace made to the Jews, differs from the Covenant made with us; but I desire to know whether in the one, or in the other, they find any promise of Salvation by Christ to any Infants dying in their Infancy, whose parents no way belonged to the Family of God, or Covenant of Grace" (p. 7).

April 2d, 1646, Stephen Marshall published A Defence of Infant Baptism in Answer to two Treatises and an Appendix to them concerning it lately published by John Tombes. For this work Marshall received a vote of thanks by the Westminster Assembly. He replies to Tombes thus:

"Next let us see how you avoid being goared by the three horns of my Syllogisme. I said, all being left in the same condition, 1. All must be saved. Or 2. All must be damned. Or 3. God saves some of the Infants of the Turkes, and some of the Infants of believers pro beneficio.

"After some discourse of the two first of these, you deny the consequence: It follows not (say you) God may save some, and those some may be the Infants of believers, and none of the Infants of Turkes and Indians.

"Its true, a man that will may venture to say so; and if another will, he may venture to say, That those some, are the Infants of Pagans, and not of Christians: and bee that should say so, hath as good warrant for this, as you have for the other, according to your principle. But what's this to the question before us? I said, This opinion leaves them all in the like condition; One having no more reference to a promise than another.

"Now if you will avoid being goared by any of these three horns, you should have shewed, that according to your opinion, there is some promise for some of the infants of believers, though there be none for the Infants of Pagans. But instead of shewing how your doctrine and opinion leaves them: you tell me what God may possibly doe in his secret Counsell, which is altogether unknowne to us. But I perceive your selfe suspected this answer would not endure the tryall: and therefore you quarrell at that expression of mine, That if any of the Infants, of such as live and die Pagans be saved by Christ; then salvation by Christ is carried out of the Church, whereof God hath made no promise.

"Against this you except; 1. That salvation is not carryed out of the invisible Church; though some Infants of Pagans should bee saved by Christ.

"I answer, it's true; and I adde, That if any man shall say, the Devils should be saved by Christ: even that Opinion would not carry salvation out of the invisible Church. But Sir, we are enquiring after the salvation of them to whom a promise of salvation is made. Now when you can prove that God hath made a promise, that he will gather a number, or hath a number whose names are written in the Lambs book, although their Parents never knew Jesus Christ, nor themselves ever live to bee instructed, you may then persuade your Reader to beleive, that even some of the Infants of Pagans dying in their Infancy belong to the invisible Church: and till then, you must give him leave to beleive that this answer is brought in as a shift, onely to serve your present need" (pp. 87, 88).

William Carter, a leading preacher among the Independents and a member of the Westminster Assembly, thus distinguishes between the children of believers and the children of unbelievers:

"That which made this difference was not to be found in that which was meerly nat-
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ural; for the Jewes were borne in original sinne, and corrupted thereby as much as the Gentiles; but in something supernatural, namely, because the Jewes, though they were sinful too, yet they were under the means of grace, and they had God engaged by covenant to them and their children for their good. But as for the Gentiles, he left them to their natural condition, without such means to mend them, nor was God engaged so to them for their good; but they were under the curse of God, therefore they grew wild as a tree in the Wilderness that hath none to order it. And so were all those that came of them, such children of such parents, alike under the curse of God in sinne, and not looked after or regarded by the Lord.

Therefore I say, this is one thing which makes this difference between the children of beleevers, and of unbelievers, that they are holy, and these common or unclean, because they are under such a word of blessing which these are not; yea though we cannot with certainty affirm of this or that Infant of a beleever that it is inherently holy yet holy as thus separated and differenced, from those who are common, by that word of blessing from God, under which they are. As we cannot upon certainty affirm of any particular person in the Church that he is inherently holy, because he may make a lye in his confession, yet of every such person we can say he is in that sense holy, namely, as separated unto God in that relation, and thereby differenced from those who are common or unclean."

Anthony Tuckney was a leader among the Westminster divines. He was chiefly responsible for the Answers to the Questions on the Ten Commandments in the Larger Catechism, and was chairman of the Committee that prepared the Shorter Catechism. July 4th, 1652, he preached at Cambridge a sermon on Acts iv. 2. This was published in 1654 under the title None but Christ, with an Appendix discussing the salvation of 1. Heathen; 2. Those of the Old World, the Jews and others before Christ, and 3. Such as die infants and idiots, etc., now under the gospel." This was written in answer to a book of Nathaniel Culverwell, entitled Light of Nature, 1652, which advocated the salvation of some of the heathen.

1. It cannot rationally be said, that there was an equall invincibility of ignorance in those Heathens, to that which is in Infants and distracted persons, which want the use of reason, which they had; and therefore might have made more use of it then they did; and therefore their sin was more wilful, and so made them more obnoxious to Gods wrath, which therefore these Infants, etc., as less guilty, may in reason better escape.

2. How God worketh in, or dealeth with elect Infants, which dye in their infancy (for any thing that I have found) the Scripture speaks not so much, or so evidently, as for me (or it may be for any) to make any clear or firm determination of it. But yet so much as that we have thence ground to believe, that they being in the Covenant, they have the benefit of it, Acts iii. 25. Gen. xvii. 7).

Whether God may not work and act faith in them then, (as he made John Baptist leap in the womb) which Beza, and others of our Divines deny, and others are not unwilling to grant, I dare not peremptorily determine. Yet this I may say, that he acteth in the souls of Believers in articulo mortis, when some of them are as little able to put forth an act of reason, as they were in articulo nativitatis. But the Scripture (for any thing that I know) speaks not of this, and therefore I forbear to speak any thing of it.

Only (as I said) it giveth us ground to believe, that they being in the Covenant may be so wrapt up in it, as also to be wrapt up in the bundle of life, and did it give us but as good hopes of the Heathens (of whom it rather speaks very sadly) as it doth of such Infants, I should be as forward as any to persuade my self and others, that they were in a hopeful condition.
"For such infants, suppose they have not actual faith, so as to exert it, yet they may have it infused in the habit, they are born in the Church, and in the Covenant, and what the faith of the Church, and of their believing parents may avail them, I do not now particularly enquire into! . . . .

"And whereas mention was made of an anticipating and preventing grace of God, by which without faith he might be saved; I conceive and believe that it is abundant anticipating and preventing grace, when either in Him or in any, God beginneth and worketh faith to lay hold on Christ. But such a preventing grace as to accept us for Christ sake without faith in Christ, the Scripture mentioneth not, is a new notion of a young Divine, which without better proof must not command our belief, or impose upon our credulity." (None but Christ, pp. 134-37.)

This passage also makes it clear that the Westminster divines did not mean to make the salvation of infants a different salvation from that of adults. The Westminster Confession, chap. x. i and 2, defines effectual calling. This work is the same with reference to all the elect. The special mention of infants and incapables does not separate them from the work of effectual calling. It defines with reference to them that this calling is not in the ordinary way of "being outwardly called by the ministry of the word," but in an extraordinary way of being inwardly called by the Spirit, who "worketh when and where and how he pleaseth." The time, the place, and the mode of this effectual calling is not determined. As Tuckney does not venture to affirm that this takes place in articulo mortis, so the Confession does not define it. But as Tuckney states that it is a new notion of the young man Culverwell that there can be salvation without faith in Christ, and he preached his discourse against Culverwell's doctrine that some heathen might be saved, and contended that salvation was by faith in Christ only; so the Westminster Confession takes the position that "those whom God effectually calleth he also freely justifieth" (xi. 1); and "God did, from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect; and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification: nevertheless they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them" (xi. 4).

This section of the Confession was aimed expressly at the Antinomian doctrine of eternal justification, and it insists there can be no justification until Christ has been applied by the Spirit and appropriated by faith. This doctrine of eternal justification without faith was urged at this time by John Saltmarsh, and is strongly opposed by Thomas Gataker (a member of the Westminster Assembly), in his Shadowes without Substance, published in 1646, thus:

"Christ you say, is ours without Faith; but we can not know him to be ours but by believing; and you reject this under the title of the Reformed opinion and more general, that none are justified or partakers of salvation, but by faith. And if no conditions at all be required for obtaining Salvation by Christ as was formerly affirmed by you, then neither Faith also: Yea, to this you come fully home, where you say, that the Covenant now under the Gospel is such a kind of Covenant, as was established with Noah, Gen. ix. 1 clear against the strain of the old, wherein man was to have his life upon condition. And in this your Reply, you deny the receiving of Christ to be acknowledged by you as a condition. And indeed, if the promise of salvation by Christ, be as absolute and free from all condition as that Covenant made with Noah; then may a man be saved by Christ, tho he
never know or look after Christ; as he is sure never to perish by an *acumenical deluge*, tho he neither know nor believe, nor do ever hear of such a *Covenant* concerning it." (Shadowes without Substance, 1646, p. 13.)

"2. The Apostle telleth us in express terms, that he *believed in Christ*; that he might be *justified by Christ*, thereby implying that he was not *actually justified*, or had part in the justification procured and purchased by the death of Christ, until he *believed*. And albeit the ransome, whereby we are *freely* (in regard of our selves) *justified*, be wholly in Christ Jesus; yet is he said to be *set forth for an atonement unto us through faith in his blood*; nor were those branches of the *wild Olive*, which were taken to succeed in the roome of those who were broken off, *actually in Christ*, but out of Christ, until upon their believing they were *engraffed into Christ*. (Shadowes without Substance, p. 44.)

It is evident, therefore, that those who take the position that "in the justification, therefore, of that majority of the elect which dies in infancy, personal faith does not mediate," go against the Confession in the passage cited above. The Westminster standards allow no advance in theology in that direction. The Westminster Confession does not define the time when the justification of elect infants and incapables takes place; it does not define the place where it takes place; it does not define the mode in which Christ is presented to the elect Infant, and how the child exercises saving faith. It leaves all these questions undetermined.

We are able to say that the Westminster divines were unanimous on this question of the salvation of elect infants only. We have examined the greater part of the writings of the Westminster divines, and have not been able to find any different opinion from the extracts we have given. The Presbyterian churches have departed from their standards on this question, and it is simple honesty to acknowledge it. We are at liberty to amend the Confession, but we have no right to distort it and to pervert its grammatical and historical meaning.

The difficulty involved in the salvation of elect infants is: to define *when* the Spirit effectually calls them "by enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God; taking away their heart of stone and giving unto them an heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ;" and how "being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit he is thereby enabled to answer this call and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it." In the infant who lives to years of discretion we can see the operation of the divine Spirit in regeneration, renewal and drawing him to Christ; and with regard to infants dying in infancy we can understand that the dynamic work of regeneration has been wrought; but how can we conceive of his drawing to Jesus Christ, his answer to the call, his embracing of the grace freely offered, and his exercise of faith. The Westminster standards leave all these questions unanswered for us, and we are free to speculate as much as we please so long as we do not trench upon the substance of doctrine that has been defined. It is, however, contrary to the Westminster Confession to believe in the salvation of all infants, or to believe in the salvation of any of the heathen who are capable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word.
Anthony Burgess meets the difficulty in this way:

"Thirdly. That which the most solid Divines pitch upon, is, that Infants have (I speak not generally, but indefinitely) a seed of faith, because they have the Spirit of God and regeneration, otherwise they could not be saved; and by this seed of faith, they become members of Christ, and that relation which is in their faith to Christ's merits, is the instrument by which they obtain remission of sinne. As for that place, Faith cometh by hearing, it is to be applied to the ordinary means of faith, and that in persons grown up. Neither can I say, that an Infant is bound to have actual faith; for happily in the state of Integrity, Infants then, though they had the Image of God, yet could not have put forth the actual exercise of graces, and if they could not do it in that state, it is not to be expected they do so now. (True Doctrine of Justification, 1655, I., p. 201).

But this explanation is a theory of some divines that has no official sanction in the Westminster standards.

As late as 1728 Professor Simpson, of Glasgow, was charged with heresy for teaching

"that it is more than probable, that all unbaptized infants dying in infancy are saved, and that it is manifest, if God should deny his grace to all, or any of the children of infidels, he would deal more severely with them than he did with fallen angels." (Case of Professor Simpson, Edinburgh, 1728).

The doctrine of the extension of redemption to a few elect persons who are idiots and incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, and to elect infants who might be baptized, and the few of the children of believers who died unbaptized, might leave the time, place, and mode of their calling and acceptance of Christ undetermined. But the doctrine of the universal salvation of infants dying in infancy involves the doctrine that "heaven is in great measure composed of the souls of redeemed infants," and that "the majority of the elect die in infancy;" and that the vast majority of our race are saved, not in the ordinary way of the outward call by the ministry of the word, but in an extraordinary way, without that outward call. This extension of salvation vastly beyond what the Westminster divines contemplated constrains us to ask what that extraordinary way is, and how it may be reconciled with the ordinary way of salvation, and how the two ways may be comprehended in a greater whole.

The late Dr. A. A. Hodge made a brave effort in this direction in his able article on the Ordo Salutis (Princeton Review, 1878, p. 315), by breaking through the Confession of Faith in his doctrine that infants are justified without personal faith. Other theologians will have to follow his example, whether they try it here or elsewhere, if they are to construct the doctrine of the universal salvation of infants into their systems of theology, for certainly the Westminster divines not only left no room for such a doctrine in their symbols, but they barred the way against it.

As Dr. Prentiss says:

"The change from the position generally held by Calvinistic divines at the beginning, or in the middle of the seventeenth century, to the ground taken by Dr. Charles Hodge, in 1871, in his Systematic Theology, is simply immense. It amounts to a sort of revolution in theological opinion, a revolution all the more noteworthy from the quiet,"
decisive way in which it was at last accomplished, the general acquiescence in it, and also the apparent unconsciousness of its logical consequences." (Presbyterian Review, IV., p. 556.)

If the Church has failed thus far to advance to the inevitable consequences of this doctrine, it cannot refrain much longer from it. It must either recede to the Westminster position, or, having abandoned it for a new doctrine, it must give good reasons for the new doctrine, justify it by evidence from Scripture, and make the reconstruction of the related doctrines that is necessarily involved.

We do not hesitate to express our dissent from the Westminster Confession in this limitation of the divine electing grace. We are of the opinion that God's electing grace saves all infants, and not a few of the heathen. We base our right to differ from the Westminster divines on their own fundamental principle, that the electing grace of God is not tied to the administration of the ordinary means of grace. We leave to others, who are to write on this subject in subsequent numbers of this Review, to give us the basis for the hope in the salvation of infants, and to tell us how, in their judgment, infants may be saved.

C. A. BRIGGS.

New York.

BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

This is one of a series of articles bearing on the question of probation (or, to avoid a disputable term, of salvation) after death. It is an attempt to exhibit the Biblical Doctrine of the Intermediate State not as a whole, which would be impossible within the limits assigned to me, but in those essential features of it which stand related to the question immediately before us. I am constrained by my limitations to give results rather than processes, although I may be allowed to say that these results are based on the widest induction of facts and statements which I have thus far been able to make in my Biblical researches, and that almost every clause might be buttressed by ample textual references. To economize space I have omitted all such references, sources, authorities, Hebrew and Greek terms and characters, etc., in the confidence that those most familiar with the subject will be able to dispense with them, and that the general reader will not clamor for them, unless it be for the texts, which I should have been glad to insert. The reader will kindly overlook the dogmatic form of statement; this too on the ground that I have no space for apologetic and hypothetical circumlocutions.

Schenkel has said that there is no Biblical Doctrine of the Intermediate State accessible to us. It will be acknowledged by all who have looked at the subject thoughtfully that it is at least one of the most difficult and most imperfectly developed departments of Biblical Theology.

I shall say but little of the Biblical topography of the Middle World. I doubt whether we have given us a fixed, definite outline of its topographical configuration and contents. The Bible abounds in localizations, but these represent conditions far more than places, their boundaries expand and contract,
their relations to each other change, their characteristics vary in precision or intensity. When we come to the consideration of these localized conditions and modes of existence we are beset with perplexities. The time-relations and the space-relations vary. Here is a foreshortening, there a lengthening of the perspective. The lines of demarcation shift their position, and ever and anon disappear altogether.

I. In the Old Testament the notion of an Intermediate Future is conveyed only by hints and fragments. The Future is gazed upon with dumb awe, as, overhung with shadows, it stretches outward and onward through "dim æonian periods," while the children of immortality stand "on its shore, and hear the mighty waters rolling evermore." The Future there revealed is an Intermediate Future, into which the soul enters at once, and an Indefinite Future, reaching one knows not whither, or how far. An Intermediate Future is distinctly conceivable only where there is a clear, all-illuminating revelation of one final, decisive Day of Doom. Such a revelation the Old Testament does not give.

At the same time this immediate future which lies before the Old Testament saint represents in the main what in the distinct light of the New Testament revelation of the Day of Doom is signified by the Intermediate State. Although the pious Hebrew but faintly, if at all, appreciated its intermediacy, it was intermediate all the same.

The leading etymological representative of this immediate (intermediate) futurity is the word Sheol. As to its origin, Sheol is doubtless a survival of the mythological period in the earlier Hebrew history. It is noteworthy that its New Testament Greek equivalent has also a mythological source. To the student of the religious history of mankind this adoption, assimilation, and spiritualization of mythological elements is of importance as illustrating the relations of Divine Revelation to the ethnic religions of the world. To the interpreter of that Revelation such elements are of interest as indicating the point where the line is to be drawn between the more exact and the more popular representations of Scripture. Sheol in the earlier stages of the Old Testament representation is the underworld, as the home of the dead. So at least predominantly, if not exclusively. Its subterranean location belongs to its mythological pedigree and associations. The mental picture which it presents is serviceable chiefly at two points: first, as furnishing a point of connection with the grave, with which, however, it is not to be identified; and next as furnishing a point of contrast with heaven. For the Hebrew, with his concrete conceptualism and his contracted cosmology, Sheol, particularly in its "depths," "gorges," "abysses," and "pits," furnishes the counterpart of Heaven, the "Heights," the eternal "summits" of light and glory and bliss.

This underworld, Sheol, is the realm of Death, who shepherds its dwellers as his flock. Its inhabitants are indeed living beings, but not having been as yet released from Death's dread rule, and with but a doubtful prospect of such release, they pine away in a shadowy, fractional, gloomy, benumbed, passive, barren existence. They are shadows, "weaklings" (Rephaim). This "land
of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness," is the receptacle of all the departed.

With the ethical and religious development of the Hebrews, and with advanced views of retribution, especially as showing itself in the punishment of the wicked, Sheol acquired presently a twofold application, being used sometimes in the older and wider sense of the abode of the departed, and sometimes in the sense of the place of punishment for the wicked. In the latter sense, for precision other terms came to be attached to it, such as Abaddon, Gehinnom, Tophet, Abyss (Pit), and the like, which gave increased definiteness to the idea of a primitive retribution in the future. On the other hand, while God's servants continue to look forward to Sheol as their future dwelling-place, they begin to make a larger use of such terms as "life," "joy," "glory," and even "heaven," as descriptive of their final, if not immediate futurity, which may be conceived as either the upper realms of Sheol, or as a place apart from Sheol, viewed as the Kingdom of Death. In the latter sense Job breathes the hope of a deliverance out of Sheol, and David that he might not be abandoned to Sheol. In such passages, which are, however, of rare occurrence, the Intermediate Future emerges into distinct view. For the most part the more generic conception of Sheol as a place and of its passive, shadowy, sombre, monotonous existence predominates. We find it as late as Hezekiah, Job, Koheleth.

In a word, then, we may say that the Old Testament doctrine of the Intermediate Future is: (1) Generically—a passive, dreamlike, barren, monotonous, limited existence. (2) Specifically: (a) On the part of the holy, a life which is the negative of absolute death, a state of hope, now feebler, now stronger, patient expectation of a "change," "release," a "revivescence" to a fuller and more blessed life; (b) on the part of the wicked a state of dread, of banishment from light and from God, pain, wrath, self-retaliation, remorse, corruption, death.*

II. In the New Testament the nearest equivalent of Sheol is Hades. In the use of this word we find, however, that the drift already noticeable in the Old Testament use of Sheol has made a marked advance. Hades, even more decidedly than Sheol, merges practically in Hell. In a very few passages, indeed, where the expressions relate to our Lord's intermediate state, it is distinctively the region of the dead. In the parable of Dives and Lazarus it may be regarded as doubtful whether "Hades" is used in the broader or the narrower sense—doubtful, in other words, whether "Abraham's bosom" is to be viewed as a part of Hades. In most passages the latter term has unmistakably a primitive significance, which may be illustrated by the association of Death and Hades, and the remarkable Apocalyptic prediction that Death and Hades will be cast into the Lake of Fire; although this prediction of itself implies that Hades as the place of torture, as the "prison" in which souls are held

* I must pass over the inter-canonical as well as the early Rabbinical literature, which would furnish interesting illustrations of the transition from the Old Testament view to that of the New. -
until the Judgment, has an intermediate significance, and will hereafter find its issue in the Dead Sea of Eternity.

It follows, however, from this brief statement, which might be amply confirmed by a larger induction from such terms as "heaven," "kingdom of heaven," "heavenlies," "underworldlings," that in the New Testament the local force of such words is greatly weakened, or rather idealized, and that they are to be interpreted much rather as descriptive of conditions. The emphasis rests on the state rather than the place. In considering accordingly the New Testament Doctrine, we direct our attention to the Intermediate State.

What now do the New Testament writers teach us in regard to the Intermediate State? We need not specify individual variations. Christ centres his teaching on the Absolute Future, the Consummation. The Apostles, called on to face the eschatological problems of the World-Crisis through which their age was passing, tell us more about the Future both as immediate and as final. Let us summarize the facts.

1. Let us note at the outset as a highly significant fact that the New Testament writers never disparage, much less antagonize the Old Testament Doctrine. They never repudiate Job, or Hezekiah, the sons of Korah, or Koheleth. This would have been quite impossible for them as devout Israelites, believers in "the prophets" and in the "holymen" who "spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." Their revelation, indeed, goes far beyond that of the Old Testament. They speak in the light which "has illuminated death and incorruption." Their outlook is irradiated with the foregleams of an undying Day. Death for them has lost its sting. They even "long to depart." But never do they put the stamp of denial or disapprobation on the Old Testament representation of the after-death existence. They, too, agree that the existence into which death ushers even the beloved of God is relatively incomplete, dismembered, expectant, passive, self involved, limited. For more precise correspondences, see below.

2. The New Testament writers carry on more definitely the tendencies and drifts of the Old Testament development. Sheol, as we have seen, invests itself more and more with the sinister sense of "hell," and its equivalents. This is still more decisively the case with Hades. The thread which connects "Paradise," or "Abraham's bosom," with Hades is of the slightest, if it exists at all. This again is a most suggestive phenomenon. Is it not a reasonable inference that the drifts of the inspired doctrine of Hades indicate the drifts of Hades itself? For corroborative considerations, see the points which follow.

3. The Intermediate State is so called because it intervenes between Death and the Judgment. It becomes important, then, to ask, What is the significance of these momentous facts in their bearing on the Intermediate State?

First. Death.

General Remark.—Let us think for a moment on the immense significance of Death for all personalities alike as involving a total change of environment. Modern Science, in two of its best-established dicta, asserts: (1) The incalculable influence of environment on organism; (2) the modification of the life
and functions of the individual by the modification of its organism. These conclusions are in entire harmony with those of Biblical Theology. The loss of the bodily mechanism by death, the tremendous change of environment after death, the replacement of familiar sensations and experiences by such as were before altogether unknown, the investiture of the spirit with new instrumentalities and media for mental and spiritual activity, the substitution of totally new space and time-conditions for those of this earthly life—all this will of necessity occasion the most significant change in the mode of existence. That it will revolutionize character is nowhere asserted or implied. That it will affect very differently the development of character in an existence subject to the law of deterioration and disintegration, and in a life subject to rehabilitation and growth, will be obvious on a moment's reflection, and is supported by what was said above of the drift of the Scripture doctrine of Sheol-Hades.

A. For the regenerate death means:

(i.) Deliverance from the body, as the "body of sin" and the "body of death." It secures the elimination of the last vestige of corruption from the "earthly" side of their nature. The sin-saturated organism is laid in the grave to decay, and to be left behind forever.

(ii.) Death does not destroy the continuity of the real life of the believer's essential personality. "He that believeth shall never die." It is an incident in his progress toward a perfect manhood, especially in his progress from the "earthly body" to the "spiritual body."

(iii.) It is thus a decisive factor in the reconstruction of the "new," the "heavenly" man, which begins at regeneration and culminates in the resurrection, a process which from beginning to end affects the entire man and the entire life—pneumatic, psychic, and bodily. It is a twofold process, "being unclothed" (at death, negative) and "clothed upon" (after death, positive). See below on v.

(iv.) It introduces the departed spirit into the immediate presence of Christ. "Absent from the body, at home with the Lord." In a word, the essential conditions of the ultimate glorification of the redeemed will be realized, so far as these can be attached to the incompleteness of the Intermediate State. On the other hand, we must take into account the characteristics of this incompleteness.

(v.) Death occasions the temporary dismemberment of manhood. How important in the activities of the earthly Christian life are the functions of the earthly body appears from the prominence given to the term "members" as the instrumentalities of that life. How large a modification of holy activity will come through the loss of these members needs only to be stated to be seen. Whatever may be said of the intermediate body—a subject which must be passed by at present—it is at least true that it cannot be the body to which the departed Christian has been accustomed in this life, nor yet that which awaits him at the resurrection. The physiological investiture of the believer in his intermediate life will of necessity largely determine the form, the agencies, the volume, the energy of that life, and in certain directions at least materially
reduce the same. It is only in view of these limitations of the Intermediate Life that the intense yearnings of the apostles for the completed redemption and glorification of the Great Day become an intelligible reality.

(vi.) The conditions of the Intermediate State as just described will tend to favor a life of predominant internality, retiring within itself, contemplation of the supra-sensual essences laid open to the "unveiled" vision, a life indeed of yearning rather than of reminiscence, stirring with the germinations of the latent powers of the "inner man" in its "underworld" life.

(vii.) In like manner the modification of the environment and of the space and time-conditions of existence, above all, the sweet penetration of the soul's atmosphere with the supernal light streaming into the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies, will favor a mystic, devotional, entranced type of life, in which æons will count as hours, adoration will absorb thought, communion service, and self will be forgotten in the ecstasy of love.

(viii.) With these conclusions perfectly accord the Scripture representations of the Immediate Future of believers.

a. Their life, prior to the Second Epiphany, is "hid with Christ in God," awaiting its full "manifestation" in the final "manifestation" of Christ. That coming is that Christ might be glorified in his people, and marvelled at in all them that believe. Here is an unveiling, an unfolding of what was before veiled and hidden.

b. To die, for the believer, is to "fall on sleep." The theory of a literal sleep of the soul is indeed to be decisively rejected. But error is not seldom a distorted truth. The Intermediate State has many analogies to sleep, in some even of its essential features, particularly in the recoil of the soul upon its centre with the suspension of its peripheral sensations and experiences; in the subject of space forms and time metres to internal conditions; in the subjective subtlety with which transpositions and transmutations of related existences are effected; in the glamour of ideality (the transcendental reality) with which the inner sense invests the objects of its vision. The Christian's sleep of death means all this. It means still more doubtless rest, calm, refreshment, readjustment, reunification.

c. In the same line is our Lord's representation—"We must be working the works of him that sent me while it is day; there cometh a night, when no one has power to be working." The figurative cast of the representation is obvious. But does not our Lord speak in figures because the parable conveys more of the reality than the bare prosaic statement of the ultimate fact? Night is the period of "sleep" (see above), of mystery, of self-involution, of reminiscence, of anticipation, of crypto-physiological conditions of existence, of silence, of inactivity. If the Intermediate State (of which our Lord is incontestably speaking) stands related in its general characteristics to the earthly day which precedes it, how much more to the Heavenly Day which follows it?

d. It is not to be overlooked that the essential characteristics of "Abraham's bosom" and "Paradise" belong to the same general category. Each suggests
bliss on the side of quietude, passivity, contemplation, the rapture of simple contact, and pure sensation.

(ix.) While for the Christian the Intermediate State implies a blessed experience of rapturous communion with his Lord in a state of sinlessness, and of a happiness to the full commensurate with the capacities of an incomplete condition, the above considerations teach us that it will be in the nature of a beatific monotone. It will be no sooner begun than to the consciousness it will leap to the larger, fuller, absolute glorification and beatification of the resurrection-life and the ascension-life, which has its definite beginning on the Day of Judgment. The Resurrection will come to Christ's friends swiftly, radiantly, triumphantly, with the "awakening" inspiration of "the trump of God," as the morning comes to the sleeper after a night of ecstatic visions and benign rest. And thus to the Church, living or asleep, the Day of the Lord is ever at hand.

(x.) Note how, in all the preceding aspects of it, the Intermediate State is for all who "rest in Jesus" prophetic, nay, decisive of destiny.

B. For the unregenerate death means:

(i.) Punishment. It is the most complete execution of the penalty of sin which has thus far in his existence been inflicted on the transgressor.

(ii.) Organic disintegration of manhood.

a. Of the body. "Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." The natural law of dissolution which, apart from sin, would have been an incident in the transmutation of the "earthly body" to the "spiritual body," becomes under sin the consummation of the physical disintegration.

b. Of the soul. Sin is progressive corruption, spiritual dissolution advancing toward a crisis. Death as a totality (physical and spiritual), being predicated of man as a unit (not of the body alone), marks such a crisis in the spiritual no less than in the physical development. In this crisis the man, who is already dying, dies. This of necessity presupposes an advanced stage in the progress of the æonian death, a diminution in the functions and possibilities of vitality. There is absolutely no intimation that death, ipso facto, breaks the continuity or works the reversal of the ethical and spiritual development on which it falls. Per contra (see above) in the Bible representation Hades becomes more and more the realm of death. Its law is thus the law of death.

(iii.) Restriction of the sphere of existence. The "spirits" of the unregenerate departed are "in prison." This confinement, apart from its reflex physiological and psychological influences, has a judicial significance, which must still further intensify those influences. Those imprisoned spirits are "reserved" for the Day of Wrath. A priori speculations (see Dorner, Martensen, Plumptre, Farrar, etc.) respecting the physiological and psychological conditions of the Intermediate State need to be supplemented with these unquestionable Biblical data.

(iv.) Rupture of association with holy personalities. This is distinctly announced in the parable of Dives and Lazarus. The "great gulf" between those "in torment" and those in "Abraham's bosom"—a gulf which has been
"firmly fixed" and which makes intercourse impossible—is palpably not a mere pictorial adjunct of the scene. In the parable it can have but one interpretation, and in the reality it can have but one effect.

(v.) Per contra: The separate aggregation of sinful personalities can in like manner have but one effect. This is implied in what was said above of the "reservations" of the Intermediate State. The evil are thrown to act and to react on one another. Nay more, they are drawn together by virtue of the gravitations and affinities of the spiritual universe. Each, like Judas, "goes to his own place."

(vi.) Exile from God. This is as the antithesis of being with God, with Christ, as the dread counterpart of "Paradise" and "Abraham's bosom," and as the necessary corollary of the issues of the death-crisis and the progressive deterioration of the soul.

(vii.) The total change of environment (cf. General Remarks) in such a life as is herein described can tend only to the aggravation of the internal confusion, bewilderment, disorganization, paralysis of the personality which find their awful summary in the word Death.

(viii.) We are justified by Scripture correlations and considerations derived from other departments of Biblical Theology in assigning to these features of the Intermediate State of the unregenerate the same quality of decisiveness as affecting destiny which attaches to the corresponding conditions of the state of the regenerate.

Secondly; Judgment. This subject is to receive separate treatment. I am concerned with it here only as it stands connected with the intermediateness of the after-death existence.

One of the most conspicuous features of the history of the Divine Kingdom is what, for lack of a more convenient expression, I must call the law of deuterosis. The cycle has its epicyle. There is a First and a Second; or, as we may also say, a First and a Last. Thus there is a First and a (Second) Last Adam; a First and a (Second) Last Covenant; a First and a Last Paradise. Especially does this deuterosis find its ultimate factor in the Last Day, thus: a First and a Last Regeneration; a First and a Last Justification; a First and a Last Reconciliation; a First and a Last Adoption; a First and a Last Redemption; a First and a Last Parousia, or Epiphany; a First and a Last Resurrection; a First and a Last Judgment. The drift from First to Last is in the nature of an irreversible advance. There are no refluxes in the currents. The Last gives emphasis to the First. It is the cosmic reaffirmation of the individual fact, the Amen of Eternity to the foregoing Yea.

It is so confessedly in the career of the regenerate. The Biblical Doctrine of the Intermediate State furnishes no ground for doubting that is so in the career of the unregenerate. The internal conditions of existence in that state are such as make a reversal of the course of a fallen and still falling soul impossible there, without an influx of Supernatural Grace immeasurably transcending aught witnessed here. May such an influx be inferred from the fact of Christ's "Descent into Hades"? Biblical Theology justifies no such in-
ference. Christ himself expressly limits his activity in "working the works of him that sent him" to the "day" of his earthly life. When he went to the realm of the dead he passed into the "night" wherein no one has power so to work.* Christ went there and returned thence as "the firstfruits of them that are asleep." His apparition in Hades is no doubt a fact of the most profound significance. But the dynamics of Redemption are never associated with the Intermediate State. The sole authority for such an association would be the famous locus in Peter. But against the assumption of a proclamation of the Gospel by Christ in Hades, or that such a proclamation would have a redemptive significance, are the following considerations: (1) The strict construction of the passage; (2) the context and scope; (3) its doctrinal and phraseological correlations; (4) the Petrine theology as a whole. (5) "Preaching" is one of the "works" to be discontinued during the "night." (6) "Preaching" as a Gospel instrumentality to be effective must be continuous. Christ's apparition in Hades was momentary. (7) It must be energized by the Holy Spirit. The ministry of the Spirit is not, to say the least, a characteristic of the Intermediate State. _Per contra_, the after-resurrection humanity of believers is more distinctively "spiritual" than that which precedes it. (8) It does not regenerate apart from the "truth." The Bible specifies no provision for an adequate communication of the truth after death to those who have never heard it; (9) its efficacy presupposes conditions favorable to the susceptibility of the hearers. No such conditions appear in the Biblical Doctrine of the Intermediate State. (10) The personal preaching of Christ on earth was preparatory to that of the Church and its ministries. No such provision appears in the Intermediate State, where it would appear to be far more imperative. Missionary communication between "Abraham's bosom" and the abode of Dives is pronounced to be impossible. (11) Christ's personal preaching of three years as the Word Incarnate was followed by small results. A three days' apparition as a disembodied spirit to a specific class of imprisoned spirits would present yet fewer conditions of permanent power and success. (12) Bearing in mind the above considerations, and the awful abyss-ward drift of the Intermediate State of the "perishing" from the First Judgment to the Last, are we not justified in the conclusion, as a necessary implication of Biblical Theology, that such a Hadean proclamation of the Gospel as an inadequate exegesis has thrust on Peter's words would be little less than a stupendous mockery? The Gospel has brought into the world a "larger hope" indeed; but also, and what is even more precious, "A BETTER HOPE."

_Llewellyn T. Evans._

*C It is true that this "night" is otherwise named "Paradise." So heaven is described sometimes as rest, sometimes as reigning.*
THOMAS CROSKERY, D.D.

Among the numerous losses which the ministry of the Irish Presbyterian Church has recently suffered by death, none is more serious than that of Professor Croskery, of Londonderry, who for some years has acted as one of the Associate Editors of this Review, and who as a writer was favorably known on both sides of the Atlantic.

He was born at Carrowdore, in County Down, Ireland, on the 26th of May, 1830, and spent his youth in Downpatrick. He belonged originally to a Unitarian family, and was a member of that community when he entered Belfast College in 1845; but owing to the influence of two companions, who set him the example of a holy life and put into his hands Dwight’s Theology, he withdrew from the Unitarian body at the close of his first Session, and joined the Presbyterian Church. His father was a tradesman, but was impoverished by bad debts made in the famine year of 1847; the result of which was, that the young student was obliged to supplement his slender means at college by reporting and writing for the Belfast newspapers.

On being licensed to preach the Gospel, in 1851, by the Presbytery of Down, he went to America, where he remained two years, preaching and writing as opportunity offered. Returning from America to Belfast in 1853, he became first reporter and afterward editor of the Banner of Ulster, an able bi-weekly newspaper of the time, published in the Presbyterian interest. During the same period he preached and supplied congregations when invited to do so. He does not seem in these years to have been very popular as a preacher; for, as he often told afterward, he preached in twenty-six vacancies before he received a call. In 1860 he did, however, receive an invitation from Creggan, a small congregation in a remote corner of County Armagh, where he was ordained on the 17th of July in that year. From Creggan he removed to Clonakilty, in County Cork, in 1863, and after three years’ labor in the extreme South he was settled in the North as minister of the new congregation formed at the Waterside, a suburb of the city of Londonderry. Here he had free access to books, literary friends, and other means of information, of which he took full advantage. In 1875 he was appointed to a Professorship in Magee College, and on the death of Professor Smyth, M.P., he was removed from the Chair of Logic to that of Theology. In the congenial pursuits connected with this office he was occupied up till his death, on the 3d of October, 1886.

During the last period of his life Dr. Croskery was in high reputation as an instructive and practical preacher. As a professor he was esteemed by his colleagues and respected by his students. But his main distinction was earned as an able and prolific contributor to the periodicals of the time. It is now a subject of regret that his strength was spent on articles for reviews and magazines, temporary in their influence and ephemeral in their nature, rather than in the production of one or two works of solid and permanent value. Books
have at least a chance of life, but magazine articles have none. The best of them live but a month or two; then, as a rule, they die and are forgotten. His Catechism, Plymouth-Brethrenism, and Irish Presbyterianism—a pamphlet specially written for strangers attending the Council of the Reformed Churches held at Belfast in 1884—are the only productions of his which appeared separately. The first of these is very short, but it has run through many editions, and has been translated into various Continental tongues. The second is a book, discussing theologically the peculiarities of the sect from which it derives its name. The third is a summary of the past history and present condition of the Irish division of the Presbyterian Church.

All his other writings were essays, reviews, articles, or biographical sketches contributed to the periodicals of the day. His literary life extended from 1862 till 1886. During these twenty-four years he wrote fifty-four solid and elaborate articles, of which two appeared in the Eclectic, four in the Princeton, six in Fraser, seven in the London Quarterly, eight in the British Quarterly, fourteen in the British and Foreign Evangelical, eleven in the Edinburgh, and two in our own Review. Nor was this all. For some years he was editor of the Evangelical Witness, an able religious monthly founded by Dr. John Hall, of New York, during his ministry in Ireland. He contributed also to the Pulpit Commentary, to the Evangelical Magazine, the Presbyterian Churchman, Christian Irishman, as well as to the Northern Whig, Belfast Witness, and other newspapers. In the spring before he died no less than five articles from his pen, some of them very elaborate, appeared in the same month in five different magazines, yet at that time the shadow of death was upon his face. His lectures on "Westminster Theology and Modern Thought," delivered on the Carey Foundation the winter before he died, would have been published separately had it pleased God to spare his life.

His popular lectures, illustrative of Ulster manners and customs, as well as his biographical sketches, particularly those of Dr. Reid, the historian, and of Dr. Goudy, have been much admired. The latter was left unfinished at his death. His iron industry must have done something to shorten his days. Incessant labor had become natural to him, and work was as pleasant and attractive to him as leisure is to many. Till health utterly failed him, he could not resist an invitation to preach, or to deliver a public lecture, or to write an article. He had always a subject before his mind, on which he was gathering information and meditating to produce an essay. He lived among his books and papers, and when business called him from home he went forth with notebook in hand, jotting down incidents, gathering hints, noting and perpetuating impressions. Above and beyond all he was amiable and wise and good, deeply interested in the Church and in advancing the cause of God. A man of his rare taste, wide and general reading, ardent love of work, power of literary expression, and kindly nature is not often met with anywhere, and when taken away in the maturity of his intellectual strength and usefulness, he leaves behind him a gap that is not easy to fill.

Thomas Witherow.
REVIEWS OF
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

I.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.


Professor Weiss belongs to that intermediate school of theologians which is exposed to attack from two sides—from the conservatives, for what they yield to critical methods, and from the radicals, for what they retain of conservative presuppositions and results. It is a difficult position, but likely to be a right one, in as far as extremes are apt to be unjust, and the middle course the truest. It is sometimes in ill repute because taken by weak or timid men who desire to avoid giving offence on any hand. Such men command no respect and gather no followers. Weiss is not one of these. He commands respect and he gathers followers by virtue of the bold strength of conviction with which he insists on his presuppositions and results, and the vigorous freedom with which he makes use of critical methods in the process.

His Introduction to the New Testament displays these characteristics. He is no novice in this field, and this book has been ripening through years of lecture-giving on this branch of New Testament science. Indeed the interest of the book is somewhat lessened by the fact that the most original part of his work in Introduction—that on the Gospels—has long been before the public.

After a brief sketch of the history of New Testament Isagogics, he proceeds to the history of the New Testament Canon. From this he separates, as not pertinent to the historical and literary questions which form the subject-matter of Isagogics, the history of the text and textual criticism. These topics he treats in an Appendix very briefly, and somewhat under protest, since he assigns them to the department of Hermeneutics. If it be agreed that the business of the science of Biblical Introduction is to inquire into the origin and collection of the Bible writings, this separation is very well; but the fact that Weiss has, after all, given a place to the subject of the text, indicates that he is not quite prepared to insist in practice on what he claims in theory, and that he has drawn the lines of his definition too narrowly. Higher Criticism may be profitably studied quite apart from Lower, but the name of "Introduction" should not be appropriated exclusively to the former.

The Special Introduction is so arranged as to give, as far as possible, the historical setting of each book. This is easiest in the case of the chief epistles of
Paul, with whose writings this part of the book begins. They are followed by the Epistle to the Hebrews, and these by the Apocalypse. Then come the Catholic epistles, and finally the historical books—the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Gospel of John. While the scheme is, in general, a chronological one, it appears that the author has thought best not to cause distraction by making it rigidly so, but completes a whole group, even though the later works of this group post-date the earlier ones of the next group. The case of the Apocalypse, which falls into no group, is exceptional. Its position before the Catholic epistles, some of which certainly antedate it, perhaps relieves the confusion which would follow if it were placed after the group, since this ends with the epistles of John, which post-date the Apocalypse. It is, however, to be said of this arrangement that a grouping which, e.g., brings the Epistle of James and those of John under one heading, for purposes of historical discussion, is obviously defective; nor do the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John belong in exactly the same corner of the picture.

Weiss maintains the authenticity of all the epistles commonly attributed to Paul, hesitating more at the Pastoral epistles than at any other, because of the familiar difficulties in fixing the historical situation. The letters to the Ephesians and Colossians and to Philemon he assigns to the Cæsarean captivity, but without new arguments therefor. This is one of the matters that can hardly be decided. For Hebrews he favors the authorship of Barnabas, on the basis of Tertullian's well-known statement, and of the internal probabilities, and such likelihood as there is in the matter seems to be on the side of this opinion. The date he sets just before A.D. 70. The Apocalypse is put very little later. That this is the proper date for the Apocalypse, at least that it long precedes the epistles and Gospel of John, instead of following them, should, it would seem, be now everywhere accepted. Of the difficult questions of structure and composition connected with this book it is perhaps enough to say that Weiss has not settled them. The recent theory of Vischer, finding a Jewish document at the bottom of our Apocalypse, was not before him. He holds to the Johannean authorship, and supposes the visions, at first disconnected, to have been constructed by him into an artistic whole. Any intentional conflict of James' argument with Paul's is put out of the question by holding James to have written early in the Apostolic period, before Paul's great missionary successes had shifted the centre of Christianity to the Gentile world, and before Paul's great doctrinal epistles were circulated. James he considers, rightly as we believe, a son of Mary and Joseph, and a uterine brother of Jesus.

The structure of the Gospels is Weiss's familiar territory; his views are in no essential respect altered. The authenticity of John's Gospel is advocated. Mark's is explained as based on the apostolic Logia and on Peter's recollections; our Matthew as based on the Logia and Mark, and Luke's Gospel as based also on the Logia and Mark, with some auxiliary source—Luke and Matthew being, however, mutually independent. We refer with pleasure, in this connection, to Dr. A. B. Bruce's article on the Synoptical Gospels in this REVIEW for October, 1884.

The Lucan authorship of the Acts is maintained, and its trustworthiness as a historical document. In general, then, the author's results are conservative. The only considerable exception which might be taken to this statement concerns the Synoptic Gospels, and even these he puts within the apostolic period.

As a text-book, which it aims to be, this volume is sufficiently full without being overburdened, the materials form for the most part a continuous text which is not harder reading than the subject makes necessary, and much easier than is furnished by most books of the kind. The chief criticism from this standpoint would be a lack of clear, compact statement of the propositions maintained, and of various little practical contrivances in the way of sub-headings and the like.
As a book of reference, on the other hand, it possesses the value to which its author's reputation entitles it, and as a history of the origin of our New Testament books it is readable and instructive. **Francis Brown.**


This is a comprehensive sketch of the literature of the Jews, beginning with the Bible and coming down in the parts before us well into the Middle Age. It is intended in the later parts to reach as far at least as Mendelssohn. Why the title-page should have "History of the Literature of European Peoples" is a problem we have been unable to solve.

The Jews in their dispersion have not been able to shut out all influence of the civilization of their Gentile neighbors and oppressors. This influence has shown itself in their literature. If we understand by Jewish Literature the literature produced by Jews, we shall include in it works which show the most various tendencies. In the flourishing period of Arab philosophy and belles-lettres, Jewish literature is a reproduction (not servile, yet dependent) of Arabic thought. Maimonides is an Arabic philosopher just as Mendelssohn is a German philosopher somewhat attenuated. Charisi made his Hebrew Makamat directly under the influence of Hariri, whose works he translated into Hebrew.

In this state of affairs it would be well to limit the enormous field of inquiry by including in Jewish literature only those works originally written in Hebrew. Even then the object of study is too vast for one man's thorough mastery. A broad line should therefore be drawn between the Bible as strictly Hebrew literature and the later works. To the Jew indeed the Talmud presents itself as the continuation of the Bible. But it must be evident to the most superficial student that there is a great gap between them. Christian authors generally treat the Old and New Testament separately, and orthodox Judaism ought to make at least so much distinction between Bible and Talmud.

Our first criticism on the work before us is that the author has attempted too much. Old Testament Introductions we have in superabundance both for scholars and for the people. Such an outline as is given in this work is too little or else it is too much. If the author had made his theme the Talmudic and rabbinical literature he would have made a better book.

But this is not all. In what is here given us we find a lack of clearness in arrangement and in expression. The author does not seem thoroughly to have worked out his own conceptions. He often gives the views of another without expressing any opinion of his own, though perhaps on another page he may make other and inconsistent statements. The source of the quotations is nowhere given, and this is a grave fault.

A few examples will serve to justify these criticisms. The author of the Books of Kings, we are told, "refers to two earlier works, the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel, which can be reconstructed with considerable accuracy from the extant Books of Chronicles" (p. 47). How the statement we have italicized can be so, when our Books of Chronicles deal, as is well known, only with the history of Judah, is hard to see. After speaking of Ezra and Nehemiah, "it remains only to treat of that 'Great Synagogue' which comes suddenly into view, to disappear as quickly in the darkness of history." But where this sudden appearance is found is an unanswered question. So with the authority for the statement that "Flavius Josephus received from the Temple its whole library, which consisted (as can be proved by his indisputable statements) of exactly the books which we yet recognize as parts of the Biblical
literature." Now the present reviewer believes the Bible of Josephus to be identical with our Old Testament, but it would give him a great deal of trouble to prove it indisputably. In fact, Josephus' own statements are anything but exact. The book of Tobit "seems to have existed in a Chaldee text from which Jerome claims to have made his translation." Nothing is said of Neubauer's publication of such a text. "Aristotle is said to have been converted by Jewish doctrine, other Greek philosophers are said to have drawn their wisdom from an earlier Greek version; this, however, must not be understood as historical fact, but according to its deeper meaning." It is certainly to be regretted that the author had not space to expound for us this deeper meaning. Of the Talmud (more exactly of the Haggada) we learn that, "born of the spirit of prophecy and nourished by the sun of the East, it conquered the heathen world, became the schoolmistress of other religions as they appropriated her deepest truths; that "the whole cycle of pious Biblical legends which Islam has told and sung now twelve hundred years in many languages to the entertainment of sages as well as of women and children," may be found in embryo or fully developed in the Haggada; that, finally, much of what is familiar to us from the mediaeval world of legend, from Dante and Boccaccio, Cervantes and Milton, springs consciously or unconsciously from this wonderful region." The breadth of assertion quite as much as the length of the sentence takes our breath away. It is not to be denied, of course, that Mohammed was influenced much by the Old Testament; Arabic and Christian tradition were influenced more. But the specifically Haggadic elements are quite insignificant in all of these. Such sweeping statements only harm the cause they are intended to promote.

We find, then, much to which we must take exception. The author, however, has been a diligent collector of material, and many sections of the book will be read with interest. One reads, however, with some uncertainty where in conspicuous instances there is such lack of accuracy.

H. P. Smith.

KURZGEFASSTES EXEGETISCHES HANDBUCH ZUM ALTEN TESTAMENT. XIII.

With this volume Dr. Dillmann completes his masterly exposition and analysis of the Hexateuch. Knobel published his Genesis in 1852, but did not reach the concluding volume until 1861. Dillmann began his work revising the second edition of Knobel's Genesis in 1875, and for eleven years he has been hard at work upon the successive volumes until the present year. We congratulate the distinguished professor that he is able to look back upon his completed work. Although he has built on the foundations laid by Knobel, he has yet so worked over the whole material that the present volumes on the Hexateuch will henceforth bear his name.

In our judgment these volumes are the most satisfactory commentaries that have thus far been published on any portion of sacred Scripture. They are brief, terse, compact—every word has been weighed and every inch of space has been carefully considered—and yet there are few questions of interest in connection with the textual criticism, higher criticism, historical criticism, grammatical and historical exposition, and even literary and doctrinal exegesis, that have not been duly considered.

We shall have to confine ourselves in this notice to Dillmann's Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch. Dillmann has exceptional qualifications for the work of literary criticism. He is cool and cautious, firm and unflinching, swerving neither to the right nor the left in his persistent determination to find the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. In our judgment no candid mind, unbiased by a priori theories, can follow him in his masterly analysis of the Hexa-
teuch as he advances in succession from the first chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of Joshua, without accepting in the main his results. Indeed, the critical analysis of the Hexateuch is the result of more than a century of profound study of the documents by the greatest critics of the age. There has been a steady advance until the present position of agreement has been reached in which Jew and Christian, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Rationalistic and Evangelical scholars, Reformed and Lutheran, Presbyterian and Episcopal, Unitarian, Methodist and Baptist all concur. The analysis of the Hexateuch into several distinct original documents is a purely literary question in which no article of faith is involved. Whoever in these times, in the discussion of the literary phenomena of the Hexateuch, appeals to the ignorance and prejudices of the multitude as if there were any peril to the faith in these processes of the Higher Criticism risks his reputation for scholarship by so doing.

There are no Hebrew professors on the Continent of Europe, so far as I know, who would deny the literary analysis of the Hexateuch into the four great documents. The professors of Hebrew in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh, and tutors in a large number of theological colleges hold to the same opinion. A very considerable number of the Hebrew professors of America are in accord with them. There are, indeed, a few professional Hebrew scholars who hold to the traditional opinion, but these are in a hopeless minority. I doubt whether there is any question of scholarship whatever in which there is greater agreement among scholars than in this question of the literary analysis of the Hexateuch.

Students now have access to the completed works of Wellhausen, Reuss, Kuenen, and Dillmann, and it is necessary that they should study this question for themselves and make up their minds according to truth and facts, without regard to theories and prejudices, whether these be new or old.

There is concord among all critics in the analysis of the Hexateuch into the four documents and also as to the greater part of the material that belongs to these documents. It is quite easy to separate the Deuteronomist (D), whose work is chiefly in one solid mass. The large work of the priestly narrator (A) may be readily distinguished. There are a few passages in which the editor has so combined the priestly narrative with the prophetic story that it is difficult to separate them; but the work of the priestly narrator has been sufficiently determined to make its characteristic features and its chief contents unmistakable. But even if scholars should never be able to overcome the difficulties of these few passages, the solid results of the analysis of the priestly document remain unshaken. The separation of the theocratic narrator (B) from the prophetic narrator (C) is not so easy, owing to the fact that these documents are so closely related in many respects. There are great difficulties in some passages where two or three narratives have been so worked over that the critic is obliged to analyze verses and clauses, and he cannot be so sure of his results. But such difficulties are where we should expect them from the nature of the case; for the men called of God to edit the Hexateuch in the different stages of its organization were not making patchwork. They were using ancient inspired documents, in which every statement and every word was precious, so that the editors preserved as far as possible the very words of their originals and used the material so far as possible even at the expense of diffuseness, duplicate narratives and even triplicates, and only made such modification as was necessary in the compacting the material into a symmetrical and beautiful whole. The analysis of Dillmann is exceedingly minute at times, but one feels confidence in him owing to his transparent honesty. He gives reasons and balances them carefully, and where the decision is doubtful he does not hesitate to say so. The critic is not dismayed at a few doubtful passages in view of the vast number in which the results of criticism have become assured.
The differences of the documents are very carefully and fully stated; these are in vocabulary, in style, in method of composition, in scope, and in views of religion and doctrine. Any one who will examine these features of difference will be convinced that they are fully as great as those that distinguish the gospels in the New Testament. His only way to overcome the argument is to disprove the differences. We think that he might as well try to show that the four gospels have not the distinguishing features that most scholars find in them.

The differences among the critics begin when they come to consider the date of the origin of the documents and the work of editing. These problems have not yet been solved. The school of Reuss agree with Dillmann as to the date of Deuteronomy, but differ from him on the date of the priest's narrative. They hold it to be post-exilic, but Dillmann maintains that it was pre-exilic, and that it was written in the kingdom of Judah in the ninth century B.C. Dillmann in this has measurably advanced in the direction of the school of Reuss, but he stoutly resists their main thesis. Dillmann also differs from the school of Reuss as to the relation of B and C. They make C the earlier document, but Dillmann holds that B was written in the northern kingdom in the first half of the ninth century B.C. and that C was written in the southern kingdom not earlier than the middle of the eighth century.

There is also difference of opinion as to the work of editing the documents. Dillmann denies that B and C were first compacted and then D added to it and finally A. He holds that A B and C were three independent documents, and that they were compacted at one editing just before the exile, and that during the exile they were attached to Deuteronomy. This question of relative priority is an exceedingly difficult one. It seems to us that the order of religious development is B C D A, but it does not follow that the writings must be arranged in that chronological order, or that we should begin so late in the history of Israel for their composition. It is interesting to note that Dillmann places the origin of the four documents within quite narrow chronological limits. His researches favor the view that we have set forth that the four narratives represent four types of thinking rather than four stages of religious development.

One of the most important and most successful parts of the analysis of Dillmann is his work upon that section of the priest code which he names the Sinai code (S). This includes the sanctity code of Leviticus and other parts of the priestly legislation that shares its peculiarities. Kuenen recognizes this as an earlier stage of P, and distinguishes it as P1. But Dillmann holds that it is later than A, although it contains many laws of great antiquity. These had been handed down in the circle of priests and were codified shortly before the exile, possibly even before the composition of Deuteronomy. This code was, however, revised during the exile and enlarged. Other Thoroth were also collected during the exile apart from this codex. These together with S were incorporated in A B C D by an editor of the priestly circle among the exiles. This view of Dillmann is also an approximation to the school of Reuss, for it makes a considerable portion of the priest code later than the priestly narrative, and thus removes many of the objections to the older view of Ewald, De Wette, and others that the priestly narrative was the fundamental writing of the Pentateuch. We think that Dillmann has done great service in the analysis of the Sinai code, but we cannot agree with him in his view of the date of it and of its relation to the priest's narrative. Here is a field where, as Dillmann admits, the difficulties are very great. It is reserved for future investigators to solve this problem. It seems to us that Dillmann has shown that many of these laws of code S are in the very ancient form of the Pentateuch, and that the priest code is really a complex of laws of different origin. There are many questions in Pentateuchal criticism that remain undecided. It is probable that new questions will arise in the
further progress of investigation. There are so many critics now at work on
this subject in all churches and lands that we may expect more rapid progress
in the future than we have had in the past. Scholars will co-operate and in
good time solve all the problems of Biblical study in a true scientific spirit. This
scientific study of the Bible will greatly increase the knowledge of its treasures,
the appreciation of its literary beauties, and, above all, will deepen the convic-
tion of its divine inspiration and authority.

C. A. BRIGGS.

Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel. Herausgegeben von Lic. Dr. Carl
Heinrich Cornill, assiorord. Prof. d. Theol. an d. Universität Marburg.
& Co.

After this book it can no longer be said that the textual criticism of the Old
Testament is in its infancy. It has attained a vigorous youth, with the full
promise of long and effective life. Cornill's work, though confessing indebted-
ness to predecessors, is more extensive, systematic, and satisfactory than any
which has gone before it in this field. It shows more distinctly than ever how
little reason there is why we should go through the New Testament text freely
amending and revising, and still walk tamely through the Old Testament in
the leading-strings knotted by Rabbinic fingers. This one book answers, or
shows how to answer, the chief objections urged against the textual criticism of
the Old Testament, and gives us, at the same time, a specimen of the results it
may be expected to yield.

The book contains 175 pages of Prolegomena. A dozen pages of this number
are given to remarks on the need of revision and on the impossibility of revision
from Hebrew MSS. alone. The author strongly maintains Lagarde's view that
all our Hebrew MSS. are copies of one archetype, not older than Hadrian's time,
and gives striking illustrations of their slavish agreement. He passes to the chief
dependence in Old Testament textual criticism—the ancient versions. Pages
13-109 discuss the LXX, its MSS. and the versions made from it, its citations in
the Fathers, its various recensions, with brief accounts of the later Greek ver-
sions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. The "Targum" is the subject
of twenty-seven pages, the "Peshitto" of twenty, the "Vulgate" of four. Some
twelve pages are devoted to a discussion of the mode of publication of the text.
Prolegomena and text alike show great care, thoroughness, honesty, and shrewd
critical judgment. The amount of patient, detailed work which the author has
accomplished marks him as a scholar of no ordinary power, while the fact that
he has done it alone, and in the short space of five years, should silence those
who claim that a century of preliminary labor is needed before any fruitful
attempt can be made to better the Massoretic traditio
sion of the LXX, which must be of great value for the Egyptian text, is used only in the Latin translation of Tattam. The Vetus Latina, the Arabic and the Ethiopic version receive a more satisfactory treatment. The general conclusion in regard to Hesychius's recension of the LXX is that it must have been similar to the Alexandrinus, but that still more closely related to it is a group of cursive, which in turn agree with the Aldine edition. The Alexandrinus has marked peculiarities, which appear also in the dependent versions just named, but are shorn away in the cursive group. Of the careful examination of witnesses to the Eusebius-Pamphilus text we mention only the proof which is undertaken that the Vaticanus belongs to this recension, and in which the fact that Professor J. Rendell Harris has, by a totally different route, reached the conclusion that the New Testament text of the Vaticanus was written in Caesarea affords the author a welcome support.

The great importance of the establishment of the three recensions of course lies here, that the existence of three independent and ancient witnesses to the original text of the LXX makes the LXX itself a witness, not infallible, but far more respectable and valuable, to the Hebrew text from which it was originally made than if the testimony to the LXX text came to us through a single line. They give us the same kind of evidence for the original LXX that the families of New Testament MSS. do for the original New Testament. Even without reconstructing the LXX text in detail, the independent witnesses to it secured in these recensions enable us in particular cases to determine what the LXX text probably was, and hence to determine, with the obvious limitations imposed by a version, what the Hebrew probably was from which the LXX was translated. This supposes, of course, that the LXX is an accurate version.

This brings us to the other point—the value of the LXX as a witness to the Old Testament text. Cornill shows beyond a doubt that the translator of Ezekiel into Greek was extremely conscientious. Difficult Hebrew sentences are put into Greek, word for word, even where no sense results; the arrangement of words follows the Hebrew closely; pronouns, conjunctions, and prepositions are carefully reproduced, the tenses of the verb are observed—in short, the Hebrew is in general given so faithfully that the presumption is overwhelming in favor of a Hebrew text differing from ours, in those cases where the LXX text cannot be explained from ours, and particularly where it contains additional matter.

It would be profitable to note other points—all discussed in the same thorough manner—in this remarkable introduction. Indeed, it is of far more consequence just now, at least in America, to persuade Old Testament scholars to study these 175 pages than to exhibit the results when the principles are applied to text-revision. A few words must be given to this, however, to which the part thus far discussed is but the threshold. It occupies 340 pages. Here we have the unpointed text, as revised, with a German translation on the opposite page, and the critical notes extending across both pages below. For the lack of points, which is offset by a consistent, though frugal, use of the mater lectionis, and especially by the translation, scholars can have nothing but praise.

The translation is both smooth and close. Word play and paronomasia are reproduced from the original, yet with the least possible appearance of pedantry. It is a pleasure to read it. The critical apparatus is supplied with judgment and is much more than a mere citation of authorities and variants. There are discussions and suggestions—enough to make us wish there had been more—the attempt to distinguish candidly between different degrees of proof, and to bring out in each case the real condition of the evidence, the whole put compactly, and yet made actually readable. These notes deserve study for more reasons than one.
The resulting text shows striking differences from that in our Hebrew Bibles.*

It is no news that the text of Ezekiel, even in the most accurate Massoretic form, is in a bad state. Anything like thorough revision was sure to bring about marked changes. But the author has not taken the attitude of one who simply emends according to the best authorities when a reading is obviously bad. He has treated the Massoretic text as one among a number of witnesses—the one which furnishes him the groundwork, and entitled to every fair consideration, but by no means so exceptional in trustworthiness that all its readings that make sense are to be received as true. Of course the result must shock the orthodox Rabbi, ancient or modern, Jew or Christian, but it is nevertheless far more secure than the traditional text. This is not to assume that all Cornill's readings are probably the true ones—some of them are probably not; but mainly because, in the intricate and delicate problems that constantly arise in work like this, no human judgment can be always in perfect balance, and no keenness of critical acumen can penetrate all the mysteries of transmissional error. But these are slight defects. The main thing is that we are beginning, in work like this, to see our way toward an Old Testament text worthy of an age that does honor to Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort.

Whatever well-grounded criticism of special conclusions there may be, and however numerous may be the points at which certainty seems now impossible, we do not hesitate to express the belief that Cornill's work represents the original manuscript of Ezekiel's prophecy more justly than any Hebrew text which has been accessible to scholars, Jewish or Christian, for 1700 years. He declares the intention of doing a like work for Isaiah and Jeremiah. We trust others will catch fire from his enthusiasm and success, and, bringing to the same problems as they appear in yet other books an equal conscientiousness, an eye as clear and a critical faculty as alert and as soberly trained, will at length give us through their united efforts an Old Testament in Hebrew which shall no longer embarrass us at step after step of exegetical work by disturbing doubts as to whether it is even likely that the author wrote as his words are handed down to us. An Old Testament text resting on the best testimony available will make many commentaries useless, but it will give such freshness to Old Testament study as nothing else can possibly do, for it will bring the student closer to the truth as it came from God. And may God hasten the day!

FRANCIS BROWN.

* We give a very few illustrations, taken from early chapters: I., 1 bracketed as doubtful, but no decision reached; v. 2, תָּאֹר לְרֵבִּיקָה inserted after הָיוֹתָא; v. 3, הָדָעִים (Inf. abs.) omitted, and הָעַל וְלָבָּד read for הָעֲלָבָּד; v. 4, transposition, putting "brightness" before "fire," etc.; v. 10, מַטְּדָּר inserted after מַטְּדָּר. II., 11, תֶּלֶת וְלֶמֶנְתָּה לְאָימוֹת הָלֶמֶנְתָּה inserted before לְאָימוֹת הָלֶמֶנְתָּה; v. 20, לְמַרְחֵץ inserted after לְלַמְּכֻּרָה, לְלַמְּכֻּרָה, etc., etc. In the R. V., v. 13 reads: "As for the appearance of the living creatures, their appearance was like burning coal of fire;" marg., "The Sept. has, 'And in the midst of the living creatures was an appearance,'" etc. Cornill's text yields the latter. II., 3, R. V., ", , , which have rebelled against me: they and their fathers have transgressed against me." Cornill's text gives: ", , , which have rebelled against me, they and their fathers;" v. 6, R. V., "Be not afraid of them, neither be afraid of their words, though briers and thorns be with thee, and thou dost dwell among scorpions." Cornill: "Be not afraid of them and be not terrified before them, when they oppose thee and despise thee, and thou must dwell among scorpions." III., 15, Cornill agrees with R. V. text, against margin. VI., 9, Cornill, "When I break their heart" (R. V., "I have been broken;," marg., "I have broken"). VII., 2-9, Cornill treats vv. 2, 4, as doublet of 8, 9, omits the former, and sets v. 5 and part of v. 6 after v. 10, omitting "an evil, an only evil," from v. 5. As in all textual criticism, the great majority of the changes are slight: lesser or greater, the reasons for them are furnished in the notes, the abbreviations and notations of which can be easily mastered by any one who reads German.
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Dr. Steinmeyer is well known to English readers through two of his works, which have been translated for Messrs. Clarke's Foreign Theological Library: The Miracles of our Lord Examined in their Relation to Modern Criticism and The History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord Considered in the Light of Modern Criticism. With the present little book, which is soon to be followed by a study of the conversation with the Samaritan woman, is begun a series of studies in John in which the richness of the author's insight into Christian truth will have full scope. The speciality of this treatment of Jesus' High-Priestly prayer, accordingly, may be said to be the warmth of Christian feeling that dominates it. The exegesis is reproductive in the best sense of that word, and the task the author has set himself is to bring out and commend to the reader all the contents of the prayer rather than merely to outline the propositions in which they may be contained.

Exegetically speaking, its speciality consists in the stringency with which the distinction between a prayer and a discourse is insisted upon. All former efforts to expound this chapter, the author thinks, have been more or less injured by failure to make this distinction. While not forgetting that this prayer, unlike that of Luke vi. 12, was not spoken to God alone, we must remember that it was spoken to God, and its reference to hearers on earth was secondary. Herein, the Jesus precibus patrem compellit, lies the difficulty of the passage, but herein also its only key. It follows, for instance, that we are not to expect in it a logical ordering of the matter, but rather "a psychologically ordered diatactic" to which our Christian experience will help us. Not that we can measure this incomparable prayer by our human prayers; but, though in matter and spirit and reach it is immeasurably above us, it is in essence a prayer, and we pray. And as it has happened to us that words fail and unutterable sighs fill the pauses, and we begin again the speech of the heart with an "and" which asks nothing of logical laws, so we can understand why here too we lose, by mere logic, the clue, and are led by loose "ands" over chasms that no grammatical exegesis can bridge. It follows further that the usual divisions that are traced in the prayer are unjustified. The author finds a safer hint in Hebrews iii. 1, and sees Jesus here as the Apostle sent on a mission by God, and as the High-Priest who is to enter in where God is. His Apostleship is here completing itself, his High-Priesthood beginning. Hence the essential elements of the prayer may be said to be (1) the ACCOUNT which Jesus renders of the work that has been given him to do; (2) the CLAIM which he makes on the Father on the ground of his completed work, and (3) the AMEN which he speaks in the name of the Sender. On the lines of these divisions the treatise develops the contents of the prayer after a manner which is as instructive to the heart as it is to the mind of the reader.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.


The publication of this Commentary is one of several cheering indications of
the active vitality, the aggressive energy, and the productive vigor of the evangelical scholarship of the day in Germany, and in particular of the group whose names appear in part on the title-page as editors and collaborators of the work. Another outgrowth of the same activity is Zöckler's "Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften," a work produced under the same auspices and largely by the same collaboration, and designed for the same circle of readers.

The work before us is not primarily a popular commentary in the sense that it is addressed to the non-scholastic public. It is a critical work, dealing with the textual, grammatical, exegetical, and esagogical questions which confront the Biblical student of to-day. The names of the editors, Drs. Strack and Zöckler, and of their associates, Drs. Kübel, Luthardt, Nösgen, Orelli, Ottli, Schnedermann, and Schultz are a sufficient guarantee that the discussion of these problems will be as thorough as is consistent with the limits of the work, and that the results presented will be fully abreast with the critical progress of the last quarter of a century.

As a condensed commentary it has its value alike for the scholastic and the non-scholastic reader. While, on the one hand, the most minute and even microscopic examination of Scripture in all its details will amply repay the student who can devote to such examination the time and labor demanded by it, there is perhaps on the other hand even greater need of a broad and comprehensive study of the Word of God as a whole and in all of its parts, especially on the part of those whose time and opportunities are restricted. For such study a commentary like that before us, at once comprehensive, exact, and condensed, seizing on the broad and salient features of the Divine Record, and presenting them in their inspired continuity, throwing a passing flash of light on dark and intricate problems of criticism and exegesis, and discussing questions of authorship, composition, environment, structure, etc., now of such vital and absorbing importance, with luminous and suggestive terseness, is an invaluable aid as well to the intelligent and especially the educated layman as to the hard-pressed student and pastor.

The work before us may well be commended as a model of its class. Its leading features are as follows: 1. The introduction to each book treats with great completeness and brevity the burning questions relating to authorship, structure, etc. In addition to the particular introduction to each of the gospels, Professor Nösgen has a General Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, which brings the discussion of their origin and relations down to its latest phases. 2. At the beginning of each book is given a carefully and indeed scientifically outlined plan of its contents. 3. A fresh and independent version of the original is furnished in sections and paragraphs, based on v. Gebhardt's revision of Tischendorf's text, with constant reference to that of Westcott and Hort. 4. For the most part to each paragraph is prefixed a brief statement of its central thought or purpose, its local significance and essential characteristic. 5. Nösgen adds to each paragraph a succinct, pregnant, logical, and doctrinal development of the contents. Luthardt and Zöckler mostly include this development in their preliminary statement. The method of the former is the more satisfactory and instructive. 6. Points which require special and more elaborate treatment, such as Christ's Baptism or Temptation, duplicate transactions (the purification of the Temple, etc.), "Son of Man," "Logos," the resurrection of Lazarus, the Pentecost, the Apostolic Conference, etc., are discussed in excursus. It is to be regretted that no index is given of these excursus. 7. Textual, grammatical, philological, geographical, archaeological, and historical questions are discussed briefly but, on the whole, satisfactorily in foot-notes. A wise discrimination is shown in the selection and condensation of the material of these notes.

Of course in a work of this character it is difficult or, indeed, impossible, to
meet all the requirements of a commentary. The treatment, e.g., of the rich veins of thought in John will doubtless often seem meagre. But the material limitations of such a work are inexorable, and the reader will be disposed rather to congratulate himself on the wealth of material provided within so small compass.

The tone of the commentary throughout is evangelically sound and devout, and critically conservative. The discussion of the eisagological questions is marked by candor, breadth of view, mastery of the facts, calm moderation, a grasp of underlying unities, and a depth of insight into controlling currents of thought and purpose which are in refreshing contrast with the dogmatic presuppositions, arbitrary assumptions, capricious analyses, and reconstructions of the radical school. Nösgen's treatment of the genesis and relations of the Synoptic Gospels is masterly, and some of his positions are independent and striking. Luthardt grapples with the Johannean problems with his wonted vigor. Zöckler's unfolding of the plan and movements of the Apostolic History (Acts) is decidedly fascinating. One is strongly tempted to particularize points of interest, but to begin doing so would be dangerous to the condensation which should at least characterize the notice of a condensed commentary.

LL. J. EVANS.


Dr. Briggs needs no introduction to the readers of this REVIEW, in which his previous volumes have been successively noticed. The one before us exhibits the same learning and enthusiasm by which they were characterized and which are characteristic of his review articles. We shall take these for granted, and proceed to give some idea of the scope and contents of the volume before us.

That Christ is the central theme of the Old Testament as well as the New is what the whole Christian Church believes. The difference is that in the Old Testament he is presented prophetically, in the New we see him historically. The point of view has, therefore, changed in passing from one to the other. Prophecy rightly forms a study by itself. In looking at the Old Testament alone now we find the prophet not merely a foreteller, but in a very broad sense a leader and instructor of the people. In this broad sense prophecy is religious instruction. The Christian preacher of to day is a genuine successor of the Old Testament prophets. But so far as other religions than our own have had truth as their content, their teachers also have been prophets, and their words have been prophecy. Unless God has left himself wholly "without witness," there have been elements of truth in other religions—faint and rudimentary, no doubt, but truth nevertheless. It is on this ground that Dr. Briggs makes his start, beginning with the broad subject of prophecy in general. "Prophecy," he says, "appears in any religion so soon as the need is felt of religious instruction, and therefore at a very early stage and among the most primitive peoples." "Hebrew prophecy does not claim to be the only genuine prophecy." "The Old Testament Scriptures represent prophecy as extending beyond the range of the chosen people in Melchizedek, Jethro, and Balaam. It is not necessary in the interests of the Christian religion to insist that God left all other nations except Israel without religious guidance. The more the great historic religions of the world are studied in their genesis and their relations to the peoples who were influenced by them, the more truth, beauty, and good are found in them" (p. 4). Nevertheless Hebrew prophecy possesses features of its own which lift it above what is found in other religions. An extraordinary divine (supernatural) influence used the psychological and physical conditions of human nature to de-
termine the Hebrew religion so as to work out the divine plan of redemption. "These extraordinary divine influences give Hebrew prophecy its characteristic features; for we find them extending through a long period of historical development, increasing in intensity, complexity, and comprehensiveness, as they accumulate upon one another, combining so as to constitute Hebrew prophecy an organic whole, a sublime ideal of redemption" (p. 19).

This being so, the author proceeds with his study of Hebrew prophecy in its unfolding of the divine plan. He emphasizes the organic structure of the plan, and has avowedly in his eye throughout the development of the Messianic idea. So much has been said of late about the proposed reconstruction of the history of Israel a priori on the basis of a theory of evolution that some may take alarm at the word development. But it requires only a moment's reflection to see that where there is a plan carried out in time there must be an order in which it is carried out, there must be a progress of thought as well as an order of action. If the divine mind acts in an orderly manner there must be a development in all history—most distinctly of all one would say in the history of revelation. It is not at all because "evolution is in the air" or because of atheistic or pantheistic bias that attention is just now so strongly turned to this idea of a progressive revelation.

The general plan of the book will suggest itself after what has been said. After a chapter on Hebrew Prophecy and another on Predictive Prophecy, Dr. Briggs takes up Primitive Messianic Ideas (the Protevangelium, the Blessing of Shem, the Blessing of Abraham, the Blessing of Judah). He then passes on to the Mosaic Age. The Age of David and the Messianic ideas of the Earlier Prophets bring us down to Isaiah and the written prophets. These are taken up in the chronological order, so that the arrangement is historical throughout. It is at once evident that such an arrangement presupposes the work generally known as the higher criticism. In order to a historical order the documents must first be dated. Many parts of the Old Testament are not distinctly dated. In many the dates are only approximately given, as where for many parts of Isaiah we have only the long period of his active life given in the title of his book. Even where we have inscriptions to particular books or discourses, there is always the possibility that they formed no part of the original text. The whole material must therefore be carefully gone over in a critical investigation with these points in view. This preparatory work—laborious and unpretending—has been done. Its results are shown in the arrangement of the material. In most cases the author himself calls attention to any variation from the accepted order, and justifies himself briefly, for, of course, it would take a separate volume to discuss the questions involved. He defends "the analysis of the Pentateuch into four distinct narratives with their distinct codes of legislation" (p. 67). He dates Zechariah ix.-xi. in the time of Hezekiah. He believes that Isaiah xiii.-xiv. 23, xxiv.-xxvii., xxxiv.-xxxv. and xl.-lxvi. reflect the situation of the exile. "These recognize that Babylon is the great enemy, and that deliverance from Babylon is the great Messianic blessing; whereas Isaiah is the great prophet of the Assyrian period" (p. 191). "It seems that these anonymous prophecies were gathered about the name of Isaiah as the sentences of wisdom were grouped about the name of Solomon, the Psalms about the name of David, and the laws about the name of Moses. These pieces differ from the writings of Isaiah in style, historic situation, theology, and conception, although they resemble him in spirit, and appropriate not a few of his ideas." In accordance with this the later prophecies are arranged after Jeremiah and his contemporaries. The question of authorship is again touched upon on page 293 sqq. in a note of some length. If experience had not shown the tenacity with which old views are held, one would think the argument as there stated sufficient. But it will probably be
controverted. If the English reader wants to form an opinion, let him read the first twelve chapters of Isaiah, and then turn to the fortieth chapter. He will easily discover the difference "in style, historic situation, theology, and conception."

Perhaps the part of Dr. Briggs's work which shows the most originality is his analysis of this great prophecy of the Exile. It has long been seen that the prophecy in its present form contains fragments from more than one source. Dr. Briggs has made the first thoroughgoing analysis on the basis of the poetic structure. After saying that there are differences in rhythm, he goes on:

"These differences might have been designed to give variety of movement to a poem of such great length, but there are certain facts that seem to imply that the trimeters were originally a prophecy by itself. The introduction, the conclusion, and the intervening refrains have the longer movement. If there be a difference in date, the trimeters must be earlier than the framework of the prophecy that incloses them. There are also several long pieces of the pentameter movement and lyrics in the hexameter movement. But there are several other important differences, among which we may mention: (1) That the great theme of the trimeters is the divine advent for the deliverance of the servant of Jahveh, and that in the pentameters and hexameters the wife and mother, Zion, takes the place of the servant in a parallel representation; (2) that the great conqueror who is to be the divine instrument in the deliverance of Israel is referred to in the trimeters in general terms, but in the other part of the poem is named by his name, Cyrus; (3) that the pentameters use quite frequently the name Adonay Jahveh. It seems to me, therefore, that there was an earlier prophecy with the trimeter movement, whose great theme was the divine deliverance of the servant of Jahveh; and that this was taken up into a larger prophecy in a second edition and associated with a parallel theme, the divine deliverance of Zion, the wife of Jahveh" (pp. 340, 341).

On these lines we have in one chapter "the prophecy of the servant of Jahveh," and in another "the prophecy of the restoration of Zion."

It will easily be understood that a final judgment can be pronounced on this theory only after the analysis has been carefully followed step by step. We cannot here subject it to such a test. But it will be evident to any candid reader that it justifies itself by its results in the two chapters now under review. The unity of thought in the passages of each group is apparent, while it is equally apparent that each group has its own peculiar shade of thought and expression.

While we are in hearty accord with the main line of argument in the book, there are, of course, matters of detail on which there is likely to be difference of opinion. The author himself would not expect it to be otherwise. We have put an interrogating point opposite the following passages. On page 36 we read that necromancy "was a favorite resort of the religion of Baal—consulting the dead by means of necromancers, who were supposed to hold communications with them. We have a curious case of this in the bringing up of Samuel for Saul by the witch of Endor." This may be so, but we do not recall any passage which distinctly associates necromancy with the worship of Baal, and we suppose the witch of Endor to have been a professed worshipper of Jahveh. In connection with the blessing of Shem we should have been glad to have Dr. Briggs's opinion of Budde's suggestion, which has stuck in our memory as a peculiarly happy one. Budde sees, as Dr. Briggs does, that the line usually rendered "Blessed be Jahveh, God of Shem" is too long; but instead of striking out "Jahveh" he would strike out "Elohim." This leaves מ"מ ולל in which he would make מ"מ a construct and translate "the blessed of Jahveh is Shem." By the way, would not thorough consistency compel Dr. Briggs to write "Yahweh" instead of "Jahveh"?
We have had serious doubts whether the Aaronic priesthood ought to be considered in Messianic prophecy, as where "Phinehas receives the covenant of the everlasting priesthood of his seed as a reward of fidelity" (p. 109). The emphasis of the New Testament at any rate is laid upon the priesthood of Melchizedek, though to be sure that of Aaron is brought into connection with it by way of illustration. Perhaps Dr. Briggs might have considered Melchizedek in connection with the promise to Phinehas.

One of the vexed questions in Old Testament criticism is the age of Joel. Dr. Briggs puts him in the first part of the reign of Joash (p. 153). Yet he expressly says that Jeremiah, though a priest, shows no acquaintance with the priest's code. Joel makes the impression of being acquainted with this code, and so far as this goes ought to be put later. "The reference to the Philistines and the Arabians as the chief enemies" may be interpreted in more than one way, if indeed the Arabians are not there by a petitio principii. The translation of יִדְיוֹנָה as "distributor of spoils" is at least precarious. Finally the question as to Daniel will be raised in many minds. We do not intend to discuss it here. Dr. Briggs places the final redaction of the book in the Maccabean age. "We hold, therefore, that the predictions were delivered by the Daniel of the exile, but that they were written down in their present form by a Maccabean editor; and we should not be surprised to find traces of his editorial work in the historical setting and in the coloring of the predictions." Such traces evidently exist, or there would be no evidence of the Maccabean editor. We do not mean to deny their existence. But if they exist, ought they not to place the book later in the scheme than it is placed by Dr. Briggs? To our mind the Messianic ideal of the Book of Daniel is the most fully developed that we find, and as a consequence (whatever we may hold of the date of the book) this ideal should be considered after Haggai, Zechariah, and even Malachi.

And now a query as to the title of the book. The phrase Messianic prophecy suggests only prophecy of the Messiah. But the theme of the book before us is broader. It includes such passages as the blessing of Shem, the adoption of Israel as God's son, the doctrine of the divine judgment as seen in the blessing and the curse in Deuteronomy, and (not to mention others) the Psalms, which declare the reign of God. The author himself sees this, and says, "Messianic prophecy is in some respects not an adequate term, for we do not limit ourselves to those predictions which point evidently to a personal Messiah." He speaks of von Orelli's "Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom," and criticises its title, as indeed it is awkward in its length. But why not the Prophecy of Redemption, which Dr. Briggs himself suggests?

Whatever the title, the subject could not be well made less comprehensive without marring its unity. We have no doubt the various aspects of the kingdom of God as revealed to the prophets of the old dispensation are here rightly grouped together in their proper relation to each other and to their grand central theme. In his last chapter the author, under the title the Messianic Ideal, gathers up the various threads which he has traced in the Old Testament. How various those threads, and seemingly far apart, we may see as we follow his recapitulation under these heads: (1) The Ideal of Mankind, (2) the Conflict with Evil, (3) the Divine Advent, (4) the Holy Land, (5) Jahveh the Father and Husband, (6) the Kingdom of God, (7) the Day of Jahveh, (8) the Holy Priesthood, (9) the Faithful Prophet, (10) the Messianic King, (11) the New Covenant. But various as they are, how beautifully they harmonize as we see their fulfilment in the kingdom of Christ! Our author indeed keeps the question of fulfilment purposely in the background, though it sometimes forces itself to the front. His purpose is to trace the organic picture as presented in prophecy. But having the picture, he points out its completion; but we will let him speak for himself:
We have in the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament an organic system constantly advancing on the original lines, and expanding into new and more comprehensive phases with the progress of the centuries. Vast and complex that organism is—so complex that the wisest sages of Israel could not comprehend it—as vast as the difference between a divine advent and a human advent, as contrasted as a suffering and a reigning Messiah, as an advent of grace and revival, and as an advent of judgment and perdition; and yet there is a unity in all this variety and complexity that no one could discern until Jesus Christ was born, God manifest in the flesh; until he passed through the experience of a suffering Messiah, and advanced to his throne as the reigning Messiah; until the advent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost warned of the advent of the great and terrible day of judgment. In Jesus of Nazareth the key of the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament has been found. All its phases find their realization in his unique personality, in his unique work, and in his unique kingdom. The Messiah of prophecy appears as the Messiah of history. The redemption predicted as the completion of the redemption experienced in greater and richer fullness in the successive stages of the old covenant is at last completed in the Messiah of the cross and of the throne, in the Lamb that was slain for the redemption of men, but who ever liveth as the fountain of life and the owner of the keys of Hades" (pp. 497, 498).

We had marked other passages for quotation, but space for bids. We should have been glad to give some specimens of Dr. Briggs's translations from the Hebrew. These translations are generally very well done. The author has evidently bestowed great care upon them. We have been especially gratified by the judicious use of textual criticism. Foot-notes on difficulties in the original give a student all the help he really needs for most of the passages quoted. Indeed, a careful student will be much better off with these notes in his hand than he would be in wading through the undigested mass of some large commentaries. As an example of a difficult text made comprehensible, we may cite Is. viii. 19 (p. 38):

"When they say unto you, Seek unto the necromancers and unto the wizards;—
Ye chirpers and mutterers, should not a people seek unto their God?
On behalf of the living will they seek unto the dead for instruction and for testimony?"

As longer examples (which we cannot quote) we may mention Deut. xxxii. 6–10 (p. 101), Zech. x. 3–12 (p. 185), Is. xxviii. 14–18 (p. 209), the long prophecy of the New Jerusalem given on page 430 sqq. and especially the very difficult Psalm lxviii. (pp. 429–33). Only one who has himself worked carefully through some of these passages and noted the perplexities or absurdities of the commentators can fully appreciate what has been done in this direction.

The volume is supplied with an index of texts and one of subjects. We have noted a few typographical errors; p. 82 (line 6) the word face seems to be a misprint for race; p. 487 (l. 13) Psalm 1 should be Psalm L.

Dr. Briggs has given us an able, scholarly, and at the same time evangelical book. He expects to take up the subject of New Testament fulfilment and New Testament prophecy in another volume. We shall look for that volume with expectations raised by the one before us. Meanwhile if there still be among us any to whom the higher criticism is identical with unchristian speculation, or necessarily moved by atheistic bias, we commend to them this volume, in which the results of higher criticism are so fearlessly adopted and made to throw light on the grand scheme of the world's redemption through Jesus Christ.

H. P. SMITH.

The following works in the department of Exegetical Theology may be briefly noticed:

Beiträge zum Ausgleich zwischen alttestamentlicher Geschichtserzählung,
Zeitrechnung u. Prophetie einerseits u. assyrischen nebst babylonischen Keil- 
schriften anderseits. Dargeboten zu Nutz der Gemeinde des Herrn durch 
Nikolas Howard, Diener des göttlichen Wortes. Pp. xxx., 290. (Gotha: Perthes, 
1887.) This book is written in precisely the temper which a man who seeks to har- 
monize should not display—namely, one of heat and bitterness. The Assyriolo-
gists, and particularly Schrader, have attacked the Scriptures, as it seems. The 
Scriptures are entrusted to us; we must see to it that arrogant human science 
does not put stumbling-blocks in the way of weak brethren. Contempt and scorn 
will not, indeed, be overcome entirely until He Himself accomplishes it, at the 
appearance of His person in divine glory. We can, however, render the good 
cause a service, etc. One who can adopt this tone with reference to Assyriology 
and its leading representatives is, to say the least, a man of very imperfect judg-
ment. The book is, however, not devoid of real force. The author has most 
positive convictions, and carries a sharp sword. By the fury of his onslaught he 
at times gives interest even to the chronological questions, with which he is 
largely concerned. The courage with which he attacks, and the cheerful con-
fidence with which he revives views thought buried, are admirable. Thus, all 
the evidence does not convince him that Pul and Tiglath-pileser are one and the 
same, nor will anything induce him to identify the eclipse of the eponym canon 
with that of 763 B.C. Oppert's break of 46 years in the canon comes to the front 
again. Sennacherib, too, invaded Palestine in 711—not in 701. In general the 
author depreciates the value of the cuneiform documents, and the trustworthi-
ness of the records of Assyrian kings. He is aware, of course, that the dates in 
the Books of Kings have difficulties of their own, independent of Assyrian testi-
mony. As a specimen of his way of overcoming these difficulties, it is enough 
to refer to his argument that 2 Kings xiv. 21 ("And all the people of Judah took 
Azariah, when he was sixteen years old, and made him king in the room of his 
father Amaziah") shows that they waited some time after Amaziah's death, 
until Azariah reached the age of sixteen; he thus assumes an unlikely meaning 
for the italicized clause, which should read "he being sixteen" (R. V., "who 
was sixteen"), and gets a most convenient interregnum between Amaziah 
and Azariah! We add only, as a matter of curiosity, that the orthography 
of the book in some aspects is peculiar, the author following a system of 
his own, which, with his reasons for not joining a Spelling Reform Associa-
tion, he briefly expounds on one page of the preface.—Biblical Theology 
of the Old Testament. Based on Oehler. By Revere Franklin Weidner, Pro-
fessor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Scandinavian Evang-
gelical Lutheran Augustana Synod at Rock Island, Ill. Pp. xvi., 224. (Chicago: 
F. H. Revell, 1886.) This is a condensed reproduction of Oehler's Old Testa-
ment Theology, prefaced by some pages on Historical Theology which do not 
seem pertinent. Dr. Weidner has a just opinion of the distinctive importance of 
Biblical Theology, and is a great admirer of Oehler's book, which has done 
amirable service, though we hardly join the editor in his "question whether it 
ever will be superseded." At all events, the crying need is for more original 
work in this field, and less of translating and adapting.—Biblische Theologie 
(Leipzig: Fr. Richter, 1886.) It is evident that this book has vitality. The first 
edition appeared (posthumously) in 1853; the second, 1859; the third, 1863; the 
fourth, 1868. Then Weiss's book on the same subject took the field (first edition, 
1868; second, 1872; third, 1880; fourth, 1884), and one might have supposed 
that Schmid's day was over. The publishers seem to have ground for a differ-
ent view. It is a good thing to have both these standard works current. The 
editor will be generally commended for making no material change in the book.
It is still Schmid's New Testament Theology, in fact as in name.—The Book of Revelation: An Exposition; Based on the Principles of Professor Stuart's Commentary, and designed to familiarize those principles to the minds of non-professional readers. By Israel P. Warren, D.D. Pp. 300. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1886.) The substance of these pages was originally contributed to a religious newspaper. They retain the unassuming, popular form which commends them to the non-professional reader. The point of view is a sensible one. The Apocalypse is dated just before the fall of Jerusalem, and the interpretation sought in the experiences of the church, at that time present and impending. The author assumes that it was meant to be intelligible to believers and obscure only to the persecutors, whose unrestrained power was about to have sway. For the beginnings, at least, of the prophetic picture we are thus required to look within the horizon of the believers of that critical emergency. The whole, after the messages to the seven churches, is divided into two prophetical books, the first busied with what was nearest at hand. The woes of these earlier chapters are pronounced against Israel, which has not repented and received its Lord. The measuring of the Temple (ch. xi.) is a symbol of its imminent destruction by the Romans. The kingdom of Christ was established at His glorification, and was already existing for John, though still in conflict. The second prophetical book looks farther on, and announces the persecutions under Nero and his successors, with their resumption under the Turkish power. We cannot accept the literalness with which the author interprets certain numbers, making, e.g., the "Millennium" extend from Constantine, when persecutions were stopped, to the Ottoman Empire under Othman I. He finds no need of insisting on the exactness of the 144,000 redeemed ones; why should the 1000 years demand more mechanical treatment? Nor can we agree to his terminus a quo for the "Millennium," though it is pleasant not to find him seeking this in the future. The number of the beast, 666, he interprets as "Nero-Cesar." The judgment of chap. xx. is not the general judgment of all men, but the judgment passed upon guilty nations, the enemies and persecutors of the Church of Christ. The book is written honestly, and, in general, with clearness. Its indebtedness to Professor Moses Stuart is so abundantly acknowledged that it need not be here particularly shown.

FRANCIS BROWN.

II.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.


We have already noticed the first volume of this "Select Library" of Patristic literature (see PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, January, 1887). We heartily commend the practical wisdom and sound common-sense of this American enterprise. At the same time we gratefully recognize the Christian sagacity and self-reliant scholarship which is undertaking to place within the easy reach of American ministers and laymen this early Christian literature, so varied, comprehensive, and desirable, yet hitherto well-nigh inaccessible. Indeed, the average reader, lay and clerical, had come almost to despair of any ready access to these writings of the Christian Fathers; the period was so great, stretching from the second to the ninth century; the writers were so numerous and so productive; the Library even of Migne was so vast, comprising 389 volumes; the language foreign, and the cost immense.
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But this American enterprise has, we think, sounded the difficulty and solved it by a better division of labor and a prudent reduction in cost. The plan is to issue two select libraries—the first comprising the Ante-Nicene Fathers, the second comprising the Nicene and Post-Nicene, and reaching to the ninth century A.D.

The first library is already completed—successfully and admirably completed, to the satisfaction of the American public and to the gratification of the American editor, Bishop Coxe, and of The Christian Literature Company, Buffalo, N. Y. The eighth and last volume, of over 800 pages, appeared in January, uniform in style and execution with its predecessors—a princely volume, worthy of its place.

The way is in every respect now open for the publication of the second library—the Fathers of the Nicene and Post-Nicene period. Circumstances have specially favored this advance—the successful publication and sale of the other Library; the large and increasing demand for this undertaking in our day; the leadership—scholarly, wise, experienced, earnest leadership—of Dr. Schaff as editor-in-chief, supported by eminent scholars both in Europe and America; and the skill of The Christian Literature Company. This library follows the other in proper and prompt order, is from the same publishing house, upon the same liberal terms, and in the same excellent style. It will be divided into two "series," each containing thirteen volumes, so that the two Libraries, comprising the wealth of the Christian Patrology, will number 33 volumes instead of 389, as issued by Migne.

Although this American enterprise was so recently undertaken, already the tenth volume has appeared, completing the first Library of eight volumes, and reaching the second volume of the second Library. By such energy and promptitude the expectant subscriber and reader may feel reassured that, at no distant day, he will have this desired Christian treasure in his possession—a treasure which the German professor, Adolf Harnack, thus characterizes: "Whatever the German people have received of spiritual good, the inheritance of antiquity and the inheritance of Christianity, they have received through the patristic literature." The first volume of the Nicene and Post-Nicene library (as noticed in The Presbyterian Review, January, 1887) contains the Life and Work, Confessions and Letters of Augustine. It is edited by Dr. Schaff, to whose competent supervision the entire publication is committed.

This second volume, edited by Dr. Marcus Dods, comprises, from the same Latin Father, "The City of God" and "The Christian Doctrine." These are, perhaps, the ablest productions of this ablest among the Latin Fathers, who, if not foremost, stands acknowledged a prince among the sons of men. Leibnitz styled Augustine "a man of true greatness and stupendous genius."

As a philosopher he ranked with the ablest Greek or Roman. As a theologian he reminds us of Paul, and he will be read and revered by the earnest thinkers of all time. As a Christian he asserted the primacy of faith in God and Christ, and cherished a fervent and quenchless devotion.

In Vol. I. the "Confessions" reveal to us the heart of the manly saint humbly, earnestly, tenderly communing with God; while the "Letters" show us the saintly man holding free, familiar, but respectful fellowship with men.

In this second volume we see the man of master mind, of vigorous faith, of supreme consecration, and of joyous activity revealed in his De Civitate Dei and his De Doctrina Christiana.

These volumes furnish a specimen and a pledge of this "Select Library." Such a library thus placed within the easy reach of our ministers and intelligent laymen is worthy of our American enterprise and American patronage.

R. B. Welch.
The German translation of the Bible is the greatest work which Luther did for the German people. If he had done nothing else, he would deserve a place among the benefactors of mankind. But he was not the first German translator, as is sometimes stated. Before his translation (begun 1522, completed 1534) there appeared between 1466 and 1522 seventeen printed editions of the whole Bible in high German and three in low German. They were printed at Strassburg (1466, 1485), Augsburg (8 editions, 1473, 1477 twice, 1480, 1487, 1490, 1507, 1518), Nürnberg (1483), Köln (1480), Lübeck (1494), and Halberstadt (1522). These editions are one and the same translation with slight alterations. The later editions after the fourth contain sundry emendations and adaptations to the prevailing text of the Vulgate. Besides these complete Bibles there were numerous German editions of the Gospels and Epistles for the church year. There were about 25 editions of the Gospels before 1518, and about 13 editions of the Psalter before 1513. These prints were widely circulated and excited the spirit of inquiry among the laity which endangered the power of the clergy. Hence Berthold, the Elector and Archbishop of Mainz, issued, January 4, 1486, a notorious edict prohibiting, on pain of excommunication, the printing of books within his province without permission of clerical censors. He speaks of the erroneous opinion that unlearned men and women should be able properly to understand the Gospels or the Epistles of Paul. (See the edict in Haupt's pamphlet, p. 46.) Hence no edition of the German Bible was printed at Mainz.

Professor Krafft, of Bonn, has furnished the proof that Luther made extensive use of this older German version. See his University Programme of 1883, Über die deutsche Bibel vor Luther. But it does not diminish Luther's merit, for his translation was so far superior that it superseded the former altogether.

The question as to the origin of this pre-Lutheran German Bible has been recently discussed in German pamphlets and periodicals with a good deal of learning and interest. Some English periodicals (the Academy, the Independent, and THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, October, 1886) have taken part in the discussion.

Dr. Ludwig Keller, Archivarius at Münster, Westphalia, who has devoted much attention to the history of the sects in the age of the Reformation, especially the Waldenses, Anabaptists, and Mennonites, started the discussion. He first suggested the conjecture that the pre-Lutheran version was of Waldensian origin. (See his Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien, Leipzig, 1885.) He based his conjecture on certain Waldensian features in the Codex Teplensis, a MS. of the German New Testament, which dates from the close of the fourteenth century and is identical with the printed pre-Lutheran text. This MS. belongs to a Bohemian convent at Teple and was published by P. Philipp Klimesch, the librarian of the Convent, in the interest of German philology, under the title, Der Codex Teplensis enthaltend die Schrift des neuen Gezeuges, Augsburg and Munich, 1881-84. The Codex was written by four different hands.

Dr. Hermann Haupt, Secretary of the University Library at Würzburg, Bavaria, attempted to prove Keller's hypothesis in a pamphlet of 64 pages, Würzburg, 1885. His arguments were derived partly from the Codex itself, but especially from the additional matter bound up with the Codex. These additions, however, contain nothing that is specifically Waldensian, and could prove at best only that the Codex Teplensis was in possession of a Waldensian.

Dr. Haupt's pamphlet was met with a counter-argument by Dr. Franz Jostes, a Roman Catholic scholar of Münster, Die Waldenser und die vorlutherische...
Bibelübersetzung. Eine Kritik der neuesten Hypothese, Münster, 1885. He claims the credit of the pre-Lutheran version to the Catholic Church.

I happened to be in Münster when this pamphlet appeared, and learned from Dr. Keller that, in his opinion, Jostes had proved the inconclusiveness of Haupt's arguments, but had not proved the Catholic origin; and that he hoped before long to put his hypothesis on a stronger basis. He was then preparing the work which has now appeared under the title given above. Shortly before his last book Haupt had defended his position against Jostes in a second pamphlet (Der Waldensische Ursprung des Codex Teplensis, etc., Würzburg, 1886), and Jostes had made another reply (Die Tepler Bibelübersetzung. Eine zweite Kritik, Münster, 1886), without materially advancing the controversy.

Dr. Keller correctly admits (p. 11) that the question cannot be decided by the character of the additions to the Codex, which may prove Waldensian or Catholic proprietorship, not authorship, but only from the character of the translation itself. Has he succeeded in this? Let us see. We omit the personalities between him and his critics (Kolde, K. Müller, Tschackert), and present the facts and arguments.

1. The sects which opposed the Roman Church, especially the Waldenses, encouraged the spread of popular translations of the Bible; while the Popes and bishops discouraged and even forbade such translations, or permitted them only under severe restrictions. This forms a presumptive, but by no means conclusive argument for Keller's hypothesis.

2. The Waldenses had a translation in the Romance language. Of this there are four MSS. preserved in Dublin, Paris, Grenoble, and Zurich. The late Dr. Herzog, of Erlangen, transcribed the MS. of Dublin, and his copy is now in possession of the Royal Library at Berlin.

3. The German translation of the Codex Teplensis has some resemblances with the Romance translation in departures from the Clementine text of the Vulgate and agreements with the older Itala. But the Itala text was used centuries after Jerome's Vulgate, and the Vulgate itself passed through various recensions and textual corruptions before the Clementine edition. The Clementine text was issued in 1592, and therefore cannot be used as an argument in this controversy.

4. The Codex Teplensis contains, besides the New Testament, extracts from Homilies of Chrysostom and Augustin, and other additions. But these may as well have been added by a Catholic as by a Waldensian. On the other hand, the Codex contains also the spurious letter of Paul to the Laodiceans, which is wanting in the Romanic version of the Waldenses, but found in some Catholic MSS.

5. Dr. Emser, the Roman Catholic opponent of Luther, raised the objection to his German version of the Bible that he had used a Hussite text. The Hussites and Waldensians were in friendly intercourse, and often confounded. This is a new and the most specious argument which Dr. Keller adduces for his hypothesis, but we cannot find it convincing, in view of the confused condition of the Latin text of the Bible during the Middle Ages. The variations cannot be traced to dogmatic or sectarian bias. Take as an example the variation in 1 Cor. x. 17, which Dr. Kaweran communicates in Luthardt's Theol. Literaturblatt for August 27, 1886. In that passage the Codex Teplensis reads, in addition to Paul's words: "We all partake of the one bread," the addition, "and of one cup" (und von ain Kelch). The same addition appears in the first three prints of the German Bible. It suggests at once Hussite or utraquistic origin. But it was omitted in Luther's version, and appears in the rival version of the Romanist Emser, 1528, although in parenthesis (und eins Kelchs). Emser must have taken it from the text of the Vulgate. And, indeed, several MSS. of the Vulgate examined by Dr. Jacobs have the same addition (de uno calice).
While Dr. Keller's book passed through the press, Dr. Jostes took the field with a reply to the second pamphlet of Haupt, and Dr. M. Rachel published a programme (Ueber die Freiburger Bibelhandschrift, Freiberg, 1886), in which he gives an account of another MS. of the German New Testament from the fourteenth century, preserved in the Library of Freiberg. This MS. contains likewise the spurious Epistle to the Laodiceans, but none of the foreign additions of the Codex Teplesniss; it was in possession of a Catholic priest at Speessbach, in 1616; and this fact speaks against the Waldensian origin.

It is very manifest that the origin of the pre-Lutheran German version of the Bible needs further discovery and investigation before it is safe to pronounce a verdict.

PHILIP SCHAFF.


That the real Irishmen are to be found in Scotland, that the present Irishmen are the descendants of outside invaders, that a Scottish missionary is the Patron-saint of Ireland, that he founded a Church in which neither Pope nor diocesan bishop had any recognition, that an infallible Pope, the only Englishman who ever reached the Papal throne, handed over the island to the English King—these are historical facts, detached from a mass of legend, and well known to scholars in the Old World, but not familiar to many American readers. Yet Christians on the western side of the Atlantic ought to be interested in these details, when it is remembered that Ireland gave to the United States their first Presbyterian missionaries—outside New England, their first Presbytery, their first college, and an overwhelming majority of their Presbyterian people.

They who would acquaint themselves with the history of the Mother Church, and the movements to which, in the providence of God, she gave origin, will find the facts in readable form in the attractive little book of Mr. Hamilton, himself a Presbyterian minister and son of one of the holiest pastors the island ever had, owning his obligations to Reid, Killen, Professor Briggs, Dr. Withcrow, and others, and making good use of such ancient records as the Book of Armagh, he carries his readers down to the present day, and presents with fairness and historic candor the conflicts and the hardships through which the Church of his fathers has held her ground and witnessed for the truth. We heartily commend the book to all, and especially to Presbyterian readers.

JOHN HALL.


The first volume of this memoir was noticed in the REVIEW for April, 1885. The delays which had so long retarded the appearance of that volume have fortunately not intervened again, and after an interval of precisely two years the work is completed. The author's favorable relations and excellent qualifications appear even more clearly than before. With admirable taste and skill he has accomplished his loving tribute to his teacher and friend. The co-operation of those who could contribute most to his store of material has been heartily rendered, as it was richly merited.

The first volume carried us to the Saturday evening, April 1st, 1826, when in company with his friend, Julius Krumachner, he entered the city on the Saale where he was to spend the next half century. Even Hegel and Schleiermacher had sent him on his way with words of cheer, to "bring a peregr to the old Rationalism of Halle," and to "take it for granted that God would remember him,
to wake up a gift that as yet lay hidden in him." Much as he had already done, they knew what was before the young Professor, then just twenty-seven years of age, as he entered the stronghold of Rationalism, to bring to that University the dawn of a new day. Wegscheider and Gesenius had had full sway for sixteen years. Gesenius frequently had over four hundred students in his auditorium to admire and respond to his rare power as a philologist, but to feel no less the frivolity, the sarcasm and bitterness with which he handled evangelical truth and the miraculous elements of Scripture. Guericke, who was a Privat-docent, was the only man in the entire corps of University instructors who was in sympathy with Tholuck. But few had given their names for the courses which he opened on the 18th of April. That afternoon he made his way to his desk through crowds of students who with threatening looks and stormy murmurings had packed his room to silence him the first hour. His opening sentence: "Gentlemen, science is opposed to aggregation," commanded their attention; they heard him through. His first Semester saw One hundred and seventy-five names enrolled for his public course, and one hundred and ninety-nine for his Dogmatics, while Gesenius himself had only two hundred and sixty-two for his Isaiah. The struggle was long and intensely severe; the devices of his opponents were limited by no scruple, and sometimes unprecedented for their discourtesy; personal intercourse was now and then at a standstill. Feeble in body and extremely sensitive in spirit, obliged in such an atmosphere to work afresh through every problem that had already reached the solution of faith, and every one suggested by all the investigations and controversies of successive years, it often seemed that he must break down. It was not until June, 1875, that advancing years and overwhelming infirmities sent him home from an absolutely empty lecture-room to wait two years longer for the summons to his well-earned rest above. He fought virtually single-handed until 1859, when, to his unspeakable joy, Julius Müller stood by his side instead of a Hase or a Baur, whom the ministry of the day had been intent on appointing to the existing vacancy. Ullmann, who had belonged to the Halle Faculty for a few years, however kindly his dispositions, was not in positiveness of conviction or in natural fibre the man for such a time and place. Guericke, by his uncompromising Old Lutheranism in the matter of the Union, had brought about his own deposition, and from his personal characteristics and his confessional position had but a limited influence after he was reinstated.

In five years Tholuck saw his lecture-rooms equally well attended with those of Wegscheider in parallel lines of instruction. The change went on, and in a few years more the extreme type of rationalism had almost entirely vanished from the University. This was a great change from the stormy days in 1830, when, in a celebration of Gesenius's birthday, Tholuck's windows were to be broken in, and on the day following the Prrector and two beadles were in requisition to put down a violent demonstration at his lecture hour. It would be easy to fill pages with a history in outline of this transition, and of Tholuck's part in it. As his biographer well says (p. 516): "A man of a school Tholuck never was; a school he never wished to found. . . . Therefore it could not be our problem in this book to set forth in a connected way the dogmatic views of Tholuck; he wished to devote everything—nature and grace, speaking with tongues and prophesying—to the one end of winning souls for the Lord, following Christ to become a fisher of men. And if in his fisher's net there were also threads from Tyre and Sidon interwoven, he still with these caught souls." In a letter to a former amanuensis, he says: "I believe that it is for this reason that my work has some fruit, that I will not make spirits all of one type; I sow, and wait to see what kind of body God gives the seed corn. But in truth, poor in spirit, and Christ one and all, that is the reason." He de-
lighted to be called a students-professor rather than a book-professor, and took his deepest satisfaction in the arduous toils of "a seeking and following love." He had great insight into character, with great tact, and could on occasion cut to the quick to render the service that love demanded of him. This experience, gained in personal dealing with the souls of young men, was part of his power as University preacher. This position was secured only by persistent effort. For ten years he was nominally second preacher, although doing nearly all the work, for twenty-five years sole preacher, and for nine more senior to Professor Beyschlag. Then he retired from the pulpit.

His health and his circumstances made systematic work essential. His day began at 5 A.M.; his most productive scientific work was done (his biographer tells us) in the first three hours; his poor health demanded three hours daily for exercise—hours of privilege and great profit to those who were asked to share them with him. Lectures, dictation, correspondence, etc., filled up the day, which closed at ten. The amount of his literary work is indicated by a list filling nearly ten pages—almost one hundred and fifty titles. And one of the items is the Literarischer Anzeiger, which he edited in its semi-weekly issue for about twenty years. His year in Rome with Bunsen, in succession to Rothe as preacher to the Embassy, furnishes material for an interesting chapter. He was discriminating, ardent, and loyal in his friendships. These pages give us at one period an interesting counterpart to those in Dr. Charles Hodge's Memoir, which allude to the fifty years' intimacy between him and Tholuck that began in Halle in 1826-28. At a later day Drs. Henry B. Smith and George L. Prentiss (one of his "elect souls") were among the American friends in intercourse with whom he took great delight. Dr. Smith was with him at Kissingen in 1838 when he became acquainted with the young Baroness von Gemmingen, who became in a few months his second wife, and whose noble character and many accomplishments, with her rare piety and her admirable adaptation to him and to the demands and opportunities of his position, were such a joy and benediction to the half of life that remained to him. She, too, has a hallowed place in many a memory.

His "tea-evenings;" his Christmas eves, when he gathered his students in large numbers to a commemoration that was full of home and full of Christ, and to which he brought with special thoughtfulness such friends as were far from their own homes; his vacation journeys, are among the characteristic features of his life that live again in these pages. He was most loyal to his sovereign and fatherland, and received in turn all the honors that sovereigns could pay a clergyman and theologian. We recall the earnestness with which, in one of his walks, he expressed his inability to conceive of real loyalty to an abstraction—all that was possible to us poor citizens of republics. Loyalty in his view must have in this sphere, if not in all, a concrete, personal object. In the high excitement of 1848 he was threatened with personal violence for his conservatism.

This recital is in its personal elements well proportioned, very comprehensive, complete, and just. It tells the story, too, of important and critical times, and of a very fruitful work in those times.

Charles A. Aiken.

The following works in the department of Historical Theology are worthy of notice:

A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. By Emil Schürer. 2d Division. Internal Condition of Palestine and of the Jewish people in the Time of Christ. Translated by Sophia Taylor and Rev. Peter Christie. Vol. III. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.) This valuable work was reviewed at length in this Review in April, 1886. We are glad to see it in English dress. It ought to be widely read, and used as a text-book in theological seminaries.
The History of Rome. The Provinces from Cesar to Diocletian. By Theodor Mommsen. Translated, with the author's sanction and additions, by William P. Dickson. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons.) This continuation of Mommsen's history of Rome was noticed at length in this Review, July, 1886. We have only to thank Professor Dickson for his painstaking and accurate translation, and to recommend the work to a wide circulation in English-speaking lands. We have to thank him also for the excellent index he has prepared and the correction of some of the errors that escaped the author in the original German edition.—Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Leslie Stephen. Vol. VII.: Brown—Burthogge. (New York : Macmillan & Co.; London : Smith, Elder & Co.) This invaluable dictionary continues to improve as it advances. It is a treasury of information for biographical material, and its bibliography is excellent. The present volume contains a goodly array of the great names that adorn British history. It is indispensable for scholars.—The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century. By John Henry Overton. (London : Longmans, Green & Co.) This is an interesting book by an able hand. It gives an account of the rise of Methodism, greatly emphasizing the influence of Law upon the movement and the churchly tendency of Wesley. There is a marked preference for Wesley over Whitefield and a depreciation of the work of Whitefield. It is in keeping with this that the author seems to know nothing of the great revival in America in which Jonathan Edwards, the Tennents, and Freylinghuysen were the leaders, and in which Whitefield took so important a part. There is also a careful study of the evangelical movement in the Church of England, but we notice here a prejudice against the Calvinistic tendencies that marked that movement. The influence of the Revival among the Independents, Baptists, and Presbyterians is slurred over notwithstanding the remark of the author that the proportion of Dissenters to Churchmen increased from a ratio of one to twenty-five to a ratio of one to four in 1800. The author seems to know nothing of the work of the Revival in Scotland and Ireland. He is still more unfortunate in his comparison of the Evangelical Revival with Puritanism and Pietism. It is not true that the great Puritan wave upset the Church of England as a national establishment. The Long Parliament and the Westminster Assembly reformed the Church of England in a Presbyterian direction, but the Church of England continued to be the same national establishment. At the Restoration the national establishment was continued under the Episcopal form of government; the great mass of the clergy retained their positions at both of these changes. The Evangelical Revival was essentially a revival of Puritanism. The author tries to depreciate the Puritan influence in the ways we have mentioned, but does not succeed in removing it. The concluding statement as to Pietism is exceedingly unfortunate. Pietism has had as long a history in Germany as Evangelicalism has had in England. It began earlier. Evangelicalism has run the same race in England as Pietism has in Germany. In another generation it will probably reach the same position as Pietism has in Germany at the present time.—History of the Presbyterian Church in New Bern, N. C., with a Résumé of Early Ecclesiastical Affairs in Eastern North Carolina. By Rev. L. C. Vass. (Richmond, Va., 1886.) This is an interesting and valuable local history, containing a number of original documents of some importance. The origin of Presbyterianism in North Carolina is somewhat obscure. The author has put the origin of the Highland colony on the Cape Fear a little too late. In 1741 they were there in sufficient numbers to apply to the Society in Scotland for the Propagating Christian Knowledge for a minister. In 1642 a large number of Highlanders went over from Argyleshire to join their brethren already there. The leader of those Highlanders seems to have been Duncan Campbell. The researches of a large number of local historians is needed to lay the foundations.
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

-or more comprehensive work in American history.—

Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. 4th series. II. The Town Government in Rhode Island. By William E. Foster. III. The Narragansett Planters. By Edward Channing. These are two contributions to the local history of Rhode Island. The former has bearings upon the general history of our country which it is important for the student of history to know. The little State was in some respects a miniature of the nation.

C. A. BRIGGS.

III.—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD. By Samuel Harris, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1887.

This volume makes the impression of long-continued, connected, and systematic thinking. It is the product of a mind that has formed for itself a theory of God and the universe, and discusses subjects in the light of it. Such a work is not thought out in a day, but is the growth of years of professional study and reflection. He who reads it may not agree with every opinion presented, but will nevertheless perceive that he is in a current all the while, and that it is a steady and strong one. Few books in Apologetics have been recently produced that will be more influential and formative upon the mind of the theological or philosophical student, or more useful. We shall not attempt to examine it in detail. To do it justice by analytic criticism would be to make another book. All that our limits permit is, to specify some of its salient features.

1. The strength of apologetics the author finds in the immediate consciousness of man. There is an excellent account of the religious consciousness, unfolding it from its lower sensuous forms to its higher rational elements and characteristics. The proof that this kind of consciousness, like all other kinds, supposes an object in order to account for it, is vigorous and conclusive. The gradation in the powers of the soul is well stated, and the variety in the force of the evidence arising from this is indicated. The different ways in which the religious consciousness is developed in the various systems of natural religion, and in that of revealed religion, are amply presented, and the points of radical difference between the two species firmly asserted. The only criticism that would be made in reference to the general subject of consciousness is, that the distinction between consciousness and self-consciousness is not always sufficiently marked—a defect that clings also to Hamilton’s otherwise careful discrimination.

2. There is an incisive discrimination through the whole work between genuine and spurious religion—between its healthy and its defective or morbid forms. In pages 20–29 the author defines in concise and sharp terms the agnosticism of Spencer, the moralism of the younger Arnold, the semi-naturalism of Schleiermacher, the cosmotheism of Strauss, and the humanism of Seeley. The radical deficiency in certain necessary elements of true religion, in each of these types, is conclusively shown. At a time like the present, when religious opinions are so mixed and confused, such a lucid and sifting analysis of schemes and theories is invaluable, especially for minds in a formative state. It will do much toward preventing them from running after those “artificers of religions who call on us to go back from the light and maturity of our civilization, and worship the abandoned divinities of ancient times, the rubbish of decayed religions” (p. 26).

3. There is a proper blending of the a priori and a posteriori methods in the discussion of subjects. Dr. Harris is not afraid of the high a priori road, but he
verifies intuitions by experiment and observation. "The mind acts in these rational intuitions presenting these principles in consciousness, only on some occasion in experience which calls forth thought. Man cannot find God by mere dint of thinking without knowing him in experience, any more than he can find the outward world in that way" (p. 3). The effect of a materializing philosophy is to teach men to undervalue the intuitive convictions of reason, and to judge according to sensations. The whole influence of this volume goes to restore reason to its primacy over sense, and to inspire confidence in the higher rather than in the lower part of the soul. The author puts the physical and the metaphysical sciences in their proper places (p. 100 sq.).

4. The writer affirms the intrinsic harmony of faith and reason (p. 10). He has no fear of genuine philosophic reflection. Only spurious philosophy and spurious science are antagonistic to religion. He fights Carthage in Africa, not at Rome. By a searching method he evinces the untenableness of the postulates and deductions which make the substance of materialism, and in this way the alleged contradiction between religion and reason falls of itself.

More of such features as these might be mentioned; but these are sufficient to suggest the general character of this volume. We hope that it may have a wide circulation, especially in the colleges of the land. It is calculated to influence opinions, and to influence them truthfully, seriously, and strongly.

WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD.


The literature of Hinduism forms a whole library by itself, and to the ordinary reader a great deal of it is in the highest degree confusing and wearisome. In order to interest him it requires an interpreter. This friendly service Dr. J. Murray Mitchell has performed in the present volume. Both as to matter and spirit it is a model in its kind. Leading facts and principles are dwelt upon at sufficient length to furnish an introduction at once to the sacred writings of Hinduism and to the writings of the eminent Western scholars who have investigated Indian religion. The following admirable passage will show the spirit in which the discussion is carried on:

We by no means desire to deal with our subject as if there were a lawsuit between Hinduism and Christianity, in which we held a brief for the latter and intended to press to its furthest consequences every point that is adverse to the opposing party. On the contrary, we feel ourselves in duty bound to do the utmost justice to Hinduism, and to point out its merits as faithfully as its demerits. Time was when non-Christian systems of religion were regarded by Christian writers as simply masses of unrelieved falsehood; but such was not the belief either of the apostles or the early Christian authors. The declaration of St. Paul is that "God has never left Himself without witness," and that "the Gentiles, which have not the Law, are a law unto themselves." Conscience is not wholly extinguished in the human breast; it speaks, indeed, often in feeble and faltering accents; but we shall welcome even its faintest whispers when it testifies on behalf of God and goodness.

The work opens with an account of old Hindu belief as contained in the Rig Veda. Dr. Mitchell regards it as a great mistake to call this system monotheism. It is rather a polytheistic nature-worship, although there is often an undertone of pantheism. Still, he thinks that in the pre-Vedic period the various branches of the Aryan race had a common faith, and that the divinity they all worshipped was understood to be wise, powerful, and good; an organizer, if not in the strict sense of the word a creator, of the world. In every case this divinity was the
god of heaven. This fact cuts up by the roots the theory that religious faith had its origin in ghost-worship; and it certainly gives no countenance to the hypothesis that polytheism preceded monotheism. Chapter II. relates to the Vedic ritual as set forth in the Brahmanas. Worship in the early times seems to have been almost exclusively personal, or domestic, each man dealing with the gods on his own account. Chapters III. and IV. give a very interesting sketch of the rise and character of Hindu philosophy as contained in the Upanishads and methodized in the six so-called Darsanas. Then follow instructive chapters on the development of Brahmanism, especially in social life and caste; on the struggle between Brahmanism and Buddhism; and on the reconstruction of Hinduism in consequence of the revolutionary influence of Buddhistic thought and sentiment. This influence is specially traceable in the Avataros, or "Descents" of divine beings to mingle in the affairs of human life. The Avataros are first distinctly developed in the two great heroic poems—the Ramayana and the Mahabharata. Having described these epics, as also the Puranas and Tantras, and the numerous Hindu sects, the author proceeds to take a bird's-eye view of modern Hinduism. His account of the system is clear and deeply interesting; and so, too, is that of recent Hindu reformers, particularly Ram-mohan Roy and Keshub Chunder Sen.

His notice of the latter strikes us as eminently fair, kindly, and appreciative. Some things in the last years of Mr. Sen's career as a Hindu reformer raised the question of his sincerity and also of his mental soundness. His public lecture in English on Asia's message to Europe, delivered in January, 1883, was in altogether a different tone from his address in England in 1870, in which he said, "Hinduism has degenerated into a most horrid and abominable system of idolatry and polytheism." The following passage in Dr. Mitchell's notice is very touching:

I do not profess myself fully able to understand Mr. Sen's character. I would by no means tax him with insincerity; but I found it difficult to reconcile his private and public utterances. I have spoken of an interview I had with him shortly before the lecture just referred to. Two missionary friends were with me. Our conversation extended over two hours, and all the characteristic truths of Christianity were considered, such as the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the atonement wrought by Him, salvation by faith in Christ, regeneration and sanctification as effected by the Holy Spirit, communion with God and Christ, and on these great doctrines none of us could discover any palpable difference between Keshub's views and our own. Two points, indeed, remained on which the diversity was great. He did not believe in miracles, therefore not in the bodily resurrection of Christ. But the whole interview was deeply solemn; and at the end we all united in prayer for Divine teaching. None of the survivors can forget that remarkable evening, and the brotherly fellowship which we all had together.

The closing chapter contains a comparison of Hinduism with Christianity, and is marked, like all that goes before, by wise discrimination, candor, and the charity of the gospel. If the religious systems of paganism had always been discussed by Christian believers in the spirit of this excellent volume, it would have been a great gain to the cause of truth.

GEORGE L. PRENTISS.


Mr. Du Bose is a member of the Southern Presbyterian Mission in China. This attractive volume has grown out of a lecture on the "Three Religions," which
he delivered in some 150 churches during a visit to the United States in 1882. It is designed not so much for scholars as for popular impression. The author describes himself as "a plain man, who daily walks to and fro among idolaters, and testifies of what he has seen and heard." Many of the best thoughts in the volume are quoted from the writings of Edkins, Eitel, Legge, and Beal; also from general works on China, missionary journals, and other sources. But its facts have been gathered chiefly from the study of native sources and from the author's own observations during a residence of fourteen years in China. It is dedicated with a beautiful tribute to the Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, D.D., for so many years a model missionary and a model secretary of foreign missions.

In the title of his book Mr. Du Bose uses the "Dragon" as an emblem of China and its State church, or Confucianism; the "Image" as a synonym for the Indian religion, or Buddhism; and "Demon" as Taoism "in a nutshell." But he does not content himself with mere fanciful names and emblems; he gives a detailed account of the different systems in their origin, characteristic traits, mutual relations and ceremonies, as also in their effects upon the mind and morals of the people, upon social and family life, and upon government. Almost all conceivable points are touched upon, and nearly two hundred excellent illustrations add greatly to the interest and value of the work. It is, indeed, a storehouse of fresh and useful information respecting the religious condition of China; and although somewhat desultory—a succession of passing glimpses and items rather than a connected treatise or general view—this, perhaps, does not render it less adapted to the class of readers for whom it is more especially intended. An extract from the opening chapter, entitled "The Three Religions Dovetailed," will show its style and spirit:

There are two considerations which make the study of religions in China of prime importance. One is the vastness of the population, say 350,000,000, one fourth of the inhabitants of the globe, men with moral accountability, intellectual activity, and immortal destiny. Looking at this mighty host marching toward the grave, surely the Christians should give their eternal happiness or misery more than a passing or a passive thought. The other is the length of time the three religions have had for their operations—Buddhism, one thousand eight hundred, Taoism, two thousand five hundred, and Confucianism four thousand years; they have influenced sixty, eighty, and one hundred and twenty generations of men once living, but now sleeping in the tomb. The field of action has been in an empire where literature has been progressive, and the arts have flourished; amid a high order of civilization, and under a government which has seen Babylon fall, Nineveh destroyed, and Greece and Rome crumble to dust. Surely if men by searching could find out God, this Land of Sinim would have found Him ages long since passed away, and rejoiced in Him as the living God. Alas! the people have been drifting farther and farther from the truth, and in their development these hoary systems have had an upward but downward tendency.

The following titles to some of the chapters will indicate the character and variety of the topics discussed: the Church of the Learned, the High-Priest of China, the Adoration of Nature, Ancestral Idolatry, Confucius, the Confucian Sacrifices and Gods, Buddha, the Night of Asia, the Theology, Worship, and Idolatry of Buddhism, Women and Buddhism, Gods of the People, Gods of Trader, Taoism as Philosophy and as a Religion, the Star Gods, the Immortals, Demonolatry. It is a wonderful picture that is thus given of the working of religious thought and sentiment among the myriads of China—a picture for the most part strange and grotesque, sometimes repulsive in the extreme, and yet bright here and there with the light of truth. The following passage from the Preface deserves to be here quoted:

As this is not a comprehensive work on the Middle Kingdom, but simply on "Religion in China," there has been no opportunity to express my admiration for the many
noble traits of national character—the brightness of their intellects, the love of literature, the frugality and industry, the strength of the government, the solidity of their institutions, their peaceful dispositions, and their courtesy to foreigners. What a glorious country will the Land of Sinim—the land of promise—be, when they “turn to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven”!

A wide circulation of this bright and instructive volume cannot fail to be helpful to the cause of missions. It is specially fitted to be useful in the Sunday-school library. “I write in a plain style,” says the author, “so that boys may understand as well as men. When six years old my father gave me a little red picture book about Rev. R. Moffat in Africa; it took full possession of my soul, and in the ‘log parsonage’ I resolved to go to the heathen. I trust that this book will follow every Christian boy that reads it like a policeman.”

G. L. PRENTISS.


We advise theological students to buy this book and keep it within easy reach for frequent reference. It is a handsome octavo of 758 pages, of which the last 158 are indexes. It is a marvel of compression and at the same time of clear statement. The reader is greatly helped in the study of the book by its mechanical execution as well as by the author’s great skill in the art of expression. By judicious use of large and small print Dr. Strong is able to present his arguments adequately, and at the same time introduce ample references to the literature of the several topics with which he deals. Every page gives evidence of his wide reading and painstaking scholarship. He evidently wishes his pupils to be reading men and to theologize for themselves.

The work is divided into eight parts: Prolegomena; The Existence of God; The Scriptures a Revelation from God; the Nature, Decrees, and Works of God; Anthropology; Soteriology; Ecclesiology; and Eschatology. The author is a Calvinist, and his book a defence of the Augustinian theology. Here and there statements are to be met with which differ somewhat from the positions usually taken by the Reformed theologians; and these statements, together with the author’s positions regarding Ecclesiology—which, of course, are very different from those advocated in this REVIEW—would constitute the only basis of any adverse criticism we might feel disposed to make.

The chapter on the Existence of God shows acquaintance with the latest phases of the theistic controversy, and is very discriminating; though the author’s defence of the intuitive nature of the belief in God is at least questionable, especially when the author affirms that “he who denies God’s existence must tacitly assume that existence in his own argument by employing logical processes whose validity rests upon the fact of God’s existence.” This would be a strong position if it could be maintained, and perhaps it can be maintained to the extent of saying that we must choose between Theism and Agnosticism. The chapters that deal with the Scriptures are very satisfactory, the author taking conservative positions and defending them intelligently and in full view of opposing theories. The apologetic value of prophecy and of miracles is vindicated in a way that exhibits a very gratifying contrast to the hesitating and half-hearted manner of some of our recent apologists. The defence of Inspiration and the exhibition of the various theories regarding it is the best that we have seen in a work of this kind. We should have been glad to see a fuller treatment of the Divinity of Christ, satisfactory in other respects as Dr. Strong’s treatment of it is; for the de-
fence of the doctrine of the Trinity rests really on the vindication of this doctrine and not upon \textit{a priori} reasons. The doctrine of the Trinity may be "essential to any proper Theism," but Dr. Strong does not make it clear that it is, and we do not believe that the man who gives up the Trinity is logically bound to give up Theism.

On the doctrine of the Decrees the author teaches the ordinary Calvinistic belief. In regard to the Mosaic account of the creation he accepts neither the "allegorical," nor the "hyperliteral," nor the "hyperscientific" view, but what he calls the "pictorial-summary—which holds that the account is a rough sketch of the history of creation, true in all its essential features but presented in a graphic form suited to the common mind and to earlier as well as later ages."

Part V. deals with Anthropology. Recent discussions in biology and comparative psychology lend new interest to the old discussions, but do not materially affect the old conclusions, so far as the author's judgment goes. Dr. Strong rejects the speculations of Lubbock and others regarding the origin of civilization, affirms the literal truth of the Bible account of man's creation, is a traducianist, and a believer in the dichotomy of soul and body.

The chapters that deal with Sin and with Imputation are among the finest in the volume. Dr. Strong believes very firmly that man has a depraved nature; that this depravity is culpable; and, moreover, that the guilt of original sin can be accounted for only by some hypothesis which establishes a very close judicial relation between Adam and his posterity. What, then, is the relation of Adam to his race in virtue of which the latter inherits guilt? Dr. Strong enumerates the different answers to this question, rejecting in turn the "Pelagian," the "Arminian," the "New School," the "federal," the theory of "mediate imputation," and affirms as his own what he calls the "Augustinian theory, or theory of Adam's natural headship." He rightly sees that there must be a judicial basis for the fact that we are born with depraved natures, and in seeking for this finds it in the realistic rather than in the federal theory of Adamic relationship. But he also makes a remark that should not go unchallenged, to the effect that "certain schools of theology, notably the federal school, have attached to it [imputation] an arbitrary, external, and mechanical meaning—holding that God imputes sin to men not because they are sinners, but upon the ground of a legal fiction whereby Adam, without their consent, was made their representative. Dr. Strong will pardon us for saying that federal theologians do not regard imputation as either arbitrary or mechanical. They believe that Adam was the federal head of the race because he was its natural head. And Dr. Strong himself is witness to the fact that this view is not necessarily absurd, for he says, in defence of his own position, "It permits whatever of truth there may be in the federal theory and in the theory of mediate imputation to be combined with it, while neither of these latter theories can be justified to reason unless they are regarded as corollaries or accessories of the truth of Adam's natural headship. Only on the supposition of natural headship could God justly constitute Adam our representative or hold us as responsible for the depraved nature we have received from him."

The next part deals with Soteriology. Dr. Strong discusses the familiar topics usually included under this head, stating his position clearly, discriminating sharply between different theories, and fortifying his own view by argument and citation of Scripture. The different theories of the Atonement are classified thus: The Socinian or Example theory; the Bushnellian or Moral-influence theory; the Grotian or Governmental theory; the Irvingian theory, or theory of Gradually Extirpated Depravity; the Anselmian or Commercial theory, and the Ethical theory. The criticisms of the author on the first four of these theories are acute and just. It is neither acute nor just to stigmatize the Anselmian
theory as Commercial, and it is not fair to the memory of Dr. Charles Hodge that his system should be characterized by an epithet that is generally understood to indicate a view of the Atonement that Dr. Hodge systematically contended against. Dr. Strong advocates what he calls the ethical theory, and endeavors thereby to reconcile a general atonement with a particular application of it to the elect, and to meet the objection that in the atonement of Christ the innocent suffers for the guilty. Dr. Strong teaches that our Saviour by becoming a member of the race became involved in the guilt of Adam's sin, and though he was not chargeable with inherited depravity, is nevertheless responsible for the guilt of Adam's first sin. "The humanity of Christ was not a new creation, but was derived from Adam through Mary his mother; so that Christ, so far as his humanity was concerned, was in Adam just as we were, and had the same race-responsibility with ourselves." . . . "This original sin and inherited guilt, but without the depravity that ordinarily accompanies these, Christ takes, and so takes away." . . . "We hold that by virtue of Christ's union with humanity that guilt was not only an imputed, but an imparted guilt." Dr. Strong answers one objection by raising a far greater and more serious objection. He meets those who allege that in the atonement of Christ the innocent suffers for the guilty by saying that Christ was not innocent: he was under obligation to suffer since, being a member of Adam's race, he had participated in Adam's sin. This is a serious charge to bring against the Saviour of mankind, and it is not relieved by saying that Christ was free from depravity by reason of his miraculous conception. Dr. Strong's objection to the doctrine of immediate imputation is that, according to it, God considers men as if they had done what they have not done. His defence of his own position is that in declaring mankind to be guilty of Adam's sin God only judges them for what they have done. They sinned in Adam really, and therefore his sin is imputed to them. Our Lord by this reasoning must be charged with guilt, because he is a sinner. This view makes a sinner the world's Saviour, destroys the voluntary character of Christ's atonement, and puts Christ in the position of the Jewish high-priest, who needed to atone first for his own sin and then for that of his people.

In the division that deals with Eschatology Dr. Strong defends the orthodox doctrine of retribution against the advocates of restorationism and annihilationism. The author's views on Church government and the Sacraments are those which are understood to be maintained by the Baptist denomination, and, of course, are not in harmony with those advocated in this Review. It is to be hoped, however, that Baptists do not generally sympathize with the author's mode of defending "close communion." To say that Baptism is a prerequisite of the Lord's Supper, and that (in the judgment of Baptists) those who have not been immersed have not been baptized, is, it seems to us, an adequate defence of close communion. But when the refusal to commune with pædo-Baptists is defended on the ground that the latter are guilty of "disobedience to the commands of Christ" ("since baptism is a command of Christ we cannot properly commune with the unbaptized"); "heresy" ("since pædo-Baptists hold and propagate false doctrine with regard to the church and its ordinances—doctrine which endangers the spirituality of the church, the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and the lordship of Christ—we cannot properly admit them to the Lord's Supper"); and "schism" ("since pædo-Baptists, by their teaching and practice, draw away many from Scripturally constituted churches—thus dividing true believers from each other, and weakening the bodies organized after the model of the New Testament—it is imperative upon us to separate ourselves from them so far as regards that communion at the Lord's table which is the sign of church-fellowship"), we feel within us the promptings to an unusual form of speech. 

F. L. Patton.

It is a sufficient recommendation of this work that in the form in which it first appeared over two hundred thousand copies have been sold. The present edition has been greatly enlarged and the articles in a great measure rewritten. It is printed on fine paper, and in the admirable style of typography for which the Tract Society is so famous. The illustrations are numerous and well executed, and the book is well supplied with maps. The results of recent archaeological investigation have been embodied in the text of the present edition wherever they could be introduced with advantage. The work is not only a Bible Dictionary, but to a certain extent a theological dictionary as well, as the reader will see by turning to such words as Atonement, Justification, Baptism.

Dr. Rand, the accomplished Secretary of the publishing department of the Tract Society, is as modest as he is scholarly, and does not make the claim of authorship on the title-page of a work which is the fruit of his own labor, and on which he has been engaged without assistance from any quarter for many years.

We hope that this Dictionary will have a circulation exceeding even that of its predecessor, and do not hesitate to say that it is beyond all question the best Bible Dictionary for the people that is before the public.

F. L. Patton.

We have space only for a few words regarding the following books:


This book is intended to aid the faith of those who though almost Christians are nevertheless perplexed by the difficulties suggested by the scepticism of the day. It belongs to the class of popular apologetic literature, and is a very well written and useful book. It would have been better, in our judgment, if the author had not attempted to write the history of Materialism and Pantheism, which is to be found in the essays on these subjects respectively; the space at his command did not allow him to do justice to the subject, and the attempt to crowd the history of a topic like Pantheism into a few pages only ends in inaccuracy of statement or impression. The author takes ground that is far too low in his account of the Bible, though his apologetic management of his material is good. The chapters on Miracles and the Resurrection of Christ are stimulating, and the general impression that the book makes is good. We commend it, with the exceptions noted.—Old Faiths in New Light. By Newman Smyth. Revised Edition. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.)

The author of this book is known in this country and in Great Britain as a prominent advocate of what is called the "new theology." The present volume appeared several years ago, and was, as the author says, "a pioneer in certain directions of religious inquiry." The method and the creed of what is known as "progressive orthodoxy" are not saliently exhibited in this volume, which may be considered rather as an apologetic than a dogmatic treatise. With the author's speculations regarding the incarnation, the resurrection, and the future state, we do not have much sympathy; and we should probably not agree with his positions respecting inspiration. But we nevertheless believe that he has presented a defence of the supernaturalism of Scripture which is stimulating and refreshing. We can commend his apologetic without sympathizing with his dogmatic. There is nothing flippant or irreverent in his pages, and there is much that is sensible and well said.

F. L. Patton.
IV.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.


Dr. Moore deserves the thanks of the Church for his labors in connection with the preparation of this volume, the third of the kind which has come from his hand. It will be difficult for those who are not in the habit of consulting the Minutes of the General Assembly to appreciate the immense labor which the production of a book like this involves. The present volume should be in the session-room of every church. Ministers often receive letters of inquiry that need no further answer than a reference to the Digest. Dr. Moore says that "to decide under what head to place a given deliverance cost often anxious thought." We do not wonder at that, though we think he need enter no fear respecting the "approval of those who pass upon his work."

We are inclined to the belief, however, that the existing method of arranging the acts and deliverances of the Assembly under the successive sections of the Form of Government and Book of Discipline will soon prove too cumbrous. In the present volume these formularies are printed twice, simply to conform to the plan of finding in some section of them the proper rubric for the Assembly's decisions. There is no reason, so far as we can see, why the decisive deliverances or enactments of the Assembly should be rubricised in this way.

Some method should also be adopted in future of making visible the distinction between Acts, Deliverances, and Judicial Sentences.

F. L. Patton.


This is the first volume in a new series of translations designed to contain "the best and newest contributions of Orthodox Foreign Scholarship to Biblical Study and Research." The selection of the volume which introduces the series will show that a wide range is to be taken in the development of the publishers' scheme. The other volumes which are announced for early publication are Delitzsch's Commentary on the Psalms, 3 vols.; Selected Sermons of Schleiermacher; Kurtz's Church History; Delitzsch's Commentary on Isaiah. The translations of Delitzsch and Kurtz are to be made from the last editions, specially revised by the authors. Here is certainly a list rich in its promise of good things.

The volumes are in convenient form; the paper and type are excellent; the binding tasteful, substantial, and durable; the price reasonable, 7s. 6d. The translators are not known to us, but are doubtless chosen for their competence. In the volume before us we have observed but one in felicity—the mistake which is so often made when Bewusstsein is rendered "consciousness" where it is not Selbstbewusstsein, but a being aware, a knowing, of other things not subjective.
The "Still Hours" of the eminent theologian Rothe is a posthumous work published five years after his death by his pupil and subsequent biographer, Nippold. It was made up by Rothe from the note-books in which he had been wont for many years to make a minute of passages that interested him, with his reflections on them. The suggesting passages are thrown out. The reflections are grouped under a dozen heads, comprehensive, and very various. They are in themselves very concise, often condensed in a single sentence, and only in the rarest instances filling a half page. Such excerpts, torn away from the soil in which they had their root, always suffer in the process of transplanting. The reader of a translation must often make his way back into the time of the author, the atmosphere he breathed, the system he represented, the systems he was opposing, and even into the personal idiosyncrasies of the man himself before he can understand these fragments. The Germany of from twenty to fifty years ago; Heidelberg, which was the chief scene of his work; the scientific and theological position of the author of the "Beginnings of the Christian Church" and of the "Christian Ethics," and the intellectual and spiritual temper and habit of the man, if we could know them all, would open to us the full treasure of this most suggestive and stimulating volume. "As a theologian I am a supernaturalistic rationalist, not a rational supernaturalist." Can he run that readeth it? "I have no objection that my believin miracles, and my supernaturalism in general, should be apologized for as a childlike naïveté." This is plain and satisfactory. Very many of these reflections open to us new views of truth, qualify our judgments of men and things, and instruct us by the incisive utterances of a great teacher.

We have always had a warmer and more tender feeling toward Rothe since we read in Tholuck's Memoirs (I., 203) an extract from a letter written by the young Director of the Theological Seminary at Wittenberg in 1832 to the young Halle Professor. Tholuck had lamented his spiritual poverty. Rothe writes: "When you feel yourself poor, my dear brother, this comes from your having so rich a Lord, on whose breast you are daily learning better what riches is. You know, however, better than I, that he shows us his riches not merely that we may look on them, and that to feel one's self poor is, in fact, nothing but receiving from his riches grace for grace and truth for truth;" and more is added in the same strain with all the tenderness and warmth that the German Du adds to such spiritual utterances. We may have difficulty in following him in many of his speculations; we may refuse to agree with him in many of his conclusions; but where we differ we shall differ with truer appreciation and respect, and we shall find much more in which we can agree and rejoice together than in our ignorance and possible prejudice we had supposed to exist before his "Still Hours" made him better known.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

presented as God's "signal pillar" going before the Church, and pointing out the path of duty. But, on the other hand, the author sees many indications that the Church does not appreciate her opportunity. She is too slow in occupying the fields that are waiting. While God's providence is plainly saying, "Go forward," the word "Retrench" is becoming the key-note of missions. A new theology, which throws doubt on the lost condition of the heathen, is making itself felt in the Church, and in some quarters weakening missionary zeal. Never was there greater opportunity, and never was there greater risk of losing it. This is the Crisis of Missions, and it must be met.

Perhaps Dr. Pierson exaggerates somewhat the indifference of the Church to the signs of the times. Yet undoubtedly his book is most timely and useful. What Christian people need in order to appreciate fully their duty to Foreign Missions is to have the facts clearly presented to them. This is done most admirably by Dr. Pierson, and our Missionary Board would do a good work for the Church if they had his book produced in some cheap form and widely circulated. It glows in every page with the fervor of one who thoroughly believes that "the spirit of missions is the spirit of Christ." No one could read it without catching something of the author's enthusiasm. S. M. HAMILTON.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST IN THE WORLD. Sermons by the Rev. ARTHUR BROOKS.

New York: Thomas Whittaker.

This handsome volume contains twenty-five sermons. Some of them are occasional, but all of them are practical. The Church of the Incarnation is to be congratulated that such provision is made for their instruction. The sermons are thoughtful and fresh, never commonplace. There is a certain dignity in them, a manliness of tone, an evidence of elevation and of honesty of purpose which are quite characteristic of their author. There are no affectations of style, there is no straining after effect by any tricks of rhetoric. Among the subjects of the sermons are a number which are rarely treated in the pulpit, and which indicate the independence of the preacher and his desire to reach the living wants of the people; while there is among all the twenty-five titles only one—"The Work of Lent"—which indicates to what branch of the church catholic the preacher belongs. The publication of this volume is timely, as the author is having a long leave of absence from his pulpit for extended foreign travel. The book is like the man, and must be peculiarly welcome to those who know and love him best. May he long live to preach of the "Life of Christ in the World."

THOMAS S. HASTINGS.

BOOKS FOR PRACTICAL EDIFICATION:

From B. Westermann & Co. we have received the five following volumes, all save one from the press of Fr. And. Perthes, Gotha. Two are translations from Kingsley. Aus der Tiefe. Worte für Betrübten. Uebersetzt von Anna v. Kockritz, and Predigten. Autorisierte Uebersetzung von Dina Krakinger. Both are a striking indication how deeply the peculiar characteristics of the Canon of Eversley have struck the Teutonic mind. The preface to the latter volume says that while the author at home was counted among the Liberals, in Germany he is considered orthodox. His freedom from tradition and conventionalism works rather toward building up faith than weakening it. In this view the reproduction of his writings on the continent is a pleasing fact. —Evangelische Trostworte für Kranken und Leidende von einem Mitgenossen an den Trübsal. This volume consists of twenty-five biblical meditations designed to give comfort and encouragement to the sick and suffering. The author, who herself has learned much in the school of affliction, shows singular skill in the fresh application of the Word to the needs of God's suffering children. The book would repay translation.
— _Beicht- und Kommunionbuch._ Von Wilhelm Baur. Fünfte Auflage. This volume consists of eight essays which trace the course of Christian experience from the first seed-corn of faith to its maturity in enduring fellowship with Christ. Written in a simple style and with much tenderness of feeling, it well answers its purpose as a helper and guide to the young believer. Each part ends with a prayer, and at the close of the volume is a selection of appropriate prayers and hymns from different authors.— _Die Lehre von den Gnadenmitteln._ Nach dem Worte Gottes und den Lutherischen Bekenntnissen. Dargestellt von Wilh. Rohnert. (Leipzig: Georg Böhme.) This volume by the Lutheran pastor at Waldenburg is not intended for scholars, but for the younger ministry and thoughtful laymen; yet it is by no means deficient in learning. The author dwells upon the sacraments as if these were the only means of grace, and throughout contrasts the Lutheran view of them with that of the Reformed on one hand and that of the Romanists on the other. While he presents the opinions of his own church with force and clearness, he hardly does justice to those of the Reformed, as, for example, when (p. 13) he makes the latter responsible for the Quakers and other sects who, he says, "sprang from them."

— _True Words for Brave Men._ By Ch. Kingsley. (T. Whittaker.) A little volume of selections from the unpublished sermons and addresses of the author, intended for soldiers and sailors. The book is extremely well suited for its purpose, being direct, fresh, and striking, because wholly unconventional. The tone throughout is that of Christian manliness.— From R. Carter and Bros. we have three volumes by Mr. Spurgeon— _Storm Signals._ A Collection of Sermons. _My Sermon-Notes._ A Selection from Outlines of Discourses. From Matthew to Acts. _All of Grace._ An earnest word with those who are seeking salvation. All these books are replete with their author's characteristics. They are not profound nor learned, but simple, straightforward, intensely earnest, and full of the marrow of the Gospel. It is pleasant to see a man who has so much power in the pulpit similarly useful through the press.— _Orient, with Preludes on Current Events._ By Joseph Cook. (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) This is the most recent volume of the well-known Boston Monday Lectures. It looks like a collection of odds and ends, and is quite inferior to its predecessors. The only notable feature is its fresh and complete and impartial statement of Keshub Chunder Sen and Hindu Theism.— _Bible Warnings._ Sermons to Children. By Richard Newton, D.D. (Carter & Bros.) Another volume from the fertile pen of the author. He enforces the warnings of Scripture against sin, pride, anger, sloth, etc., with a great fluence of illustration. Indeed, we should fear that so much incident would hinder the clear perception of the truth.— _Earthly Watchers at the Heavenly Gates._ The False and the True Spiritualism. By the Rev. John Chester, D.D. (Presb. Bd. of Pub.) As the title shows, this book is aimed at the detestable imposture called Spiritualism. Its arguments, spun on the thread of a slender story, are conclusive, and well adapted to meet an error which, although so often exposed, continually finds new victims.— _Stadien auf dem Lebenswege._ Von Sören Kierkegaard. Uebersetzt von A. Barthold. (Leipzig: J. Lehmann. From Westermann & Co.) Kierkegaard is said to have been the greatest philosophical genius Scandinavia has produced. Born at Copenhagen in 1813, he died there in 1855, having given to the world numerous writings, the chief of which are two series, produced at the same time, one with his name, the other pseudonymously. It is from the latter that the work before us is taken. In it "Hilary, bookbinder," gives his views. Allowing that outside of Christianity there is much that is good, he yet claims for it alone the arousing of the deepest impulses of human nature. The book is very ably written, and contains a great deal of fine criticism, yet one is at a loss to see why it should be reproduced in German at this late date.— _Proceedings of the
American Congress of Churches. Cleveland, O. (Hartford: Case, Lockwood & Brainard Co.) This thick pamphlet contains the usual mixture of things good, bad, and indifferent to be expected in the utterances of so many different persons. The title is a misnomer, for it is neither churches nor persons authorized to represent them that make the congress, but merely individuals of more or less repute who speak their different views. The subjects treated are important, but it does not appear that unity of opinion or feeling concerning them is much advanced by these discussions. In the present case Mr. George was allowed to ventilate his empty but mischievous fallacies. Another speaker gravely maintained the theory that the failure of the church to do its best work on outsiders was because it gave itself to "evangelization without baptism," or "because preaching and baptism, which God joined together, have been put so far asunder by men" (p. 40). This seems rather strange to those who remember that the great Apostle thanked God that he baptized none of the Corinthians, and declared that Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel. The initiatory ordinance of the Christian Church has divine authority, but it is just as easy to exaggerate its importance as it is to underrate it, and one extreme is as bad as the other.

Missionsstunden. Von R. W. Dietel. III. Heft. (Leipzig: Fr. Richter.) This new heft has much the same character as its predecessors. The author takes up a number of mission fields in the East Indies, and after a rapid sketch of the characteristic features of the land and people furnishes a lively narrative of the origin and progress of the work carried on. The circulation of such works cannot but be very useful.—Anecdotes Illustrative of Old Testament Texts. (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.) This is a new volume of the publishers' Clerical Library, and is worthy of its place in the series. The selections in the main are well made and pertinent.—D. L. Moody at Home. (New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell.) This volume describes the home of the well-known evangelist and the work carried on there, together with an account of the various Christian conferences and the best thoughts exchanged there. The first two chapters are descriptive, all the rest being given up to the reports of addresses. The practical and suggestive character of these renders them very helpful to all Christian workers. But the three chapters on the Second Advent are rather singular specimens of Bible study.—Some Lessons from the Parable of the Sower, the Parable of Growth, and the Law of the Harvest. By J. P. Egbert. (Buffalo: Ulbrich & Kingsley.) These are pulpfit studies reproduced in print. They are fresh and stimulating.—Many Infallible Proofs: a Series of Chapters on the Evidences of Christianity. By Arthur T. Pierson, D.D. (Chicago: F. H. Revell.) This is a fresh presentation of the ordinary material of Apologetics, set forth with clearness and vivacity. Dr. Pierson speaks first of the Volume of the Book, its support in miracle and prophecy, its scientific accuracy, its moral beauty and sublimity, and then turns to consider the divine person it discloses, his nature, character, and teaching. The argument is skilfully conducted and the whole treatment attractive. The book is well adapted to strengthen believers and to meet the wants of honest doubters. We observe one error (p. 281), in attributing to Schleiermacher a saying of Ewald, and in failing to give the nervous conciseness of the original as recorded by Dean Stanley (Jewish Church, III. 10), "In this little book [the New Testament] is contained all the wisdom of the world."—The People's Bible. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. Vol. IV. Numb. xxvii.—Deuteronomy. By Joseph Parker, D.D. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls.) This new volume of Dr. Parker's elaborate work has exactly the same character as the volumes previously noticed. Without being a commentary, it has many striking adaptations of Old Testament utterances to our own day and time. The portions entitled "Handfuls of Purpose"
are full of suggestive and edifying matter, but the prayers which accompany the discourses seem to us very good specimens of what a pulpit prayer ought not to be. They lack simplicity, directness, and fervor, and seem calculated to draw the people's attention rather to the speaker than to the Being whom he professedly addresses.—**Applied Christianity. Moral Aspects of Social Questions.** By Washington Gladden. (Boston and New York : Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) This is a clever contribution to the question of the day. There may be some doubt about the position that, while among us "wealth is increasing rapidly, poverty, even pauperism, is increasing still more rapidly;" but Mr. Gladden steers clear of the panaceas of cranks, and urges what is the only solution of the problem—the application of Christianity to the dealings of employers and employed. The author has a good chapter on Amusements, in which he cites what has been done in Cleveland, O., as a fair specimen of what may be done by Christian people in the way of providing innocent and healthful entertainments for the people. Another chapter, on Popular Education, well enforces the point that our public schools should give more attention to the formation of character than to the communication of abstract knowledge. The pages in which Mr. Gladden speaks of gambling are not as carefully written as the other parts of the book. Gambling, we think, is often enough denounced in the pulpit, but it is by no means easy to draw the line between the speculation that is legitimate and that which is illegitimate. A conversation with men of established Christian character, whose business requires them to deal on a large scale with the products of the soil, would show any thoughtful man that the solution of the question is anything but easy.—**Morning Family Prayers for a Year.** By J. R. Macduff, D.D. (New York : Carter & Bros.) The subject of this volume commends it in advance. The importance of domestic worship and the degree to which it is neglected give value to every book which calls attention to it and facilitates the performance of the duty. The prayers in this volume are founded upon select portions of Scripture, which, though not quoted in full, are referred to in every case. This feature secures a sufficient variety and freshness in the petitions. The book is not a model of liturgical composition, but it is devout, earnest, simple, and direct, and is thoroughly Scriptural and evangelical in tone. It will be found useful whether the head of a household adopts its contents bodily, or simply consults it as an aid in framing his own devotions. We would fain hope that it will do something toward a revival of family religion, which is the great need of the present day.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

---

**V.—PHILOSOPHY.**


This volume forms a worthy companion to the author's previous works on Psychology and Logic. Like them, it displays astonishing industry, a truly wonderful amount of special knowledge, a high order of psychological insight, a general sobriety of judgment, and a logical arrangement of the material that leaves little to be desired. After a brief introduction discussing the nature, the methods, and the problems of Ethics, the subject-matter of the work is treated under the following four divisions: 1. The Facts of the Moral Life; 2. The Systems of Moral Philosophy; 3. The Principles of Morality; 4. The Departments of the Moral Life.
It is the peculiar fortune of ethical science, as over against Logic or Psychology, for example, that almost all writers agree as to its nature. It is the science of right conduct. It operates with the conception of the ought in relation to the Will. Wundt speaks of it as a science of norms in the original conception of the norm as a rule of Will opposing that which should be to the matter-of-fact is. There is also a pretty general agreement as to what conduct is and what conduct is not normal. The dispute is as to the right theory of right conduct. What makes conduct right? What is the end or what are the ends toward which human action ought to be directed? And, since all conduct is the product of Will, what is the nature of the Will to which moral law prescribes such and such activity? Of the three methods usually followed in approaching these questions, the speculative, the subjective psychological, and the objective Folk-psychological or sociological, Wundt adopts the last. He rejects the first as offering too great a temptation to do injustice to the enormous wealth, in this department, of empirical facts; he criticises the second as presupposing what may be true, but needs to be proven, that the story told by the moral consciousness in one case will be alike for every case. He holds, on the contrary, that our moral conceptions, like all our conceptions, are subject to the law of development, and that this development is essentially conditioned by the sociological environment; and the whole of his first division is a well-constructed attempt at tracing the gradual growth of our moral ideas from their first rude groundwork in sensuous experience to their assumption of purity and independence in the systems of philosophers. The moral nature of man, however, is presupposed; the germs of the evolution, it is held, are alike from the beginning, and the evolution itself, with manifold diversities in particulars, follows generally accordant laws (p. 32).

The results arrived at by this examination of the facts of the moral life in their genesis and by a critical review of the chief systems of moral philosophy given in the second division are formulated into a system in the third part, where Wundt finds himself, in certain respects, in surprising agreement with the speculative Idealism of the followers of Kant. Here, at the close of the investigation, speculation is accorded the full rights which were denied at the beginning. This appears, for example, in the theory that the spiritual consists purely in activity as opposed to every theory of spiritual substance. There is as much reality as there is actuality. Hence the Will of the community, the Will of the state, indeed, every form of universal will to which that of the individual stands related and to the imperatives of whose laws it is subject, possesses just as much reality as the individual personality itself—a view of things which, as Wundt claims, finds its legitimate conclusion in the religious conception of God as the creative Will of the world, who is at once individual Will and Universal Will (p. 397).

It may seem to some that Wundt's form of the actuality-hypothesis, while avoiding the materialistic implications of the term substance, tends, on its part, to an abstraction. An activity can no more exist without an agent than an agent without an activity. Reality consists ever in concrete relations. So of the universal will and the individual will; neither exists apart. Wundt, at any rate, is no materialist. Those who may still suppose that physiological psychology necessarily leads to Materialism may find instruction in the remarks of this foremost representative of the science under "spiritual and mechanical causality" in the present volume (pp. 402-11). And it is greatly to Wundt's credit that he has been able to so far transcend the atomistic tendency of the empirical method which he everywhere follows as to recognize the reality and the importance of the universal element in our spiritual experiences. Has he carried this synthesis of particular and universal far enough, or recognized with sufficient clearness the significance of this relation as a principle?
Wundt's method and standpoint are seen nowhere more characteristically than in his treatment of the ethical ends and the ethical norms. As to the former, he does not first postulate a *sumnum bonum* as a single principle, from which all lesser ends are then to be deduced, but asks, in truly empirical fashion, What are the ends which, in our judgment, are universally recognized as moral? This, as he admits, is simply an appeal to the normal moral consciousness; but he claims that an appeal to the normal consciousness is the only criterion of certainty in any case. An examination of the ends so recognized leads to the conclusion that no individual end, such as happiness and perfection, can ever, as such, be the final end of morality; that the individual is rather, though not entirely, an instrument for the production of such social ends as the public welfare and general progress, and that the final end of all morality is an ever-receding ideal of an objective spiritual creation, the content of which it is impossible to define, having reference to the organic whole of Humanity, and in relation to which every individual in his moral activity may apply to himself the words of the Earth-Spirit in "Faust:"

"Tis thus at the roaring loom of Time I ply,
And weave for God the garment thou seest him by."

This conception of the relativity of ends then passes over into the conception of the relativity of norms. There is no particular rule of morality but what has its exceptions in practice. In all such cases of the "conflict of norms," the deciding principle is the relation of the rule to the ethical end: "the preference is to be given to that rule which serves the more comprehensive end; the social claims preference over the individual, the end of humanity over the social" (p. 469). If now we ask why we should obey these moral laws, the only answer is again an appeal to the developed and developing moral consciousness. There is no abstract "categorical imperative," but the moral nature of man has converted certain impulses into ethical imperatives, and these it is the business of the moral philosopher to find out. Wundt names four such: the imperatives of compulsion, external (punishment of wrong-doing) and internal (habit formed by education and example), and the imperatives of freedom, lasting satisfaction and a moral ideal of life. Action from the idea of the ideal human destiny is rational. This is certainly not "rigoristic."

Wundt's doctrine of the Will as an integral part of all psychical life, whether conscious or unconscious, and not as "a mere abstraction of action embodied into a real power," is worth studying as perhaps the most important contribution in modern psychology to the discussion of this subject. As regards freedom, Wundt is psychologically a determinist; but psychological determination he considers compatible with freedom as "the capability of a being to be immediately determined in its acts by self-conscious motives" (p. 397). We doubt if it would not, on the whole, be better to reserve the term Will for just this power of rational self-determination. Wundt escapes the difficulty by using "Willkür," but "caprice" in English means something very different.

The advanced student of Ethics will find this treatise a perfect store-house of facts, and the new points of view from which many of the old problems are discussed cannot fail to interest and stimulate him, whatever his opinion as to their value. We know of no recent German work in the same field its superior. It compares not unfavorably with some of the great English treatises of the past decade. It should be translated.

H. N. Gardiner.
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A new book from Mr. Lowell is an event in the literary world. No man living, it may be safely said, speaks to a wider circle of cultivated minds. He alludes to himself as "growing old," but his literary reputation only gains in extent and ripeness with every new publication from his pen. In one respect the volume before us marks a new venture for him. His prose writings hitherto have been composed of articles originally published in our leading reviews. The present volume is made up of Addresses, all of which, with two exceptions—that on "Books and Libraries" and that on "The two hundred and fiftieth Anniversary of the foundation of Harvard University"—were given before British audiences during his occupancy of the post he so adorned, of Minister at the Court of St. James. It may be said at once, in the way of a general estimate, that he has succeeded as signally in the work of "addressing" audiences as in that of delighting and instructing readers. Essays and Addresses alike show the same faultless and telicitous literary execution.

The volume under notice embraces a wide variety of topics, abstract, like that of the address on democracy; commemorative, like those on President Garfield and Dean Stanley; literary, like those on Fielding, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Don Quixote; educational, like those on Books and Libraries and on the Harvard Anniversary. The most notable, as indeed the longest, are perhaps the one on Democracy, which opens the series, and that on the Harvard Anniversary, which closes it.

The address on Democracy, entitled "Inaugural Address on Assuming the Presidency of the Birmingham and Midland Institute," was delivered at Birmingham, October 6th, 1884. It attracted wide attention at the time of its delivery both from the nature of the subject discussed and from the reputation Mr. Lowell had gained by his address on Fielding, given the year previous, as a man of letters who could use his voice as effectively as his pen.

Mr. Lowell never himself forgot, nor allowed the British public to forget, that he was an American, and as such a firm believer in the institutions of his country. "I have," he said in his Garfield Address, "an imperturbable faith in the honesty, the intelligence, and the good sense of the American people, and in the destiny of the American Republic." So on the occasion at Birmingham, while avowing "himself precluded, in [his] quality of national guest, by motives of taste and discretion, from dealing with any question of immediate and domestic concern," he sought to defend American institutions from a reproach somewhat general in England and on the Continent. "I shall address myself to a single point only in the long list of offences of which we are more or less gravely accused, because that really includes all the rest. It is that we are infecting the Old World with what seems to be thought the entirely new disease of Democracy." To this text Mr. Lowell closely adheres, and enforces his doctrine by a brilliant exposition of the truth that "the sentiment which lies at the root of democracy is nothing new;" that it did not come to its birth in America; that it is really a bequest to America from other ages and lands, even from England herself. "There can be no doubt that the spectacle of a great and prosperous Democracy on the other side of the Atlantic must react powerfully on the aspirations and political theories of men in the Old World, who do not find things to
their mind; but whether for good or evil, it should not be overlooked that the acorn from which it springs was ripened on the British oak," etc. (pp. 14-17).

This point effectively made is then supplemented by the view that the working of democratic institutions in America shows that, if wisely founded, they are safeguards not destroyers of government nor social order (pp. 23 et seq.). We have no space to go at any length into his discussion of these propositions. It is characterized by a degree of political wisdom which very few men of letters are thought to possess. In fact, the American Congress has not had a man in it for many years who could so dexterously and convincingly put our cause before the people of England. There are some among us whose opinions are entitled to great respect, who would consider his doctrine as too optimistic, as not sufficiently taking into account threatening evils which the ballot arms with new terrors. The address is more open to criticism from this quarter than from any other. But his optimism has a reason to give for the hope that is in it, as the concluding pages of the address show. It is not that tone of everlasting brag about our great country which is the staple of so much Congressional eloquence. It is a political philosophy which has studied the history of other ages and other nations than our own.

Any notice of this address would be inadequate which failed to note as one of its salient features the wit which enlivens and enlightens it. Its shafts are driven to the centre by force of logic, and there is sometimes an effective argument in ambush behind the witty sentence. As when he says: "A French gentleman, not long ago, forgetting Burke's monition of how unwise it is to draw an indictment against a whole people, has charged us with the responsibility of whatever he finds disagreeable in the morals or manners of his countrymen;" and then adds: "If M. Zola, or some other competent witness, would only go into the box and tell us what those morals and manners were before our example corrupted them!" If possible a neater thrust is given in this passage: "The English race, if they did not invent government by discussion, have at least carried it nearest to perfection in practice. . . . Yet, if one should ask why it should not rather be called government by gabble, it would have to fumble in its pocket a good while before it found the change for a convincing reply." There is a touch of Montaigne in the following: "It is said that the right of suffrage is not valued when it is indiscriminately bestowed, and there may be some truth in this; for I have observed that what men prize most is a privilege, even if it be that of chief mourner at a funeral."

The addresses commemorative of President Garfield and Dean Stanley, though very brief, show insight into both men, and are marked by a quiet but very deep tone of appreciation. They are far removed from all the commonplaces of eulogy. The admirers of President Garfield will have to go far before they find a finer estimate of his powers or a more feeling expression of the national sorrow over his untimely death.

The addresses on Fielding and Coleridge were given on the occasion of unveiling the busts of these distinguished authors, the one in Shire Hall, Taunton, the other in Westminster Abbey. It was in itself a memorable tribute to Mr. Lowell as a man of letters that he, a representative of American Literature, should in England, having so many distinguished men of letters, have been asked to do this service. It is scarcely less a tribute to him that he should have been chosen President of the Wordsworth Society, in which capacity the address on Wordsworth was given. That on Don Quixote is modestly entitled "Notes Read at the Workingmen's College, Great Ormond Street, London." It is enough, perhaps, to say of all these, that they are marked by the same critical powers which in his volumes, "My Study-Windows," "Among My Books," first and second series, have made him the foremost of American critics. They are certainly
free from a fault which has been charged against him in these volumes, that in
his critical discussion "he too often introduced illustrations or collateral state-
ments that were confusing, non-pertinent, and ungraceful." While nothing like
extended or minute criticism is attempted, the critical survey is made on those
broad lines which, after all, often deals most justly as well as generously with
authors. One—if not the main—office of all criticism is to secure a true inter-
pretation of the soul of literature. Professor Dowden's article on this subject
in the Contemporary Review has made this abundantly clear, and it is the merit
of Mr. Lowell as a critic that he gives the key to a clear and just appreciation of
authors whom he discusses. The address on Wordsworth naturally brings into
play more of this critical faculty than do the others. The limitations of Words-
worth in his poetic genius and work are freely handled and acknowledged. Mr.
Lowell is no blind devotee of that Wordsworth cult which has done quite as
much to obscure as to secure the poet's fame. In fact, it is a test in itself of
critical power to be able to treat satisfactorily four authors so diverse in gifts and
work as Fielding, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Don Quijote. The reader can
see how easily and naturally Mr. Lowell rises to meet the demands of such a test.

While the address on "Books and Libraries" is chiefly valuable as the com-
ment of a man of letters on a topic which in the rapid multiplication of books is
becoming almost portentous in significance—viz., How to read, that at the
Harvard Anniversary deals with very pressing issues touching the very vitals of
the highest education. Harvard University has no son more proud of her history,
more loyal to her traditions, more solicitous for her future than Mr. Lowell. He
is her most distinguished living graduate. He is no blind worshipper of the
past. To quote his own choice line, he is not by any necessity

"the born disciple of an elder time."

He has been often in the van of progress when our gravest statesmen shook their
heads solemnly in protest. Witness his early and unflinching advocacy of anti-
slavery views. But against the known educational policy now in vogue at his
Alma Mater, and against a wide, we fear a growing popular sentiment in its
favor—he has spoken out. Under all the playfulness of his wit it is easy to see
the depth and strength of his convictions that the trend of things at Harvard is
away from what is wisest and best in education as a discipline for life—and the
work of life. He has put on record his deliberate judgment as to the position
which the study of Greek should hold in any college or university curriculum.
The need of it, in his view, is absolute. Nothing can take its place (pp. 224-27).

So also has he entered his protest against an unrestricted system of elective
studies in our colleges (pp. 221-24). "Is it, indeed," he asks, "so self-evident
a proposition as it seems to many, that 'You may' is as wholesome a lesson for
youth as 'You must'? Is it so good a fore-schooling for life, which will be a
teacher of quite another mood, making us learn, rod in hand, precisely those
lessons we should not have chosen?" It is of no small account in the discussion
now going on as to the place elective studies are to hold in our educational
system to have the testimony of one who has shown himself a man of affairs as
well as a man of letters on a point so vital to a true theory of education. The
closing portion of the address is almost of equal moment in its discussion of the
relation that should exist between the higher and lower education. That, too,
is pregnant with grave issues. We are well aware that this review has been
mainly laudatory. From some literary views in his other volumes we should
have been obliged to dissent. But it is seldom our fortune to find a book in
which, from beginning to end, we have found so little to find any fault with, and
so much to be instructed by and enjoy.

J. O. Murray.
THAYER'S GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. A Greek-
English Lexicon of the New Testament, being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi
Testamenti, translated, revised, and enlarged by JOSEPH HENRY THAYER,
T. & T. Clark.

The title-page of this great work exhibits the modesty of the editor, and his con-
scientious care to acknowledge obligations to his predecessors, but fails to sug-
gest the extent and importance of his own labors. Wilke's "Clavis Philologica"
can no longer be identified in the form or structure of the book, and his name
deserves its position in the title even less than it did in that of Grimm's "Lexi-
con," where it was placed only because the publishers who had issued his book
planned and published its successor. Grimm's was essentially a new work, and
Dr. Thayer has still further broadened its scope, so that it now stands as an
attempt to compile a condensed cyclopaedia of New Testament interpretation, in
the light of to-day's scholarship. A final estimate of the success of this attempt
can only be formed after it shall have been thoroughly tested by long use; but a
careful examination of its plan and of many of its details, for the purposes of this
notice, is sufficient to show its great superiority to all previous works of its class.
Until the time, probably far distant, when Dr. Thayer's book will be superseded,
as he anticipates, by "the joint product of several laborers having at their com-
mand larger resources than he has enjoyed, and ampler leisure than falls to the
lot of the average teacher" (Preface, p. ix.), it must remain the student's best
accessible guide to the meaning of the words of the sacred text.

It is gratifying, therefore, to find at the outset that the translation of Grimm's
"Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Libros N. T." (second edition, Leipzig, 1879),
which is the basis of the book and determines its form, may fairly be called
perfect. Dr. Thayer might have treated it more freely, and would doubtless
have pleased many students by rewriting the leading articles independently,
using Dr. Grimm's work, where he approved it, with his other materials. But
he has chosen to give that work complete in an English dress, with the silent
correction of a few obvious errors, mainly in the figures of references, and
everywhere to distinguish his own additions. The translation, as a whole, is a
masterpiece of its class, expressing, with the precision of extreme literalness, yet
with the ease and freedom of original composition, the sense of the Latin. We
find no passage in which it can be said that this sense is perverted or obscured,
but many in which admirable advantage has been taken of the superiority of the
English language, to give it with simplicity, clearness, and force. Equally
complete is the adaptation of the Lexicon to the later revisions of the Greek
text by Tregelles and by Westcott and Hort; every reading admitted by these
authorities into the text or the margin being carefully noted. The proof-reading
has been done with marvellous accuracy, and the mechanical execution of the
book is admirable.

Yet now that this useful work is in the hands of students, it is worth while to
note that with much less labor it might have been made a more serviceable hand-
book. The conscientious care with which the original work has been preserved in
its integrity has left in the articles a large amount of matter which might have
been spared; especially the numberless references to books which are inacces-
sible in this country, and recourse to which, were they within reach, would not
repay the time and labor it would exact. Grimm assumed that his students
would have access to a large library; Dr. Thayer retains all his references, and
adds many more, which not one in a thousand of those who will read the New
Testament under his guidance can use. For the mass of purchasers and students
the size and cost of the volume are thus largely increased to no purpose, while
all scholars who need to refer to the authorities named, and have the means of
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doing so, possess other and far more complete ways of access to them than by the meagre index which even the largest general lexicon can furnish. In his modesty and intense precision Dr. Thayer gives not only results, but processes, where, for his purpose, results only are of value. Thus a vast amount of research has been expended in ascertaining what heathen writers, whether classical or late, have used particular words found in the text, or used them in particular meanings; and to these authors, and even to the passages in question, Dr. Thayer has multiplied references. Yet any good Greek lexicon will, for this purpose, be both more complete and more convenient than this special lexicon can be made; and it is not to be supposed that any student who possesses a library of Greek authors is without his Passow or Liddell and Scott. Still less in place are the numerous bare references to such books as Elsner's "Observationes Sacrae," Alberti's "Observationes Philologicae," Raphael's "Annotations," Kypke's "Observationes Sacrae," Meisterhaus's "Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften," and many more; filling the space which might and ought to contain the author's own conclusions, after he has examined and weighed all that these authorities contribute to illustrate the word in hand.

But the most unfortunate result of adherence to the integrity of Grimm's rule is found in the preservation of his etymological remarks, which are of no value, and in many cases are misleading. It is sad rather than ludicrous that for the origin of ἄγγει we should still be told by Grimm to compare Germ. Auge, on the authority of Pape; but it is altogether sad that Dr. Thayer should not only preserve this unfounded suggestion, but should add in brackets the English word eye, which really corresponds with Auge, and should then add a bare reference to Liddell and Scott, as if they sanctioned the blunder. Nothing more absurd can be imagined than that ἰὲλω is " derived from ἐλεῖν with a fuller aspiration," yet this wild guess is not rejected by Dr. Thayer, but is seriously reprinted with a vague and unsatisfactory alternative suggestion. We are told that λανθάνω is a " lengthened form of ἵθηθοι;" λυκὸς is referred to ἐνεκεῖν instead of to the root of ἄγκων, nor is the Latin uncus remembered; ἀσθενεία is represented as from σθένω for θελεῖν, a notion with no support in authority or in the form or sense of the word. Occasionally a more careful note is found; thus, Grimm compares with ὤργω, Lat. rego, Germ. recken, strecken, reichen, and Dr. Thayer adds, Eng. reach. If we erase strecken, which belongs to a widely different class of words, the others may profitably be examined as probably having more or less connection with ὤργω. But if it is intended to stimulate the student to inquiry into the history of forms, why are the known facts concerning the relations of the commonest words wholly unnoticed? Under id, the Latin virus; under μῦ, the Latin mensis and the modern Monat and month; under είδω, οἶδα, the German wissen, Eng. witt; under ποίε, besides pes, the modern Fuss, foot; under βοῖς, Latin bos; under γνώσκω, kennen and know; under ἐποτε, vox and voice; under δός, salvis; under ἰπτος, equus; under ἱγί, ich and I should be mentioned. In fact, however, these, as well as the more remote facts of comparative philology, are out of the province of a New Testament Lexicon. The book is none the worse for the omission of them. It would be much better for the omission of every word upon the subject of etymology, since what is given is not only in the highest degree fragmentary, but is largely antiquated and demonstrably incorrect. Students must be directed to use the Lexicon as if the etymological remarks were blanks, and to look elsewhere for all their information on this subject.

A very different judgment must be passed upon Dr. Thayer's additions discussing synonyms. These are mostly taken from Schmidt's exhaustive treatise. The principal results of Schmidt, as far as applicable to New Testament usage, are selected and condensed, and the articles are often enriched by remarks from other authorities, sometimes, too sparingly, by Dr. Thayer's own comments.
Examples of brief but very valuable discussions of this class may be found under the articles μνήμη, γνώμων, δοκεῖ, ερχόμαι, καθάρω, καταγράφω, κόπω, μορφή, οίκος, νόφος, παίς, ποιέω, σκοπέω, τόπος, and many others. Indeed, the severest critic can find little to censure in this feature of the Lexicon, except that the modesty which the editor has shown throughout sometimes amounts to unreasonable timidity. In instances in which from the nature of the subject it seems impossible to suppose that he has not formed a decided opinion, and even where a careful study of his references will show clearly what that opinion must be, he appears in his summing up to hesitate, and sets forth conflicting views without a decision. The long note on θελω and its synonyms, and the shorter ones on διάδημα and on κακία are striking instances. To the student who is not trained to independent research and judgment they are unsatisfactory and bewildering. Yet he is the reader to be first considered. And even the mature scholar would prefer to find in his Lexicon results rather than processes; fortified conclusions rather than the crude materials for investigation.

Besides the valuable additions which have been mentioned, Dr. Thayer has done much for the completeness of the work by the addition of classified lists of the words in the New Testament which belong to late Greek; of those borrowed from other languages; of those peculiar to it, or used by its writers in a peculiar sense; and of the words used only by particular writers. These lists appear to be full and accurate, and will be welcomed as a precious aid in investigating the growth of conceptions and forms of thought in the early life of the Church. The long list of "Forms of Verbs" which follows is a concession to indolence and ignorance, and is of no importance to any one who ought to take such a book in hand.

But one set of additions, which Grimm's book sorely needed, has unfortunately not been made; and a tithe of the labor expended by the American editor in furnishing references which are of small value, or quite out of the province of the book, would have sufficed to supply them. Dr. Grimm was a man of positive views, not highly tolerant of dissent. He is decided in his opinion upon almost every question of interpretation, and too often dismisses without notice opinions which he regards as unfounded, though they may have been supported by authorities as high as his own, or even though they may have had a profound influence on the belief of the Church and the history of exegesis. Dr. Thayer, on the other hand, is timidly modest. He preserves with perfect good faith the positive views and words of his predecessor, and where he evidently dissents from them, contents himself with stating that there is another explanation, and referring to writers who maintain it. But where he agrees with Dr. Grimm, he does not supply his deficiencies, and still leaves us too often in ignorance that any other interpretation has ever been suggested. Under διάθηκα, for example, we are not informed that a respectable body of exegesists have rejected the meaning, testament, entirely, and insisted that everywhere, even in the ninth chapter to the Hebrews, the sense is covenant, and that the phrase διανομή του διαθημένον means the death of a victim offered to confirm it. That the Lexicon gives the true meaning, and that the writer of the epistle plays with the word in a double sense, which generalizes his argument and makes every translation helpless, is doubtless the accepted conclusion of scholars; but the opposing view historically deserves to be mentioned, if not logically to be refuted. Again, in the wonderful words of Christ to Nicodemus (John iii. 8), "το πνεύμα οποιον θελε πνεύμα," the Church for ages supposed that he was speaking of the Spirit of God alone, and to this day the Latin Vulgate conveys only this sense to that great part of the Christian world which regards that version as no less sacred than the Greek. Bengel, the greatest of Protestant interpreters, defended it, and at least answered successfully the reasoning of those who then advocated the rendering wind. It is
true that, following Lücke, nearly all later commentators have rejected Bengel's view; but in some branches of the Reformed Church, and notably in the Society of Friends, Bengel's translation is still almost an article of faith. A difference in interpretation of such historical moment certainly deserves mention in a comprehensive lexicon to the New Testament, but we look in vain for it here. Nor is there any explanation of the difficulty which arises from the double use of the word in the same verse, and which seems at first sight to make the exegesis impossible.

The defects which have been mentioned, however, do not in any degree qualify our conclusion that Dr. Thayer's Lexicon is a vast improvement upon all its predecessors. For the present, and probably for many years, it must be the constant companion of students who wish to know the mature conclusions of scholars upon the meaning of the words in biblical Greek. It can only be superseded by a work which, whether or not it be the product of "several laborers" with "larger resources," shall at least confine itself strictly to the province of special lexicography, and, while attempting nothing else, shall with completeness set forth all plausible and important explanations of the sacred words which have been potent in the Church, and give, with reasons for the decision, those which are finally preferred. Antiquated philology will be excluded, and no attempt will be made to index a library of exegesis. But in accuracy of statement, in clearness of arrangement and style, in fairness of spirit and in industry of research, Dr. Thayer's work is a model for all future laborers in the same field.

CHARLTON T. LEWIS.
formative in its effects upon the German educational system, was bequeathed to Herbart, who succeeded Kant at Königsberg. Herbart elaborated as his own work the idea that a true pedagogics not only rests upon a true psychology, but is also its highest product. He treated psychology accordingly as the great means to pedagogics. Rosenkranz followed Herbart at Königsberg, and tell heir to those influences which had preceded him there. The elaborated philosophic view of education which Germany can furnish us is to be found fully presented in Herbart and Rosenkranz. How much our teaching in this country has suffered from the want of philosophic comprehension and, worse still, from the bald empirical educational maxims and rules which have been palmed off as educational philosophy, need not be written. For this state of things Rosenkranz's work is both corrective and tonic.

Professor Payne's faithful work at Ann Arbor is giving him wide repute, and his book deserves longer notice than can be accorded here. He is an investigator, and his 'Contributions' are real studies. Though full precision of definition and finality of view is not approached in as great a degree as we might desire, his want of ambition in this respect is counterbalanced by his moderation. He is apparently dismayed by the prodigious amount of work to be done in constructing a complete pedagogic, and so is satisfied to do a part when the whole cannot be compassed. One exception, however, must be taken against this volume, or rather against his discussion of 'The Secularization of the School,' which is colored by the idea of neutrality and even of abandonment of religious instruction in the school. The task of solving the enigma of how to teach anything more than the conventions of morality, if religion is excluded, is as insoluble to Professor Payne as to every one else who has essayed it.

Professor Stanley Hall continues his very useful activity by giving us our first attempt in this country at a genuine bibliography of education. For this he deserves the thanks of every one who desires to study the subject. The modest title understates the value of his book. It would be hard to say where else any one could find in collected form the information here so admirably arranged. Certainly no German or English work contains such references to the latest phases of American discussions. A second and improved edition is promised, which will no doubt exceed the present one both in detailed accuracy and greater fulness under several topics which need further elaboration.

Andrew F. West.


Mr. Upton has given us in this volume a bright, interesting, and instructive sketch of an important class of musical compositions. His aim is descriptive. His range is wide, including works closely cognate to oratorios on one side or another, and not such only as would be strictly covered by his definition. He only hints at the antecedents of the oratorio, in the miracle plays and passion music of an older time, and then, with appropriate biographical and historical notices, brings before us, not in a chronological or genetic order, but simply in the alphabetical order of the composers' names, about forty of the representative productions of their class. While he answers satisfactorily the surface questions of the superficial lovers of sacred music and of musical art, he stimulates more thorough and disciplinary study. Charles A. Aiken.
PLATO'S theory of education is as many-sided as human life. It is a noble dream of what man might be were he to realize all that is in him; to waste none of his powers; and to be moved by nothing that does not make for perfection of character. It is a dream that in large part can only be realized, if at all, in some far-off age, and under conditions not contemplated by the dreamer.

It tells of what the world will be
When the years have passed away.

To call it a dream may seem to be pronouncing sentence of condemnation on it, but, as has been well said, "the dreams of a great intellect may be better worth our attention than the waking perceptions of ordinary men." The value of a theory is to be judged not so much by what it says as by what it suggests; not by its capability of realization in immediate practice, but by its presentation of an ideal toward which men may slowly work. The theory itself I shall not attempt to criticise, but I shall go on at once to give Plato's answer to these three questions: (1) What is the aim of education? (2) What is the nature of education? (3) What are the means by which education may secure the end aimed at?

(1) The aim of all education is to produce perfect citizens in a perfect state in this world, and to prepare men for advancing to a still higher degree of perfection in the life to come. Thus education is not only coextensive with human life here, but it is only the beginning of a process of development that can know no end. Education must aim at the production of the perfect citizen. Why Plato looked at the problem of education from this point of view it is not
difficult to understand. The historical development of Athens had led it to a point where the simplicity of an earlier age—the absorption in public life, the intense patriotism of a small aristocratic city commonwealth, and the child-like faith in the religion of their fathers—had been rudely shaken, and luxury, faction, disloyalty, and religious skepticism had honeycombed society to its very centre. Like Dante at a later time, Plato's remedy for these evils was drawn from the past, but from the past idealized and transfigured by the light of his own genius. Let us, he thought, restore by foresight and reflection the primitive state of society, when

None was for a party,
But all were for the State;

let us make it impossible for men to turn from the path of duty, by taking hold of them at their birth, and training and developing them in a life of pure and disinterested devotion to the State. The possible danger of destroying individuality, and so defeating the end held in view, did not and indeed could not occur to him. No man can put himself entirely outside of the spirit of his age; the most that he can do is to comprehend what that spirit is in its ideal essence, or to take a single step beyond it. Plato, revolutionary as, from one point of view, his doctrine was, was yet a revolutionist who wielded weapons snatched from the armory of the past. He proposes to abolish all private property, to do away even with private families, to have a compulsory system of national education, and to make women undergo the same education and discharge the same functions in the State as men. The last two propositions do not seem to us so revolutionary as they appeared to our fathers, but we rightly feel that to endorse the first two would be to destroy the very foundation of our modern civilization. We are so strongly convinced of the necessity of individual property, and of the sacred and ennobling character of the family, that we shrink instinctively from laying profane hands upon either, or even from allowing a word to be breathed against their permanence. But we must remember that to an ancient Greek the family held a very subordinate place. His true life he sought in the discharge of affairs of State, the State being to him the arena on which all his best powers were deployed, as well as the instrument by which they were developed. We must also remember that the doctrine of laissez faire was quite foreign to him. The right of the people to compel the individual to do what was for the common weal was an unwritten law, and his only question was whether the measure of reform proposed was good for all or no. Moreover, Plato had before his eyes a State in which the purity and
manliness of an earlier time had been preserved by a constitution framed expressly with that end in view. In Sparta he saw an approximation to his notion of what a State should be, for Sparta, receiving its military organization from Lycurgus, had preserved it in large measure intact. Why, then, should not the same thing be done in a new Sparta of nobler type? Why might not Athens also take and keep the mould constructed for it by a philosophic lawgiver? Let us ask, then, he thought, what is the perfect form of the State, that so we may be able to determine the sort of training our citizens should receive? Not that Plato was not eager to secure a perfect type of man, but to him it seemed impossible to have the perfect man by leaving things to take their course. The perfect man, by all means! but how shall you make a man perfect by leaving him to the lawless devices of his own unregenerate nature? We see what condition of things that has already brought us to, and the only way to mend it is by a complete, thorough, and comprehensive system of education.

(2) What, then, is education? Two opposite ideas of education are familiar to us: that it consists in the acquisition of the knowledge required in one's special vocation and for success in life; or that it consists in training all our faculties to their highest excellence. Neither of these views is that adopted by Plato. He has expressly told us what he thinks of the former. He insists indeed upon the importance of arithmetic and geometry to the soldier and the tactician; but he says that a very moderate amount of knowledge is needed for such purposes, and that such a method of study is not one which tends to make a man truly educated. Plato has more sympathy with the second conception of education referred to; in fact, it is comprehended and absorbed in his own theory. The aim of education is, indeed, to develop all a man's faculties, but such a development of himself cannot be separated from his education as a citizen. To train up a race of men of mere culture, valuing literature and science and philosophy simply as an instrument for the production of a supple, nimble, or vigorous intellect, would not have seemed to Plato an end worthy to be achieved. The "intellectual gymnastic" point of view is altogether alien to his mode of thought. "What is the value," he would have said, "of a kind of education that teaches a man to divorce the form from the matter, to value ability for its own sake, to pride himself on his own excellence of faculty? I wish to make perfect men, and by that I mean perfect citizens—men whose whole energies shall be devoted to the common good; such men are not produced by a process of 'intellectual gymnastic.'" This view of education is also foreign to Plato, be-
cause it attaches, or seems to attach, no value to the object of thought, to the truth of things, but only to the condition of the subject. But the discovery of truth was to Plato but another form of the doctrine that education seeks to produce the perfect man in the perfect state. For how shall a man be a true citizen who cannot distinguish semblances from realities? A good citizen he cannot be, because he does not know in what good citizenship consists.

To be indifferent to truth was to Plato to be a Sophist, and "Sophist" was his bitterest term of reproach. The Sophist was indifferent to truth, and made a profession of teaching men how to make sham knowledge look as well as truth, and he even showed how little of the disinterested spirit of the true citizen he possessed by taking pay for destroying men's natural love of the true, the beautiful, and the good. Plato therefore refused to separate the discovery of truth from the training of the powers of man. That training best develops a man's faculties which leads him by the best path, long and arduous though it may be, into the presence of Truth herself. Divorce education from the search for truth, and you corrupt the whole soul. For education is a turning not of the imagination alone, or the intellect alone, but of the whole soul to the light. It must not be thought of as if it consisted in putting sight into the soul; the sight is there already, and the eye of the soul only needs its appropriate object to be full of seeing. The eye of the soul cannot be destroyed; it remains an indefeasible possession even of the clever scoundrel, who has lost the desire to behold the fair form of truth. What has lent countenance to the idea that Plato endorses the "intellectual gymnastic" theory of education is, that he rejects merely technical knowledge as no worthy aim. But his reason for rejecting this bread-and-butter doctrine is that it does not lead to the discovery of truth. The knowledge of particulars is no real knowledge; true knowledge lies in "seeing things clearly and seeing them whole." The little bit of knowledge which technical education gives becomes untrue for the man who knows nothing else, because he does not see it as a part of a greater orb of knowledge comprehending the whole universe. True education must therefore take a man by the hand, and conduct him from particulars of sense to the forms of art, from art to science, and from science to philosophy, the last being, in Plato's view, the comprehension of all things from the point of view of the Good or God, and therefore one with Theology. This leads us to ask,

(3) What are the means by which the end aimed at in education is to be reached? By what process may our citizens be led to see Truth in her naked majesty? With this question the greater part
of the "Republic" is occupied. I can only give a hurried summary of the answer. The State is the individual man "writ large," and if we succeed in discovering the true nature of the former we may then reason back to the latter. Now in every State there must be a class engaged in producing the means of subsistence, a class whose duty it is to protect the State from invasion, and a class to attend to affairs of government. There are, in other words, the tradesman, the military man, and the statesman. And as the work which each has to do demands a special type of character, we may say that the peculiar virtue or excellence of the tradesman is obedience, of the military man courage, and of the statesman wisdom. Like State like man; as the character of the State is determined by the character of the individuals who compose it, we must expect to find in the virtuous man the three qualities of obedience, courage, and wisdom. And so we do; a man of noble character has his sensuous nature in thorough control, and his courage is not less assured than his foresight or wisdom. As education seeks to make good citizens, it must be adapted to call into harmonious exercise the three virtues of self-restraint, courage, and wisdom. What sort of education will do that? We may take a hint, says Plato, from the education hitherto in vogue. A Greek youth received, like our own children, a double training, mental and physical. Besides the rudiments of knowledge he learned by heart a good deal of poetry, especially from the poems of Homer. Perhaps because so much of the poetry was originally sung or accompanied, all education in literature was called "music." Using the word in this sense, Plato says that the training of the youth must begin with "music" and gymnastic. Now, "in all work," says Plato, "the beginning is of the greatest importance, especially when we have to do with a young and tender creature, for then, more than at any other time, it receives the particular fashion and stamp which we wish to impress upon it. . . . What the child hears when it is young generally becomes fixed fast and indelibly in its mind." The general principle is that we must teach children nothing that we should not wish them to retain when they are grown up. In particular, no poet in our State can be allowed to follow Homer in his misrepresentations of the divine. God is absolutely good and absolutely unchangeable; He is not the author of evil, nor is He fickle and changeable. Poetry at the best is a "noble lie," being based on no certain knowledge of the facts which it represents, but it is an ignoble lie when it is not true even to the ideal nature of things. What could be more corrupting to an undeveloped mind than the "lie in the soul," which is the most irredeemable of all lies, since it arises from absolute ignorance of the divine
nature. The representation of true moral ideas must also be enjoined on the poets, and we must have a censorship over them to secure obedience to what is enjoined. They must inculcate reverence for parents, as well as courage, truthfulness, and self-control, the main virtues of the good citizen. Dramatic poetry, and most of all comedy, must be excluded altogether, for nothing but harm can come of the representation of women scolding their husbands or railing against high heaven, or from pictures of bullies, cowards, drunkards, and madmen. Can a man "put himself into the mould of inferior natures" without himself receiving a taint? Poetry must "imitate what is right, and that only." Its educational value lies solely in its appealing to the gentle side of man's nature, to that faculty which in its highest form is wisdom, and so in preparing the way for science and philosophy. But it becomes an instrument of corruption when it not only represents truth in a sensuous form, but entirely distorts its true nature. The same remarks apply to painting, sculpture, and music.

The function of gymnastic in education is not solely or even mainly to develop the body, but to train the mind. As the study of literature refines the mind, so gymnastic strengthens it. A one-sided education makes a boy either effeminate or brutal. Witness your professional athlete, who dozes away his life, and if he deviates a little from his accustomed diet falls sick. In our State gymnastic must be employed to make our young men able to bear fatigue, and to be courageous in spirit, so that in times of war they may make good soldiers.

Before passing to the higher form of education complementary to music and gymnastic, I may remark that our respect for the comprehensive character of Plato's idea of education must be qualified by the admission that he makes no provision for the education of the working-class. This is a fatal blot in his theory, but it is one which was inseparable from the Greek conception of the State. Every Greek State, even when it called itself democratic, was aristocratic in the sense that it rested upon a broad substructure of slavery. As Tennyson, addressing Freedom, beautifully says:

"For thou—when Athens reign'd and Rome,
Thy glorious eyes were dimm'd with pain
To mark in many a freeman's home
The slave, the scourge, the chain."

Plato's problem was therefore much more simple than ours. He assumes that his citizens are free to devote themselves to intellectual pursuits, as they might very well be where all the menial offices
were discharged by a vast body of slaves. This fact made it possible for him to propound a theory of education which continued educational training through the whole of a man's life.

Education in "music" and gymnastic should last, he says, from early years to the age of twenty, and from twenty to thirty the citizen should devote himself to the study of science. In science are included arithmetic in its higher forms, plane and solid geometry, dynamics and acoustics, and during this period he must also be serving his apprenticeship in military service and testing the courage of his convictions in the discharge of the ordinary duties of a citizen. Last of all comes the study of philosophy, which is to occupy him exclusively from his thirtieth to his thirty-fifth year. To appreciate properly Plato's theory of education we must get some idea of what he means by philosophy.

The first thing to be borne in mind is that philosophy in his view of it is not a species of intellectual curiosity; it is not a mere doctrine, but a life. Education and years are needed to "bring the philosophic mind." A second thing to be observed is that the material with which philosophy as a theory of knowledge deals is not different from the material of ordinary knowledge and the special sciences; its superiority lies not in the things from which it takes its start, but in the point of view from which it contemplates them, and the comprehensive glance which it is enabled to take by comparing together different branches of knowledge and viewing them all in the light of a single principle. There is, for example, a philosophic and an unphilosophical way of regarding social problems. The ordinary citizen and especially the ordinary politician are compared by Plato, in his famous allegory at the beginning of the seventh book, to men living from childhood in a sort of underground den, having their necks and legs chained, so that they can only see the shadows cast on the inner wall by statuettes carried past the mouth of the cave. Such men naturally take the shadows of images for realities, and they revile and persecute the man who has been able by prodigious efforts to wrench off his fetters, to go forth into the light, and to contemplate the sun and the stars and all the glory of the upper world. Nevertheless, we must compel those who have had the vision of reality to come back among their fellows; necessity is laid upon them, and they must no longer live "in the heaven of ideas." The salvation of a State will come only then, when the rulers of the people are genuine philosophers. Again, there is a philosophic and an unphilosophic way of studying the sciences. The mere mathematician, for example, cannot fully comprehend even
his own science. He is apt to confuse the visible lines and angles which he draws with the true nature of things, and he starts from hypotheses which he makes no attempt to trace back to their ultimate source. For all the mathematical relations by which the visible world is interpreted—number, extension, and motion—have their source ultimately in the divine reason, and the true nature of the sensible can only be understood completely by reference to the supersensible. Now it is the work of the philosopher to give an account of the hypotheses assumed in the special sciences, to "purge and rekindle" the mental vision, and so to produce a complete inversion or conversion of the ordinary method of regarding things. Science, as such, looks at things from the point of view of the parts, philosophy contemplates the parts in relation to the whole. Could philosophy complete its work there would lie before the mind of man a vision of all things in their connection and dependence on one another. Then we should be able to give the "reason why" each thing is what it is; we should be able to see not only that "not a worm is cloven in vain," but "why" it is cloven; we should know the ultimate form of human society; we should, in short, be "as gods, knowing good and evil." Plato is well aware that such a science is not in possession of any one. But, he would say, it is none the less important that we should keep the idea of it ever before us, and strive to realize it. Hence the immense educational value of the study of philosophy. It enables a man to grasp the best that has been thought and done in the world. The man of philosophic mind is a "spectator of all time and of all existence;" he counts nothing foreign to him that has any bearing on human life—and all things bear on human life; he has a single eye to the discovery of truth, and he digs for it as for hidden treasure, never feeling satisfied until he has reduced things to a principle. In ordinary discussions men fight for victory, not for truth; they are content to persuade themselves and others by marshalling an array of high-sounding phrases, appealing to men's prejudices and uncritical beliefs, or gaining a seeming victory by a smart turn of phrase. The philosopher, looking at all things "under the form of eternity," and seeing that "our noisy years are moments in the eternal stillness," has an insatiate desire for the comprehension of things as they really are. Trained for long years in the art of looking through the shows of sense and of ordinary life to the reality behind, he at last gets a well-defined outline of the fair form of Truth herself, and an approximately correct system of universal knowledge. He has no ready-made formulæ, but everything that he affirms he sees for
himself, and knows "why" he affirms it. Hence, when asked to explain the "reason why" he holds anything, he is able to give an intelligible and self-consistent answer.

All this is for Plato summed up in saying that the philosopher has the "beatific vision" of the Good. What does he mean by the Good? (1) In the first place, it means perfection of conduct. A man realizes his true nature, the nature which it is his chief end in life to attain, by training himself in every way to be a perfect citizen. And it is one of Plato's charges against the ordinary undisciplined man of the world that he is not conscious of the true end of life, nor persistently follows up any end at all, but allows himself to be "tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine." He has no firm grip of himself, because he has no clear conception of what he is aiming at. How can a man, he asks, order his life aright, if he has "no clear pattern" of the Good in his soul? He is like a blind man who can get along well enough by feeling out the path which he has gone over before with his stick, but who is helpless in a new road, and is useless as a guide to anybody else. To be conscious of the Good, and in every act to seek it, to grow gradually toward the divine image, is the aim of the philosopher. (2) In the second place, the Good is the principle of unity in all things. To know the Good is therefore to apprehend things as a system of related elements all adapted to a single end. (3) Lastly, the Good is, in Plato's idea, identified with God. For there is a Divine Intelligence, who may be called the "maker and father of the universe," whom it is "hard to find out and impossible to declare to every one," and who, being himself good and incapable of envy, eternally created the world in a form as nearly approaching perfection as its sensible matter will allow. Because the world is a "sensuous symbol" of the divine, and because the divine reason is immanent in it, art, morality, and science insensibly lead the mind in search of truth through lower forms of knowledge to the highest of all, the knowledge of the Good or God. A true system of education follows this natural course of development, and hence it is that it begins with simple stories for childhood, goes on to present types of noble character to boyhood, represents all that is fair and beautiful to eye and ear for the elevation of youth, continues with the training of science in early manhood, and adds the close study of philosophy in the man who has reached the most vigorous period of his life. Then come fifteen years more of public service, extending from the age of thirty-five to the age of fifty, "in order that the man may not be behind others in experience," and to test the strength of his prin-
ciples. Not till then is he to be made to "turn the eye of his soul upward and look at the very Good itself, which is the universal source of light." Then is he prepared to enter the other world, where his education must begin anew and go on for "millennial periods." So the Republic of Plato, itself a vision, passes away in a vision of the unseen world.

JOHN WATSON.

Kingston, Canada.
II.

UNION AND CO-OPERATION IN FOREIGN MISSIONS.

It is now ten years since this subject engaged the attention of the First General Council of the Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System, which was held at Edinburgh in July, 1877; and the object of this article is to trace the progress of the movement to its present conditions during the decade. From the beginning it has been regarded with increasing interest as one of the most important practical aims of the Alliance, and its history shows its strong hold upon each succeeding Council. It began with the unanimous adoption of the following resolution, contained in the report of the Committee on Foreign Missions:

"That the Council, having regard to foreign mission work as an essential and urgent duty, needing to be much more earnestly prosecuted by all Christian Churches, and in which it is of increasing importance that there should be the utmost attainable cooperation among the Churches of this Alliance, appoint a Committee to collect and digest full information as to the fields at present occupied by them, their plans and modes of operation, with instructions to report the same to next General Council, together with any suggestions they may judge it wise to submit respecting the possibility of consolidating existing agencies, or preparing the way for co-operation in the future."

The wisdom of this cautious initiation of the subject was demonstrated in the elaborate and valuable reports made by the European and American sections of the Committee to the Second General Council at Philadelphia, in 1880. The most important portions of these reports were the collations of responses received from the various Missionary Boards, Committees, and other officials of the Churches uniting in the Alliance. The subject was also carefully discussed in papers prepared for the Council, and presented by the veteran Senior Secretaries of the Boards of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Churches, North and South, the Rev. Drs. J. C. Lowrie and J. Leighton Wilson. But as the subject was comparatively new, and the reports were necessarily preliminary and tentative, the whole matter was again referred to two Committees, one representing the United States and Canada, and the other "Europe and other places not provided for," with instructions to report to the next Council. Accordingly, a much more extensive and satisfactory
review of the question was made to the Third General Council, at Belfast, in 1884. These reports embraced responses from all of the Churches in Europe and seven of those in America that were addressed by the Committees. They elicited a general and earnest desire for closer union, but differed upon important points, such as the extent and nature of co-operation and the methods and agencies by which it may be practically secured. The grip of the subject upon the Council, the spirit of the written and spoken discussions, and the urgency of the main issue, with the evident progress toward it, resulted in the unanimous adoption, by a rising vote of the whole assembly, of an extended minute, recognizing with great rejoicing the expressions of earnest desire for as large a measure of union and co-operation as it may be found possible to obtain; and appointing two Committees, consisting of fourteen European and thirteen American members, for considering and reporting on important topics brought out by the discussions, especially the constitution of Mission presbyteries, the relations of the Mission Churches to the Home Churches, the self-development and self-government of Native Churches, etc. These Committees were also instructed "to approach the various churches connected with the Alliance with the expression of the Christian and brotherly regards of the Council, soliciting at the same time an early expression of their views and suggestions on these important topics."

The Committees appointed by the Council consisted of the following members:


As thus constituted, this double Committee represents all of the leading branches of the Reformed Churches of the Alliance, with some due preponderance to those which have the largest foreign missionary work in hand. With real sorrow we note the recent decease of the Rev. Dr. William Fleming Stevenson, of Dublin, whose departure leaves a vacancy in the European Section that cannot be easily filled.

In obedience to these instructions the two Committees organized their work with the following results:
I. Action of the American Section.

A circular letter was issued July 1st, 1885, addressed to the various Boards and Committees of Foreign Missions, connected with the Alliance, requesting replies to the topics and inquiries suggested for consideration. The principal subjects are these:

1. The urgent need of friendly co-operation by the Foreign Missionary Boards of all the Churches represented in the Alliance, in the location and conduct of Missions in separate or contiguous fields, in order to avoid conflict, to save expense, to promote Christian and Missionary unity, and to employ all the means and workers on each field to the best advantage.

2. The importance of having but one united Ecclesiastical organization in each Mission field of the family of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System, and the best way of accomplishing this result.

3. The most effective means for promoting the self-support, self-extension, and self-government of Native Mission Churches.

4. The nature, extent and working of the relation between the Native Churches and the Churches at home. Should it be organic and permanent, or voluntary and temporary, existing only so long as may be required by the infancy and growth of Churches in the unevangelized nations, and until they can stand alone and take care of themselves?

5. The relation between the Missionaries and the Native Churches and Ecclesiastical bodies. Should the Missionaries be members of the local Church bodies, such as Presbyteries, Classes, and Synods, on an equality with the native pastors? Or should they retain their membership in the Ecclesiastical bodies in the Home Churches, which sent them forth? Are the Missionaries to be regarded and commissioned as Apostolic Evangelists, whose office is to occupy the opening fields, preach the Word, evangelize the people, plant and train Christian Churches, educate the young, prepare a native ministry, and do other foundation work which belongs chiefly to the formative stages of the Christian Church in Pagan, Semi-Christian and Moslem lands? It is evident that the decision of this question will practically decide that of the relation of Missionaries to the Native Churches, and the future growth and success of evangelistic work among the nations.

6. Without transcending the limits assigned us, or interfering with the operations of other Missionary Societies and Boards of Churches not connected with the Alliance, we also suggest the expediency of kindly conferences with them upon subjects of common interest, for the purpose of furthering the spirit and habit of union and co-operation, wherever it is practicable, in "the field," which "is the world."

The answers to these queries are the more satisfactory because they were the fruit of ample consideration, and they carry with them the weight of deliberate official declarations by the highest ecclesiastical authorities on the basis of enlarged and varied Missionary experience. In addition to these ecclesiastical testimonies, we have the explicit opinions and powerful pleadings of some of the most eminent Missionaries of different branches of the Church, and the still more effective results of actual co-operation in important Mission fields. An ounce of fact is worth a pound of theory, but here the facts have already shaped the theory, and the logic of events is gradually but surely compelling the Churches toward an organized
system of practical co-operation and organic Union. To fortify these statements, and as matter of record in the current history of the movement, the following testimonies are presented for comparison and reference:

I. Official Replies to the Inquiries of the American Section of the Committee on Co-operation on Foreign Missions. We quote freely and fully the deliverances on both sides of the question, that the whole matter may be candidly considered and preserved for future use.

I. The Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church report as follows:

"1. There should be the most friendly and cordial co-operation by the Foreign Missionary Boards of all the Churches represented in the Alliance, so as to avoid occupying the same fields or having any apparent conflict of laborers or any unnecessary expenditure of Missionary effort or of money in the various fields.

"2. We do not think that it would be best for the truth's sake or promotive of interest in the Churches at home in the Foreign work, that there should be one united ecclesiastical organization in each Mission field of the family of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system. Our Church has certain distinctive principles. We think it as important for the sake of truth and the glory of God that they be taught and maintained in foreign fields as at home. One united ecclesiastical organization in any field would render this impossible, and doing this would detract from the interest felt in the work by our people.

"3. We think that the most effective means for promoting the self-support, self-extension, and self-government of Native Mission Churches is by teaching the truth, by organizing congregations and establishing Presbyteries and Synods, as is done in this country and other countries where the Presbyterian Church exists.

"4. Our judgment is that the aim should be to have the Native Churches in each country become self-supporting as soon as possible. When they are able to stand alone the Foreign Missionaries may be withdrawn. The question as to the continued connection of the Native Church, when self-supporting, with the Church at home, may be left to be determined by circumstances of contiguity, etc.

"5. The Missionaries, we think, should be members of the local Church bodies, such as Presbyteries, Classes, and Synods. In these Church Courts there should be entire equality between them and the native pastors. The money sent by the Churches at home for the general work should be controlled by a Missionary Association in each field, composed of the Foreign Missionaries alone. The Foreign Missionaries should act mainly as evangelists, preaching, teaching, organizing, and overseeing generally until the native ministers can do this work without their assistance. Then they may retire from the work and the field.

"6. It may serve a good purpose for the Missionaries representing the Churches of the Alliance to hold Conferences with other Missionaries in contiguous fields; and also for the Boards of these Churches to confer with other Boards and Societies in relation to the work in general, the occupying of fields, etc., so as to promote friendly feeling in the work, to have the benefit of a comparison of views, and to avoid, as far as possible, any apparent interference with each other or any seeming or real conflict in any of the Mission fields."

II. The General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which met June, 1885, adopted the accompanying minute:

"1. We believe union on the Foreign Mission field is desirable, and will cheerfully enter into whatever measures may seem best, looking to that end. Instead of trans-
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ferring our differences to Mission lands we would gladly join our sister denominations in the plan of establishing one Presbyterian Church in each Mission field.

"2. We regard it as very desirable, if not essential, to formulate a short and simple yet comprehensive creed, in harmony with and containing the essential doctrines held by the Churches composing the Alliance, the same to be used in ordaining native ministers, elders, and deacons. A worthy example in this regard has already been exhibited by our brethren of the Churches in Scotland.

"3. The Foreign Mission work in the Church at home would be conducted in each denomination as at present, except as the union in the foreign field would naturally bring about a better understanding of each other’s methods, mutual correspondence and conference between Boards, together with a general feeling of sympathy and unity of action throughout the Churches, such as could not otherwise be secured.

"4. In effecting the desired union, the principal practical point of difference would perhaps be in determining the relation of Foreign Missionaries to the Home Church. The Missionaries themselves, who know best the circumstances and needs of each field, are most competent to advise in this matter. If the Home Churches will agree to submit this and kindred subjects first to the Missionaries themselves, we believe that they, through conferences among themselves, can speedily arrive at substantial agreement. Whatever the course pursued in the effort to bring about union, difficulties will arise, but we believe a wise adjustment lies in the line of policy here suggested. For illustration, we refer to the experience of the Presbyterian Church of England and the Reformed Church of the United States in China. In a matter of this kind it is safe to make mutual concessions and trust the providence of God."

III. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, at its last meeting, held in Augusta, Georgia, May, 1886, unanimously adopted the following minute contained in the Report of its Standing Committee on Foreign Missions:

"It would leave this report incomplete, did we not acknowledge, with great thankfulness to God, the evidences of His goodness in the indications of rapidly increasing interest in the great matter of co-operation on Foreign Missionary work among the various branches of the Presbyterian Church in this and other countries. The position of our own Church has been very pronounced, and her practical suggestions have been strongly presented in regard to this matter through the expressions of her Secretaries in communications to the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System. From the organ of the Alliance and other sources we learn that rapid progress is making in the public sentiment of our own and other Churches toward more wise and practical co-operation. We recognize these movements as most hopeful indications of large advances in Foreign Missionary success."

The views above referred to are substantially these:

1. "That it should be the aim of Presbyterian Missionaries that there shall be but one Presbyterian Church in China, one Presbyterian Church in Brazil, and so in every Mission field."

2. To effect this two methods are suggested:

The first is the method adopted by the three Presbyterian Missions in Japan, where all the foreign and the native Presbyters are united in one Synod.

The second is for the native Presbyters alone to form the Presbytery or Synod, while the foreign Presbyters, retaining their connection with their respective home Presbyteries, have only an advisory relation to the native Presbytery. All Presbyterian Missionaries in the field would thus bring their native converts and native Presbyteries into one purely native Presbytery.
The Southern Presbyterian Church is not committed to any course of action in these matters; yet the prevailing view in the Church here would favor the second method. We think that our Missionaries generally would prefer not to be amenable to a Presbytery of which the majority might be natives. We have heard of a case in India in which a Presbytery was composed of two foreigners and three natives. One of the foreigners united the three natives with himself in deposing the other foreigner from the ministry. Afterward another Presbytery, in which foreigners had the majority, restored the brother who had been deposed. We would wish to avoid the risk of such difficulties. It might be said that in matters affecting ministerial character, the foreigner could remain under the jurisdiction of his home Presbytery, and not be subject to mission Presbytery. But where two Presbyteries have jurisdiction over one man, it may not be always easy to define the line where the jurisdiction of one ends and the other begins; and for the foreign Presbyter to have a control over the native Presbyter which the native cannot reciprocate, would be anomalous and contrary to that view of the parity of Presbyters which the Scriptures present. Then, too, we think that where two races are combined in a Presbytery, there is a tendency to divide on questions according to the line of race.

It may be asked if the Foreign Missionaries are not united in a Presbytery, how will they ordain pastors, Evangelists, or Elders, in the first instance. The view held here is that all our Missionaries on the ground shall be regarded as an ecclesiastical commission of the General Assembly, and in all ordinations shall act jointly. If there is but one Missionary in the field, the power of ordaining would, of course, be vested in him. After the formation of a Presbytery the whole matter of ordination would be in the hands of the native Presbyters. The Missionaries would commend the Churches "to God and to the word of His grace, which is able to build them" up; and when a Missionary sat in the Presbytery, it would be as a corresponding member to advise. In questions about the distribution of the Foreign Missionary force in the field, the equipment or management of theological seminaries or colleges, and other things of this kind, all the Missionaries of the different Presbyterian Missions on the ground could confer and act together, under arrangements made by themselves, without affecting their original ecclesiastical relations.

IV. The Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at its meeting held April 19th, 1886, refers to the Action of the General Assembly of 1879, as corroborative of the subsequent views of the Belfast Council, in 1884, and quotes as follows:

"In regions occupied by the Board and by the Missions of other Presbyterian denominations.

"1. In such regions Missionary Churches, Presbyteries, and Synods holding the same faith and order should be encouraged to enter into organic relations with each other for joint work in the common field.

"2. For purposes of representation, however, the ordained ministers, foreign and native, connected with the Board of Foreign Missions, if sufficient in number, shall, with an elder from each of their Churches, be regarded as a distinct Presbytery, entitled to appoint Commissioners to the General Assembly.

"3. In all organizations, constituted on this plan, it is understood that no allowance is to be given to any departure from the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain and America.

"In regard to these principles, the Board of Foreign Missions express the judgment—

"First. That in countries jointly occupied by Missionary Boards and societies holding
the Presbyterian system, organic union upon a common ecclesiastical basis and under a common name is to be devoutly desired and sought.

"Second. That the precise time for such union must of necessity be determined by the Missionaries on the ground; but always in connection with the Board and the proper ecclesiastical bodies. Their dependence for support imposes on them the obligation to take no step of such importance without fullest conference with those who have sent them forth and are responsible to the Church at large for which they act.

"Finally, we recommend that the Board submit to the General Assembly the question whether in their judgment it is consistent with the Polity of our Church, and with the interests of the Missionary work that our Missionaries should be members of Union Presbyteries abroad, and at the same time members of Presbyteries at home."

Upon this reference, the General Assembly of 1886, at Minneapolis, adopted an important minute, embracing, first, a most cordial expression of its sympathy with the "growing and most encouraging tendency toward closer fellowship as Christians and Presbyterians," now represented in the "Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System; believing it to be a token for good to all branches of our Church in this country, and having in it the wisely-guided promise of freer and more hearty intercommunication between Churches now separate and of a more cordial cooperation in the work of Christian Missions at home and abroad."

The minute then says:

"Further, in order to give practical effect to its own earnest wish, thus freely declared, this General Assembly would respectfully represent to all the Churches in this country, now united in the Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System, that it is prepared to confer with them in any proper way, in reference to cooperation in the work of extending the faith and orders which we hold, and especially in regard to unity of effort and organization on the Mission fields abroad; and the Assembly hereby directs its Stated Clerk to transmit a copy of this minute to the Chief Courts of these Churches for their consideration" (Minutes, pp. 76, 77).

V. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada adopted the following statements:

"1. That we recognize the urgent need of friendly co-operation by the Foreign Missionary Boards of all the Churches represented in the Alliance, in the location and conduct of missions in separate or contiguous fields, in order to avoid conflict, to save expense, to promote Christian and missionary unity, and to employ all the means and workers on each field to the best advantage.

"2. That we recognize the importance of having but one ecclesiastical organization in each Mission field. The laborers in the field should be consulted, their opinions obtained, and the parent Churches should endeavor to give effect to the recommendations of the Missionaries upon the field.

"3. That the most effective means of promoting the self-support, self-extension, and self-government of Native Mission Churches is by the formation of Sessions and Presbyteries as soon as possible, and the education of a native ministry.

"4. That the relation between the Native Churches and the Churches at home should be voluntary and temporary, until the Church is fully established and self-sustaining.

"5. Respecting the relation between the Missionaries and the Native Churches and
ecclesiastical bodies, we would recommend that the Missionary be a member of the local Church body on an equality with the native pastors, and the Presbytery connected with the Home Church.

"6. That we accept suggestions regarding the expediency of kindly conferences with other Missionary Societies and Boards upon subjects of common interest, for the purpose of furthering the spirit and habit of union and co-operation wherever it is practicable in the field, which is the world."

VI. The Reformed Church in America. The most elaborate and complete of all the papers elicited by the Committee's circular is that of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, which has been published in a separate pamphlet; and which led to the following action of the General Synod of that branch of the Church at its last meeting, in June, 1886, at New Brunswick, N. J.:

"Resolved, That the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America heartily approves the stand taken by its Board of Foreign Missions, in their paper submitted for its judgment, on the important subjects of Union and Co-operation in Foreign Missions; of self-support and self-government in the Native Churches established; and of Co-operation between Home Boards of different Churches in the selection and occupancy of contiguous fields in foreign lands; and that this General Synod will be prepared to take the necessary legislation to give effect to the views of the Board, as occasion shall arise.

"Resolved, That the Classis of Arcot be permitted and advised to initiate such measures as shall tend to bind together the Churches of the Presbyterian polity in India.

"Resolved, That this Synod will endorse the union of the Classis of Arcot with such a Union Church of Christ in India, composed of those holding the Reformed faith and Presbyterian polity.

"Resolved, That the Rev. Jacob Chamberlain, D.D., be commissioned to present to such of the Presbyterian General Assemblies as he may be able to visit (in passing through Great Britain on his expected return to India in 1887) the fraternal greetings of this body, and to draw their attention to the unanimous action taken by this body in favor of Organic Union on Mission fields of those holding the Reformed faith with the Presbyterian polity, in the hope that similar permissive action may be taken by their respective bodies, authorizing their Missions in India to take part in such a Union."

The significance of the commission thus given to Dr. Chamberlain will be manifest from some passages of an address which he delivered at the public meeting held under the direction of the American Section of the Committee on Co-operation, in the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York, January 12th, 1886, in which he made the ensuing statements:

"There are to-day in India, laboring side by side, representatives of thirteen different organizations of those holding the Reformed faith with the Presbyterian polity; that is, thirteen different branches of the Presbyterian family, European and American. They number two hundred ordained ministers, foreign and native, with over five hundred Native ruling elders, and many thousands of communicants."

Then, after tracing on the map of India the scattered locations of these Missions in the great Presidencies of Madras, Bombay, and
the Provinces, from the southern point of Ceylon to the gates of Afghanistan, and from the frontier of China to the Bay of Bengal, he said:

"What splendid strategic points have these different regiments of the Presbyterian hosts already secured for a united attack upon the enemies of our one Lord!"

"And yet, alas! they are not united; they are not even, in some cases, working in harmony with one another. Judah vexes Ephraim, and Ephraim envies Judah.

"In one up-country station in India, which I have repeatedly visited, where one Mission could well do all the work, the representatives of two different branches of the Presbyterian family, both represented in the late Belfast Council, have been working in unseemly rivalry. Members of the one Church, publicly excommunicated after careful judicial process by its Ecclesiastical Courts, were received to the Lord's Supper in the other without a question; and rival services were held in the same street, so near that the singing in the one sometimes prevented the congregation in the other from hearing the preaching of their own minister. I do not name the Churches. I do not formulate charges. It is not our province here to sit in judgment on such cases. I mention these facts, and I could cite others similar, solely to emphasize the urgent need there is of friendly co-operation by Boards at home in the location and conduct of their Missions—aye, the need of a united organization on each of the different Mission fields, in order to avoid conflict, to save expense, and to employ all the means and workers on each field to the best advantage, and to prevent scandal in the presence of the Heathen, and the wounding of the body of Christ.

"Were there but one united ecclesiastical organization on the Mission field mentioned above, the scandals and unholy rivalries I have adverted to could not occur, and the united forces of all could be brought to bear upon the common foe."

In reply to the question of the feasibility of such an organic union, Dr. Chamberlain proposed this scheme for grouping geographically the Missions of the Reformed Churches in India:

"The Presbyteries of the Established Church and Free Church of Scotland in Bombay, the Presbytery of the Irish Presbyterian Church in Gujarat, the Mission of the Original Secession Church in the Central Provinces, and that of the Canada Presbyterian Church in Indore, with the Kolapore Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., might readily form the Synod of Bombay.

"The Presbyteries of the Free Church and Established Church of Scotland in Calcutta, the Mission of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church in Assam, and that of the English Presbyterian Church in Bengal might form the Synod of Bengal.

"The Presbyteries of the Established and Free Churches in Madras and the Classis of Arcot of the Reformed Church in America, with the few Dutch Reformed and Presbyterian Churches in Ceylon, might form the Synod of Madras.

"The Presbyteries of Allahabad, Furruckabadd, Lodiana, and Lahore of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., the Presbytery of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of America at Roorki, the Presbytery of Rajpootana of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and Presbytery of Sealkote of the United Presbyterian Church of America, might form the Synod of North India.

"Then these four synods, uniting, would form The General Assembly of India—a vigorous, homogeneous, enthusiastic Native 'Presbyterian Church of India.'"

In regard to difficulties that might occur in working out the details of the plan, the speaker made certain suggestions which are in the line of the inquiries of the Committee. We quote his language on these important points:
"To allow of such organic union in India, as on any other Mission field, it would be necessary for the Home Churches each to loosen its hold on its Missions in things ecclesiastical, while retaining that control in matters financial.

The Missionaries appointed and sent out by the Home Boards would retain their connection with those Boards as their agents, just as now, being responsible to them for the management and expenditure of their funds. But the Native Churches, established by those Missionaries, should be set free to form an alliance with surrounding Churches of like faith and polity, forming Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, as God should give them growth. The Home Church courts would no longer be the supervising bodies, the courts of appeal for the distant Native Churches they had planted. But their place would be taken by the Synods and Assemblies organized on the Mission fields, which would be within reach of appellants, and conversant with their languages and environment.

"Some mistakes might be made by the infant Church. What child learns to walk without some tumbles? Did the infant Churches in Europe and America make no mistakes? Yet they lived and grew. How is it possible, without autonomy, for the infant Church of Christ in Mission lands to grow into self-reliant, vigorous manhood?"

There is good evidence that the views of this enthusiastic and successful Missionary are fully shared and sustained by many of his eminent co-laborers in India and other Mission lands. And while there may be differences in relation to particulars and methods of doing the work, there is an ever-growing conviction of its necessity and practicability. Like all great experiments in Church and State, the very effort to accomplish it will suggest ways and means. Difficulties will inspire courage, prayer will call down "the wisdom that is from above;" and, above all, "the zeal of the Lord of Hosts shall perform it." How it looks to the workers themselves may be known from these resolutions of The International Missionary Union of America (an Association of all Foreign Missionaries from the United States and Canada, who are at home on furlough or permanently—averaging about one hundred members, sixty of whom were present at the last annual meeting at Thousand Islands Park):

"1. That we are earnestly in favor of Missionary union, courtesy, and co-operation in all Christian work among the Heathen, and of the organic union of Church families, and of federal union among all Missionary societies laboring in the same field.

"2. That we would recommend to and urge upon all the Home Churches and Boards the duty and expediency of authorizing and encouraging their Missionaries to follow this line of Missionary policy in the different fields, wherever it is possible."

II. ACTION OF THE EUROPEAN SECTION.

Our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic have necessarily moved less rapidly but not less earnestly in their prosecution of the work assigned them by the Belfast Council. Their difficulties are greater, but by no means insuperable, and we shall expect wise deliveries from them to the London Council in 1888. Their latest and most decisive action was taken at a Conference of Representatives
of the Mission Boards of the Presbyterian Churches in the United Kingdom, which was held by invitation of the European Section, in College Building, Castle Terrace, Edinburgh, October 6th, 1886. The special object of the Conference was to get the views of the various Churches upon this subject of Union and Co-operation. Eminent representatives were present from the Church of Scotland, the Free Church, the United Presbyterian Church, the Original Secession Church, the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Churches of England and of Ireland, with Missionaries from Bombay, Central India, Ahmedabad, and Amoy, China; and also members of the Committee of the Alliance.

Dr. J. Murray Mitchell was the Convener, and Professor W. G. Blaikie, Secretary. After a full and friendly consideration of each of the points to which the Belfast Council requested the Committee to direct its attention, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, and ordered to be sent to the Mission Boards or Committees of the various Churches, in the hope that they would submit them to their Foreign Missionaries and to the Supreme Courts of their respective Churches, and communicate the result to the Committee in time for the preparation of a full report to the Council in 1888:

1. It is in the highest degree desirable that Mission Churches should be encouraged to become independent of the Home Churches—i.e., self supporting and self-governing—self-government naturally following upon self-support.

2. It is desirable that Churches organized under Presbyterian order, and holding the Reformed faith, should be placed under a Presbytery within territorial boundaries suitable for effective government; and that such Presbytery, wherever constituted, should, as far as practicable, include all the Presbyterian Churches within the bounds, by whatever branches of the European or American Churches originated.

3. In the incipient stages of the Native Church, it is most desirable that the Foreign Missionaries should be associated with the Presbytery, either as advisers only, or as accessory members with votes.

4. It is undesirable that Presbyteries of Native Churches should be represented in Supreme Courts at home, the development and full organization of independent Native Churches being what is to be arrived at, whether these are founded by a single foreign Church or by two or more such Churches.

The Conference agreed to record their high satisfaction and their gratitude to God for the opportunity afforded to the representatives of so many Churches for conferring together on important questions connected with the progress of the Gospel, and for the brotherly and Christian spirit which had marked all their deliberations."

III. These general movements in the Home Churches have been accompanied by some notable cases of actual unification, which prove that "where there is a will there is a way" to its accomplishment. The volumes of proceedings of the three General Councils of the Alliance furnish a large collection of facts and experiences on the subject which are worthy of careful study, for both sides of the ques-
tion. We can only refer briefly in this article to the well-known instances of practical union that have stood the tests of time and trial in the New Hebrides, Trinidad, South Africa, and especially at Amoy, China, between the Missions of the English Presbyterian Church and of the Reformed Church in America, which has been successfully maintained the last thirty years. The most notable recent illustrations of the working of the principle at the extremes of Missionary service have occurred in Central Africa and in Japan.

When Henry M. Stanley, the explorer of the great valley of the Congo, published his memorable letter concerning that vast region as a Missionary field, the Scotch Presbyterian Mission, at Livingstonia, on Lake Nyassa, was first established, then the Church Missionary Society settled its work at Lake Nyanza, and the London Missionary Society fixed its station on the shores of Lake Tanganyika. But the geography and physical conditions of the country, the necessities of the workers and the work, their common temporal and spiritual interests, and the habits, ignorance and superstitions, wrongs and conflicts of the barbarous tribes and kingdoms into which they had gone, compelled the Societies and their Missionaries from the start to unite and work together for the one kingdom of heaven, whose banners they carried into the heart of the Dark Continent.

The latest phases of this heroic Mission work, which are already blazoned with the martyr spirit and victories of Bishop Hannington and the Native Christians, who "loved not their lives unto the death," make new arguments for a more complete and lasting union of all the Cross-bearers among those savage peoples. The late Dr. Mullens only told the experience of Christian ages when he said, "Standing alone, every Missionary is a power in the world. United with his brethren, combining his service with theirs in any city or district of heathenism, his power and theirs is greatly increased. But with every band working in harmony with every other, who shall calculate the moral force with which such men press the truth of Christ?"

The "United Church of Christ in Japan" presents the most remarkable modern instance on record of actual Union and Co-operation in Foreign Missions. Many were the apprehensions, misgivings, objections, and distrusts of the experiment which began with its formation. But, according to the most reliable recent reports of careful observers, this Union movement has already proved itself to be "a complete success."

The Rev. H. Loomis, Agent of the American Bible Society, in a careful and extended review of the work, dated at Yokohama, De-
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cember 15th, 1886, sums up the case under the following statements of results, which we condense for our readers.

"The disadvantages of Union, if any, are not apparent, and yet to be developed." "There is a sense of loneliness in the largest missions in the face of such overwhelming odds" (referring to Buddhism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Romanism, the Greek Church, and, most of all, infidelity on every hand), "and it is the universal experience of all Missionaries that, no matter what their name or creed, they are irresistibly drawn toward each other. It is mostly the influence and direction of the Christians at home which keeps up the separation on the field." (The italics are ours.)

The advantages of the union have now been tested, and are as follows:

1. Greater harmony in each mission.
2. Harmony with the native brethren.
3. Economy of means, including educational agencies for both sexes, Christian literature, evangelistic and pastoral work, and the training of a native ministry, together with medical work at nearly all important stations.
4. Economy of men by combination and consolidation of forces in all departments of service.
5. Greater wisdom in the conduct of the work, securing the experience of natives and foreigners in discussion of new and perplexing problems that attend progress in the field; and also more union and uniformity among the Boards and Churches at home.
6. This Union movement will accomplish the greatest and best results.

On this subject we quote more at length:

"There is no possible reason for propagating on a foreign field those differences which are purely accidental at home, and which have no weight abroad. Any attempt to divide the native Christians for a mere name is wicked. The believers are still only a few in comparison with the great mass of heathen and infidels. They need all the influence that is possible to make their example and teachings effective. A united body has a power in opposing evil and engaging in aggressive work that it is not possible for the same individuals to separately exert. The advantage of this union is already recognized by the Government, and it meets with favor because it tends to national unity and strength. Men of the world see and recognize in the combined forces of Christians a conquering force, and it meets with attention and respect that would not otherwise be given.

"There are now Christians to be found in all parts of Japan. It is important that they be cared for and as fast and as far as possible gathered into Churches. That each Mission can care for all its scattered flock is utterly impossible. But a combination of Missions renders this far more feasible and, of course, helpful to the cause in which all are alike interested.

"As an example, one Mission is now established at Kochi, and is placing there all its strength. Another will probably do the same at Sendai. A third occupies another and a particularly isolated field."
"And yet by the Union plan each of these small Missions has the same advantages as the others. Wherein they are deficient they can depend upon and do receive aid from the rest. Each supplements the other, and this renders the whole complete. As converts multiply and scatter from place to place they more readily find a home, and the whole body of workers are benefited by it. Such a system has every advantage, and has enjoyed God's richest blessing. Whatever else may come, the future Church of Christ in Japan can never be divided on the same lines that exist in the home lands. It has flourished in the past, and the outlook to-day is brighter than ever. The spirit of unity has spread and prevails very largely among the Christians of all names and creeds. Many desire that the divisions may be still more lessened, and efforts are being made to that end. That all shall be one in name and creed is not advocated, or is it possible, and yet we rejoice that we witness here in spirit that unity for which our Saviour prayed."

CONCLUSIONS.

From this collation of official deliverances on the subject, it appears:

1. That there is a unanimous verdict of all the Ecclesiastical bodies and Missionary Boards and Conferences in favor of the most friendly and cordial Co-operation of the Churches at home and the Missions abroad, so as to avoid conflict of fields, laborers, and operations, and any needless expenditure of effort and money on the several fields.

2. For the establishment and maintenance of Separate Ecclesiastical Organizations in each Mission field, as in the Home Churches, only one positive declaration has been made, that of the Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States.

3. For Organic Union at the earliest practicable period—i.e., for one independent, national Church in each great Mission field, all of the representative bodies in the United States, Canada, and in Europe, that have responded affirmatively to the Committees of the Alliance, excepting the United Presbyterian Church in the United States.

4. As to Minor Questions, such as the relations of the Foreign Missionaries to the Home Churches and to the Native Churches; the relation of the Native Churches to the Home Churches; the time and methods of separate independent organization; the measure of attainment of self-support and self-government requisite to independence of Mission Churches, etc., the general conclusion is that these questions can be best determined by the Missionaries in each field and the sustaining boards of the Churches at home.

5. As means toward both Co-operation and Organic Union, there is a common desire for more frequent and stated conferences of Missionaries, and Missionary secretaries and boards and local and general conventions of the Christian people of the Churches at home, to-
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gather with careful public discussions in the religious press and on
the platform are suggested.

It is manifest, therefore, that this first decade of discussion of the
great Missionary problem has made wise, cautious, and actual progres-
toward its final solution. Large gains have been secured by
the candor and friendliness of its consideration and the evident desire
and endeavors for some closer unity and co-operation. Careful
measurements of the ecclesiastical and evangelistic polygon have
been taken by men of experience and power. We know its many
bearings better than before. The principle of Union is immanent in
the Missionary system, and is making new channels for its outflow.
As a rule, it appears that Missionaries and native Christians are far
ahead of the ministry and Churches at home, in the actual develop-
ment of that genuine and visible unity for which Christ prayed.
There is a strong and general conviction that it would be a calamity
to propagate and prolong in Mission lands the ecclesiastical divisions
of Christian Churches in America and Europe. Objections that were
made at the outset of the movement have gradually vanished or
have been materially weakened in the course of discussion and by
the facts of experience in cases of actual unity. It is no longer
"premature," nor "impracticable," nor "unsafe," nor does it
lessen the interest of American and European Christians, nor loosen
their ties to the Missions and Native Churches in China and Japan
and elsewhere, that have practically demonstrated the feasibility of
the work. Distrust of native pastors and elders, fears of failure,
theories of ecclesiastical government and denominational polities,
and some old ways of conducting Missions have slowly but certainly
given place to more generous views and larger plans in the irresis-
tible progress of modern Evangelization. Even the venerable creeds
of Evangelical Christendom, which grew out of ages of controversy
and at critical eras of Church history, have been reduced to their
simplest elementary scriptural forms for the native believers and
infant Churches. Thus the theory and the facts of the case agree.
Wherever it has been attempted this system of Union and Co-opera-
tion has succeeded in proportion to the wisdom, fidelity, and ear-
nestness with which it has been started and carried out. Sectarian
differences fade away in the solar light and heat of "the common
faith." The opening of new fields; the breaking down of old bar-
riers; increasing facilities of travel and intercourse with the peoples;
the civil and religious liberties secured by international treaties; the
protection given by heathen governments, as in the recent remark-
able decrees of the Emperor of China; the mighty pressure of Divine
Providence, and the desperate efforts of pagan priesthoods and mod-
ern unbelief, and semi-Christian and Moslem hierarchies to keep
their fields—all these and other contemporary oppositions demon-
strate the absolute necessity of the utmost possible Organic Union
between all branches of the One Holy Catholic Church that affiliate
enough in doctrine and polity to secure it, and for hearty co-opera-
tion of all Christian Missionaries and Churches that cannot yet come
into closer union. Feeling this urgent need, monthly meetings of
Missionaries of various societies in Europe and America have been
held for years past in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay for conference
and prayer; and larger conferences and conventions have been occa-
sionally held in great evangelistic centres, as at Allahabad and Ban-
galore, in India, and elsewhere.

The latest official word from India on the subject is contained in
the Proceedings of the Fourth Council of the Presbyterian Alliance,
held at Bombay, December 15th and 16th, 1886. After an address
by the Moderator, the Rev. Dr. William W. Scudder, of the Arcot
Mission of the Reformed Church in America, in which he advocated
co-operation with a view to ultimate organic union, the Alliance
voted, by a majority, "that it is in the highest degree desirable that
Mission Churches should be encouraged to become independent of
the Home Churches—i.e., self-supporting and self-governing." Steps
were taken toward carrying out this recommendation among the
Presbyterians in Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Sealkote. And the
following resolution was also unanimously adopted:

"That the Indian Presbyterian Alliance, having considered the
question of the co-operation of the various Evangelical Churches hold-
ing the Presbyterian form of government and Reformed doctrine, re-
solve that it is highly inexpedient that there should be the intrusion
of one of the Evangelical bodies into a field already occupied by an-
other; and that the Pan-Presbyterian Council be requested to take
such steps as may seem expedient to prevent this intrusion in all
cases of the future extension of Missionary work. That a copy of
this resolution be sent to all the Evangelical Churches represented
in Mission work in India."

In London the Secretaries of the Evangelical Missionary Soci-
eties also meet every month for information, consultation, prayer and
praise, and practical co-operation. Might not the officers of our Mis-
sionary agencies in New York and other American cities hold similar
stated conferences with mutual profit to themselves and to the
Churches at home and the Missions under their care? Would not
such fraternal unity in official counsels be likely to produce greater
unity in Home Mission work and in all inter-denominational rela-
tions and movements? As the Missionaries in foreign lands pray,
and plan, and teach, and preach, and make long tours, and work together in many other ways, may not the same spirit and service bind together, in the bonds of Christian fellowship and Evangelistic works, hundreds and thousands of Christian ministers and Church officers at home who are now comparatively strangers to each other?

Certain it is that the discussions and reports of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System and the results now attained cannot be safely ignored nor pushed aside by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Assemblies and Synods that have already made their solemn declarations of approval, both as to the main principle and its applications to specific cases. This family of Christian Churches is fairly committed to the cause, and it remains only to carry it forward to its proper ends in wisdom and in faith.

If this movement of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System shall succeed, with the blessing of the Lord, it will probably lead to larger combinations with the Missions of other Evangelical Churches. In a note to his address, from which we have quoted above, Dr. Chamberlain suggests this extension of the system of Union and Co-operation:

"Our further aim is that on each Mission field all of the Churches of the same faith and polity shall first organically unite, forming, say, one Presbyterian Church in India, one Methodist, one Baptist, one Lutheran, one Congregational, one Episcopal, and then form a Federal Union of all these, with periodical congresses, or councils, that shall work in increasing harmony, until at length, in God's good time, led by our One Master, we may be able, in the premillennial future, all to unite and have one self-governing, self-supporting, self-propagating National 'Church of Christ in India,' as prayed our Glorious Leader—'that they all may be one, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me.'"

And we ask further: If one great National Church for India, why not one like it in every nation and kingdom throughout the world?

Is it too much to expect, as the outgrowth of the work itself, that the next great Æcumenical Council of the Christian Church may be held before the close of this nineteenth century at some great world centre like London, Rome, Constantinople, or New York, not to settle theological controversies nor to make new creeds, but to plan, and pray, and work for the evangelization of the world upon a scale of means and measures and unification such as has not been seen since the days of the Apostles?

William J. R. Taylor.

Newark, N. J.
III.

SIMON FISH AND HIS "SUPPLICATION."

No chapter of ecclesiastical history repays perusal with larger interest than that which records the rise, progress, and decline of monasticism. That it originated in a sincere desire on the part of individuals to realize the supreme blessedness of the Christian life is undeniable. That it came, by a very natural process, to represent the worst developments of human nature is also undeniable. In its inception it was a protest against the social corruption of a depraved Graeco-Roman civilization. In its full expansion it was a vast organized evil that threatened the destruction of the Church, whose interests it had originally sought to conserve. It is true, as Dean Milman declared,* that, at certain times and in certain places, it proved itself "the guardian of learning, the author of civilization, the propagator of humble and peaceful religion." It is true, that it promoted the downfall of heathenism and the victory of Christianity in the Roman Empire and among the barbarians. It stood as a warning against the worldliness, frivolity, and immorality of the great cities and a mighty call to repentance and conversion. . . . It was to invalids a hospital for the cure of moral diseases, and, at the same time, to healthy and vigorous enthusiasts an arena for the exercise of heroic virtue. . . . It showed hospitality to the wayfaring and liberality to the poor and needy. It was an excellent school of meditation, self-discipline, and spiritual exercise. . . . It was a prolific seminary of the clergy, and gave the Church many of her most eminent bishops and popes. . . . Monasticism, at least in the West, promoted the cultivation of the soil and the education of the people, and, by its industrious transcriptions of the Bible, the works of the Church fathers and the ancient classics, earned for itself, before the Reformation, much of the credit of the modern civilization of Europe.†

All this is true; but it is also true that with the multiplication of orders and the increase of temporal wealth there was a corresponding development of ignorance and vice. Again and again did consecrated men recognize the need of a reformation in the system and endeavor to restore it to its earlier purity. Benedict of Nursia, in the sixth century, sought to check the increasing corruption among the monks by introducing "a severer discipline and spirit of order," to use Neander's words. His effort succeeded in awaking such an

* History of Christianity, p. 432.
† Schaff's History of the Christian Church, vol. iii., pp. 175, 176.
interest in the monastic life, that to enter a monastery came to be regarded as identical with conversion, and to live in a monastery, identical with religion. After him, in the work of monastic reform, came Benedict of Aniane, in the eighth century, and Berno of Clugny, with his successor, St. Odo, in the tenth. But these spasmodic attempts at improvement proved unavailing. With the opening of the thirteenth century we find the Church forced, for its own protection, to forbid the extension of monastic power, the establishment of new orders. A letter written by Arnulf, Bishop of Lisieux, to Pope Alexander III., begging for the dissolution of the Benedictine abbey of Grostain, on the ground of the moral chaos there reigning, discloses sufficient reason for Innocent’s prohibition in 1215, since the condition of things described by him was by no means confined to the abbey mentioned. He tells of the utter absence of charity and hospitality; of frequent and shameful brawls; of deliberate murders; of nameless vices. The testimony from within as from without the Church all tends to confirm the concise assertion of Dr. Mosheim,* that the orders “were incapable of contributing in any respect to promote the true interests of the Church, and abandoned themselves, without shame or remorse, to all manner of crimes.”

Perhaps none of the reformatory movements of preceding centuries could equal in importance those which were inaugurated under Francis Bernardone of Assisi and Dominic Guzman of Osma, in the early years of the thirteenth century, and which culminated in the establishment of the two great Mendicant Orders of Franciscans and Dominicans. There is no need, in this connection, that we should discuss the characteristics either of the sects or of their founders. Suffice to say that the Franciscans represented an effort to reform the morals of the Church by reintroducing the external characteristics of the apostolic life, while the Dominicans sought to restore to its original simplicity and purity the creed of the Church. The antagonism of the latter order to heresy afterward came to be exercised toward heretics. In 1533 the sacred trust of the Inquisition was committed to them by the pope. Their management of it warranted the popular derivation of their name, Dominicans, the dogs of the Lord. In their early history the two orders borrowed freely from one another whatever methods of work or modes of life seemed best adapted to secure the result at which both aimed. The Franciscans adopted the Dominican system of itinerancy; the Dominicans the Franciscan habit of mendicancy. Together they constituted “the very soul of the hierarchy, the engines of the state. the secre

spring of all the motions of the one and of the other, and the authors and directors of every great and important event both in the religious and political world." They were received with open arms in every portion of the Christian world. "Bishop Grossetête, intolerant of monks as he was, could greet the first coming of the friars into England with words like these, 'The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light.'" Some thought themselves able to distinguish in Francis and Dominic

"the two anointed ones that stand by the Lord of the whole earth (Zech. iv. 11-14); they were hailed as the two forerunners of Christ's second coming, who should go before him in the spirit and power of Enoch and Elijah, each, indeed, having his own peculiar glory, the one to find his place in the order of the Seraphim, who love most; the other in that of the Cherubim, who know most; Francis, so Dante describes him an Ardor, inflaming the world with the fire of divine love; Dominic, a Splendor, causing the light of the glory of God to shine over all the earth."*

But the popularity of the orders became their ruin. They continued to assume their vows of poverty while wealth was pouring into their coffers. "Mendicant" became a name which, save as a satire, was without significance. Concern for the salvation of souls sank to a minimum of indifference; while professed indifference to the gratification of the body rose to a maximum of concern. They came to be the objects of the jealous hatred of existing orders and each other's rivals. The evils against which they had stood at the first as an organized protest came to be their own most marked characteristics. Nicolas de Clamenges, rector of the University of Paris, better known as "Doctor Theologus," wrote in the earlier part of the fifteenth century a treatise, entitled De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu, which gives a most appalling picture of the existing condition of the Mendicant Orders.

The closing years of the fourteenth century saw in England a movement under way that was to issue finally in the mighty Reformation of a century and a half later. Its inaugurator was a man of distinguished parts and devoted character, John Wiclif, der Spitsige, as Luther afterward, rather maliciously, named him. The nature of our subject necessarily limits us to the briefest of allusions to himself and his labors. Let it suffice, therefore, to say, that in addition to his great work of reawakening the spirit of patriotic devotion in his countrymen; in addition to his greater work of assisting, as an educator, in developing the intellectual resources of England; in addition to his greatest work of turning the Bible of Jerome into the language of the people, a language for whose permanent purity, simplicity, and dignity the English-speaking race is largely

* Trench, Medieval Church History, p. 236.
indebted to him—Wiclif organized an evangelistic movement which had much to do with the laying of the foundation upon which the events of the sixteenth century were built up. That England was ready for this movement we have little reason to doubt. Already satirists and rhymesters had given expression to the widespread convictions of the people at large, in words more conspicuous for their boldness than for the literary excellence of their arrangement or the moral elevation of their suggestions. In his *Vision Concerning Piers Ploughman*, Langlande was voicing the growing indignation of the people against the rapacity of the favorite sons of Rome, although, as Mr. Marsh suggests, he was as yet far from possessing the courage which enabled Wiclif to face the consequences of an open rupture with the papacy. Still he did not mince his words when dealing with the notorious "coveitise" of the friars. And at a later date, when penning *The Creed of Piers Ploughman*—if, indeed, that work was of his production—his previous timidity passed away, and he employed the full energy of his satire to kindle and feed the fires of public indignation against the vices of monks and friars. Dan Chaucer also, by his matchless contrasts, was helping on the popular movement. His "Somonour" and "Pardoner," placed side by side with his "Poore Personne of a Toun," characters undoubtedly drawn from life, disclosed qualities which, by the association he gave them, must have appeared more than ever loathsome. Chaucer lived to see Lollardry in possession of one half of the realm. But the last year of his life, which was also the last of the century, saw the Plantagenet Richard II. superseded by the Lancastrian Henry IV., among the first of whose acts after his ascent to the throne was the notorious declaration *De comburendo hereticos*. Church and state combined to fight faith with fire. Devoted men and women passed in chariots of flame to glory. As a name, "Lollard" was burned out of English history, but the principles of Lollardry continued. For a whole century watchful eyes might have detected group after group of faithful ones, to whom the Word of God was the light of life, gathering secretly in lowly cottages of the country and secluded places of the city for social worship and mutual instruction. And when, in the opening years of the sixteenth century, the light of a new day was to be seen tinging the skies in the east, it was among the ranks of the descendants of these saints that the Christian Brotherhood arose, those "Paladins of the Reformation." William Tyndale, whom Mr. Marsh has called "merely a full-grown Wycliffe," found that a century and more of his predecessor's influence had been eminently helpful as a preparation for the work which he was called upon to
do. The Bibles sent over by him from the continent found eager purchasers among those who had already been taught something of the preciousness of a personal acquaintance with the written Word.

Meanwhile, as a consequence of Henry's removal of the check upon their reformation, the Monastic and Mendicant Orders had gone from bad to worse, until they had passed the point where reform was a possibility. The fact that no obedience was acknowledged to any save the superiors of their various orders, most of whom resided abroad, or else to the pope himself, rendered impossible any regular system of visitation.

"The foreign superiors, who were forbidden by statute to receive for their services more than certain limited and reasonable fees, would not undertake a gratuitous labor; and their visitation, attempted with imperfect powers by the English archbishops, could be resisted successfully under pleas of exemption and obedience to the rules of the orders. Thus the abbeys had gone their way, careless of the gathering indignation with which they were regarded by the people and believing that in their position they held a sacred shield which would protect them forever."*

In 1489 Archbishop Morton secured from Innocent VIII. a commission for investigating the conduct of the regular clergy of England. A visitation of the Abbey of St. Albans resulted in the most revolting of disclosures; and yet nothing whatever was done to remedy the evils made public by this visitation, save that a gentle reprimand was given the abbot, who seems to have been in the forefront of the offenders. In 1511 Archbishop Warham attempted another visitation, with the same result. Wolsey's visitation in 1523 ended similarly. But each of these visitations served the purpose of calling the attention of the people to the fact that the evils were becoming more and more flagrant; and when the popular outbreak came, as it did come, very shortly thereafter, it did not stop its salutary work until every trace of the evils of monasticism was completely obliterated from the national life of England.

The part played by Simon Fish in bringing about this much-to-be-desired result was by no means an insignificant one. And yet it is doubtful whether his name is familiar even to many of the readers of the ecclesiastical history of England. The majority of our modern cyclopedias may be carefully searched without affording the slightest information as to who he was or what he did. The briefest of mention is allowed him by any English historian, and then only when the history bears with special emphasis upon the time in which he lived. It is with the desire, so far as it lies in our power, to do justice to his memory, and with the hope that the study will not be altogether without interest to our readers, that we present

---

the results of our investigations concerning the man and his work.

Of the early life of Fish we know absolutely nothing, save that, according to the statement of Antony à Wood in his *Athenae Oxonienses*, he was born in Kent, and "after he had been instructed in academical learning he retired to Gray's Inn, in Holbourn, to obtain knowledge in the municipal law." Our main information must, however, be sought for in the pages of Foxe, the martyrrologist, and even his statements need most careful investigation and revision. According to him, Fish made his appearance at Gray's Inn in 1525. During the first year of his residence there a "M. Roo or Roe," of the same inn, "made a certain play or interlude in which was matter against Wolsey." In the rendering of it no one could be found sufficiently bold to act the part touching upon the character of the Lord Cardinal save young Fish; and some informan having made known the fact, the very night of the performance Wolsey attempted the arrest of the rash and inexperienced actor. He "was compelled of force," says his biographer, "to voyde his owne house and so fled ouer the Sea vnto Tyndall."

Among the writings of this great reformer one passage occurs which has occasioned considerable perplexity to his readers and elicited various interpretations from his commentators. We are constrained to believe that it bears in a very interesting way upon the subject in hand, and introduce it at this juncture because convinced that it is of value as testimony confirmatory of that of Foxe. It will be found in the preface to *The Parable of the Wicked Mammon*, and reads as follows:

"Whyle I abode a faythful companyon which now hath taken an other vyage vpon him | to preach Christ where (I suppose) he was neuer yet preached (God which put in his herte thythre to goo sende his sprite with him | comforthe him and bringe his purpose to good effecte) one William Roye a man somewhat crafty when he cometh vnto new acquayntance and before he be thorow knowen and namely when all is spent | came vnto me and offered his helpe."

The question as to who may have been intended by the "faythful companyon" has been answered variously by different commentators. But we have never seen even a hint that circumstances all point to Simon Fish as the man. *The Parable of the Wicked Mammon* was "finished at Marburg, 8th May, 1528." From language used in its preface with reference to the coming of Jerome (William) Barlow —"a yere after that (the departure of Roye) and now xii. monethes before the pryntinge of this worke"—we are enabled to conclude with certainty that the time at which Tyndale was "abiding a faythful companyon" must have been in the spring or early summer of
1525, a date coincident with that of the departure of Fish for the continent. Furthermore the duration of the "companionship," as given by Tyndale, is identical in its extent with the absence of Fish from England, as recorded by Foxe, which certainly tends to confirm our conjecture.

It was in all probability while with Tyndale on the continent that Fish published, if he did not also write, his Supplication, although its circulation was delayed until a considerably later date. Upon the title-page of the Supplication of the Poor Commons, published in 1546, it is said that The Supplication of the Beggars "was compiled by Simon Fyshe anno MCCCCXXIV." * Foxe, however, gives 1527 as the probable date of its composition. The latest authorities, Mr. Edwin Arber, and after him Mr. Frederick J. Furnivall, assign its publication to the latter part of 1528 or the earlier part of 1529. These apparent variations in chronology will confuse us unless we keep in mind the fact that the composition or "compilation," the publication and the circulation represent three separate and distinct dates. That the Supplication was written prior to August, 1526, there is internal evidence to prove. Sir Thomas More, in his Supplication of the Poor Souls in Purgatory, alludes to the fact that Fish valued the angel at 6s. 8d., proving that he was ignorant of "the new valuacyon; for he ranne awaye before the valuacyon changed." The noble was increased in value to 7s. 4d. in August and 7s. 6d. in November, 1526.† We may therefore conclude the writing to have taken place in all probability some time in 1525. The publication, or "making," of the tract was probably early in 1527, the date given by Foxe. It is not impossible that Fish, whose return home is to be set down as in this same year, brought with him copies of his work to his hiding-place in Whitefriars,‡ and distributed them thence among certain trusted friends. It seems certain that at least two copies found their way to the hands of the King during the ensuing year. The first of these was brought to his attention by the future Queen, Anne Boleyn. Foxe tells the story in detail, and is responsible for the assertion that Henry became deeply interested in the author of the book and subsequently came to entertain for him most friendly sentiments.

Meanwhile, however, Wolsey had been forced to deliver up the great seal, and it had been entrusted to the keeping of Sir Thomas

* Herbert's Ames, iii., p. 1537.
† Foxe, Acts and Monuments, App. to vol. iv. (Townsend's ed.).
‡ That Fish was in England late in this year appears from Robert Merton's Confession, made before Cardinal Wolsey May 14th, 1528, and recorded by Foxe in his Acts and Monuments.
More. With the change in the chancellorship there had also come a most pronounced change in the official attitude toward heresy and heretics. The Cardinal had been content with making the offenders carry the fagot whose heat was to be spent upon obnoxious volumes; Sir Thomas, despite the views previously heralded in his famous *Utopia*, was not content till bodies as well as books had suffered a common purgatorial experience of fire. So, despite the King's assurance of personal interest, Fish was unwilling to trust himself in public, till Henry "taking the signet of his finger, willed him to have hym recommended to the Lord Chancellour, chargynghym not to bee so hardy to worke hym any harme." More did not dare disobey the mandate, but sought to vent his malignant spite on the wife of Fish for refusing to permit certain priests to read in her house from the Latin version of the Testament. Within the space of half a year Fish was removed by the plague. His widow, after a year or more had passed, was married to James Bainham, who, for his heretical opinions, was compelled to suffer martyrdom in the winter of 1531.

In More's *Apology* a passage occurs, the statements of which we are inclined to distrust, because of their failure to harmonize with certain strong circumstantial evidence. In it he writes of Fish that "he had good zele, ye wote well, whan he wrotethe Supplicacion of Beggers. But God gave hym suche grace afterwarde y' he was sory for that good zele, and repented hymselfe and came into the Church agayne : and forsoke and forsware the whole hill of those heresyes, out of which the fountain of that same good zelesprange."

The "circumstantial evidence" alluded to is that furnished in the Prologue of John Frith to his *Disputation of Purgatory*, a work to which we will have occasion to refer later. The *Disputation* was written in 1531, and the author evidently had been informed of the death of Fish at the time of its composition, since there is plainly an allusion to that event in the following quotation. Had More's assertion been correct, Frith would doubtless have heard of the fact and given expression to his regret concerning it. Instead of this, however, he wrote:

"There was a brother of ours, named Simon Fish (which now, I trust, resteth in God's hands), whose eyes God had opened, not only to espy the wily walking of hypocrites and ruin of the realm, which through their means was nigh at hand,' etc.

We are inclined to believe that More confounded Fish with Barlow, at one time the companion of Roye and afterward Bishop of Bath and Wells, who did recant his heretical opinions and return to the arms of holy mother Church.

It was on Candlemas eve (February 2d), 1529, that a number of
copies of the *Supplication* were scattered about the streets of London. The mode, then in vogue, of celebrating the festival doubtless led to the adoption of this plan of getting the tract into the hands of all classes. It seems to have been Wolsey's first acquaintance with the fact of its existence. The act was simply the touching of the torch to well-seasoned fuel. Burnet says concerning the work that it "took mightily."* There is no reason to doubt the statement. The people at large were fast coming to look upon the Monastic and Mendicant Orders as the cause of the universal poverty of the realm. The nobility had long regarded with jealousy and indignation the privileged class that acknowledged no authority outside of itself, while it swept the national wealth into its coffers, fearless of interference. The King himself, stirred to anger by the persistent interference of the hierarchy with his cherished purpose of a divorce from Catharine, as well as by the growing insolence of the representatives of the *imperium in imperio*, was ready to adopt extreme measures, measures fully as radical as any suggested by Fish. And certainly there was good reason, if the statements of the *Supplication* were based upon facts; and that they were so may be believed, since no denial of them seems to have been made, no protest against them raised. Their correctness was not once called in question.

This, then, was the condition of things which, in the plainest of plain language, our author held up for the consideration of all. As the title suggests, the tract purported to be a petition of the paupers of the realm to the King for the redress of manifold grievances. It began thus:

"Most lamentably compleyneth theyre woffull mysery vnto youre highness, youre poore daily bedemen the wretched hidous monstres (on whom scarcely for horror any yie dare loke), the foule, vnhappy sorte of lepres, and other sore people, nedy, impotent, blinde, lame and sike, that live onely by almesse, howe that theyre nombre is daily so sore encreased, that all the almesse of all the wel-disposed people of this youre realme is not halfe ynowghe for to susteine theim, but that for verey constreint they die for hunger."

The writer thereupon proceeded to show that the responsibility for this condition of things lay with the various orders of monks and friars. He thus continued:

"The goodliest lordshippes, maners, londes, and territories are theyrs. Besides this, they have the tenth part of all the corne, medowe, pasture, grasse, wolfe, coltes, calues, lambes, pigges, gese and chikens. Ouer and besides, the tenth part of euery servantes wages, the tenth part of the wolfe, milke, bony, waxe, chese and butter. Ye and they loke so narowly vpon theyre prouffites, that the poore wyues must be

* History of the Reformation, vol. i., p. 262 (Am. ed.).
countable to them of every tenth eg, or elles she getith not her ryghtes at ester, shalbe taken as a heretike. . . . Euerly man and childe that is buried, must pay sum what for masses and dirigis to be song for him, or elles they will accuse the dedes frendes and executours of heresy. Whate money get they by mortuaries, by hearing of confessions . . . by halowing of churches, altaires, superaltaires, chapelles, and belles, by cursing of men and absoluing them again for money? What a multitude of money gather the pardoners in a yere? How moche money get the Sommers by extorcion yn a yere, by assiying the people to the commissaries court and afterward releasing thapparaunce for money? Finally the infinite nombre of begging freres: What get they yn a yere? Here, if it please your grace to marke, ye shall se a thing farre out of joynyt. There are withyn youre realme of England .1ij. thousand parisshe churches. And this stonding that there be but tenne housholdes yn euery parishe yet are there fiue hundreth thousand and twenty thousand househoulde. And of euery of these households hath euery of the fue ordres of freres a peny a quarter for euery ordre, that is in all the fiue ordres fiue pens a quarter for euery house. That is for all the fiue ordres .xx.d. a yere of euery house. Summa, fiue hundreth thousand and twenty thousand quarters of angels. That is .cclx thousand half angels. Summa cxxx. thousand angels. Summa totales .xliij. thousand pounding, and .cccxvij. ii. vi. s. viij. d. sterling, whereof-not foure hundreth yeres passed they had not one peny. . . . Whate good Christen people can be abill to socoure vs poore lepers, blinde, sore, and lame, that be thus yerely oppressed? Is it any merueille that youre people so compleine of pouertrie? . . . Compare the nombre of this vnkind idell sort vnto the nombre of the laye people. . . . Compare theim to the nombre of men, so are they not the .C. person. Compare theim to men, wimen and children; then are they not the .CCCC. parson yn nombre. . . . And whate do al these gredy sort of sturdy, idell, holy theues, with these yerely exactions that they take of the people? Truely nothing but exempt theim silues from thobedience of your grace. . . . Here were a blessed sort, not of meke herdes but of bloudsuppers. . . . Ye and what do they more? Truely nothing but applie theym silues by all the sleighghtes they may, to haue to do with euery mannes wife, euery mannes daughter and euery mannes mayde, that cukkoldrie and baudrie shulde reyne ouer all emong your subjectes. . . . Who is abill to nombre the greate and brode botomes ocean see, full of euilles that this mischeuous and sinful generacion may lawfully bring vppon vs vnponisshed?

" Whate remedy? make lawes ageynst theim? I am yn doubt whetherye be abill: Are they not stronger yn your owne parliament house then your silfe? Whate a nombre of Bisshoppes, abbotes and priours are lordeys of your parliament! Are not all the learned men in your realme in fee with theim to speake yn your parliament house for theim ageynst your crown dignite and comon welthe of your realme; a fewe of youre owne lerned counsell onely excepted? Whate lawe can be made ageynst theim that may be made advaylable? Who is he (thoughhe be greued neuer so sore) for the mordre of his auncestre, rausishment of his wyfe, of his daughter, robbery, trespas, malheme, dette or any other offence, dare ley it to theyre charge by any way of accion? and if he do, then is he by and by, by theyre wilynesse, accused of heresie, ye, they will so handle him or he passe that except he will bere the fagot of theyre pleasure, he shall be excommunicate and then be all his accions dashed . . . haue they not translated ynto theyre bondes, from your grace half your kyngdome thoroughly? . . . of one kyngdome made twanye; the spirituall kyngdom (as they call it), for they will be named first. And your temporall kingdoms. And whiche of these .ij. kyngdomes (suppose ye) is like to ouergrowe the other? ye, to put the other clere out of memory? Truely the kyngdome of the bloudsuppers. . . .

" Set these sturdy lobies a brode in the world to get them wises of their owne, to get theire liuing with their laboure in the sweete of theire faces, according to the commandement of God, Gene. iij. . . . Tye these holy idell theues to the cartes, to be whipped naked about every market towne til they will fall to laboure. . . . Then shall
With what force the *Supplication* struck home was soon made manifest. Fish had not confined himself to an assault upon the Monastic and Mendicant Orders alone. He had charged gross evils upon "Bishopes, Abbottes, Priours, Deacons, Archdeacons, Suffragans, Prestes, Monkes, Chanons, Freres, Pardoners and Somners." Those highest in ecclesiastical authority were included under the same condemnation with those who were servants of servants in the Church. So that it is not hard to understand the alacrity with which all set to work to counteract the influence of the revelations of the "little Book." To quote the words of Foxe:

"After that the clergeye of England, and especially the Cardinall vnderstode these booke of the Beggers supplication aforesayd, to be strawne abroade in the streetes of London, and also before the Kyng, the said Cardinall caused not onely his seruantes diligently to attend to gather them vp, that they should not come into the Kynges handes, but also, when he vnderstode that the Kyng had receaued one or two of them, he came vnto the Kynges Maiesty, saying: "If it shall please your grace here are diuers seditious persons which have scattered abroade books containyng manifest errours of herisies; desyryng his grace to beware of them. Whereupon the Kyng, puttyng his hand in his bosom, tooke out one of the bookes and deliuered it vnto the Cardinall. Then the Cardinall, together with the Byshops consulted how they might prouide a speedy remedy for this mischief and thereupon determined to geue out a Commission to forbidd the readyng of all Englishe bookes and namely this booke of Beggars and the new Testament of Tyndals translation; which was done out of hand by Cuthbert Tonstall, Byshop of London, who sent out his prohibition vnto his Archdeacones with all sped, for the forbidding of that booke and diuers other more."

That Foxe has confused two distinct events, as is not infrequently the case with him, is evident from the fact that Tonstall's prohibition is dated October 23d, 1526, while in the list of books appended by the historian as included in the interdict, are some, among them the *Supplication*, which as yet had not seen the light. It is possible, however, that Tonstall was the author of another prohibition the text of which has not been preserved. But as this is purely conjectural we do not care to urge it.

As we have already stated, Wolsey was compelled to yield the great seal in October, 1529, and Sir Thomas More succeeded to the chancellorship. In putting on the robe of office he put off the mantle of charity. He retained his humanism, but laid aside his humanity. From the expression of views on the subject of freedom of worship, which even with us would be regarded as eminently liberal, he came to exult in the ambition of being "troublesome to heretics." Henceforward

"he may be said to have lived to illustrate the necessary tendencies of Romanism in an honest mind convinced of its truth; to show that the test of sincerity in a man who pro-
fesses to regard orthodoxy as an essential of salvation is not the readiness to endure persecution, but the courage which will venture to inflict it." *

It was undoubtedly through his influence with Henry that the latter was induced to affix his signature to the clergy's interdict of the Supplication and other so-called heretical books. It was in the spring of 1530, but a few months after More's entrance upon his office, that Convocation declared Fish's book and others that had come from the pens of the reformers, both British and Continental, condemned, on the ground that they were "totally swarming full of heresies and detestable opinions." †

So potent was felt to be the influence of the Supplication that it was deemed necessary not only to attempt its repression by special injunction, but also to meet its statements with argument. The main purpose of Fish had been to direct attention to the enormous evils in practice that had grown up under the hierarchy in England. But in the course of his attack upon the rapacity of the "gredi goulafres," which were swallowing up the substance of the realm, together with the sword, power, crown, and dignity of the King and the obedience of the people, he had asserted that they had no other

"coloure to gather these yearly exaccions ynto theyre hondes but that they say they pray for vs to God, to delyuer our soules out of the paynes of purgatori : without whose prayer, they sey, or at lest without the popes pardon, we coulde never be deliuered thens."

And after declaring that there were many able men who, on both rational and Scriptural grounds, denied the existence of purgatory, and claimed that it was "a thing inuented by the couitousnesse of the spiritualtie onely to translate all kingdomes from other princes vnto theim," he advanced the two very logical propositions that, "if there were a purgatory, and also if that the pope with his pardons for money may deliuer one soule thens ; he may deliuer him aswel without money ; if he may deliuer one he may deliuer a thousand ; yf he may deliuer a thousand he may deliuer thym all and so destroy purgatory ;" and further, as to "the hole sort of spiritueltie, that if they will not pray for no man but for theim that gyve them money, they are tyrauntes and lakke charite, and suffer those soules to be punisshed and payned vncheritably, for lacke of theyre prayers." Wherefore, concluded he, "this purgatory and the popes pardons is all the cause of the translacion of your kingdome so fast into their hondes."

† Wilkin's Concilia, vol. iii., p. 706 (fol.).
This assault upon a cherished and lucrative doctrine of the Romish Church had the effect of turning attention away from the main point of the tract, or, at least, afforded an excuse to the champions of the Church for ignoring the many truths which it contained. It was deemed necessary that the foundations upon which the said doctrine was based should be laid bare. Three men—whether independently or by prearrangement is not known—determined to make the attempt. The first, John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, a man of unquestionable integrity and devotion, as well as of intellectual acumen, if we measure him by the standard of his age, made his appeal to the continuous faith of the Church through its long history, a faith that had found expression in the repeated declaration of its councils. "Because the Church hath affirmed it we must needs believe it, for the Church cannot err." The second, the Lord Chancellor, made his main appeal to Scripture; though, relying rather upon the imaginative than the logical faculties of his readers, he presented his answer in the form of a Supplication of the Poor Souls in Purgatory, whom he made "to wail and lament that they heard the world waxing so faint in the faith of Christ, that any man had need to prove purgatory to Christian men." "If ye pity any man in pain," he made them say, "never knew ye pain comparable to ours, whose fire passeth as far in heat all the fires that ever burned upon earth as the hottest of all these passeth a feigned fire painted on a wall." The third, John Rastell, More's brother-in-law,* a printer by trade, a man of whose character little is known, devoted himself to proving the reasonableness of the doctrine of purgatory, his answer being in the form of a Dialogue between a Mussulman and a Christian, wherein, as Frith humorously wrote, he made the Turk teach the Christian what he ought to believe.

Of these three answers, that of More, at least, reached the continent early in 1530. That this is so seems evident from the fact that there appeared from the press of Hans Luft, in Marburg, during the summer of that year, A Proper Dyaloge, the production of William Barlow, in which occurs an interesting allusion to the Supplication of Fish and also to that of More.

At the time of the publication of this Dialogue John Frith was in the company of Tyndale, zealously laboring upon the translation of the original Scriptures into his mother tongue. His writings indicate that he was intimately acquainted with Fish, which fact probably accounts for the more than ordinary interest which he mani-

---

* Not "son-in-law," as Foxe erroneously states. He married Elizabeth, the sister of Sir Thomas. (Anthony à Wood, Athena Oxonienses.)
fested in the history of the *Supplication.* It having come to his knowledge that Fisher and More had prepared answers to it, he sent word to some friend in England, soliciting that they might be transmitted for his perusal. "On St. Thomas' day, before Christmas, 1530," they came to hand, and with them Rastell’s answer, concerning which his friend wrote, that the author "goeth about to prove purgatory by natural philosophy, which thing, I think, be more easy to do than to prove it by any good Scripture." In his rejoinder Frith wrote that he "was marvellously desirous and tickled" to see what reasons Rastell could assign for his belief in the doctrine of purgatory, and, having ascertained that he cited seven, took in hand to propound "by God's grace" seven times seven, "which should have such pith that painful purgatory should not be able to abide the worst of them." In three successive books he took up and answered in order, with remarkable clearness and completeness, all the arguments of the three assailants of the *Supplication.* In spite of his youthful years—he was but twenty-seven—he proved himself more than a match for his antagonists, who were all well advanced. His thorough conversance both with the Scriptures and the works of the Fathers, and his skill as a dialectician, gave him an easy conquest. Of the three, Rastell alone attempted a reply with the pen. More, whose subsequent treatise could hardly be dignified with such a title, was never satisfied till he had brought Frith to the stake. To the second publication of Rastell, Frith, a year and a half later, wrote an answer from the Tower; and so complete and conclusive did it prove that, to use the words of Foxe, "he—Rastell—was well content to count his natural reason foolishness, and with hearty thanks given to God, became a child again."

This public discussion could not fail to emphasize the assertions of the *Supplication,* and render more peremptory its demands. That which had been told in the ear came to be proclaimed on the house-top. The claim of an individual became the clamor of the populace. At length the appeal crystallized in law. That the famous Vagrant Act of 1531, or, as it is better known in history, "the 12th of the 22d of Henry VIII.," was in a greater or less degree the outcome of the *Supplication* is made clear not only by the resemblance in the wording of the two,* but also by the statement of contemporary publications.

From the Vagrant Act to the dissolution of the monasteries proved no long step. In 1536 the smaller houses, in 1538 all the re-

---

* Froude, History of England, vol. i., p. 86—"It seems as if in framing the Act he (Henry) had Simon Fish's petition before him, and was commencing at last the rough remedy of the cart-tail, which Fish had dared to recommend for a very obdurate evil."
mainder, were suppressed. England began to breathe more freely. The main incubus upon her development was removed. It may be, as has been asserted by some, that the suppression of the monasteries was the result not of a sincere desire for the welfare of the state, but of a desire to increase, by an easy method, the revenues of the kingdom. But whatever the motive, to any one conversant with the history of monasticism in England there can be no doubt that the existing condition of things was a sufficient warrant for the severity of the measures taken.

The causes co-operating to bring about the great events of history have ever been complex as well as multiplex. In tracing the progress of human society, to keep before us all the factors combining to produce a given result may not always be possible; but where it is possible it is surely right not to withhold just credit. It has been with the purpose of emphasizing an event which, though apparently insignificant, was really an occasion of great historic changes, that we have thought it not unmeet to direct attention to the life and work of a “forgotten worthy.” In the lustre of the lives of famous contemporaries his own little life-light seems dim; but he helped to bring about that in which we to-day rejoice. Simple gratitude demands some expression of a sense of obligation. Such expression it has been our desire, however unworthily, to give.

NEWELL WOOLSEY WELLS.

Brooklyn, N. Y.
IV.

THE POSTULATES OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

The last thirty years have been rich in new things. We hear the claims of a new theology, a new literature, a new education. And if these departures were new as the styles are new, and exhibited the changing phases of intellectual taste alone, we could judge them ephemeral, and let them die. But when we remember that intellectual history is a dynamic, that thought is the true reality, and a movement in thought an irrevocable step of progress or retrogression—that a new means an old and age is decay, we feel the importance of radical changes in any of these departments, and wish to be well convinced before we endorse them.

The present encouraging state of psychological science and its hopeful outlook into the future are due, no doubt, in large measure, to the clearer enunciation of the principles of the so-called "new psychology" and the wider range which contemporary science affords for their consistent application. The question was asked, indeed, long ago, "Can psychology be made a natural science?" and when the most acute thinker of modern times, from his seclusion at Königsberg, confirmed as an oracle the negative of his predecessors, the impulse toward an empirical treatment of mind was again restrained for a century; and necessarily restrained, since French empiricism was sentimental rather than earnest, and English empiricism was agnostic rather than constructive. But the change is now making, and it seems to be the necessary outgrowth of sweeping tendencies of the times. M. Janet describes the movement, whose product is a world-wide realism in general thought, as the reconciliation of science and philosophy, yet holds to the essential separateness of the two intellectual spheres; but the change for psychology means more than this. Either philosophy is too general to mean anything, or it means the rationalizing of science; in either case, we are told, psychology may dispense with philosophy as the other sciences dispense with it, except as their declared results form the ensemble of knowledge which, in its ultimate concatenation and adjustment, exhibits the work of a true philosophy. Physiological
psychology has no quarrel with general philosophy as such nor with a metaphysic which is sufficiently modest; it only asserts its right and its ability to deal with its own content after its own fashion, promising when it shall have attained full scientific self-consciousness to hand in its reports to the tribunal of higher and more general thought for a place in a developed world-theory.

To say that the soul is natural is not to say that it is mechanical, nor is it to say that there is continuity of law in the natural and spiritual worlds; on the contrary, it is to say that nature is intelligent and that the laws of thought are the laws of things. Selfhood is nature's point of departure, and if nature be natural it must be construed by mind. We know nature as we think it. Nature apart from thought would not be the nature that we know, since nature is realized thought. Absolute being is impossible as long as being is a notion. A thing is an object, and a thing which is not thought is, as Zeller well remarks, a thing with nothing objective about it—that is, no thing. And this is necessarily so from the nature of the perceptive process. Perception has both its objective and its subjective side; that is, perception without an object cannot be perception, just as the object without perception cannot be an object, and the recognition of this duality is the fundamental idea of the new psychology.

For twenty centuries men have been reasoning from the ego side of the equation of perception to the non-ego side, and the rich fruits of natural science are the consequence, while they have seldom thought to reason from the non-ego to the ego side, a process whose legitimacy stands or falls with its reverse. If you say I cannot reason from nature to mind, I reply that you cannot reason from mind to nature, since both rest upon the same perception. Why do I believe in external causation? Because I have a causal judgment, and perceive that it works in nature. So to the extent of causation I conclude that nature is realized thought. If there be subjective causation, nature could not have been constructed without objective causation, and if there be objective causation, the mind could not have been constructed without subjective causation; for the contrary in either case would invalidate perception. We must assume the validity of perception for all science.

This being so, we rationalize nature, and afford, as we have already said, ground for a philosophy of things, but not until we have attained science, and not by a deductive method. Mr. Dewey is right in emphasizing consciousness, but wrong in refusing to see that consciousness is bipedal. M. Ravaisson is right in saying that "the true substance of things is the unity of thought," provided we say also that the true substance of thought is the unity of things. We
may obtain psychic data from without as well as from within, for the without is as necessary to the within as the within is to the without.

Far from undermining the standpoint of the old psychology—that is, the inductive science of Aristotle and the Scottish School, this position tends to confirm it; for consciousness can never be escaped, and a groundwork of ascertained knowledge is necessary for scientific construction. The experimenter on association must know that there are ideas and that they are associated, and only a descriptive, that is, a subjective psychology can give these facts. This is admitted by the leaders of the new school, as Wundt,* Bain, Ribot, however much in their metaphysic or in the absence of metaphysic the last two may tend to positivism and however much they may exaggerate the relative importance of the objective method.

As to the legitimacy, moreover, of such a psychologic expansion a test is ready at hand. Do psychic phenomena present the conditions necessary to the employment of objective and naturalistic methods? Can the mind be subjected to experiment in analysis, synthesis, and measure? Has the mind magnitudes, first, in duration or time, second, in quantity or mass? The first of these inquiries suggests the function of mathematics, the second the function of general dynamics, and together they constitute the question of method so fiercely discussed in Germany during the last thirty years. It may be stated in classical language thus:

(a) How is mathematical psychology possible? (b) How is experimental psychology possible?

We have thrown these points of inquiry into the Kantian form because it is Kant who replies to them, with his usual conciseness and authority. He says in effect:† "Psychology can never be raised to the rank of an exact natural science," because (a) mathematics is not applicable to internal phenomena, "for the internal intuition in which these phenomena must be construed has only one dimension, time," and (b) experiment has no range in internal phenomena, for the varied phases of inner observation cannot be changed at will by ourselves or others, and moreover the very fact of observation alters the condition of the subject observed. These two objections hit precisely upon the points upon which a natural psychology as such must rest, and as long as they remained unanswered rendered such

---

* "With the same right with which the physicist conducts his investigations of the phenomena of nature, without reference to the subjective meaning of sensation and perception, with the same right can the psychologist investigate the course of men's experience, inasmuch as he may regard the external world as presentation merely, the product of psychological processes and laws (Phys. Psych. II., 454).

† Metaph. Anfangsgründe d. Naturwissenschaft (Rosenkranz, 5, 310).
a science impossible. Two recent psychologists, Herbart and Wundt, have taken issue respectively here and there; we will briefly interpret the answers they have given.

Herbart is essentially a metaphysician. He postulates ontology and subsumes psychology as a department of the real. Like German thinkers generally, before the rise of the materialistic and positivist movements he began up, to use Fechner's expressive figure, and came down, instead of beginning down and going up. He knew the ego immediately, and from this knowledge postulated the universal category of the real, then by a direct circle, to escape the meshes of Fichteanism, as he himself says,* subsumed the ego as a species of the genus into which it had been expanded. If the ego be my first knowledge of the real, why may it not be the sum of the real? If the ego be consistently subsumed from the first, whence comes my knowledge of the real? This is the circle of the realist and the justification of the subjective idealist, and Herbart learned from Hegel to take the former. But if he was saved thus from the meshes of Fichte, his original conception of the problem of general philosophy and its method saved him, on the other hand, from the fruitless ontological development of the Hegelians. Philosophy, says he, is the elaboration of conceptions, the completion of internal facts. Matter, a simple thing, a logical subject, is to the senses no longer simple, but a sum of qualities or attributes, each of which is a real. Here is a contradiction. How can the presentation be elaborated and the logical opposition eliminated? Such contradictions meet us on all hands, in our notions of motion, causation, the ego—how can the subjective be immediately the same as the objective I?" The reconciliation of logical opposites and the consequent rectification of the notion is the task of philosophy.

This is readily recognized as the old problem of Hegel, and the antinomy is formally the same: \( a = \text{non } a \). Hegel admits the validity of both members of the equation and the reality of the contradiction, and aims to make the valid thinkable. Herbart denies the validity of the first member of the equation, makes a substitute for it, and aims to make the thinkable valid. Here is again the standpoint of the new psychology—external validity.

Suppose we represent an object by \( A \), its notion by \( M \), and its phenomenal manifestation by \( N \); then in the interpretation of \( A \), we have the equation \( M = N \). But we find that this is not true. \( M \) in thought is a unit, a simple; \( N \) in experience is an aggregate, a complex. As valid, \( M \) must be one with \( N \); as thinkable, \( M \) must

---

* Tractate, "Uber die Subsumtion d. Psychologie, etc., Göttingen, 1835."
not be one with N. Assert the contradiction and deny the oneness—you have a valid M (claiming with Herbart the ultimate basis of philosophy to be experience, hence the validity of N), but not a thinkable—and Herbart looks toward Comte; deny the contradiction and assert the oneness, and you have a thinkable M, but not a valid—and Hegel looks toward Fichte. But if we have knowledge by the notion at all, M must be both valid and thinkable. So the notion must be elaborated, changed into conformity to the reality, from a simple to a complex.

To illustrate this and at the same time contract our thought to an application that is psychological, let us look for a moment at the solution of the contradictions in the ego.

As metaphysics is the science of the thinkableness of experience in general, so psychology is the science of the thinkableness of mind experience—how is a natural science of psychology possible? We have seen how Kant answered this question, and are now in a position to interpret the answer of Herbart, for the development of the preceding paragraph is true in times of self. Let A be the ego as it is, M the ego of self-consciousness (subject), and N the ego of which M is conscious (object). Now, to make M equal to N, the presenting must be the same as the presented I—the subject identical with the object. But, says Herbart, the same entity cannot be in both members of a relation, "the subjective cannot be immediately the same as the objective I." Here is a contradiction. Philosophy must perform its function. The conception must be completed. Instead of a simple M must be a complex; wherein does the complexity reside? To answer this question, we must inquire into the nature of the real I, and in this answer we shall discover Herbart's true contribution to the new psychology.

The soul is a "real" in a definite and technical sense. "Reals" are the simple, penetrable, innumerable, differentiated, spherical, ultimate postulates of existence. They are "pure position," and by reason of their penetrableness can be conceived as overlapping or interpenetrating each other; this gives rise to material bodies or matter. "The grouping of the monads according to experience is called by us a thing." Thus the noumenon becomes phenomenon. Conceive the reals projected from the space of intellect into the space of sense,* and give to them motion in right lines, with all conceivable degrees of velocity. Each real becomes a centre of contending forces, and the resultant varies with the quality of the opposing reals. If reals of opposite quality come into opposition, a condition of

* For the doctrine of "intelligible space," see Metaphysik, § 7.
permanent strife is induced in consequence of the continued action of unneutralized contraries. The tendency to maintain itself thus found in all things in their last analysis is called self-persistence.

The ego, then, as simple being located at a point strives to maintain itself against the action of vibrating cerebral elements. This opposition gives ideas, which, when viewed as inherent objects of the soul's self-consciousness, are efforts at psychic self-persistence and, considered in their independent relation, objects of internal cognition. "The presentation of these objects," says Herbart, "may be a row of acts of self-persistence against interference from other essences." Now, the sum of these acts of self-persistence of our ideas or mental states must be identical with the subject itself, since the ego sees itself, substituting for the manifoldness of its manifesting states the unity of the manifested I. So this substitution should be reversed. The true multiplicity of consciousness must take the place of a mistaken unity, and the conception of the ego is elaborated. M is no longer a simple but a complex. M = N is a valid and thinkable equation, and the process of self-consciousness is vindicated.

Whatever we may think of this metaphysic, we see in Herbart's idea of the interaction of representations or images, considered as forces, a new conception of internal facts. If psychic states tend to any degree to influence one another, if one dominates and others grow subordinate, this is sufficient confirmation, in so far, of the new conception, and makes possible a dynamic of mind. For such a science it is not necessary that mental states be forces per se in any occult or metaphysical sense nor still less in any materialistic sense, and Herbart distinctly discountenanced any such construction. It is only necessary that they be potent in reference to one another. The advent of a new presentation in the field of consciousness detracts from the intensity of former images, a loud sound drowns a feeble sound, the sun blots out the moon. Force, then, intensity, mass, is the second dimension of mind, as time is the first, and Kant's objection to the employment of the methods of mass determination, drawn from natural science, is overthrown.

We owe to Herbart the first step toward an experimental psychology, though he himself was false to his conception. He built up a mathematical science as rigid as Euclid and as fallacious as Spinoza. Admitting the application of mathematics to psychic states, why may we not assume psychic axioms and construct a deductive science? You may, replies the experimental psychologist, provided you show us first the psychic axioms. Spinoza was at perfect liberty to use the mathematical method, provided he were will-
ing to rear his temple on an axiomatic quicksand. Mill’s doctrine of Euclid would probably be correct if his doctrine of Euclid’s axioms were correct. But let either Spinoza or Herbart place synthetic axioms \textit{a priori} in the magazine of his deductive warfare, and we have no further quarrel with him.

This is the difficulty, and it is as old as Kant’s second objection to a natural psychology. If a purely mathematical science fail, despite the acknowledged legitimacy of the mathematical function, we must resort to an inductive science—that is, an experimental, either internal or external, or both. Kant objects in general terms. Experiment has no application to internal phenomena, for the varied phases of inner observation cannot be changed at will by ourselves or others, and, moreover, the very fact of observation alters the conditions of the subject observed. How have these positions been met?

It would not do to say that Professor Wundt has answered these objections, for the Scottish psychologists replied to them long ago by the employment of internal experiment; but we may consider him the most systematic, profound, and convincing defender of the theoretic position of the external experimentalists.

If a science of mind be possible at all, there must be laws of mind. \textit{What is the nature of these laws?} It does no good to attempt to define mind, as it does no good in the construction of physics to attempt to define matter. Whatever the ultimate constitution of matter be, physics deals with matter as we know it, and whatever the ultimate constitution of mind be, psychology deals with mind as we know it. The nature of the soul, then, is not a question for psychology, but for ontology or logic in its broad inductive sense, and is at once relegated to general metaphysics. If the metaphysician decide that the soul is a substance, psychic phenomena remain the same; and if he decide that the soul is a function of the body, psychic phenomena are not changed by his decision; so, evidently, the most sensible, as certainly the most logical, method of procedure is to define psychology as the science of psychic phenomena, external and internal, and to consider the area of its domain the conscious wherever we find it. The psychologist is no longer a speculator, but a seeker after facts. This is a modest position, and if it were properly understood much less criticism would be wasted from the side of theology and morals.

Pursuing our development, the question at once arises, \textit{What are psychic phenomena? How do we know mind?} According as we answer this inquiry we take part with one or the other of two opposing parties within the school. We know mind only in its connection with matter, say English empiricists, consequently psychology
is the science of this connection, and the psychic phenomenon is in part, at least, material. But admitting the fact of an invariable connection, we deny that it is a conscious connection in many cases, and further we maintain that when conscious it partakes in consciousness of the nature of the accidental. Not only so, but there are probably, as is held by Mr. Ward, following Wundt, and agreed to by Professor Bain, subconscious presentations just outside the conscious field. In the voluntary life, the higher reasoning processes, the moral and aesthetic feelings, there is no consciousness of the material connection, though it probably exists, and in cases of simple sensation, in which the bodily states are projected immediately into the conscious field, there is always a feeling of independence. Now, on our own definition of psychology as the science of mind, as we know it, we must with Wundt admit a free intelligent actuality known in consciousness without material connection. Here is at once the necessity and justification of a higher science, inductive, internal, descriptive, analytic, and inasmuch as the phenomena of which it is cognizant are purely psychic, it must precede and embrace those branches of the science which deal with the phenomena of body.

It is necessary, therefore, to distinguish carefully the conservatives from the extreme left in the new school. The former comprise the German physiological psychologists, as Fechner, Lotze, Wundt; the latter, the positivist thinkers of England and France, Bain, Lewes, Ribot. The latter are as untrue to the new standpoint as were the old metaphysicians whom they abuse, inasmuch as they take as definite an attitude toward the question of the substance of the soul.

What, then, shall we say as to psychic laws? If there be phenomena purely psychic, there must be laws purely psychic, and if there be phenomena psychophysical, there must be laws psychophysical. But it must be remembered that purely psychic phenomena are such only in consciousness, and not in fact, and by a necessary consequence the psychic laws of such phenomena are quite subjective, and can in no way supersede or contradict the psychophysical laws, which control all psychic phenomena in fact. Psychophysical laws cannot be confined to phenomena which are consciously psychophysical, but must be recognized as in subconscious operation, even in the highest and most ideal processes of mind. This is only to say that there is a necessary connection between mind and body. If we admit this position we have a duality in the mental life, it is true, but a duality in operation merely, the real duality being that of the conscious

† Mind, xliv.
and unconscious; while if with Wundt we maintain the independence of laws purely psychic, we violate with him the uniformity of the psychophysical connection and postulate a real duality of mind. Wundt forfeits unity in the mental account, and finds three problems on his hands instead of one: first, to account for the purely psychic; second, to account for the psychophysical; and third, to account for this duality.

The position that the whole mental life is consciously or unconsciously psychophysical may seem at first sight to be a concession to the extreme left, but in reality it is not so. Even though the question as to the nature of the psychophysical were decided—which is an unwarranted assumption—on the side of the positivist, there still remains the fact that perception is a subjective process, that matter is matter only as it is known, and that the laws of thought are laws of things. As long as the materialist continues to think, so long is he a spiritualist, and as soon as he denies the reality of thought, he denies the existence of all things.

But setting aside the defence of spiritualism as a problem of metaphysics and gathering up the advance we have already made, the crucial question now confronts us—What is the nature of psychophysical laws? It must be remembered at the outset that no answer to this question, which rests upon a preconceived hypothesis as to the nature of the soul, will be received by the new psychology. As an experimental science, it demands that the processes of induction be rigidly enforced, and the nature of the laws be decided by scientific interpretation from the nature of the phenomena upon which they rest. There are, then, three distinct steps, each involving long and detailed research in the various subordinate departments of physiological psychology: first, the observation of psychophysical facts in all their range with the aid of experiment and reliable testimony; second, the grouping of these facts under their various heads and the generalization of their common qualities; third, the formulation of laws which shall be applicable to the whole or to distinct and necessary subdivisions of the psychological area. Then we shall be able, by a consensus of established relations, to make interpretations bearing upon soul and body and the nature of either. In short, we must do here what is done in every exact science—at any rate, nothing less.

Physiological psychology is in the first of these stages, and it is useless as yet to expect and profitless to attempt more than minor generalizations. But astonishing activity of research and proportionate fruitfulness of result are preparing the way, we believe, for great discoveries. The approaching settlement of the law of cerebral
localization, the bearing of nervous inhibition and arrest upon psychic functions, the establishment of trains of cellular association, the empirical derivation of the notion of space, the differentiation of nerve courses in the higher centres, the measurement of purely psychic durations, together with Wundt's great hypothesis of central innovation and Fechner's law of the ratio of the growth of sensation and excitation—all afford data, in so far, for a more sweeping and general hypothesis as to the nature of the psychophysical connection. For example, the establishment of trains of cellular association goes far toward accounting for reflex activity, toward breaking down the barriers to a comparative psychology, toward establishing a psychophysical basis for the higher mental processes, and toward affording ground for some such hypothesis as Beaunis's as to the serial and functional interaction of the mechanistic and the voluntary. But it is only as experimental data become more extended and complete that their interpretation can be made more secure and the subterranean passages, so to speak, can be opened up toward the citadel of the soul.

As illustrating this position, the process by which the celebrated logarithmic law of Fechner was arrived at is, perhaps, the best case in point. The problem presented to Fechner was in brief this: given a series of sense excitations—say of sight—increasing in intensity by a constant multiple, to derive the law, if there be one, of increase in intensity of the corresponding series of sensations. First of all, as is a necessary preliminary in the comparison of all commensurate intensities, there must be a term of constant value in each series, sustaining a necessary relation to the same in the other. We conceive the idea that the smallest perceptible sensation may be constant and that the excitation which produces it may be constant also, and after exhaustive experiment upon all the senses, find that this hypothesis is true. Let us then call the smallest perceptible sensation the threshold or zero value in the series of sensations and the corresponding excitation unity in its series, and we have fulfilled the first condition of comparative measurement. We have a fixed point in each scale and the relation between them.

We next ask in what way our sensation scale is to be graduated, but before this can be answered another detailed and delicate piece of research upon the sense organs must be instituted—namely, to determine whether the smallest perceptible difference of sensation have a constant value, and if so, what this value is for each of the senses. Again our hypothesis is experimentally verified, and we have added to our data a second generalization, the value of the excitation which produces the smallest perceptible difference in sensation.
At this stage we assume the mathematical principle that differentials are equal and consider the smallest perceptible differences as mathematical differentials, and by a summing up of all our knowledge, write the equation:

\[ \frac{ds}{de} = k \frac{d}{e} \]

in which \( ds \) is the differential of sensation, \( \frac{de}{e} \) the differential ratio of excitation, and \( k \) the proportional constant.

Whence by integration:

\[ s = k \log_e e \]

that is, the sensation varies directly as the logarithm of the excitation. By this law the sensations in an ascending series are directly calculated from the corresponding excitations, and our sensation scale is graduated.

It is seen at once that the essential feature of this operation is its experimental quality. No less than three times we returned to individual experiment upon the sense organs, and from the facts thus learned drew general truths, to serve in turn as premises for a wider inference. This affords a groundwork of observed fact to the final result, which, in so far as the experiments are reliable and the sources of error known, is not to be damaged by a hundred objections such as the a priori impossibility of the measurement of psychic magnitudes or the error of the assumption of an uniform psychophysical connection.

In this law the first and second stages in the true development of an inductive science are exemplified, and the third, that of interpretation, or, as Mill says, of deduction, is yet to be attained. Considered alone, it is capable of several interpretations, and actually has sustained three, the physiological, the psychophysical (Fechner), and the psychological (Wundt), and it is only as physiological psychology in its other paths of inquiry is adding to its laws that the first of these is being established. As illustrating the broader function of induction, we may indicate this interpretation and its grounds.

Why is Fechner's law logarithmic? Why, says Mach, are not cause (excitation) and effect (sensation) directly proportional? They are, replies the physiologist, but you mistake in considering the terminal excitation cause. Central excitation is cause, since the centres are the theatre of the psychic and central excitation varies as the logarithm of terminal excitation. The loss is purely physical, the process is purely physical, and the soul has nothing to do with it nor it with the soul. Physiology explains the expenditure on these grounds: first, there are latent excitations in the gray mat-
ter and centres which exert an arresting influence (Wundt, Beaunis); second, nerve action is ordinarily accompanied by heat; third, internal mechanism tends to reduce the intensity, just as external mechanism tends, in the more complex peripheral organs, to subvert the law altogether (temperature); fourth, the parallel between nerve and electrical transmission would lead us to expect resistance in one case as in the other; fifth, loss of physical force, in general, is due to physical causes.

Thus each of the considerations upon which the interpretation rests is a scientific generalization, and all but one are drawn from direct observation of the nervous system. In sharp contrast with this is the interpretation originally given by Fechner to the same law, viz., it is an ultimate and universal postulate of all interaction between mind and body. Mind and body, said he, are so constituted as to affect each other in a logarithmic relation, and this relation is the how of a pre-established harmony. This is to introduce a new metaphysical principle which forbids all further research, and the new psychology will have none of it.

This single law, whatever we may say as to its scientific validity, suffices to illustrate the true method of inductive generalization, whether it be from an internal or from an external standpoint. If we attempt with Mr. Ward to reduce association by analysis to a continuity of succession, proceeding on the data of attention considered purely as a conscious operation, or with Wundt, to resolve the entire mental life into apperception, his name for attention approached from physiological avenues, the result must be none the less true to fact and capable of experimental verification.

The question as to the nature of psychophysical laws is then to be left till the science is more mature. It has been so elsewhere. Kepler’s discovery of the elliptical motion of the planets rested upon accumulated observations of the actual positions of the heavenly bodies during centuries; it would have been impossible without them. The laws of chemical combination rest upon invariably observed facts of such combination, and we would consider the man a lunatic who attempted, for reasons of convenience or prejudice, to convince himself or others that the elements combined otherwise. So when the psychologist asks that our judgment be suspended in this case in the interest of unprejudiced research, his position is only that of the physicist who will not assert categorically that all the physical forces are one, or that of the geographer who will not declare that all earthquakes are due to the cooling of the globe.

Summing up the results of the foregoing discussion, we may enumerate the postulates of the science:
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1. The naturalness of the psychic; psychology is a natural science.
2. The validity of the knowing process and the consequent reality of things; the function of experiment.
3. Uniformity of natural law in the domain of the psychophysical; the major premise and justification of induction.
4. Unity in the mental life; approach to the higher processes.

We now find it easy to exhibit to the eye the position of physiological psychology in reference to the general science:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inductive.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive (Analytic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause to Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological Psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuropsychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychodynamics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypnotism, Dreams, Illusions, Insanity, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And in accordance with our postulates we may define the science and its subdivisions as follows:

Physiological psychology is the science of nervous phenomena accompanied by consciousness.

Neuropsychology is that branch of physiological psychology which deals with intra-organic phenomena and their interpretation.

Psychophysics deals with extra-organic phenomena and their interpretation.

Psychodynamics is that branch of psychophysics which deals with the interpretation of intra-organic phenomena in terms of psychic intensity or mass.

Psychometry deals with the interpretation of intra-organic phenomena in terms of psychic duration or time.

It is not our object to enumerate results in any of these subdivisions of physiological psychology, nor to justify them as legitimate fields of inquiry; but simply to indicate the common ground on which they rest. That they are well established and permanently so, no one who is abreast of current thought can doubt. The questions of neuropsychology are perhaps receiving more attention than those of any other department, either of physiology or mental science. Professors in psychology must now be men of scientific training and spirit. Psychophysical laboratories are growing in importance, and
special organs are being devoted to the publication of their results. Recent text-books on psychology vie with one another in incorporating the fruits of experimental research. No university course in mental science is now complete which does not present at least the methods and main results of scientific psychology, even though it be only to attempt their refutation, and our eastern institutions are seeking men of proper training for exact and original work. This certainly indicates progress. If the additions that are making are additions of fact outside the domain of mind, their discovery can do no harm; but if they belong to the psychic or bear in any way, however remote, upon it, the old psychology ended in defect, and should be free to enlarge its view.

This is all that is demanded by conservative thinkers, and it is only as a department of the general philosophy of mind that they admit it to be a "new psychology" at all. Nature can be rationalized only as it is known, and knowledge of nature can be attained only through the canons of exact research; consequently spiritualists will be the first to reap advantage from any new light thrown upon the correlations of mind and body. As long as consciousness is immediate and matter is mediate there can be no question as to the ultimate adjustment of their claims, and there should be no hesitation in widening the borders of the philosophy of mind to embrace a domain of value both for construction and defence; at the same time that we do not presume to draw the dividing line which nature still conceals, and probably always will, nor attempt in a spirit of dogmatism to settle the great questions which can be approached only through the most patient and extended toil.

J. Mark Baldwin.

Princeton, N. J.
V.

THE BARRIERS TO CHRISTIAN UNION.

CHRISTIAN Union has become one of the burning questions of the day. Unity is a grand ideal of the Church of Christ. The Church, built on the rock against which the gates of Hades will not prevail, is one church. The kingdom into whose gates the disciples are admitted, and whose king is Christ, is and can be but one kingdom (Matt. xvi. 18-20). Jesus Christ, the true vine, is the source of life and fruitfulness to all the branches. Without vital union and abiding communion with him there is no spiritual life; and all the branches are, through him, in organic union with one another (John xv. 1-8). The good shepherd promised his sheep that "they shall become one flock, one shepherd" (John x. 16). And accordingly our Saviour prayed for his disciples

"that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected in one" (John xvii. 21-23).

Our Saviour seldom employs the term church, ἐκκλησία, which is the New Testament equivalent for the קֶהֶר of the Old Testament. He ordinarily employs the kingdom, flock, and vine, the familiar terms of the Old Testament prophets. These terms alike indicate in their Old Testament usage the unity of the people of God. They are one people, one congregation, one flock, one vine, one kingdom. The division of the Jewish nation was a divine judgment for sin. The reunion of Israel and Judah is an abiding hope of prophecy. The apostles hold forth this same ideal of the unity of Christ's Church. They do not so often use the term kingdom. There is a tendency to use the kingdom more with reference to the kingdom of glory that comes with the Second Advent, while they use the church more frequently instead of the kingdom of redemption. However, the Epistle to the Colossians represents that the heavenly Father "delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love" (i. 13); and the Epistle to the
Hebrews teachesthat Christians have received "a kingdom that cannot be shaken" (Heb. xii. 27).

Peter applies the covenant at Horeb to Christians as an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession; and combines with it the figure of the spiritual house, the holy temple built up of living stones on Jesus Christ, the corner-stone (1 Peter ii. 4-9). He also speaksof the flock of God and the chief shepherd (1 Peter v. 2-4). The synonymous expressions people, royal priesthood, flock, and temple combine to represent the unity and spirituality of the Church of Jesus Christ.

The Apocalypse (xxi.) and the Epistle to the Hebrews (xii. 22, 23) agree in representing the body of Christians as the city of God, the New Jerusalem. This is also a conception of Old Testament prophecy.* The Epistle to the Hebrews uses the city of God in parallelism with "general assembly and church of the first-born" (xii. 22).

Saint Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, heaps up a number of representations. Those who were alienated from the commonwealth of Israel have been united to it by breaking down the partition wall. Both Jews and Gentiles have been reconciled in one body unto God. They are fellow-citizens of the saints, of the household of God, "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom each several building fitly framed together, growtheth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. ii. 12-22). Here the conceptions of kingdom, household, and temple combine with that of body to represent in various ways and from different points of view the unity and spirituality, the holiness and the vital energy of the organized body of Christians. The favorite conception of the Apostle Paul is that the church is the body of Christ. "We, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another" (Rom. xii. 5). "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13). The heavenly Father put all things under the feet of Christ, "and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 22, 23; see also Col. i. 18). The apostle also represents the relation between Christ and his

* In Jer. iii. 14-18; Ezek. xl.-xlix.; Isaiah lx.
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Church as a marriage relation. "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. v. 25–27).

All of these conceptions of the apostles are synonymous, and set forth in various forms and from different points of view the unique relation of Christ and his disciples. They are the kingdom, he is the king; they are the city of which he is the light and glory; they are the temple, he is the corner-stone; they are the body, he is the head; they are the flock, he is the chief shepherd; they are the people, he has purchased them to himself; they are a family of which God is the Father and he is the elder brother; they are the wife, he is the husband. None of these terms in their biblical usage will allow us to think of more than one organisation, or of any other principle of organization than the life and love of Jesus Christ.*

The Westminster Confession takes this view of the Church:

I. The catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

II. The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

III. Unto this catholic visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto.

IV. This catholic church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible. And particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them (ch. xxv.).

The unity of Christ's Church is in Christ, the head, the king, and it can be found in no other person. It is centred at the throne of Christ, at the right hand of the Father in heaven; it cannot be in any place on earth. The kingdom is composed of all who are united to Christ, in all ages from the beginning of the world until the close of this dispensation. It embraces the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles and martyrs, the fathers and theologians, the saints and

* "Alle diese Begriffe sind so geartet dass sie die Vorstellung mehrerer Kirchen Christi schlechterdings ausschliessen" (Julius Müller, Die evang. Union, p. 28. Berlin, 1854).
heroes of the Church in all epochs; from all lands multitudes innumerable gathered about the throne of God and the Lamb. The Scriptures give several glimpses of this Church of Christ (Rev. vii. 9 seq.; xix. 6 seq.; Heb. xii. 23). The Church of Jesus Christ is therefore chiefly in heaven, where he is. The Church on earth is but the vestibule, the outer court of the heavenly temple (Rev. xi. 2, seq.). If all Christians in the world could be assembled in one vast multitude, they would be a small company compared with the multitude about the heavenly throne. The Visible Church prior to the Reformation had merged the invisible Church on earth in itself. The Reformation revived the biblical doctrines of the universal priesthood of believers and immediate access to the throne of Christ by faith; and thus made the distinction between the visible and the invisible Church one of the characteristic features of Protestantism. The Reformers did not teach that there were two Churches, but that the one Church was in great part invisible, and in some part visible here on earth, in accordance with the external conformity of Christians to the doctrines and institutions of Christ himself. This distinction between the visible and invisible Church has been denied in recent times by Rothe and others; but it has been reaffirmed by Julius Müller,* Dorner, and other chief divines of the Protestant churches.

The historical Church has too often committed the sin of exaggerating its own importance over against the vastly greater, more extensive, and holier Church that is gathered about the throne of Christ composed of all those, wherever they may be, who are in vital union and communion with him. The Church in this world is visible in a considerable number of ecclesiastical organizations. It is sinful pride and arrogance for any one of them to claim the exclusive rights and privileges of the visible Church of Christ.† It is easy to see that no one of them can be identified with the Church on earth; for no one of them embraces all true Christians, and no one of them is so pure that it contains none but Christians. Furthermore, if all the churches on earth could be combined in one ecclesiastical organization they could not be identified with the Church of Christ; for they would still leave outside their pale multitudes of

* "Und gewiss, so lange die evangelische Kirche auf dem Grunde des göttlichen Wortes verharren wird, so lange wird es ihr formell und materiell unmöglich sein sich von der Idee der unsichtbaren Kirche loszusagen" (Müller, Dogmatische Abhandlungen. Bremen, 1870, p. 402).

† "Nur Sünde und zwar gehäufte Sünde kann die Eine Kirche in ihrer Erscheinung in eine Vielheit von Kirchen zerspalten, welche die positive Gemeinschaft mit einander aufgeben, und immer sind Kirchenzerrissen schwere Gerichte über die erscheinende Kirche" (Dorner, Glaubenslehre, II., pp. 913, 914).
real Christians; that is, vast numbers of unbaptized children, who are the elect of God and belong to the Church of the redeemed; and large numbers from among the heathen who have never had an opportunity of attaching themselves to any form of the visible Church. And, on the other hand, all the churches contain not a few hypocrites, who are not real Christians at all. The visible Church is, at the best, a poor and faint reflection of the ideal Church. The holy and undefiled bride of the Lamb is not on earth, but in heaven, where he is. The Church on earth is defiled with sin, error, and imperfection of every kind. It is the work of redemption, very largely, to cleanse the historical and visible forms of Christianity.

The ideal of the Church is visible unity, but the visible Church cannot entirely attain its ideal until its completion in Jesus Christ. Before the Second Advent the visible will correspond with the invisible only in part. It will grow nearer the goal, but will not altogether reach it.

Notwithstanding the external discord in the Church, there is vastly greater external unity than is generally supposed to be the case. The most essential things in the Christian religion, the real fundamentals, are the common property of all the ecclesiastical organizations of Christendom.

Archbishop Ussher well says:

"Thus if at this day we should take a survey of the several professions of Christianity, that have any large spread in any part of the world,. . . and should put by the points wherein they did differ one from another, and gather into one body the rest of the Articles wherein they all did generally agree, we should find that in those propositions, which without all controversy are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much truth is contained, as being joined with holy obedience, may be sufficient to bring a man unto everlasting salvation." (Ussher's A Brief Declaration of the Universalitie of the Church. A Sermon before the King, 1624, p. 28.)

All Christians hold to the sacred Scriptures as the inspired word of God to guide the Church in religion, doctrine, and morals. The Apostles' Creed is the symbol of the universal Church. Christians of every name enter the visible Church by the sacrament of baptism and partake of the supper of the Lord, whatever may be their views of the meaning of these sacraments. They all engage in the worship of God on the Lord's day. They all use the Lord's Prayer as a guide to their devotions. Their worship has essentially the same substance, however varied may be its forms of expression. The Ten Commandments and Christ's law of love are the universal laws of Christian morals. Now, these are the great verities of the Christian religion. They are vastly more important than those other things
about which the churches of Christendom differ, and concerning which there is strife and discord. The calm and abiding concord of Christendom is vastly more profound than the noisy and superficial discord.

The Christian Church has never altogether lost sight of its ideal, but it has endeavored to realize it in mistaken ways, and has thus erected barriers in the way of Christian Union and has occasioned the development of a number of variations.

I. Divine Right of Church Government.

The first great barrier to Christian Union is the theory of submission to a central ecclesiastical authority claiming divine right of government.

This is the great sin of the Roman Catholic Church, which makes the Pope at Rome, when speaking ex cathedra, the centre of unity and seat of absolute authority to decide all questions of religion, doctrine, and morals. The way to union according to this theory is to dissolve all other Christian churches. All Christians must receive confirmation from Roman Catholic bishops, and so enter the communion of the Roman Catholic Church, and then submit with unflinching allegiance to the authority of the Pope and his bishops. Such a union requires, on the one side, the forfeiture of the right of private judgment and the violation of the liberty of conscience; and on the other side the severance of the union and communion of the believer with his enthroned Saviour and the re-establishment of union and communion through the mediation of the priests, bishops, and Pope. It makes the visible Church in a single one of its historical forms the only means of access to the invisible Church and the presence of the Lord of glory.

Richard Baxter well said:

"This cheating noise and name of Unity hath been the great divider of the Christian world. And under pretence of suppressing heresie and schism, and bringing a blessed peace and harmonie amongst all Christians, the churches have been set all together by the ears, condemning and unchurching one another, and millions have been murthered in the flames, inquisition, and other kinds of death, and those are martyrs with the one part, who are burnt as hereticks by the other; and more millions have been murdered by wars. And hatred and confusion is become the mark and temperament of those who have most loudly cried up Unity and Concord, Order and Peace" (Cure of Church Divisions, 1670, p. 276).

Under such circumstances we ought not to be surprised that the Westminster Confession should give expression to the opinion of the Protestant world in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

"There is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ, nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that antichrist, that man of sin and son
of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called
God" (xv. 6).

The Westminster divines do not here affirm that any particular pope is Antichrist, or that the Roman Catholic Church is Antichristian. Protestant divines have always recognized that the Church of Rome was a true Church, one of the many branches of Christendom. They have ever recognized the validity of her baptism and her ordination. They unite with her in veneration of the noble army of martyrs—pious monks, bishops, archbishops, and popes—that have adorned the history of the Western Church. These are our heritage as well as theirs. The Reformation broke the Western Church into several national Churches. The legitimate heirs of the ancient and mediæval Church are the national Churches of England, Scotland, Holland, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany, no less than the Roman Catholic Church which remained unreformed in the southern countries of Europe.

The Papacy as a hierarchical despotism claiming infallibility and usurping the throne of Jesus Christ is the Antichrist of the Reformers. Whether it be the Antichrist of the Scriptures or not, it is the closest historical approximation to the Antichrist of prophecy that has yet appeared in the world. The Papacy is Antichristian, the great curse of the Christian Church. The Papal system was one of the reasons for the separation of Greek and Roman Christianity into two antagonistic ecclesiastical organizations. It was the great barrier to the reformation of the Latin Church, and when the Protestant Reformation came the authority of the Pope was given to the side of error and sin, and the Reformers were persecuted unto death. As the supremacy of the Pope severed Greek from Roman Christianity, so it made a rupture between the Christianity of the North of Europe and the Christianity of the South of Europe. In more recent times the same baneful influence forced the separation of the Jansenists and the old Catholics. Thus this theory historically has proved to be the mother of discord in Christendom. It is the chief barrier to Christian Union. Until this barrier has been broken down the union of Christendom is impossible. The destruction of Popery is indispensable to the unity of the Church.*

But the Papacy is not the only form of ecclesiastical authority that has produced discord. On the continent of Europe Protestant

* "Neither indeed is there any hope, that ever we shall see a generall peace, for matters of religion, settled in the Christian world, as long as this supercilious Master shall bee suffered to keepe this rule in God's house: however much soever hee bee magnified by his owne disciples, and made the onely foundation upon which the unitie of the Catholick Church dependeth." (Ussher's Brief Declaration, p. 14.)
princes were set up as little popes to lord it over Christ's Church; and in England kings and queens usurped ecclesiastical supremacy; and the ills of the seventeenth century in the Thirty Years' War on the continent, and the civil wars of Great Britain, were largely owing to this cause.

The result of the conflict in Great Britain was the establishment of three rival theories of Church government, each claiming divine right—the Episcopal government in England and Ireland, the Presbyterian government in Scotland, and the Congregational government which was virtually established in New England. Each of these governments was alike intolerant and exclusive. Each of them alike rent the robe of Christ's Church. This should not surprise us, for any ecclesiastical government that usurps divine authority is tyrannical and schismatic from the very nature of the case. It is in itself an usurpation of the crown rights of Jesus Christ.

Calybute Downing, one of the Westminster divines, well said

"that it is very safe, and savours of a prudent and peaceable spirit, not easily to conclude many things in government, jure divino; for as fundamentals in point of belief are few, and fully revealed, and soberly to be held without any supplementive additions; and the admitting of more is the cause of all the mischievous miseries in the church in point of doctrine; so it sets us at a distance from peace, at defiance amongst ourselves; and disableth all accommodation, to fetch downe a government jure divino; yea, produces many hard charges, prejudicing the truth of God; and gives ground plausibly to arrest and attaint religion, for suspicion of disturbance or incroachment, by such forestalling the civil state, and rendering the businesse of reformation in the future impossible" (Considerations toward a peaceable reformation in matters ecclesiastical, submitted to the judicious reader. London, 1641, p. 4).

A scientific study of the sacred Scriptures and the first Christian century has shown that none of these forms of government is of divine right; they all alike are of human origin, and have arisen from historic circumstances and sincere efforts to adapt the teachings of Scripture to these circumstances. It is noteworthy that there is agreement with reference to a single officer—the pastor of the congregation. All Christian churches have pastors, and they cannot do their work without them. Here is the basis for union. It is agreed that he should be a man called of God to his work, and endowed with the gifts and graces that are needed for the exercise of his ministry. It is also agreed that he should be ordained either by the imposition of hands or some suitable ceremony. This presbyter-bishop of the New Testament is found in all ages of the Church and in all lands. Herein is the true historical succession of the ministry, in the unbroken chain of these ordained presbyters. Herein is the worldwide government which is carried on through them. This is the
one form of Church government that bears the marks of catholicity, that is *semper ubique et ab omnibus*.

It matters little comparatively how the royal government of Jesus Christ and his power of the keys is communicated to them, whether directly from the divine Master or mediately through the ordination of a presbytery or of a bishop, an archbishop or a pope, so long as the Lord Jesus Christ, the one king and head of the Church, actually carries on his government through them. We apprehend that the long-suffering Saviour will not deprive his people of the benefits of his reign even if their leaders should make some mistakes in the form of government. This point of agreement in church government should be insisted upon by the churches, whatever they may think of the importance of the other officers in the Church. If all the churches of Christendom would recognize the validity of the ordination of the ministry of the other churches, one of the chief barriers to the concord of Christendom would be removed. They might deem this ordination as irregular and even disorderly, as not conformed to their own doctrine of church government. They might contend vigorously for the superior excellence of their own orders, if they would concede this one point to their fellow-Christians and fellow-ministers, the validity of whose ministry is attested by the Holy Ghost and its fruitfulness in good works.

Apart from this single church officer there is no agreement whatever. The deacon in the prelatical churches is a young man in preparation for the priesthood in a lower order of ministry. In the Reformed churches he is a layman having charge of the poor and of financial affairs. Among the Congregational churches he is a representative of the people and an adviser of the pastor. The deacons of the New Testament have little resemblance with any of these modern deacons.

The Reformed churches have elders who are associated with the pastor in a congregational presbytery which has the government of the congregation. There are elders in the New Testament who constitute a presbytery, but the majority of the elders of the Reformed churches at the present time have little resemblance to them. There was considerable difference of opinion in the Westminster Assembly with regard to this office. Stephen Marshall said in the course of the debate: "If I conceived everyone should be called to subscribe to it or exercise no ministry, I should be loath to give my vote." *

The Westminster divines preferred to call them "other church-governors," and said, "which officers reformed churches commonly

---

* MS. Minutes Westminster Assembly, II., p. 248.
called elders;” but the American Presbyterian Form of Government calls them “ruling elders,” “properly representatives of the people,” and say: “This office has been understood, by a great part of the Protestant Reformed churches, to be designated in the Holy Scriptures by the title of governments.”

The Protestant churches of America have been obliged to introduce the lay element into their congregational government and to give it representation in the higher ecclesiastical courts; and these laymen with their different names have very similar work to that of the Presbyterian elders. The name is less important than the thing. The Presbyterian system seems to us to be the nearest to the New Testament representation and the most efficient and best organized method of lay representation. It might be best to abandon the name ruling elder, which is of questionable origin and propriety, and use some other name that is not associated with historical conflicts. We should be willing to do this if it would advance the cause of Christian Union. It seems to us there would be little difficulty in adjusting the mode of government of the congregations so as to satisfy all reasonable demands.

The chief difficulties arise when we ascend to the Presbyteries, Conventions, Conferences, Associations, and the other general bodies, and ask the question as to their authority. All agree that their authority should be moral and spiritual, but it is in dispute whether it should be legal and imperative as of higher jurisdiction. It has been found necessary in American civil government to protect the liberties of the people in communities and towns, and also in the States, and to limit the jurisdiction of the superior bodies. This matter has been too much neglected in ecclesiastical government. Here is the way to solve not a few of our ecclesiastical controversies. Authority should decrease in extension and increase in intension as we ascend. The congregation with its pastor have certain rights and liberties which should be regarded as sacred, upon which the higher ecclesiastical bodies ought not to encroach. The authority of the higher bodies should be limited, and absolute authority denied. A constitution is a great blessing to any church, for it defines the obligations of the minister and the people, and guarantees them liberty in all else. So the presbytery should have certain rights of control over its own churches into which the synod should not intrude. The synod’s power should suffer still greater limitation. The power of the General Assembly ought to be confined to very few matters, and those of general interest, such as the Constitution of the Church and its general work.

The Congregational churches, with whom the Baptists agree, stand
THE BARRIERS TO CHRISTIAN UNION.

over against the Presbyterian and Episcopal forms of government as represented by the several Presbyterian, Reformed, Lutheran, and Methodist bodies, that hold to the Presbyterian form of government, and the Episcopal Church, which maintains the Episcopal form of government. As regards agreement between the three forms, every effort was put forth for union and concord in the seventeenth century. The long debates in the Westminster Assembly show this. The words of the leading divines on both sides bear witness to it.

Thomas Hill, the Presbyterian, says on the one side:

"There is no such difference, for aught I know, between the sober Independent and moderate Presbyterian, but if things were wisely managed, both might be reconciled; and by the happy union of them both together, the Church of England might be a glorious church, and that without persecuting, banishing, or any such thing, which some mouths are too ful of. I confess it is most desirable that confusion (that many people fear by Independency) might be prevented; and it is likewise desirable that the severity that some others fear, by the rigour of Presbytery might be hindered; therefore let us labour for a prudent Love, and study to advance an happy accommodation (An olive branch of peace and accommodation. Lord Mayor's Sermon, 1645. Printed 1648, p. 38).

So on the other side Jeremiah Burroughs, the Congregationalist, says:

"Why should we not think it possible for us to go along close together in love and peace, though in some things our judgements and practices be apparently different one from another? I will give you who are scholars a sentence to write upon your study doores, as needfull an one in these times as any; it is this: opinionum varietas, et opiniantium unitas non sunt aversarum—Variety of opinions and unity of those that hold them, may stand together. There hath been much ado to get us to agree; we laboured to get our opinions into one, but they will not come together. It may be in our endeavours for agreement we have begun at the wrong end. Let us try what we can do at the other end; it may be we shall have better success there. Let us labour to joyne our hearts to engage our affections one to another: if we cannot be of one mind that we may agree, let us agree that we may be of one mind" (Irenicum to the Lovers of Truth and Peace. London, 1646, p. 255).

And so the Presbyterian ministers of the Provincial Assembly of London adopted the paper entitled Jus divinum ministerii evangelici, and issued it signed by the moderator, assessor, and scribes of the Assembly, in 1653, saying in the Preface:

"A fifth sort are our reverend brethren of New and Old England of the Congregational way, who hold our churches to be true churches, and our ministers true ministers, though they differ from us in some lesser things. We have been necessitated to fall upon some things, wherein they and we disagree, and have represented the reasons of our dissent. But yet we here profess that this disagreement shall not hinder us from any Christian accord with them in affection. That we can willingly write upon our study doors that motto which Mr. Jer Burroughes (who a little before his death did ambitiously endeavour after union amongst brethren, as some of us can testify) persuades all scholars unto, opinionum varietas, et opiniantium unitas non sunt adversarum. And that we shall be willing to entertain any sincere motion (as we have also formerly declared in our printed vindication) that shall farther a happy accommodation between us."
"The last sort are the moderate, godly episcopal men, that hold ordination by Presbyterians to be lawful and valid; that a Bishop and a Presbyter are one and the same order of ministry, that are orthodox in doctrinal truths and yet hold that the government of the Church by a perpetual Moderator is most agreeable to Scripture pattern. Though herein we differ from them, yet we are farre from thinking that this difference should hinder a happy union between them and us. Nay, we crave leave to profess to the world that it will never (as we humbly conceive) be well with England till there be an union endeavoured and effected between all those that are orthodox in doctrine though differing among themselves in some circumstances about Church government."

Richard Baxter led in a great movement for union in the organization of the Worcester Association, in 1653. Similar organizations were made in other counties, such as Westmoreland, Cumberland, Dorsetshire, Wiltshire, Hampshire, and Essex. As Baxter says:

"The main body of our Association were men that thought the Episcopal, Presbyterians, and Independents had each of them some good in which they excelled the other two parties, and each of them some mistakes; and that to select out of all three the best part, and leave the worst, was the most desirable (and ancient) form of government" (Church Concord, Preface. London, 1691).

So again in 1661–62 every effort was put forth for union between the Presbyterian and Episcopal parties. The Presbyterians were willing to accept the plan of Archbishop Ussher to reduce the Episcopate to the form of synodical government. They were willing to use the Book of Common Prayer with the exception of a very few passages and with the omission of a very few ceremonies. As Baxter said:

"Oh, how little would it have cost your churchmen in 1660 and 1661 to have prevented the calamitous and dangerous divisions of this land, and our common dangers thereby, and the hurt that many hundred thousand souls have received by it! And how little would it cost them yet to prevent the continuance of it!" (Penitent Confession, 1691, Preface.)

The Union was prevented in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries partly by political considerations, but chiefly by the theory that there could be no unity except by a submission to one strict form of church government. And so the three forms that were evolved from the religious conflicts of Great Britain have maintained themselves, strengthened their position, and have become unconquerable. What reasonable man can for a moment suppose that Presbyterianism will lose its hold upon Scotland and the North of Ireland, and give way to Episcopacy or Congregationalism, or that it will make any serious encroachments upon England or New England? There is no probability that the Church of England will ever succeed in imposing prelatical Episcopacy upon all the people of England, or will gain the supremacy over the Congregationalism of New England. Congregationalism will never gain much ground from
Presbyterianism in the Middle and Southern States of America. In the Western States the three forms are upon more equal terms. Now that conquest is out of the question, and the reunion of Christendom is impracticable by a strict adherence to any of these forms, it is manifest that there can be no union without mutual recognition, concession, and assimilation. Each form has certain advantages in it and also some disadvantages. That would be the most excellent form of government which would combine the good features and avoid the defects of all.

There has been assimilation in recent times, especially in America. The Congregational churches give more authority to their associations than is known in England. The Presbyterian and Episcopal churches give less authority to their supreme courts than is common in Great Britain. But the difference is still so great that consolidation is out of the question at present. But there is a possibility of union by Federation. It seems to me that there are no sufficient reasons why the Episcopal General Convention, the Congregational General Council, the Baptist General Council, the Methodist Episcopal General Conference, the Presbyterian General Assemblies, and the Reformed General Synods should not all alike send representatives to a General Council of the Church of Christ of America, such a Council having only moral and spiritual authority. It seems to me that there are possibilities of union and co-operation in the general work of the Christian Church in America and in heathen lands that are incalculable in the good that might be produced. There are grand possibilities in the removal of barriers, stumbling-blocks, causes of friction and strife, and in the furtherance of peace, concord, and Christian love.

But what shall we do with the historical episcopate? We answer that the historical episcopate is an ambiguous term. There are many kinds of episcopates in Christian history. Some bishops claim the authority to rule the Church by divine right, some bishops derive their authority from archbishops, and some bishops receive their authority from the Pope. There are also bishops who are superintendents chosen by presbyters, and who have no other authority than that imparted to them by those who have chosen them. There are also presbyterial bishops who exercise all the rights and fulfil all the duties of the Christian ministry. The great difference of opinion that prevails in the Church of Christ on the subject of the historical episcopate is in the matter of order and real seat of authority. Christendom might unite with an ascending series of superintending bishops that would culminate in a universal bishop, provided the pyramid would be willing to rest firmly on its base, the solid order.
of the presbyter bishops of the New Testament and of all history and all churches. But the pyramid will never stand on its apex nor hang suspended in the air supported by any of its upper stages.

We confess to a warm sympathy with those members of the Protestant Episcopal Church who desire to remove the terms Protestant Episcopal from the name of their Church, on the ground that these terms are schismatical. All such terms are from the very nature of the case schismatical. They represent that the churches that bear them are parties or branches of the Church, and not the true and pure Church of Christ.

John Durie recommended as one of the paths to peace and unity "to abolish the names of parties, as Presbyterian, Prelatical, Congregational, etc., and to be called Reformed Christians of England, Scotland, France, and Germany" (Plain Way of Peace and Concord, p. 5. London, 1660).

But the names really correspond with the facts; they express the truth. The evil of schism is in the churches. It will not cure the evil to abolish the names. When the evil of schism has been cured, then the schism and the names will disappear likewise. In the mean while it is far better that the names should remain and express the true state of the case to all earnest souls. They may perhaps sting the conscience and goad the will to earnest action in behalf of peace and unity.

"Why, sirs, have not Independents, Presbyterians, Episcopall, etc., one God, one Christ, one Spirit, one Creed, one Scripture, one hope of everlasting life? Are our disagreements so great that we may not live together in love, and close in fraternal union and amity? Are we not of one Religion? Do we differ in fundamentals or substantials? Will not conscience worry us? Will not posterity curse us, if by our divisions we betray the gospel into the hands of the enemies? And if by our mutual envyings and jealousies and perverse zeal for our several conceits, we should keep open the breach for all heresies and wickednesse to enter, and make a prey of our poor people's souls: Brethren, you see other bonds are loosed, Satan will make his advantage of these daies of licentiousnesse; let us straiten the bond of Christian unity and love, and help each other against the powers of hell, and joyne our forces against our common enemy" (Christian Concord, or the Agreement of the Associated Pastors and Churches of Worcestershire, with Richard Baxter's Explication and Defence of it, and his Exhortation to Unity, p. 96. London, 1653).

II. SUBSCRIPTION TO ELABORATE CREEDS.

Another great barrier to the reunion of Christendom is subscription to elaborate Creeds. This is the great sin of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. Every one of these creeds has separated subscribers from non-subscribers and occasioned the organization of dissenting churches. Lutherans, Calvinists, and Arminians, and sections of the same, have been separated into different ecclesiastical
organizations. These doctrinal divisions have done more than anything else to weaken Protestantism and stay its progress in Europe. These controversies that centre about the creeds of the seventeenth century still continue, but they are not so violent as they used to be. Each of the varieties of Protestantism has won its right to exist and to be recognized in the common family. The differences cannot be solved by conquest, but only by some higher knowledge and better adjustment of the problems through an advance in theological conception and definition. The question now forces itself upon earnest men whether these differences justify ecclesiastical separation, and whether they may not be left to battle their own way to success or defeat without the help of ecclesiastical fences and traditional prejudices.

"It is not the part of wise Divines, so to swell and increase the number of Fundamental points, that all Christians, as well learned, as unlearned, should be wholly uncertain, and ignorant, what, and of what kind those be which are adjudged properly to belong to the Foundation of Religion, & Catholike Faith. But if we should let the matter run on so long, till all the controverted Problemes betwixt Protestants bee counted Fundamental, long since they have grown to too numerous, hereafter they may grow to an almost numberlesse multitude. For this solemne course and practice is observed of many, that what they themselves have added to any Fundamental axiom, as over weight, and what they believe to be a consequence of the same, this they presently require of all, to be counted in the number of Fundamentalls. If we grant to any particular Churches, or to their Doctors, this power of creating and multiplying Fundamentals; all hope is past of the certainty of the Catholike Faith, all hope is gone of the Brotherly communon of the Catholike Church" (Bishop Davenant, An Exhortation to the restoring of Brotherly Communion betwixt the Protestant Churches, pp. 121, 122. London, 1641).

The differences between the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Arminians have nothing to do with the essentials of Protestantism. All alike hold that the Word of God is the only infallible rule of faith and practice; that men are justified by faith in Jesus Christ and not by works of righteousness or ceremonies; that good works are the fruits of justifying faith and give assurance of acceptance with God; and, above all, that salvation is of the divine grace through Jesus Christ, the only mediator and redeemer. These are the great verities of Protestantism, and they are vastly more important than those peculiar doctrines that distinguish the Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Arminian systems. After many efforts, renewed from time to time from the Reformation until the present century, the Reformed and Lutheran Churches have combined in the Evangelical Church of Prussia and other German States. This reunion has proved a great success, and has been fruitful for good. There is no sufficient reason why the Lutheran and Reformed churches should not unite in America. This will be accomplished when they are prepared to
recognize that the few points of difference between them are de-
batable and tolerable, rising like mountain peaks above the great
ranges of doctrine in which there is entire concord.

The Reformed Church was broken up into two great parties calling
themselves Calvinists and Arminians. Holland was the centre of
this unhappy conflict, but it extended over entire Europe and dis-
tracted all the national Churches of the Reformed faith. The
Articles of the Synod of Dort were adopted to exclude Arminians
from orthodoxy, but they have never given satisfaction to the inter-
mediate party, which has now become the most numerous of all.
Arminianism was really a reaction from the supralapsarian Calvin-
ism. It would have been simple justice to cut them both off at the
same time. But it is one of the singularities of religious history
that narrow views of sacred things and extreme rigidity of doctrine
succeed in maintaining their errors within the orthodox fold, while
errors of a more generous type are often cast out. Calvinism cannot
be identified with the Five Points of the Synod of Dort. The con-
flict with Arminianism developed a conflict between the scholastic
type of Calvinism and the milder Calvinism of the school of Saumur
of France, the Federalists of Holland, and the evangelical Puritan-
ism of Calamy, Baxter, and their associates in Great Britain. These
strifes were renewed in America in the eighteenth century, and re-
sulted in the separation of the so-called old school and new school.
Really and historically the one was as old as the other.

The two parties united in happy union in our great American
Presbyterian Church and made it broader, more catholic, and fruitful.
But this reunion ought to be the beginning and not the end of the re-
union of Presbyterian churches. There are no such doctrinal differ-
ences in the other branches of Presbyterianism as to justify separa-
tion. The Southern Presbyterian Church as a body seems to repre-
sent the scholastic type of Calvinism, the Cumberland Presbyterian
Church the semi-Arminianism of the milder type of Calvinism.
There is a natural tendency of the sterner Calvinists to affiliate with
the former and of the milder Calvinists to prefer the latter. Any
scheme of Reunion that would prove successful and give satisfaction
to all parties should embrace both these Churches. It seems clear
that the revision of the Westminster Confession by the Cumberland
Presbyterian Church was due in part to a misapprehension of its
historic sense and in part to a narrow interpretation of the terms of
subscription, the blame for which rests as much upon the intolerant
Presbytery that threw them off at the beginning of their history as
upon those who were compelled to beat their own way and maintain
their position in the midst of not a few difficulties. When they tell
us that they can adopt the Westminster Confession as it is, with the addition of the Declaratory Act of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, they virtually take the position that they can subscribe to the Westminster standards as they are, in the sense of the American adopting act and of the regular terms of subscription. We do not hesitate to say that there are no legitimate doctrinal barriers in the way of the reunion of the entire Presbyterian family in America on the Westminster standards, pure and simple. It ill becomes those who insist upon strict subscription and an interpretation of the standards in accordance with the terms of the scholastic Calvinism, to neglect the historical study of the Confessions as they are now doing, and have been doing throughout the century. The historical interpretation of our Standards makes it clear that all parties alike need the full benefit of the generous terms of subscription that our fathers framed so wisely and so well.

The largest ecclesiastical body in the United States is the Methodist Episcopal Church, which is distinguished by its Arminian type of doctrine. It is fortunate that the Presbyterian churches do not bear the name of Calvin, and that the Methodist Episcopal Church does not bear the name of Arminius. Indeed, the types of doctrine in these churches do not agree altogether with the names of these two great Protestant divines. The doctrinal system of the Westminster symbols is not the scholastic type of Calvinism of the Swiss or Dutch divines. It is not the type of the French school of Saumur or of the Federalists of Holland. It is the distinct Puritan type of Calvinism. And so the doctrinal system of the Methodist Episcopal Church as presented in its revised edition of the XXXIX Articles and the Teachings of John Wesley is not the Arminianism of Holland, but is a semi-Arminianism of the English type. There is more of English Puritanism in the Methodist Episcopal Church in its practical religious life than there is of Arminianism in its creed. The English Puritanism that is common to these two great branches of the Church of Christ is much more important than the doctrinal variations. In my judgment these differences do not justify separation.

"The evangelical Arminianism of Methodism has very close and vital affinities with the Puritan evangelical type of Calvinism; and it is for the interest of the Christian cause to emphasize this fact. So, at least, thought one of the ablest and most sagacious Calvinistic theologians our country has produced. I refer to the late Henry Boynton Smith. In a letter written in January, 1871, and addressed to a distinguished Methodist clergyman, he says:

"What is it that keeps Methodists and Presbyterians apart? Is it anything essential—to the church, or even to its well-being? For one, I do not think that it is. Your so-called "Arminianism" being of grace, and not of nature, is in harmony with our sym-
bols. It is a wide outlook which looks to an ecclesiastical union of Methodists and Presbyterians, but I am convinced that it is vital for both, and for Protestantism and for Christianity vs. Romanism in this country; and that it is desirable per se.

"I am also persuaded that our differences are merely intellectual (metaphysical), and not moral or spiritual; in short, formal and not material. As to polity, too, so far as the Scriptures go, there is no essential difference between us. Your "bishops" I do not object to, but rather like, and our "elders" I think you would like, on due acquaintance. As to Christian work, where you are strong we are weak; but your local preachers and class-leaders, are they really anything more than our "elders"—lay elders—under another name?" (Presbyterian Review, July, 1883, p. 563.)

With this opinion I entirely concur. I do not underrate the importance of the points of difference. I should not be willing to yield any single position of historic Calvinism or to depart from any part of the Puritan type of doctrine. But I see no reason why Calvinism could not maintain itself in the same ecclesiastical organization with Arminianism. We see that it does, in fact, vindicate its right to live and grow in the Protestant Episcopal Church and in Congregational churches.

I have such confidence in the principles of Calvinism that I believe they would have a better chance of overcoming Arminianism in a free and chivalrous contest in the same ecclesiastical organization than they now have when shut off by themselves and carefully excluded from the largest body of Christians in America. We doubt whether it is practicable or advisable at the present time to consolidate the Presbyterian and the Methodist families, but there might be a Federation and an Alliance for union and co-operation in the general work of the Church of Christ.

The doctrinal differences are not so great as some imagine. No one will suspect Bishop Davenant of any unfaithfulness to Calvinistic principles. He represented the Church of England at the Synod of Dort and concurred in its decisions; and yet he treats of the matters in dispute in the following generous way:

"It appeared lately in the conference of Lipsigk that there is an agreement in all these Points. If there be any other things remaining they are rather controversies about words than about matter; rather discords about subtle speculations than fundamental articles. Such are those which are disputed betwixt Schoolmen, of the Signification of the very words, namely, Predestination and Reprobation; of the Imaginary order of Priority, and Posteriority betwixt the Eternal Acts of Predestinating and Fore-knowing of the unsearchable manner of Divine working about all humane actions, whether good or bad, of the necessitie, or contingency of all things, which from Eternity were predestinated, or fore-knowne of God. In such perplexed controversies it cannot bee, but contradictions must arise, oftentimes betwixt Disputants: yet brotherly Concord may be made up and maintained betwixt the churches themselves, as anciently it was preserved betwixt the African and Latine churches, their Doctors in the meantime being of different opinions in the weighty Question of Baptizing of Heretics. To close up all in a word: those churches (falsey so called) may be forsaken, which possesse not the Foundation of the Apostles preaching: But true Churches ought not to be deserted
and pluckt asunder from others for the errors of particular Doctors, because the Faith of Churches leanes not upon the names or writings of single Persons (in l. c., p. 151, 152).

The theological systems of the three great branches of Protestantism have been elaborated by a priori logic and by deduction from premises that are not sufficiently accurate and comprehensive. They have all of them departed a long distance from the Scriptures and the Creeds of the Reformation. It has been found necessary in recent times to distinguish between the theology of the Bible and the theology of the schools, between the doctrines of the Confessions of Faith and the doctrines of the theologians. There are now three distinct theological disciplines that have to do with Christian doctrine—Biblical Theology, Symbolics, and Dogmatics. These do not by any means correspond. Protestantism has fallen into a grave error in its doctrinal development. It has substituted Protestant scholasticism for mediaeval scholasticism, and Protestant Tradition for Roman Catholic Tradition. It is necessary to overcome this error of the Protestant divines. As Davenant says:

"I conceive it no great difference whether we place unwritten traditions in joint commission with the holy Scriptures, or whether we enforce our controversies on all churches to be knowne and beleived, under the same necessity of salvation, with the solid and manifest doctrine of the Gospel" (in l. c., p. 3).

"It would apply some plaister to this soare, if the Divines of both sides would remember, that although all the Articles of the Catholique Faith are plaine, and perspicuous (as written in God's Word with capitall Letters, so that he that runneth may read them), yet what thence is extracted by the chymistry of man's understanding are divers, and of different kinds, most of them so obscure that they escapethe eyes of the most sharpe-sighted Divines. We must therefore confidently leane with all our weight on what the Scriptures have decided; but not lay so much stresse on the consequences of our own deduction. Luther said well out of Ambrose, Away with Logicians, where we must beleive Fishermen. For in the mysteries of Faith the majesty of the matter will not bee pent within the narrow roome of Reason, nor come under the roof of Syllogismes; wherefore the same Luther wisely admonisbeth us, that in matters surmounting the capacity of Humane Reason, we beware of Etymologies, Analogies, Consequences, and Examples" (Davenant, in l. c., pp. 6, 7).

Another sin of Protestantism as well as of Romanism has been the abuse of the sacred Scriptures by improper methods of interpretation. The grammatical and the historical sense has been neglected. The variety of type of the Biblical authors has been ignored. The Scriptures have been too often interpreted to conform to the Rule of Faith. The Rule of Faith to the Reformers and the Westminster divines was in the plain passages of Scripture, but the Reformed system of doctrine of the scholastic type was often substituted for the Scriptural rule of faith, and thus the Scriptures were forced to correspond with the scholastic system. It matters little if Scriptures can be adduced in favor of these elaborations of doctrine unless these
passages speak in such plain language that they convince mankind in general. As Herbert Palmer, one of the Westminster divines, says: "When we have to do with Scriptures that are ambiguous, then those things produced should not be with too much rigor urged upon other men;"* and Thomas Gataker, another Westminster divine, tersely says: "Fundamental points ly in a narrow compass." †

And Richard Baxter says:

"And indeed he knoweth not man, who knoweth not that universal unity and concord will never be had upon the terms of many, dark, uncertain, humane, or unnecessary things, but only on the terms of things, few, sure, plain, divine, and necessary." ‡

The names Lutheran, Reformed, and Arminian are the badges of distinct systems of Protestant faith; they will continue so to be. It is fortunate that Arminian is not a name given to any particular Church. The names Reformed and Lutheran smack of the old controversies; they have been rightly abandoned by the United Church of Germany, and the name Evangelical has taken their place. It would be a happy thing for American Christianity if these names could be abandoned here likewise. The names will remain, however, so long as the differences remain. We have to learn the great principle of Unity in Variety. That Variety we find in the sacred Scriptures in the four great types of doctrine represented by James, Peter, Paul, and John. We find them in the Old Testament in the Levitical writers, on the one hand, and the prophets on the other, to which we must add as separate types the authors of the Wisdom Literature and of the Psalter. We find these types in all the great religions of the world; they recur in Christian history; they are rooted in the different temperaments of mankind; they manifest themselves in those great types that dominate all thinking, that we call Mysticism, Rationalism, Scholasticism, and Utilitarianism. Accordingly the Church of Christ, like the Scriptures, should comprehend them all and not exclude any of them. There can be no true unity that does not spring from this diversity. The one Church of Christ is vastly more comprehensive than any one denomination. If the visible Church is to be one, the pathway to unity is in the recognition of the necessity and the great advantage of comprehending the types in one broad, catholic Church of Christ.

"And brotherly unity is the genuine and rare fruit of brotherly love, by every Christian to be endeavoured to the utmost extent of gospell possibility. Nothing in our own spirits of corrupt distemper, carnall ends, or undue prejudice should hinder it; nothing

* Westminster Assembly Minutes, II., f. 252.
† Ibid., f. 248.
‡ True and Only Way of Concord, p. 143. London, 1680.
III. Uniformity of Worship.

The third great barrier to Christian Union is the insisting upon uniformity of worship. This is a special sin of the Church of England. The British prelates pressed this theory of Christian Union to an extreme, and persecuted the Puritans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The result of this persecution was civil war and the organization of the three national Churches of Great Britain, with a large number of dissenting churches.

Uniformity of worship has proved the fruitful source of discord. The points of difference between the Puritans and the Prelatists at the start were not great. The separation greatly increased them. The churches that sprang into existence as the result of the civil wars are farther apart in worship than they were when they were all nestled in the bosom of the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland. It would have cost the British bishops very little concession to have satisfied the Puritans at the close of the sixteenth century, or even at the Savoy Conference in 1660–61. The Puritans were as much opposed to separation as the Episcopal party and as earnest in their desire for a national establishment. But the bishops refused to make concessions, and insisted upon uniformity and the persecution of non-conformists. The distraction in religious affairs in British and American Church History are in great part due to this fatal blunder. There can be no such thing as uniformity of worship. The separating of non-conforming churches did not lead to uniformity, even in the Church of England itself.

Francis Makemie well puts it at the close of the seventeenth century:

"Therefore let us still value and esteem unity in Doctrine and Worship, and the greater and more weighty matters, preferring it before an exact and accurate uniformity, in every Punctilio of Circumstance and Ceremony, which no nation hath hitherto attained, the Church of England not excepted; for what uniformity is between your Cathedral and Parochial worship? between such churches as have Organs and those that want them? between such as Sing, or Chant the Service, and such as do not? between such as read the whole Service, and others that Minse it, and read but a part? between those that begin with a free Prayer, and such as do not? And in the same Congregations, what Uniformity is between such as use Responses, and such as do not? between such as Bow to the East, or the Altar, and such as do not? between such as bow the knee, and those that only bow the head, at the Name or Word, Jesus? What uniformity—between such
as Sing Psalms, and most that do not? And I find many of the Sons of the church, break uniformity, and Canons, as well as their neighbours: what uniformity act or Common Prayer, allows any to begin with a Prayer of their own, as the greatest and best have done, though others call it a Geneva trick? What uniformity act enjoins Organs, and Singing Boyes: and where is bowing to the East and Altar, with all other Church Honours, commanded? What warrants the use of the publick Form for private Baptism? why is the burial Service read over any Dissenters that are all excommunicated by your Canons?

"Let me humbly and earnestly, with all Submission, address the conformable clergy—in this Island, to instruct their People, that they and we profess the same Christian and Protestant Religion, only with some alterations in external Ceremonies and circumstances; that we may unite in affection and strength, against the common enemy of our Reformation, and concur in the great work of the Gospel, for the manifestation of God's glory, and the Conviction, Conversion, and Salvation of Souls in this Island, instructing such as are Ignorant, in the principal and great things of Religion, promoting virtue and true holiness, and Preaching down and reproving all Atheism, irreligion, and profanity, sealing and confirming all by an universal Copy, pattern and example, of a holy, and ministerial life and Conversation" (Truths in a True Light, pp. 21, 22. Edin., 1699).

There are at the present time as great differences in the worship of the Church of England and her daughters. With the optional parts of the liturgy, the additions that may be made especially in ceremonial, in robes, in decorations, in altar furniture, and in gestures of bodily worship, uniformity of worship is certainly out of the question. The Reformed churches and the Methodist Episcopal Church have liturgical forms for sacramental services, and some of the Reformed churches have optional liturgies for the whole or part of the Sabbath services. The German Reformed and the Lutheran Churches have liturgical books. But there is no uniformity of worship in any of these Churches. The Presbyterian churches have Directories of Worship all based on the Westminster Directory, but these have been changed from time to time. They prescribe the order of services, but leave the use of forms of prayer entirely optional. There is an entire lack of uniformity of worship in the Presbyterian churches. The Congregational and the Baptist churches have still greater diversity in modes and forms of worship. There is greater diversity of worship in the Christian Church now than at any previous period of its history. There is every reason to suppose that this will increase rather than diminish. There is no hope whatever of uniformity of worship.

And yet there is essential unity even in the midst of all this diversity. The five great parts of worship are found in all churches—namely, Common Prayer, Sacred Song, Reading of the Sacred Scriptures, the Sermon, and the Apostolic Benediction. The differences in the selections of the themes of sermons and in the passages of Scripture to be read do not destroy the essential unity in these two parts of public worship. Some Presbyterian churches
have insisted upon uniformity in sacred song no less than the Church of England has insisted upon uniformity in common prayer. We have to thank the Episcopal churches for our freedom in praise no less than the Presbyterian churches for our freedom in prayer. Happily there are at present few Presbyterians who insist upon limiting our praise to the Psalm-book and Paraphrases, and the bare, cold worship without organs. It is a singularity of several branches of the Presbyterian Church that they insist upon excluding Christian hymns and musical instruments from divine worship. So far as musical instruments are concerned, these form so important a part in the worship of the ancient temple and in the great assembly of the Church in heaven revealed to us by the Apocalypse that one is amazed that any one should refuse to employ them. In our opinion, the use of musical instruments in the worship of God will be increased in the future. The drift is so strong in that direction that it is impossible to resist it. But if any congregation should prefer to worship without musical instruments they should be allowed to do so. Only they ought not to commit the sin of rending the Church of Christ on such unscriptural and unreasonable grounds as these. The use of Christian hymns began in the Scriptures of the New Testament. There are several hymns in the New Testament writings; so all ages of the Church have produced hymns of beauty and of power. There is no sufficient reason why these should not be used in divine worship. There is no prohibition of their use in Scripture. There is no prescription of the use of the Psalter in public worship either in the Old or the New Testament. The Psalter was a book for the synagogue rather than the temple. If any congregation should desire to limit itself to the Book of Psalms and paraphrases of Scripture we have no objection, so long as it does not obtrude this opinion upon other congregations. It is a sin and a shame to rend the Church of Christ for such a trifle as this.

In sacred song uniformity has entirely disappeared. Private selections of hymns have taken the place of the official hymn-books of the churches, and these are used often without regard to denomination. A considerable number of Christian hymns are used in all Protestant churches that do not limit themselves to the Psalms and Paraphrases. It would be easy to select a hymn-book of considerable size, even from their own books, that would satisfy all of these churches. The freedom here has wrought greater unity than we find in those parts of worship where there is less liberty.

There is greater difficulty in the common prayer. The excellence of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England is generally recognized. But considerable alterations will need to be made
in order to make it acceptable to American Christians in general; and there must be the recognition of the liberty of free prayer in a part of the service. I would prefer the use of a prayer-book for all the parts of Common Prayer at the Sabbath services, with the exception of a brief free prayer at the close of the services expressing the special needs of the congregation and the day. But the mass of American Christians would not at present go so far as this. It should also be said that there are other admirable prayer-books besides that of the Church of England. The prayer-books of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches have also their advantages; and there is no good reason why we should be confined to forms of prayer of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, or those of earlier date. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries ought to be able to enrich a prayer-book that would adequately express the worship of our day. The churches that use prayer-books should direct their energies to enriching them by removing obsolete parts and adding more appropriate prayers from other service books and modern divines. If an effort were to be made to enrich the prayer-books similar to that which has been so successful in the hymn-books, it would meet with equal if not greater success. It is probable that unofficial hands will have to lead in this noble work.

On the other hand, those churches that have no prayer-books should overcome their prejudices against their use. These prejudices are largely traditional, and are owing to the fact that our Puritan fathers had to battle for liberty against uniformity. But it is a happy circumstance that the Presbyterian churches have not taken any official action against the use of liturgical books. Any Presbyterian congregation has the right at the present time to use a book of prayer if it see fit, and some of them avail themselves of the privilege in whole or in part. There are great advantages in written forms of prayer. As Richard Baxter says:

"The famouset Divines in the Church of God, even Luther, Zwinglius, Melancthon, Calvin, Perkins, Sibbs, and abundance of non-conformists of greatest name in England, did ordinarily use a form of prayer of their own, before their Sermons in the Pulpit, and some of them in their families too. Now, these men did it not through idleness or through temporizing, but because some of them found it best for the people, to have oft the same words; and some of them found such a weakness of memory, that they judged it the best improvement of their own gifts" (Cure of Church Divisions, p. 183. London, 1670).

We hail with gratitude to God the noble declaration of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church when they say

"that in all things of human ordering or human choice relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, this Church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own."
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We sincerely hope that other Christian Churches are ready to meet them in the same generous spirit.

The greatest difficulty remains in the celebration of the Sacraments. Many of the Baptist churches hold that immersion is the only mode of baptism. This implies that all who have not been baptized by immersion are not members of the visible Church, and that therefore there are no other visible churches than these Baptist churches. The doctrine of close communion is a necessary consequence of this doctrine, for no one can rightly partake of the Lord's Supper who has not been baptized. We apprehend that our Baptist brethren do not realize how intolerant this position really is. It is more intolerant than the doctrine that refuses to recognize the validity of the ordination of the ministry of the non-Episcopal churches, for this doctrine only denies the ministry of these churches, while it recognizes their baptism as valid, and that they and their people are members of the visible Church of Christ. But the Baptist doctrine with one blow destroys the ministry and the church rights of all the people of other Christian churches by refusing to recognize the validity of their baptism.

It should be admitted, after all the scholarly discussion upon the subject of the primitive mode of baptism, seeing that the Baptist churches are in a small minority of the Christian world on this question, that baptism by immersion is not distinctly commanded in the New Testament, and that it is by no means clear that it was the mode by which our Saviour and his apostles were baptized. Our Baptist brethren have not been able to convince the ministry of the other Christian churches, who are equally competent with themselves to interpret the Bible and the first Christian century. I do not believe that Christ and his apostles were baptized by immersion. I should not hesitate to follow any evidence that could be produced to prove the Baptist position, for even then it would by no means follow that the mode of baptism should be by immersion throughout all time. It seems to me that the Baptists sin as greatly in their insistence upon uniformity in the ceremony of baptism as Episcopalians in insisting upon uniformity in certain ceremonies of worship, and some Presbyterians in insisting upon uniformity in Psalm-singing. We would suggest that if the Baptists could affirm from their point of view that the baptism celebrated in other Christian churches is valid as to its essence, owing to the application of water in the name of the blessed Trinity, though irregular in form, the barrier would be removed. Other churches recognize baptism by immersion as valid, and the ceremony might by common consent be left to the conscientious preferences of congregations, or even individuals.
The most serious difficulty is in the observance of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Here diversity of doctrine determines to some extent the ceremonies that are used. The objections that the Puritans made against the ceremony of kneeling have been removed by time. No one would impute to the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church any adoration of the Bread and the Wine such as was made by Crypto-Roman Catholics in the Church of England in the sixteenth century. The Presbyterian method of sitting at tables has been generally abandoned on account of its great inconvenience. The present fashion of sitting in pews during the celebration is a modern practice that has little to recommend it other than convenience. It might be well to return to the more reverent postures of kneeling or standing in the solemn partaking of the Lord's Supper. In the Protestant Episcopal Church the ceremonies allow people of widely different views to partake of the same bread and wine in the same service. In the Evangelical churches of Germany, Lutheran and Reformed partake of the same bread and the same cup. In the Presbyterian and Congregational churches Calvinists and Zwinglians sit down together at the communion feast. I see no sufficient reason why all of these may not hold their variant opinions and yet join in the Supper of the Lord.

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. x. 16, 17).

John Bergius, the court preacher of Brandenburg, well said:

"Whosoever hath this gracious help and presence of Christ ever before his eyes, will easily forget that unprofitable strife of words about such a presence of an invisible, untouchable, incomprehensible Body, wherein he cannot comfort himself, and whereof he cannot tell what effect or benefit it hath; and will tremble again and be ashamed before the face of Christ, to condemn or to cast out of Christ's Communion those that heartily believe and set before their eyes onely his helpfull and gracious effectual presence. Whereas on the contrary it may be justly questioned of many, that quarrel so much of Christ's corporal being on earth, whether they truly believe that he is in Heaven, and doth see and hear and will judge such unchristian contentions" (The Pearle of Peace and Concord, p. 47. London, 1655).

IV. TRADITIONALISM.

Traditionalism is another great barrier in the way of Christian Union. There are in human nature two forces which, like action and reaction, tend to keep everything in stability—the conservative and the progressive. Either of these apart is hurtful. Their combination is a great excellence. There can be no improvement without progress. There can be no genuine improvement unless the
previous attainments have been conserved. Conservatism is healthful, but it too often reacts until it becomes mere Traditionalism. This is at present one of the chief barriers to the reunion of Christendom.

The United States of America contain the largest body of Christians in any nation under heaven and the greatest variety of ecclesiastical organizations, representing nearly all the national Churches of Europe and the bodies of Christians dissenting from them. These all have entire freedom to develop in accordance with their own internal principles and organic life. Here the greatest variation in Christendom is to be found. Here, then, the problem of Christian Union must be worked out. The great variations in Christianity that exist side by side in America at the present time are, with few exceptions, not of American origin and growth. The variations simply reflect the differences that exist in the different nations of Europe. They were brought to America by the colonists from Europe. In many respects these American daughters are nearer to the mother Churches of Europe of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than the daughters that have remained in the original homestead. There is a tenacious adherence in America to opinions and customs that are regarded in Europe as antiquated. This traditionalism is quite remarkable in view of the great progress that has been made by the Churches of the same faith and order in Europe.

If one should compare the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland with the United Presbyterian Church of America no one unfamiliar with the history could suppose that the American Church was the daughter. The American Church adheres to certain customs and doctrines that have long been abandoned by the mother Church, and it is in these things alone that there is any ground for separation from the body of American Presbyterians.

The Reformed Church exists in two bodies—the German and the Dutch. The differences are chiefly in traditional usages, and these are the only things that stand in the way of the combination of them both with the Presbyterians in one organism. There was a splendid opportunity of combining British Presbyterianism with the Reformed churches in 1744 under the advice of the Synods of North and South Holland. It failed, owing to the strife in the Presbyterian Church and the division of the American Presbyterians into two rival synods.* Another effort was made soon after the American Revolution, but it did not succeed. It is desirable that these efforts should be speedily

* See my American Presbyterianism, pp. 284 seq. New York, 1885.
renewed. There is no doctrinal difficulty in the way, because the Heidelberg Catechism and the Westminster Confession are, as we understand, acceptable to both bodies. The liturgical books of the Reformed churches are optional books, and would continue so to be in the united Church. The differences in usage in other respects are in the government and worship of the congregations. Here each congregation would be left free to follow its own customs. I can see no difficulties that might not be readily removed by a conference of divines who really desire the consummation of organic union.

The American churches are in general over-conservative in matters of doctrine and worship, but in their forms of government and practical religion they have adapted themselves to the altered conditions and circumstances of the new world. They collectively bear the marks of the American national life. They have common features that distinguish them from the churches of Europe, that make them all constituent parts of American Christianity.

In some respects the American churches are traditional and in other respects radical when compared with the churches of Europe. There is thus an internal inconsistency that will erelong produce great changes that may be little less than revolutionary. The practical side of Christianity will erelong overcome the traditionalism in doctrine and worship, and reconstruct on broader lines and in more comprehensive schemes; so that there will be better correspondence between the doctrines and worship and the real American Christian life. These traditions are those of foreign national Churches that grew up out of historical circumstances that have long past and that are no longer appropriate to the circumstances of a new age and a new continent. Other traditions originated in old conflicts that have passed away, leaving no other trace behind than those old banners and battle-flags, with which it seems necessary that the denominations should parade once in a while. There are new issues and burning questions of the time that demand attention and that will exhaust the energies of all earnest men. These issues and these questions interest all the American churches alike. In the consideration of them the parties leap the barriers of denominations and divide on other lines of fracture. These are the questions that will reconstruct the churches in the future. They will destroy the old divisions and make new ones. It is greatly to be desired that the new divisions will not find it necessary to express themselves in sectarian churches.

The great questions that loom up before us are the mediatorial reign of Christ and the Second Advent; Repentance, Sanctification, and a Holy Life; the middle state between death and the Resurrec-
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tion, and the everlasting Future; Christian Union and Holy Love.
The creeds of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries point in this
direction, but they do not solve these problems of theology. The
Confessions are many of them in advance of the Churches that
adhere to them. The Churches ought to be in advance of the Con-
fessions.

It is thought by some that a simple creed is the pathway to Chris-
tian Union. I shall not deny that such a creed is desirable. It
might be well to formulate the consensus of Christendom, the con-
sensus of Protestantism, the consensus of the Reformed Churches,
and so on. This will all be accomplished in good time by the
science of Symbolics. These are historical questions for scholarly
investigation, and not for official action of Christian Churches.

But theological progress is not in the direction of simplicity, but
of variety and complicity. We cannot retreat in theological defi-
nition; we must advance in this scientific age. The Apostles'Creed represents the simple faith of the early Church; we cannot
ignore Christian history and go back to that. The Ante-Nicene
Church was crude in its theology; we cannot fall back on the
Nicene Creed for a reunion of Christendom. The inheritance of
the Truth is more precious than external Unity. Progress is to be
made by more exact definitions in theological science, not by
suppression of truth and ignoring of differences in order to a super-
ficial and transient harmony. Every Christian should follow the
guidance of the divine Spirit into all truth, and regard every truth,
even the smallest, as unspeakably precious; and yet we should have
in mind the proportions of truth, and bear on our banner the golden
words of Rupertus Meldenius, In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis
libertas, in utrisque caritas.

The chief reason of differences is imperfect knowledge and an
indisposition to follow the truth sincerely and wholly without regard
to consequences. A higher knowledge will in time remove the
differences. The barriers seem impassable when we keep in the low
levels of doctrine and life. When we climb the mountains and
ascend the peaks of Christianity the fences and hedges of human
conceits are the merest trifles.

Unity is to be attained by conserving all that is good in the past
achievements of the Church, and by advancing to still higher attain-
ments. The Holy Spirit will guide the Church and the Christian
scholar in the present and the future as he has in the past. The
Creeds give us what has already been attained. We should take our
stand on them and build higher. Such progress is possible only by
research, discussion, and conflict. The more conflict the better.
Battle for the truth is infinitely better than stagnation in error. Every error should be slain as soon as possible. If it be our error we should be the most anxious to get rid of it. Error is our greatest foe. Truth is the most precious possession. There can be no unity save in the truth, and no perfect unity save in the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Let us unite in the truth already gained and agree to contend in Christian love and chivalry for the truth that has not yet been sufficiently determined, having faith that in due time the Divine Spirit will make all things clear to us.

Christian churches should go right on in the lines drawn by their own history and their own symbols; this will in the end lead to greater heights, on which there will be concord. Imperfect statements will be corrected by progress. All forms of error will disappear before the breath of truth. We are not to tear down what has cost our fathers so much. We are rather to strengthen the foundations and buttress the buildings as we build higher. Let the light shine, higher and higher, the clear, bright light of day. Truth fears no light. Light chases error away. True orthodoxy seeks the full blaze of the noontide sun. In the light of such a day the Unity of Christendom will be gained.

There is a great movement in the direction of alliances of kindred churches. The Alliance of Reformed churches holding the Presbyterian system embraces all Churches of the Reformed faith and Presbyterian order throughout the world. They unite on the consensus of the Reformed Confessions. An effort was made to define that consensus, but it was clearly seen that such an effort must lead to the construction of a new creed, and would develop differences and conflicts. It was accordingly abandoned. It seems better to leave the work of defining that consensus to historians.

The Episcopal and Methodist Episcopal churches have also constituted world-wide Alliances in a similar way. This is a great step in the direction of Christian Union. But a greater one should soon be made in an alliance of these Alliances in a more general council. The Evangelical Alliance has done a good work in the past, but it is a voluntary association of kindred spirits, and is in no sense a representative body. There can be no effective Alliance unless that Alliance represents the Churches that constitute it; in an assembly of delegates chosen for conference. The times are well-nigh ripe for such an Alliance of the Churches in America; and we may anticipate, at no very great distance in the future, that there will be such an Alliance for the Christian world. The work of Christian Union is a work which begins in every family, and which rises in greater and greater sweeps of influence until it covers the nation and the Chris-
tian world and is absorbed in the innumerable company about the throne of God and the Lamb.

"All this while hitherto we have striven (long enough) in words one against another for Religion with much zeale and heat; it is now high time for us to begin once of all sides to contend and strive about this; who can most manifest and exercise his Religion and Faith with the best Christian workes and that towards his Adversaries, that one might say to another in the words of the Apostle James, Shew me thy Faith by thy workes, and I will shew thee my Faith by my workes (James ii. 18). This would indeed be the most effectual Demonstration, which every plain Christian would be able to see, touch, and feel, who otherwise cannot so well satisfie himself with a naked Demonstration of bare words and arguments (John Bergius, The Pearle of Peace and Concord, p. 180. London, 1655).

C. A. BRIGGS.

New York City.
VI.

NECESSITY AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

HAVING discussed, in a previous article, the nature and design of the Lord's Supper, we proceed, in accordance with our plan, to consider the necessity for the observance of this holy sacrament and the method of its administration.

All Christian obedience, through the gracious reward inseparably connected with it, rises above the hard lines of duty into the broader and brighter sphere of privilege. We are not under law, but under grace; not that grace abolishes law, but elevates the keeping of it by new motives and the consecration of higher ends. And this is especially true of positive as distinguished from moral precepts. A divine commandment which translates the law written on the heart, and appeals for its sanctions to the approval of reason, the monitions of conscience, and the natural consequences by which sin becomes its own punishment, is not more sacred to a true believer than one which has no basis in the constitution of our nature, but is designed by sovereign grace to express the love and pledge the favor of God. Such precepts, just because their only sanctions are the divine authority and the divine blessing which accompanies obedience, appeal with peculiar force to the "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" and in keeping them there is great reward. The observance of the Lord's Supper rests upon higher grounds than the keeping of the Ten Commandments, even as Christian consciousness is something higher and better than natural conscience. The sweet and tender this do, uttered in the upper chamber by the lips that tasted death for us, is not less but more imperative than the awful "thou shalt not" thundered from Sinai. The authority for both is the same. But the impress of love on the one is stronger than the seal of justice on the other. Whatever force there may be in the scholastic distinction between the necessity of precept and the necessity of means, we cannot admit that it has any application to the observance of the Lord's Supper; and above all we cannot agree with the Zwinglian writers on the subject who insist that our obligation to eat
this bread and drink this cup rests simply on the necessity of precept. If we must choose between the two, our views of the nature and design of the Sacrament would compel us to base its observance rather on the necessity of means. But we do not admit in this case the distinction between these two grounds of obligation; we insist equally upon both. The Saviour's precept implies and includes the promise of special blessing upon a loving obedience, and Christian experience confirms the promise. The Lord's Supper is necessary both because Christ has commanded its observance, and because he designed it to be and our experience proves that it is an effectual means of salvation. It is true, indeed, that God is not limited in the dispensation of his grace by any outward form, even when it bears the seal of his own authority. But we are limited in the rightful expectation of his blessing by His positive appointments. If He has promised certain things upon specific conditions, it is not faith, it is presumption to look for the fulfilment of the promise while the prescribed conditions are neglected and despised. It is nothing to the purpose to say, what no one doubts, that God can bestow upon us all that is signified and sealed in the Lord's Supper without the use of the Sacrament, or that if we have no opportunity to observe it He will not withhold his blessing on that account. Such hypothetical reasoning has no appropriateness to the question we are considering. In regard to the Sacraments, there is no comparison between our case and that of the penitent thief. We are not, and are not likely to be, cast away upon a desert island where there are no ordained minister and no Christian ordinances. The table of the Lord is spread before us by the same providence that has brought us within the hearing of the gospel, and the voice of Christ comes ringing down to our ears through all the Christian ages, saying, without qualification or exception, this do. To insist that this divine precept is not binding because it is simply positive, and without confirmation in our natural reason and conscience; or to argue from the admitted assumption that this appointed means of grace is not so essential to salvation that God cannot dispense with it, that therefore it is not necessary for our salvation, and we may observe or neglect it according to our own will; is to set up our private judgment against Christ's holy ordinance, and to impeach his wisdom in its institution. With the same propriety the blind man might have refused to be anointed with clay or to go wash in the pool of Siloam. Such reasoning belongs to the same school of philosophy with the contention of Naaman the leper about the waters of Jordan. Theologians who hold to the divine appointment and obligation of the Sacrament, and yet insist without qualification that all it represents, seals, and
conveys may be obtained without its use—or, in other words, that believers feed on Christ at his table in no other sense and to no greater degree than they feed on him in any and every exercise of faith—are utterly inconsistent with themselves. Their word is yea and nay; they scatter with one hand what they have carefully gathered with the other. As an eminent but not singular example of this inconsistency we may cite Dr. Cunningham. He maintains that "the Sacraments Christ has instituted are of imperative obligation, and that it is a duty incumbent upon men to observe them when the means and opportunity of doing so are afforded them; so that it is sinful to disregard them." * Now, to a mind unwarped by theological controversy it would seem that any one who lives in open disregard of an "imperative obligation," in habitual neglect of an "incumbent duty," in a voluntary and "sinful" refusal to use what Christ has appointed as an effectual means of salvation, must be destitute of the simplest elements of Christian character, and that the hope of salvation which may be cherished under such conditions must be, to say the least of it, without any well-grounded assurance. And yet Dr. Cunningham goes on to insist that the observance of the Sacrament, while it is necessary ex necessitate precepti, is "not necessary ex necessitate medii, or in such a sense that the mere fact of men not having actually observed them either produces or proves the non-possession of spiritual blessings—either excludes men from heaven or affords evidence that they will not in point of fact be admitted there." † As this is a fair statement of the views of those Calvinistic divines who incline to Zwinglian views of the Sacraments, and think with Dr. Cunningham that "the effort to bring out something like a real influence exerted by Christ's human nature upon the souls of believers in connection with the Lord's Supper is perhaps the greatest blot in the history of Calvin's labors as a public instructor;" ‡ it may be well for us to analyze and catechise its meaning. The question before us has no reference to those who are either ignorant of the Lord's Supper or have no opportunity to partake of it. It refers only to those whose observance of the Sacrament is admitted to be an "imperative obligation" and "an incumbent duty," and whose neglect of it is declared to be "sinful." What does the author mean by "the mere fact of men not having actually observed" the Sacraments? Is there any conceivable observance which is not actual? And the same question may be asked in regard to the author's expression

† Ibid. p. 236.
‡ Ibid. p. 240.
about being admitted to heaven *in point of fact*. We can conceive
of no admission to Heaven which is not a fact; and to our mind the
suggestion of any such qualification, whether in regard to the observ-
ance of the Sacraments or to the enjoyment of the salvation they
signify and seal, only darkens counsel by words without knowledge.
We pass from this to a more serious question: Can any one live in
the sinful neglect of an incumbent duty and an imperative obliga-
tion, without thereby giving explicit evidence as to the possession
or non-possession of spiritual blessings? Even if we admit the
scholastic distinction between the necessity of precept and the neces-
sity of means, does not the one bind us equally with the other and
present as complete a test of Christian character? Can any one
have the evidence or enjoy the fruit of regeneration by the Spirit
and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ without at the same time having
respect to all God's commandments; and upon what principle do we
exclude from the application of this universal rule that command
which comes to us from the lips of Christ on the eve of the cruci-
fixion? But there is yet another question which goes still nearer to
the core of this discussion. What ground is there for denying that
the Lord's Supper is necessary *ex necessitate medii* as well as *ex
necessitate precepti*? Did not Christ institute it and make the
obligation to observe it universal and perpetual upon all who hear
the gospel? And is it a mere arbitrary appointment, without any
gracious design or any vital connection with our salvation? The
whole contention on the part of those who would confine the neces-
sity of the Sacrament simply to the precept of Christ seems to us
more Protestant than Christian, more rationalistic than Scriptural.
It is the falsehood of one extreme leaning backward from another.
It grows out of a morbid fear lest the doctrine of the Lord's Supper
should lead to what are opprobriously called "Sacramentarian
views." It is inconsistent with the plain teaching of the confession
and catechisms of the Presbyterian Church.

All the Reformed confessions teach that the Lord's Supper is an
*effectual means* of grace and salvation. It is one "of those institu-
tions which God has ordained to be the ordinary channels of grace
—*i.e.*, of the supernatural influences of the Holy Ghost to the souls
of men." * As means and channels of grace the Sacraments stand
on precisely the same footing with the preaching of the gospel.
"This do in remembrance of me" was spoken by the same lips that
said, "Go preach my gospel." The two precepts rest on the same
authority and are designed to accomplish the same end.

---

"Let this," says Calvin, "be a fixed point, that the office of the Sacraments differs not from the office of the Word of God; and this is to hold forth and offer Christ to us, and in him the treasures of heavenly grace." * This "fixed point" is abundantly sustained by all the Reformed confessions and catechisms. The Word and the Sacraments are in the same line, they are means of grace in the same sense and in the same way.† In this all the Reformed theologians are agreed; and some who are called High Churchmen claim no more.‡ Why, then, should we hesitate to affirm that the Lord's Supper has the same necessity of means with the Word of God? §

It is nothing to the purpose to insist that the Scriptures speak more frequently of the importance of the Word than of the Sacraments. One such precept as "go, teach all nations, baptizing them," "this do in remembrance of me," is just as binding as a thousand would be. The hearing and believing of the Word is thus joined with baptism, and the remembrance of Christ is joined with the observance of the Lord's Supper; and that not by an arbitrary command, but by a gracious appointment which makes the Sacraments equally with the Word instruments, channels, and effectual means of grace. The Sacraments and the Word have this in common, that they are exhibitions and conveyances of saving truth. Jesus Christ "is set forth evidently crucified among you," in the one as in the other. "A sacrament," says Augustin, "is a visible Word, because it presents the promise of God as in a picture." Calvin calls it "a living sermon." If God has chosen two methods of revealing his truth, one by articulate words and the other by sensible signs, what right have we to say that we will hear the one and not observe the other? And how vain is the attempt to justify our self-will and vindicate our private judgment against God's express appointment by insisting without any warrant of Scripture that the one method

---

* Institute, vol. 3, p. 503.
† "The efficacy of the Sacraments depends upon their divine appointment as means and channels of grace. They were not devised by man as suitable in themselves to produce a moral impression; but they were appointed by God, and we are commanded to use them as means of grace" (Dr. A. A. Hodge, Commentary on the Confession, p. 454).
‡ "The Lord's Supper is an actual channel or vehicle of grace to the soul. It stands in this respect on the same footing with prayer, reading the Scriptures, public worship, and sermons. Only we believe that it takes precedence of them all as means of a higher grace and the instrument of a closer communion with God" (Goulburn's Personal Religion, p. 18).
§ "Many who do not scruple to speak of the Word of God as a means through which a direct and supernatural power is exerted on the hearts of men, refuse to say the same of the Sacraments because they think it is not warranted in the Scripture, and tends to superstition" (Candlish on the Sacraments, p. 39).
of revelation is more efficacious and important than the other? It is no answer to this question to say that the Sacrament has no inherent efficacy, that the grace exhibited in it is not tied to it, and that God can give all that is represented, sealed, and applied in the Lord's Supper without the use of it. All this is equally true of the Word. There is no divine power in the syllables or sound of the gospel, any more than there is in the bread and wine of the communion. The truth, indeed, of which the words of the gospel are the outward signs, has a natural adaptation to the mind, as the light has to the eye; and this also is equally true of the visible Word in the Sacrament. But the mind of man in his fallen and unregenerate state is blind to things of the Spirit of God, however they are exhibited. The gospel, whether in the Word or the Sacraments, is the wisdom and power of God to salvation, only by the blessing of Christ and the working of his Spirit in them who by faith receive it. God can give all that is represented in the Lord's Supper without the use of it, and he can give all that is revealed and promised in the gospel without the hearing of it. He does this, as we all believe, in the case of all who die in infancy; and how much further the abounding of his grace may reach we are not competent to affirm.*

The question is not what he can do, but what we have reason to believe he will do in behalf of those who have the opportunity both to hear his Word and to observe his Sacramental ordinances. It seems to us the height of presumption to teach men that they may wilfully neglect and set aside any of the means of grace he has chosen and consecrated, and yet hope for the benefits of his salvation. If Christ has said, "Do this in remembrance of me," when we do it not we refuse to remember him in the way of his appointment, and forfeit our claim to the blessing virtually promised in the very words of the institution. For the design of the Lord's Supper is not to secure our remembrance of him, but assuming that remembrance, this holy ordinance is embalmed in it, to bring us into vital connection with his remembrance of us, and so to make our remembrance effectual, through this appointed means, for our salvation.† If the Lord's Supper is not only a sign, but the seal of Christ and his benefits, when we refuse to receive and apply it, we presump-

* "We know from the Bible itself that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God is accepted of him (Acts x. 34, 35). No one doubts that it is in the power of God to call whom he pleases from among the heathen and to reveal to them enough truth to secure their salvation" (Hodge's Theology, vol. 3, p. 476).

† The Eucharist is not the remembrance; it is a memorial into the remembrance. To refuse to keep it seems to me equivalent to the refusal to acknowledge him in the definite way he has marked out" (Marshall Lang's Last Supper of our Lord, p. 90).
tuously rest our hopes of salvation upon an unsealed title which has not been ratified and delivered to us according to the law of the new covenant.

The argument so far rests upon the concession that the Lord’s Supper as a means of grace is co-ordinate with the Word not only as to its authority and as to the substance of the truth which it embodies and reveals, but also as to the degree and extent of the blessing which it confers—in other words, that the believer in the right use of this ordinance receives nothing which he does not receive elsewhere and in the use of other means of grace, nothing which God’s people did not receive and enjoy before the Lord’s Supper was instituted. We cannot agree to this position, notwithstanding the great names by which it is supported. We cannot receive it as a true exposition of the Scripture nor of our doctrinal standards. There is a vagueness and ambiguity in the language used in the discussion of this point. It is admitted, of course, by all, that Christ is from everlasting to everlasting the Word of God, the truth, the source of all grace, the end of all divine ordinances, and of all divine worship and life. In regard, therefore, to their origin, their efficacy, and their ultimate design, all revelations and means of grace are the same. Hence our Confession of Faith* declares that “the Sacraments of the Old Testament in regard to the spiritual things thereby signified and exhibited were for substance the same with those of the New”—that is to say, the substance of all Sacraments and of all means of grace is Christ and his benefits. But it does not follow from this that all Sacraments and all means of grace are designed to convey the knowledge and grace of Christ with equal fulness. If the Old Testament believer received in the passover all that the Christian receives in the Lord’s Supper, in what sense did “grace and truth come by Jesus Christ,” in what sense is “the least in the kingdom of heaven greater than John the Baptist,” in what sense is this kingdom of heaven or gospel dispensation “a new covenant, established upon better promises than the Old,” and why did Christ say, “This cup is the New Testament, in my blood”? Calvin’s authority has been unfairly quoted on this point. He does indeed affirm repeatedly that the Christian receives nothing in the Lord’s Supper but what the Old Testament believer received in the Passover. But these statements refer to the substance and end of both Sacraments, which is Christ; and are fully explained in other passages, in which he sets forth the difference between them. “While the former shadowed forth a

* Conf. ch. xxvii. p. 5.
promised Christ, the latter bears testimony to him as already come and manifested. . . . There is no doubt that if you compare time with time, the grace of the Spirit is now more abundantly displayed. . . . Both testify that the paternal kindness of God and the grace of the Spirit are offered in Christ, but ours more clearly and splendidly. In both there is an exhibition of Christ, but in ours it is more full and complete." *

As to the position that the Christian receives nothing in the Lord's Supper which he does not receive in the use of other means of grace, it may well be asked, Why, then, was this sacrament instituted? If as a means of grace it has no efficacy peculiar to itself, it is a superfluous form. If Christ does not fulfil in it some special promise, he holds out to us a mere empty sign. In answer to this it is usual to fall back upon the necessity of the precept, and to say that it is not for us to question the wisdom of Christ's appointments; he has commanded us to do this, and whether we receive any special benefit from it or not, it is our duty to obey. All this is true. But on what a low, hard level does it put the Holy Sacrament, and what a sapless and perfunctory service must its observance be to all who hold such views. If the obligation to keep this feast rests simply on the necessity of precept, it stands alone among all the divine ordinances; it is an exception among the means of grace. All Christians admit that we obtain by prayer blessings that are secured in no other way, that we receive through the reading and hearing of the Word what comes to us through no other channel; and yet theologians insist, and make it a test of orthodoxy, that we are to expect nothing from the Sacrament but what can be obtained without the use of it—nothing, at least, beyond the satisfaction of knowing that we are doing what Christ has told us to do. The same men do not reason thus in regard to any other divine institution. Paul does not reason thus in regard to the Lord's Supper. He does not rest the obligation for its observance upon the simple necessity of precept, when, applying to it language which


Dr. Marshall Lang presents the same truth with great force and beauty. "It is through the contrast between the law and the gospel, by indicating wherein the verities of the gospel excel the ordinances of the law and have the efficacy which is wanting in 'the worldly sanctuary,' that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews sets forth 'the great salvation,' the 'more perfect tabernacle,' of which Christ is high priest forever. Let us not regard the Lord's Supper as only the passover under another form. As the husk protects the seed until it is sufficiently matured to burst into life, so the economy of the law protected the truth of spiritual services 'until the time of reformation.' There was a reformation of all things in Christ. This feast is a new thing" (The Last Supper of our Lord, p. 84).
is nowhere used in Scripture in regard to prayer, or hearing the gospel, or to any other means of grace, he declares that the use of this consecrated bread and wine is the participation of the body and blood of Christ. We agree, therefore, with John Owen that "herein is a peculiar participation of Christ, such as there is in no other ordinance whatever;" * and with Bruce that the sacrament is appointed "that we may get a better grip of Christ than we get in the simple word; that we may have him more fully in our souls, that he may make the better residence in us." †

Is the Lord's Supper a converting ordinance? Protestants generally answer this question very emphatically in the negative. And the answer is unquestionably correct, provided the question be understood to refer to the distinctive design of the Lord's Supper, and if the word conversion is used in its restricted popular sense, to signify the beginning of the divine life in the soul. The Sacrament is intended primarily and chiefly for the comfort, the nourishment, and the confirmation of believers, for their growth in grace and the enlargement of their personal interest in Christ. But in a too rigid and exclusive insistence upon this distinctive design we think many Protestant writers have overlooked the influences which belong to it in common with all the means of grace, and so have unconsciously limited the grace of God itself. (1) Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as a converting ordinance. The preaching of the gospel never converted a soul. It is simply the instrument by which the Holy Spirit brings men to Christ and to salvation. In this respect all the means of grace stand on a common level.

(2) The Lord's Supper is in itself, and aside from any teaching which may accompany the administration of it, a graphic and powerful preaching of the gospel. Have not many spectators of that solemn ceremony been convinced of sin and turned to Christ by this visible embodiment of the truth, and was it not to them a converting ordinance? We admit and insist that no one ought to come to the Lord's table without faith and a full purpose of heart to lead a life of faith and holy obedience. But suppose some mistaken soul, through no contempt or carelessness, should come to the Lord's table, may not Christ, in the exercise of the same infinite mercy which instituted the Supper, make it the means of self-revelation and of conscious conversion to that soul? Or suppose some child of the covenant, without ever having been conscious of enmity or opposition to God, and therefore having no experience of conversion, and yet being free from scandal and having knowledge

* Owen's Works, 8, 560. † Quoted in Candlish on the Sacraments.
to discern the Lord's body, desires to acknowledge and confirm the obligation of its baptism by coming to the Lord's table—must such a little one be kept back by the syllogism, Except ye be converted ye cannot see the kingdom of God; the Lord's Supper is not a converting ordinance; therefore these little ones which believe in him must wait till they are converted.

(3) The truth is, that the word *conversion* in its popular use in our churches has assumed a narrow, technical sense for which there is no warrant in the Scriptures nor in our doctrinal standards. The word is not used in our confession or catechisms. In the Scripture it is not applied exclusively to the beginning of a Christian life, but to any turning of the soul from sin to God. A Christian may and must be converted, a hundred times, after the manner of Peter, to whom Christ said, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when *thou art converted* strengthen thy brethren." In this Scriptural sense the Lord's Supper is pre-eminently a converting ordinance. Its very design is to nourish and renew our Christian life, to turn us more and more from self and sin to Christ and to holiness.*

In our judgment it is a far greater injury to Christ and to the souls of men to prevent a true believer, however feeble and imperfect, from coming to the Lord's table, than by a mistaken judgment to admit one who has not true faith. It is better to have a mill-stone hanged about our neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea than to put a stumbling-block in the way of Christ's little ones. The "fencing of the tables" as practised in many churches is a human addition to the divine ordinances. It is doubtful whether it ever excluded a hypocrite; it has certainly kept back many a weak and timid Christian. It is to be feared that many have come short of eternal life who, had they been received into the bosom of the Church and enjoyed its fostering and guardian care, might have been saved. It is a fearful thing to refuse to any sinner who sincerely desires to use them any of the means of grace and salvation which Christ has appointed. Upon the whole subject of the conditions and rights of church-membership Dr. Charles Hodge has conferred a great and lasting benefit on all denominations of Christians, and especially on Presbyterians. He has demonstrated that nothing should be made a term of communion which is not declared in Scrip-

* * "The Sacraments come after the Word. They are fitted for cherishing and increasing the life of faith when it has already begun, but not for imparting it where it has not been before. They may indeed sometimes be the means of conversion; but they are not in their distinctive nature adapted for that. Hence the Word for the world, the Sacraments for the Church" (Candlish on the Sacraments, p. 42).
ture to be a term of salvation; that all who make a credible profession of faith in Christ—*i.e.*, a profession which *may* be believed, are entitled to be regarded as members of the visible Church; that the Church does not consist exclusively of communicants, but includes all who, having been baptized, have not forfeited their membership by scandalous living nor by any act of Church discipline; that baptized infants are professing Christians and members of the visible Church in the same sense that their parents are; and that we are bound to admit to the Lord's table all members of the visible Church who express an intelligent desire to partake of it. The application of these simple principles would sweep away at once many of the bars by which that table is "fenced," and most of the covenants by which individual ministers and churches have supplemented God's covenant of grace and salvation. The enforcement of the adoption of the Confession of Faith as a condition of membership in the Presbyterian Church and of admission to the Holy Communion has no warrant in our standards nor in the Word of God; and the same may be said of most of the extemporized and mutilated confessions which individual ministers and churches have substituted for it. Many ministers have felt this so profoundly that they have abolished the custom of a public confession on the part of baptized persons coming to the Lord's table. This, we think, is going to the other extreme. Such a confession is manifestly appropriate in the case of adults coming into the Church by baptism. It seems to be equally so in the case of those who have been baptized in infancy and come in years of discretion to ratify their baptism and claim their birthright privileges. In the latter case a public confession is simply an act of Confirmation, according to the early practice of all the Reformed churches. The Presbyterian Church greatly needs, and we trust will one day have, a uniform and authoritative Liturgy for this important service; so that all things may be done decently and in order, and the Church, in this solemn transaction, may teach a form of sound words rather than the rambling effusions of individual ministers.

Such a Form should state clearly what is required of those who would come to the Lord's table. It would thus serve as a guide to self-examination. It would counteract the widespread but false and unscriptural notions about worthy and unworthy communicants. The preparation for the Holy Supper sought for under such notions serves no other purpose than to harass and torture miserable consciences. It defeats its own end. It throws a dark shadow over the blessed Supper, and excludes Christ from the hearts of communicants by centering their thought upon themselves. The remedy for
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all this gloom and dreadfulness is to be found not only in right instruction beforehand, but in the conduct of the Supper itself according to its nature and design. It is not a fast nor a funeral, but a feast in God's banqueting-house under his banner of love, a feast of all that is life-giving in the person of Christ and all that is cheering and delightful in the gospel of his grace. There is no damnation in it, and no more danger in its use than there is in any other means of grace. It is not the crucifixion again, either of the Saviour or of his disciples. Its design is to turn our sorrow into joy, and fill us with all the fulness of God. Its associations are not merely with "that dark and doleful night" when the Son of man was betrayed, but rather with the glory which followed and swallowed up his sufferings. He does not say, Do this in remembrance of my death, but in remembrance of me. We come to this feast not to eat of a dead sacrifice, but to receive and feed upon Him "who liveth and was dead and is alive forevermore." For the Sacrament signifies and effects our communion with Christ in his person, in his offices, and in all their precious fruits. It is on our part a eucharistic sacrifice, an oblation of all possible praise and thanksgiving. And so, as Calvin says, the Lord's Supper is medicine to the sick, comfort to the sinner, bounty to the poor; while to the righteous and the rich, if any such could be found, it would be of no value.* How beautiful is the prayer of the Episcopal Liturgy:

"We do not presume to come to this table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy table. But thou art the same Lord whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body and our souls washed through his most precious blood, that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us."

Our blessed Lord has given no specific instructions as to the forms and ceremonies to be used in the administration of his Holy Supper. "This do" has reference simply to the eating and drinking of bread and wine in remembrance of him. The time of the day or of the year when this is to be done, the dress and posture and words of the administrator, and the bodily attitude of the communicants are left to the decision of Christian discretion, according to the principle laid down in the Confession of Faith.†

It was undoubtedly the practice of the Church in the days of the

* Institutes, 2, 598.
† "There are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence" (Conf., ch. i. 6).
apostles and for a long time after to celebrate the Lord's Supper on every Lord's day, and frequently on other occasions. "To break bread" was one chief object in the assembling of Christians. In the church at Jerusalem, in the new joy and sweet fellowship which followed the Pentecost, it was a daily observance. Such frequent communion is generally regarded by Presbyterians as a fruit and evidence of "Ritualism." Yet Calvin maintains that once a week is not too often to observe the Sacrament, and he condemns a yearly interval in the severest terms.*

Kneeling in the reception of the sacred elements, as practised in the Episcopal and Methodist churches, is certainly as appropriate and as nearly conformed to the reclining posture of Christ and the apostles at the first Supper, as the sitting attitude observed by Presbyterians. The prejudice that it involves a superstitious reverence and is a mark of Popery is neither intelligent nor just to those who practise it.

Although we do not recognize the administrator of the Lord's Supper as a priest in any other sense than as a divinely appointed representative of the royal priesthood of believers, we hold strenuously to the doctrine of our Confession, that "neither Sacrament is to be administered except by a minister of the Word lawfully ordained." We adhere as earnestly as the Roman Catholic or Episcopal Church to the necessity and validity of Ordination; and believe as firmly as they do that every minister lawfully ordained is an ambassador for Christ, a steward of the mysteries of God, as truly as the apostles were. We believe in a divinely appointed succession, not of apostles, but from the apostles. This always has been and still is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church.

While we believe that everything in the administration of the Lord's Supper not prescribed by the precept and example of Christ and his apostles is left to the decision of Christian liberty, and desire to cultivate the broadest and tenderest charity toward all Christians with whom we differ in the exercise of that liberty, we feel bound to observe and defend whatever Christ and his apostles have enjoined upon us; and this applies especially to the elements the Saviour chose and consecrated as the symbols of his body and blood. Aside altogether from their natural suitableness for the purpose, "the giving and receiving of bread and wine according to Christ's appoint-

* "The Sacrament might be celebrated in the most becoming manner if it were dispensed to the church very frequently, at least once a week. . . . Most assuredly the custom which prescribes communion once a year is an invention of the devil, by what instrumentality soever it may have been introduced." (Institutes, 2, 600-602).
ment." * is essential to the celebration of the Sacrament. His death cannot be shewed forth according to his appointment, nor can we be made partakers of his body and blood by the Sacramental use of anything but bread and wine. It is the bread which we break that is the communion of the body of Christ and the cup of blessing which we bless which is the communion of the blood of Christ. But suppose Christians are placed in circumstances in which bread cannot be obtained; may they not substitute for it some other article of food, such as flesh or fruit? Most assuredly not. Christ took bread and brake it, and gave to his disciples, and said, This do in remembrance of me. If bread cannot be procured, we are precluded by divine providence from the use of the Sacrament, and surely the Saviour will not hold us responsible for the failure, nor withhold his grace from us on that account. The use of bread in the communion is precisely analogous to the use of water in baptism. We cannot baptize a man with milk or with sand; for, "except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Better to remain unbaptized than under the plea of necessity to attempt to amend Christ's positive institutions. The obligation to observe the Sacrament ceases when divine providence renders it impossible, and God's grace is not so tied to the outward ordinance that He cannot separate them. What is true of bread in the Holy Communion is equally true of wine. That "the cup" and "the fruit of the vine" mean wine, and nothing else, no candid reader of the New Testament would ever question, if it were not necessary to do so in order to maintain a foregone conclusion. And what is wine? Let us answer in the sober words of Dr. Hodge.

"By wine as prescribed to be used in this ordinance is to be understood ' the juice of the grape ' and the juice of the grape in that state which was and is in common use, and in the state in which it was known as wine. The wine of the Bible was a manufactured article. It was not the juice of the grape as it exists in the fruit, but that juice submitted to such a process of fermentation as secured its preservation, and gave it the qualities ascribed to it in the Scriptures. That οἴνος in the Bible when unqualified by such words as new and sweet † means the fermented juice of the grape is hardly an open question. It has never been questioned in the church, if we except a few Christians of the present day. . . . Those in the early church whose zeal for Temperance led them to exclude wine from the Lord's Table were consistent enough to substitute water. They not only abstained from the use of wine and denounced as improbos aique impios those who drank it, but they also repudiated animal food and marriage, regarding the devil as their author. They soon disappeared from history. The plain mean-

* Shorter Cat. p. 96.
† It is evident from Acts ii. 13 that even the new wine would intoxicate when used to excess. "These men are full of new wine." "These are not drunken as ye suppose." The new wine was the wine of the last vintage, which at the time of the Pentecost was six months old.
The theory that there are two kinds of wine spoken of in the New Testament, one fermented, and therefore intoxicating, and the other unfermented and unintoxicating, and that Christ made at the marriage in Cana and used in the institution of the Lord's Supper only the unfermented kind, is a mere figment of a zealous imagination. It has no basis in history, nor in classic literature, nor in Biblical exegesis. It rests entirely upon antecedent grounds. It assumes that "the known character of Jesus is a sufficient guarantee that he did not furnish a promiscuous gathering of men and women at Cana with an unlimited quantity of a liquid on which such of them as were disposed could get drunk." * This is precisely the old Manichean argument for dualism in creation. The character of a good God is a sufficient guarantee that he would not fill the world with things which men can so readily abuse to their own destruction. Therefore the material universe is the work not of God, but of the devil. The argument is just as valid in its broader application as when it is applied to wine. It can be applied to the interpretation of the New Testament only by doing open violence to the plain meaning of its words. Even an ordinary reader of the English Bible, if free from prejudice, must see that what John the Baptist abstained from and the Son of Man came drinking, so that they slanderously called him a wine-bibber—i.e., a drunkard (Matt. xi. 19); what the desecrators of the Lord's Supper at Corinth abused till they were "drunken;" what Paul recommended Timothy to take a little of and forbade bishops to use in excess (1 Tim. iii. 3), was not unfermented grape juice as harmless as water, but something that might be lawfully and beneficially used, but at the same time was liable to be abused. It was this drink thus capable of being both used and abused that Christ chose to be the symbol of his blood. We know what "the cup" in the celebration of the Passover contained as certainly as we can know anything pertaining to the history of the past. We know that "the fruit of the vine" was a proverbial name for wine in common use. It is mere trifling and evasion to insist that because it is not called wine we have no proof that it was wine which the Saviour blessed and gave to his disciples.

But we are not left to the plain meaning of the Scripture on this question. The whole subject has been thoroughly and exhaustively discussed by men whose temperance in all things admits of no suspicion, and whose scholarship is as great as their reverence for the

* Dr. Willis Beecher in Presbyterian Review, April, 1882, p. 316.
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Word of God. Dr. John Maclean, in the Princeton Review of April and October, 1841, and Dr. Lyman Atwater, in the same Review for October, 1871, and January, 1872, have demonstrated that the two-wine theory is utterly without warrant in Scripture or in classic literature. Dr. Dunlop Moore, in his articles published in the Presbyterian Review, with great wealth of learning and admirable simplicity and directness of statement, has proved conclusively that the two-wine theory has been sustained on the part of its ablest advocates by a perversion of facts and an incorrect quotation of authorities, which nothing can account for but the blinding influence of religious fanaticism.* If any further demonstration on the subject is needed it may be found in two articles by the Rev. Dr. Edward H. Jewett published in the Church Review for April and July of 1885, and since republished in pamphlet form. By an array of evidence historical and critical, Scriptural and classic, which is conclusive and overwhelming, Dr. Jewett shows that unfermented wine is as downright nonsense, according to the immemorial use of language, as dry water or unelectric lightning; at the same time he adds largely to the proof by which the leading advocates of the two-wine theory are convicted either of gross ignorance or wilful dishonesty. And yet temperance societies claiming to be Christian, in which ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church are recognized leaders, continue to publish and circulate the books which

* Dr. Willis J. Beecher undertakes to answer Dr. Moore in the Presbyterian Review of April, 1882. But he begs the whole question at issue by appealing to the "known character of Jesus as a sufficient guarantee" that he would not do what the gospel record, as understood by Christian commentators of all ages, plainly declares he did; and by constantly using the terms "fermented wine" and "unfermented wine" as though the distinction were admitted. He thus holds up to ridicule what he calls "the eagerness with which those who insist that alcohol is essential in celebrating the Lord's Supper seize upon Paul's language in 1 Cor. xi. 20, 21. It is the comfort of their hearts. They return to it again and again, like a child to its mother's lap. When they once get it distinctly into their mind that nowhere else in all the Bible is there a sign of the recognition of alcohol in the Eucharist, they flee to this text as a strong refuge. Dr. Moore cites it half a dozen times in his two articles. In its strength, as we have seen, he accuses those who omit the alcohol of a violation of His solemn command. Paul rebuked the Corinthians for getting drunk when they did not eat the Lord's Supper. Does it not follow by irresistible inference that when they did eat it they used a wine capable of making them drunk? Who, then, in all ages shall dare be so wicked as to use at the Lord's table a beverage incapable of making them drunk" (p. 322)?

This is a sorry sort of wit; of course it does not pretend to be an argument. Its misrepresentation of others is sad enough; but its twisting of Paul's words, "this is not to eat the Lord's Supper," into the implication that the drunkenness for which he rebukes the Corinthians did not take place at the celebration of the Sacrament, looks to us like a shocking perversion of Scripture. Of course the author does not see it in that light; the "unfermented wine" has gone to his head.
have thus been convicted of misrepresentation and falsehood as faithful expositions of Bible temperance. The General Assembly is continually memorialized and the Church constantly agitated by movements to abolish the fermented juice of the grape from the Lord's table. Many churches, without waiting for any ecclesiastical authority, have substituted something that is not wine for that which Christ appointed to be the emblem of his blood. Meantime those who utterly disapprove of the movement, and could never be a party to the irreverent juggling with our Saviour's words and acts by which it is sustained, are for the most part silent, or utter only a timid and qualified protest against it. The open issue cannot be much longer avoided. No more serious question presses to-day upon the heart and conscience of our ministers, and no more threatening danger overshadows the future peace of the Church. Our young pastors are met by this question at the threshold of their ministry, and not a few are overawed by the ignorant and intolerant zeal of those they are appointed to instruct. We know of more than one minister who has been rejected for adhering to the teaching of our standards on this subject, and of others who have done violence to their own conscientious convictions by sanctioning in public what in private they could not defend. We undertake to judge no man's motives. We do not accuse of sacrilege those who presume to alter the Holy Sacrament which Christ has instituted. We do not charge blasphemy upon those who sustain this attempt by arguments which are inconsistent with the recognition of His divine wisdom and love. We acknowledge that the motive determines in God's sight the moral character of the action. At the same time we insist that good intentions are no sufficient vindication of bad actions. The attempt to be wise above what is written, and more holy and benevolent in our example than Christ was, must always end injuriously to ourselves and to others. To affirm, as some do, that he did not know all the consequences of using wine at his table, as they now appear to us, is an impeachment of his divine wisdom. On the other hand, to maintain that he did know, but was less careful than we are to avoid these alleged evil consequences, is equally an impeachment of his divine love.*

The idea of abolishing the use of wine in the Lord's Supper in order to remove temptation out of the way of the weak (even if we

---

* * "His omniscient eye must have taken in all possible contingencies in each age and generation until his final advent in judgment; and to suppose that he neglected any necessary safeguard, either in his sacramental appointments or in the example of his daily life, is to make an arrogant and impious reflection upon his boundless wisdom, mercy, and beneficence" (Dr. Jewett on Communion Wine, p. 60).
admit the exaggerated statements of the danger it involves, which
we utterly deny) is contrary to God's uniform method in the dis-
cipline of his people. He does not remove temptation out of our
way; but surrounding us on every hand with that which may be
abused, he strengthens us to use it lawfully, that in our own char-
acter and experience we may inherit the blessedness of the man who
endureth temptation. The ascetic maxim, "Touch not, taste not,
handle not," which is so often quoted * as a motto of Bible tem-
perance, is condemned and rejected by the apostle as a doctrine
and commandment of men (Col. ii. 21).† The substitution of some-
thing else for wine in the Lord's Supper under the plea of removing
temptation from the weak destroys the typical significance of the cup
of blessing, as the emblem of joy, as an illustration of the manner
in which Christ's blood was pressed out by his sacrificial agony, and
as a fulfilment of the evangelical prophecy, "In this mountain shall
the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast
of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the
lees well refined" (Isa. xxv. 6). Whether this prophecy refers
specifically to the Lord's Supper or not, it certainly applies to and
includes this holy Sacrament, and no ingenuity of interpretation can
so torture "wine on the lees well refined," which God makes the
symbol of all gospel blessings, as to make it mean unfermented
grape juice.

The identification of the attempt to amend Christ's holy Sacra-
ment with the cause of temperance, while it explains the fact that
so many Christian people refuse to co-operate with it under its pres-
ent leadership, goes very far in accounting for its want of success.

"No wonder that their reform has been so greatly a failure; for the pleasure of Him
whose blessing alone can make efforts at good efficient must be withheld from measures
which fortify themselves by disobedience to the divine command, and the impeachment
of Christ's wisdom and exemplary virtue." †

We are perfectly aware that in thus frankly defending the doctrine
of the Lord's Supper as set forth in Scripture and in the standards

* It is so quoted even by the General Assembly. See Moore's New Digest, p. 598.
† "God pours out his bounty for all and vouchsafes his grace to each for guidance;
and to endeavor to evade the work which he has appointed for each man by refusing
the bounty in order to save the trouble of seeking the grace is an attempt which must
ever end in the degradation of individual motives and in social demoralization, whatever
present apparent effects may follow its first promulgation. One visible sign of this
degradation, in its intellectual form, is the miserable attempt made by some of the advo-
cates of this movement to show that the wine here (in the miracle at Cana) and in other
places of Scripture is unfermented wine, not possessing the power of intoxication"
(Alford's Comment on Second Chapter of John).
of the Presbyterian Church we expose ourselves to misrepresentation and censure. We have not thought it necessary to deprecate the harsh judgment of men by declaring our interest in the good cause of temperance. We are entirely willing, without qualification or compromise, to stand on this subject with such men as Jewett and Moore among the living, with such as Bethune and Maclean, Atwater and Hodge among the dead, with the great body of Christian commentators in all ages, with the whole historic Church of God, and, above all, with Him who was called "a wine-bibber and a friend of publicans and sinners."

HENRY J. VAN DYKE, SR.
HISTORICAL NOTES.

WAS VESEY A PURITAN MINISTER?

In a recent volume, entitled "The Centennial History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York" (New York, 1886, p. 57), the Rev. Dr. De Costa, of New York, makes the following remarks:

The statements to be found in Briggs's *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 144, 145, 146, 147, form a tissue of gross misrepresentation. The statement (p. 144) that Mr. Vesey was "the fourth Puritan minister known to have been connected with New York," is an unfounded assertion. It cannot be proved that Mr. Vesey ever preached in any dissenting assembly of this city. On p. 147 he is stigmatized as "the unfaithful Vesey," who "betrayed the Presbyterians, who had chosen him as their leader." This is all grossly erroneous. He came to Long Island a boy of nineteen, and preached for the mixed congregation at Hempstead, in the building where his successor, the Rev. Mr. Thomas, a missionary of the Propagation Society, was inducted in 1704."

For all of these statements denied by Dr. De Costa in such energetic terms, I presented ample evidence. The reader will observe that Dr. De Costa refrains from presenting any evidence whatever to counteract the evidence adduced by me. He abstains from informing his readers that there is any evidence to be overcome.

Dr. De Costa also says:

It remains to be added here, however, that instead of being a Dissenter, Mr. Vesey was of a Church of England family in Braintree, Mass., being a communicant of the church in his fifteenth year. Graduating from Harvard College at an age when he could not receive Orders from the Church of England, he was advised to employ his gifts, which were admired, wherever, for the time being, he could be useful. With this understanding he preached first at Sag and afterward at Hempstead on Long Island, where, as we have seen, the Prayer-Book was employed among the mixed assemblies, including Churchmen, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians. Very likely he used it in his ministrations. There is no proof that he ever contemplated permanent service anywhere but in the Church; and when the time came he took Orders, devoting himself loyally to the ministry.

Here, again, the proof is conspicuous by its absence. The evidence for the astounding statement with regard to the Book of Common Prayer is a reference to the conflict between Samuel Erburne and his people at Setauket with regard to the use of the Book of Common Prayer. Dr. De Costa gives an extract from the town records in which Mr. Erburne signs an agreement not to use "the aforesaid ceremonies neither in his publick worhsipe or administracon of
the Sacraments excepting to such persons as shall desire the same" (p. 50). This shows that the people at Setauket were opposed to the use of the Book of Common Prayer. And yet the Book of Common Prayer was used freely by not a few Presbyterians in the seventeenth century, with the exception of a few parts to which they took exception. Dr. De Costa seems to think that any minister who used the Prayer-Book at all must have been an Episcopal minister. Would an Episcopal minister sign an agreement not to use the Book of Common Prayer, as Erbume did? This is the only evidence that Dr. De Costa brings for the use of the Prayer-Book on Long Island, with its implication that there were people there who were attached to the Church of England. I shall take the liberty of citing these pages of my *American Presbyterianism* in full, in order to show that Dr. De Costa makes these statements in the face of the evidence that I so fully adduced.

Governor Fletcher, of the colony of New York, so soon as the Act of the Assembly of 1693 was passed, began to interpret it as an establishment of the Church of England in the colony, and strove in every way to force his interpretation of the law upon the Puritan population. This brought about a severe struggle between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, which continued for many years.

"There can be no doubt that it was the intention of the Assembly to provide for the maintenance of the Dissenting clergy. Such had been the manifest tendency of the previous legislation on the subject. All the Assembly but one were Dissenters, and the Church of England was hardly known in the Province. 'There was no face of the Church of England here till about the year 1693.' The Act was very loosely worded, which as things stood then when it was made, could not be avoided. The Dissenters could claim the benefit of it as well as Churchmen, and unless wrested from its true bearing, it admitted a construction in their favor. Indeed, they had good reason to claim that it was indeed for them, and that they only had a right in it. In fact, it was arbitrarily and illegally wrested from its true bearing, and made to answer the purpose of the English Church party, which was a very small minority of the people who were affected by the operation of the law." (G. H. Moore, *Historical Magazine*, 1867, p. 328.)

January 26th, 1695(6). The Puritan vestrymen of New York City, elected by the people, chose William Vesey to be their minister. William Vesey was born in Braintree, Mass., 1674, graduated at Harvard 1693; he was trained by Increase Mather, and sent by him to strengthen the hands of the Puritans in New York. Vesey began preaching at Hempstead, and, as so many of the pastors of Jamaica and Hempstead before him and after him, also ministered to the Puritans of the metropolis in the year 1694-95. He was thus the fourth Puritan minister known to have been connected with the city of New York.

The Church of England men were now determined to take matters in their own hands, without regard to the vestrymen. Accordingly, ten principal men, led by Colonels Heathcote and Morris, March 19th, 1695(6), petitioned Governor Fletcher for leave to purchase ground and erect a church. This was granted, and they were permitted to collect funds for the purpose, and received aid in every way from the authorities.

Colonel Heathcote also made a bold and successful stroke of policy. He prevailed upon the Puritan minister to conform to the Church of England, and to sail to England for orders.

August 2d, 1697, Vesey was ordained by the Lord Bishop of London, and returned to become the first rector of the Episcopal Church of the city, and its most zealous advocate against his former friends and associates. The conformity of Vesey to the Church of England was the most unfortunate event that could have happened to Pres-
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They give the Episcopal Church the primacy in the city, which by right belonged to the Presbyterian Puritans. We have a Presbyterian view of it from a letter of James Anderson, the first Presbyterian pastor, December 3d, 1717. He says: "After the English had it, endeavors were used by the chief of the people who understood English toward the settlement of an English Dissenting minister in it, and accordingly one was called from New England, who, after he had preached some time here, having a prospect and promise of more money than what he had among the Dissenters, went to Old England, took orders from the Bishop of London, and came back here as a member of the Established Church of England. Here he yet is, and has done, and still is doing, what he can to ruin the Dissenting interest in the place."

The Rev. Alexander Campbell, a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, who was severely, but, as we believe, justly dealt with by Vesey, says in bitterness: "He was a bigot for the New England Independency before he came over to the Church, and now a bigot for the Church against the Dissenters."

"In the height of his zeal for non-conformity, the Hon. good-natured Colonel Heathcote, admiring the greatness of his memory and the volubility of his speech, by the prospect of a much better settlement at New York than what he had at Hempstead, prevailed with him to go to England and receive orders."

In our judgment these were not the motives which influenced Vesey to conform to the Church of England. At this time there was a strong tendency on the part of the Presbyterian type of Puritans to conform in England, on account of the liberality of the leading bishops and their antagonism to the Jacobite High Churchmen. There was the feeling among Presbyterian Puritans that the Episcopal form of government was preferable to the Congregational. The Low Church Episcopalian and Low Church Presbyterian of England were scarcely different. The leading Presbyterians of England were willing to accept Archbishop Ussher's model, and a little reasonableness on the part of the English bishops would have swept the entire Presbyterian party of England into the Established Church.

One can readily understand that a man like Vesey, with such tendencies, could easily have been prevailed upon to see the advantages of combining the Presbyterian and Episcopal parties of the metropolis in one church organization. We have another view of this event from an address of the friends of Governor Hunter to the Lord Bishop of London (circa 1714):

"In the year 1697 Colonel Fletcher, the governor, by his example and countenance, promoted the building of Trinity Church in New York by voluntary contribution, and placed in it the present incumbent, Mr. Vesey, who was at that time a dissenting preacher on Long Island. He had received his education in Harvard College under that rigid Independent, Increase Mather, and was sent from thence by him to confirm the minds of those who had removed for their convenience from New England to this province, for Mr. Mather having advice that there was a minister of the Established Church of England come over in quality of chaplain of the forces, and fearing that the Common Prayer and the hated ceremonies of our church might gain ground, he spared no pains and care to spread the warmest of his emissaries through this province; but Colonel Fletcher, who saw into this design, took off Mr. Vesey by an invitation to this Living, a promise to advance his stipend considerably and to recommend him for holy orders to your Lordship's predecessor, all of which was performed accordingly, and Mr. Vesey returned from England in Priest's orders." (Doc. Hist. N. Y., III., p. 438.)

Whatever the motive of Vesey may have been, there can be no doubt that the mass of the English-speaking people of the metropolis were Presbyterian Puritans, and that he was called to be their pastor. The Church of England party consisted of a few newcomers in the army and civil government. Vesey betrayed the Presbyterians who had chosen him as their leader. We are not surprised that his treachery was in part successful. The Presbyterian vestrymen were not allowed to call another minister. In addition to the civil vestrymen of the act of 1693, an ecclesiastical vestry, composed of
members of the Church of England, and chosen by members of the Church of England, was constituted by authority of the Governor. The Presbyterians had nowhere else to worship in their own tongue, so that for several years many of them worshipped in Trinity Church. As the friends of Governor Hunter say (1714):

"We have yet no dissenting congregation in English in the town, which we fear makes ours larger than it would be if there was one."

This long extract makes it clear that all the statements objected to by Dr. De Costa were supported by strong evidence.

1. That Mr. Vesey came to New York as a Puritan minister is evident (a) from the statement of the Rev. James Anderson, the pastor of the Presbyterian Church in New York City, given above; (b) from the letter of the friends of Governor Hunter, also given above; (c) from the sworn protestation of the Rev. Alexander Campbell, an Episcopal clergyman, also given above; (d) from the statement of the Rev. John Miller, an Episcopal clergyman, who in 1695 places Mr. Vesey as a minister without orders preaching to the Dissenters at Hempstead (see American Presbyterianism, p. 108); (e) from Governor Hunter, who states that "he was formerly an Independent minister in New England" (Col. Hist. N. Y., Vol. V., p. 311). Dr. De Costa knew the testimony of these five important witnesses, and yet he had the assurance to say, "There is no proof that he ever contemplated permanent service anywhere but in the Church; and when the time came he took orders, devoting himself loyally to the ministry."

In citing the evidence of Alexander Campbell, I carefully omitted what might have been regarded as offensive to the friends of Mr. Vesey. They must pardon me now if I give them something that is no less disagreeable for me to print than for them to read. It seems to be due to Dr. De Costa that his eyes should be opened, if possible, by heroic measures. Mr. Campbell says:

"Such is Mr. Vesey, a bigot for the New England Independency before he came over to the Church, and now a bigot for the Church against the Dissenters. Before the date of his conformity he has been heard to assert that the Church of England was but a ragg or relic of the whore of Babylon, and since he became a Churchman, he pleads hard for an indelible character, and an uninterrupted succession from the apostles; insists on the titles and privileges of an heavenly ambassador, and more than a declarative power of binding and absolving. Quo teneam vultus mutantem presta nodo. But the truth it is, and universally known, that the Church has no reason to rejoice immoderately at the acquisition of such a convert, nor the Dissenters to grieve extremely at the loss of such a member. It is a truth, that he is not capable to maintain either side, nor is he capable to maintain even the first principles of Christianity, if he had but the misfortune once to engage with a sensible and skilful adversary. In the height of his zeal for non-conformity, the honorable good-natured Colonel Heathcote, admiring the greatness of his memory and the volubility of his speech, by the prospect of a much better settlement at New York than what he had at Hempstead, prevailed with him to go to England and receive orders. Here his avarice got the better of his zeal, and he wisely found that there was a great deal of orthodoxy in a good living. After all, his eloquence is slight and superficial, amuses but does not inform; 'tis tinsel, not sterling. I think the French call it, une Flux de Bouche, a flux at the mouth. That immoderate fluency of speech in some men, which some unthinking people are so apt to admire, is owing to the scarcity of words, and a scarcity of ideas, whereas those whose minds are full of ideas, and their memories stocked with a variety of words, are apt to hesitate in the choice of both; but nonsense bursts out with an irresistible tide, and with a rapidity
inconceivable. Thus people come faster out of a church when it is almost empty than when it is crowded. These things I know to be true, and yet they should have had leave to remain in everlasting oblivion if Mr. Vesey had not exasperated my mind beyond the possibility of bearing, by a most ungenerous and inhuman persecution."

This document entire was at the disposal of Dr. De Costa in the Letter Book of the S. P. G. New York and New England 1702–99, when he was in London a few months ago; and my book had already referred him to it; so that he is without excuse.

2. I proved that Mr. Vesey preached to the Puritans of New York (a) by the evidence of James Anderson, who distinctly says that he did; (b) by the fact that he was called by the Puritan vestry as a Dissenting minister. This had been shown so clearly by Dr. George H. Moore, the best authority on the Colonial History of New York, himself an Episcopalian (the *Historical Magazine*, June, 1867), that I did not deem it necessary to repeat his argument. No candid mind can resist it. Since Dr. Moore made this proof from the Documentary History of the Colony of New York, I have given the additional testimony of James Anderson from his letter to Principal Stirling, of Glasgow, which I discovered in the Advocate's Library in Edinburgh. Dr. De Costa knew of these things, and yet he has the hardihood to say, "It cannot be proved that Mr. Vesey ever preached in any Dissenting assembly of this city."

3. I proved, in my *American Presbyterianism*, that Francis Doughty preached in New York City in 1643–48 (p. 101); that Richard Denton baptized a child in the English church in New York in 1650 (p. 102); that Edward Slade was recommended to be minister of New York in 1691 (p. 106); and that Mr. Vesey preached at first as a Puritan minister in New York has been shown above. He makes the fourth. And yet Dr. De Costa ventures to say, "That Mr. Vesey was 'the fourth Puritan minister known to have been connected with New York,' is an unfounded assertion."

In view of the facts here given and others mentioned, I was justified in saying, "Thus the artful Colonel Heathcote knew how to get rid of the faithful Puritan minister, and to gain over the unfaithful Vesey and Bondett, in order to accomplish his design of transferring the Puritan population into the bosom of the Church of England" (p. 149). We have no fault to find with Mr. Vesey for leaving the Puritan ministry in order to enter the ministry of the Church of England. We have put as favorable a construction upon his motives as seems to be possible. Any man or minister has the right to change his ecclesiastical relations for good and sufficient reasons. But the unfaithfulness of Vesey consisted in this: He came to New York with a commission to maintain the Puritan interest over against that of the Church of England; he allowed himself to be regarded as the head of the Puritan interest in New York City and at Hempstead; at the critical moment he went over to the other side. Under these circumstances he ought not to have accepted the rectorate of the church in New York City. He ought to have gone to another place to exercise his ministry. By changing his colors in a critical moment he betrayed his party and their interests that they had entrusted to his keeping. He thus gained a reputation for treachery and unfaithfulness that will stick to him as
long as the city of New York exists, and he laid himself open to suspicion of unworthy motives. I am well aware that it is a painful fact in the early ecclesiastical history of the city of New York. But it is fully as painful to those who suffered by this treachery as to those who gained whatever small advantage there was in it. If Dr. De Costa’s supposition be correct, that Vesey was a Churchman at heart from childhood, and that he came to New York to preach the Gospel with the full intent to serve the Church of England at the first opportunity, then he wore the mask of a Dissenter, and was a consummate hypocrite. This I do not believe. He was a weak and unfaithful Christian, but he was no hypocrite. The facts force us to one of these two conclusions.

Colonel Morris and Colonel Heathcote lived long enough to regret the wrongs that were done to the Puritan people in New York in the interest of the Church of England. They saw that a great mistake had been made, which had rather lessened than increased the strength of Episcopacy in New York. (See American Presbyterianism, pp. 156, 157.) Dr. De Costa might well follow their example. There were many wrongs committed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries on both sides, and none but a partisan will defend them. Let us learn from the errors of our ancestors, and pursue the paths of truth, of righteousness, and of peace. It has been an unpleasant task for me to turn aside from the more attractive question of Christian union to settle this unattractive historical question which Dr. De Costa has raised in such a rude manner.

C. A. BRIGGS.

THE ORIGIN OF THE PHRASE, “IN NECESSARIIS UNITAS, IN NON NECESSARIIS LIBERTAS, IN UTRISQUE CARITAS.”

This sentence of wisdom and of peace has long been the watchword of Protestant Irenics. It is the motto of the Evangelical Alliance. In the middle of this century there was considerable interest in the investigation of its origin. The first to give it a thorough historical consideration was Dr. Friedrich Lücke, who published his conclusions in a learned tract entitled Ueber das Alter den Verfasser, die ursprüngliche Form und den wahren Sinn des kirchlichen Friedensspruches in necessariis unitas, etc. Göttingen, 1850. Dr. Lücke begins his investigation with Richard Baxter’s use of these words. In the preface to The True and Only Way of Concord of All the Christian Churches, London, 1680, Baxter writes, November 15th, 1679: “I once more repeat to you the pacificator’s old despised words, Si in necessariis sit unitas; in non necessariis libertas, in utrisq; charitas, optimo corte loco essent res nostrae.”

Baxter does not here name the “pacificator” whose words he quotes. Lücke affirms that Baxter nowhere else in his writings mentions the name of this pacificator—“Baxter nennt ihn nicht, weder hier, noch sonst in seinen vielen irenischen Schriften” (p. 19). He refers to Dr. Kist’s citation from Peiffer’s Geloofsvastigheid van een waar Christen, Leiden, 1772 (II. p. 764), that Baxter had ascribed this sentence to Rupertus Meldenius, but affirms
again, "Baxter nennt, wie gesagt, den Pacificator, in seinen Englischen Werken wenigstens, nirgends" (p. 20).


Lücke found this writing in a collection of tracts, "*Misc. theologica, seorsim adhuc edita, etc.*," collected by Pfeiffer (Leipzig, 1736); and republished it complete as an appendix to his tract. There we find the sentence (p. 128): "Si nos servaremus in necessariis unitatem, in non-necessariis libertatem, in virisque caritatem Optime erieloco essent nos nostræ." This is very nearly as Baxter gives it.

Lücke thinks that the author was a German on account of his reference to the troubles of his fatherland at the beginning of his writing, and that he was a Lutheran on account of his address to theologians of the Augsburg Confession, but that he was not a strict Lutheran. He was also a friend of John Arndt, whom he defends at the close of his writing.

It must have been written subsequent to Arndt's death, May 11th, 1621, and not earlier than 1627, owing to its reference to the imposition of the Augsburg Confession *invariata*. Lücke gave some additional information in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1851, pp. 905, seq. He there stated that a copy of the original edition of the *Parænesis votiva* had been found by Dr. Schubert in the Library at Cassel, in a collection of similar tracts. This edition bears the name of Rupertus Meldenius, but is without date or place of publication. In this interesting collection of tracts there is one entitled *Consideratio theologica de gradibus necessitatis dogmatum Christianorum, quibus fidei, spei et charitatis officia reguntur*, by Gregor Frank, Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, 1628. Frank uses the sentence in the following form: "Summa est; servemus in necessariis unitatem, in non necessariis libertatem, in utrisque caritatem," and comments upon it. He does not give it as a citation. It is difficult to decide whether he derived it from the *Parænesis votiva*, or whether the *Parænesis votiva* derived it from him, or both from a common source. Lücke urges the first opinion, but his arguments are not altogether convincing.

At a subsequent date another copy of an original edition was found by Klose in the city library of Hamburg, and described in his article on Rupertus Meldenius in the first edition of Herzog's "*Real-Encyclopædie*" (Vol. IX., 1858). It is cited also in a tract entitled *Stabilimentum irenicum*. Frankfort, 1635. From its resemblance to other tracts published at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, it points thither for its place of publication.

Lücke made it probable that Rupertus Meldenius was the author of the golden sentence, but did not prove it, because, as Carl Bertheau says, in the second edition of Herzog's "*Real-Encyclopædie*" (IX., 1881, p. 531), it appears in Gregor Frank in a more independent and definite form. Bertheau also raises the question:
"Sollte aber nicht, von anderen abgesehen, aus dem Worte Richard Baxter's vom J. 1679 (I once more repeat to you the Pacificator's old and despised words: *si in necessariis sit (essent) unitas, in non-necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas, optimo certe loco essent res nostrae!*) folgen dass der eigentliche Vater dieses Spruches noch ein anderer sein muss, da nicht zu erscheinen, warum Baxter den, wie es scheint, sonst ganz unbekannten Meldenius oder auch Frank so einfach den pacificator nennen kann? Ehe nicht fest steht wer dieser pacificator ist, wird doch zu sagen sein, adhuc sub judice his est."

This is the present state of the question. During the past winter I have had occasion to read largely in the Irenical writings of the seventeenth century. I had the hope of finding the sentence in some of the numerous writings of John Durie, but thus far I have not found it in express terms, although he mentions the *Parenesis votiva* in his list of Irenical writings, and is familiar with the idea that the sentence so grandly and clearly expresses. It was my good fortune, however, to discover several additional passages in which Richard Baxter uses the phrase. Thus the very book from whose preface Lücke makes the citation upon which he bases his investigation contains also a reference of the sentence to Rupertus Meldenius. It is singular that Lücke should have overlooked this passage. It would have saved him an enormous amount of blind investigation. Lücke affirms over and over again that Baxter nowhere in his Irenical writings mentions the name of the pacificator, and yet his name was in that very book to which Lücke refers. The only way I can account for this mistake of such an excellent scholar is that he must have had an imperfect copy of *The True and Only Way of Concord*. This book consists of three parts, each part with its own title-page, and each part complete in itself, yet all comprehended in the general title, *The True and Only Way of Concord*. The passage which Lücke did not see and which gives the solution of the problem is in "*The Third Part: Of Schism, or the false dividing terms and means of unity and peace,*" and is as follows:

"Were there no more said of all this subject but that of Rupertus Meldenius, cited by Conradus Bergius, it might end all schism if well understood and used—viz., *si in necessariis sit Unitas, in non-necessariis libertas, in utrisque Charitas, optimo certe loco essent res nostrae—Unity in things necessary, Liberty in things unnecessary, and Charity in both, would do all our work*" (p. 25).

Baxter also mentions Meldenius on a previous page: "What Acontius was, or what Rupertus Meldenius was, I am not sure; some say they were Socinians, and some deny it. But I am sure, if they were heretical, these excellent precepts for love and peace may rise up in judgment against orthodox Persecutors, Schismatics, and Revilers" (p. 211).

It is evident, therefore, that the pacificator to whom Baxter alludes in his preface was the Rupertus Meldenius to whom he refers the sentence in his book. This at once removes the objection to Lücke's position that was made by Bertheau, and has been on the mind of most historical critics. Baxter also tells us that he did not derive the sentence directly from Rupertus, but indirectly through Conrad Bergius, the Bremen divine, who, with his relative, John Bergius, the court preacher of Brandenburg, was also a renowned peacemaker.
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I have not been able to examine the writings of Conrad Bergius; but I hope very soon to find the sentence in the writing from which Baxter derived it. It is singular just here that Lücke should not have found it in Conrad Bergius, to whose work, Praxis catholica divini canonis contra quasuis haereses et schismata, 1629, he makes reference.

It is quite evident that Baxter had not seen the Parænesis votiva himself, for he could not have regarded the author as possibly a Socinian. Acontius was a Socinian—indeed, he may be called the father of Unitarianism in England; but the author of the Parænesis votiva was a very different man. He was of the school of Arndt. I have also found the following additional passages in Baxter's writings:

"The long and sad experience of all the Christian Churches, which have been divided by necessary humane impositions, and the voice of all wise peace-makers in all times, who have still called for [Unity in things necessary, Liberty in things unnecessary, and Charity in both], do leave those that yet will not be persuaded to these terms, as unexcuseable persons, as almost any in all the world; worse than Physicians that would use all those things as the only remedies, which have killed all that ever used them for fifteen hundred years." (The Second Part of the Nonconformist Plea for Peace, London, 1686, p. 155.)

Baxter also mentions that when John Durie sought the advice of the ministers of the county of Worcester as to healing the Divisions among the Protestant Churches, "one principal part" of their "advice was, that the Churches should hold their Unity and Concord in [necessary things, and Liberty in things not necessary, and Charity in both]." (Universal Concord. London, 1660, p. 2.)

This phrase seems to have been a favorite one with Richard Baxter, who did much to give it currency not only in Great Britain, but also on the Continent of Europe.

It is not yet absolutely certain that this choice word originated in the Parænesis votiva, but the statement of Baxter makes it altogether probable. The passage in Conrad Bergius may aid still further in the determination of the question.

The question still remains whether Rupertus Meldenius is the name of the author, as Baxter and Lücke suppose, or whether it is a pseudonym, as Werfenfels and Bertheau suppose. John Durie, in his list of Irenical writings at the close of his tract, "De Pace inter Evangelicis procuranda sententia quatuor," London, 1638, mentions this tract thus: "Parænesis votiva pro pace Ecclesiae ad Theolog. August. Confessionis. Meldenij."

This seems to imply that he regards Meldenius as the name of the place where the author resided. This is against the view that it is a pseudonym, and favors the opinion that the author was Rupert of Melden. But who was he, and where is Melden? On the other hand, the fact that the tract was published without date and without place of publication favors the opinion that the author desired to keep himself unknown. The extracts of Baxter give important aid to the solution of the problem, and point to other sources of information that need investigation.

C. A. Briggs.
VIII.

CRITICAL NOTE.

SOME EXEGETICAL NOTES ON 1 TIMOTHY.

I. THE PROGRESS OF THOUGHT IN 1 TIMOTHY i. 3–20.

That these verses are closely bound together as a single paragraph is already apparent from the opening words of the second chapter. The παρακαλῶ there looks back to the παρεκάλεσα of i. 3, while the πρῶτον πάντων declares to us that all before ii. 1 is in some sense preliminary to the main purpose of the letter, while the exhortations for which the letter was written begin there. The οὖν, which has been admirably elucidated by Weiss, falls in with this view, advising us that now the exhortations for which the letter was written are about to begin—not without also indicating an affiliation in the salvatory purpose of these prayers (ii. 3–7), with the like purpose of the foregoing exhortation (i. 12, sq.). It must be borne in mind, however, that it by no means follows from the fact that the subject treated in i. 3–20 is of subordinate importance in this letter to those begun at ii. 1, that it is therefore, per se, of inferior interest; on the contrary, the purpose for which Timothy was bidden to stay in Ephesus is that given in i. 3–20, while this whole letter is only supplementary to that previous and therefore most important exhortation.

If we needed more proof than the wording of ii. 1 furnishes of the unity of the preceding paragraph, it would be provided by the chain of back references given by the words ταύτην τὴν παραγγελιαν, verse 18, τὴς παραγγελίας, verse 5, and παραγγελίας, verse 3. For that the same reference must be assigned to all these closely-connected phrases seems certain, in itself considered, and is raised beyond question by the almost studied indications in the context that the writer in setting down the last had the previous ones in mind. The phraseology of verse 19, especially when followed by the pointed reference to the arch-heretics in verse 20, could not fail very powerfully to point the mind back to verses 5 and 6. It may even be said that verses 18–20 are a designed conclusion of what was begun in verses 5 and 6.

On perceiving the close connection of these closing verses (18–20) with the opening of the paragraph, it becomes a matter of interest to trace out the progress of thought in this whole series of verses. Commentators have found this somewhat difficult, especially at the transition of verse 12. Perhaps, however, it is not improper to find a sort of key to it in the description which Paul gives
of himself in the opening of the letter (i. 1), where he says he was an apostle "according to the appointment" of God. As Paul writes not formally, but out of his heart, he may be thought to have held in mind at the very opening of the letter what he was about to say, and to have allowed this to color his opening expressions. Now, what these words κατ' ἐπίταγήν ἦσος declare is that Paul is writing in fulfilment of the duty that devolved on him as an apostle, appointed to that office by God. In accordance with that duty he reminds Timothy of the exhortation that he had already given him, to silence the false teachers at Ephesus (i. 3 sq.). These teachers, in contrast with Paul's appointment, had taken upon themselves (Σέλοντες, verse 7) the function of teaching, and in accordance with this assumption taught otherwise (ἐτεροδιάσκαλεῖν, verse 3) than the Gospel that had been intrusted to him (verse 11). The key-words thus far are the εἰκόνας of verse 1, the ἰδιότητας of verse 7, and the ἐπιστομώδης of verse 11. And the idea is that Paul had received a commission from God, these others were self-appointed; that he preached was therefore due to his obedience to the call of duty, that they preached, to their self-will; what he preached was the truth committed to him, what they preached their own crude inventions; and the result of his preaching was edification in Christian graces, while the result of their preaching was emptiness and folly. All this furnished good reason for silencing them.

There is more content in the phrase κατ' ἐπίταγήν, however, than the mere assertion that this letter is an official one, written in fulfilment of the duty of the apostolic office. Perhaps it is a little too strong to say that it has an apologetical tone in it; but it is certainly deprecatory. "By the will of God" puts forward a claim of right; "according to the commission of God" enters a plea of duty. It is somewhat as if Paul would say, "I should like to write to you, dear Timothy, as a friend to a friend, or as a father to a son; but now I must write as general to subordinate." There is a tenderly firm and modest tone in it. This modest tone comes to the surface again at verse 12. Having spoken of the great contrast between his teaching and that of the ἐτεροδιάσκαλοι, and that more especially in their moral effects (3-11), Paul will not appear to plume himself on his superiority to them, as if it was by his own merit that he had this truth. He goes on humbly to declare how it happens that he, of all men, was entrusted with the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God. The connection of verse 12 is, then, immediately with verse 11; and the effect is again deprecatory. It is as much as if Paul had said, "I make no claim to be in myself superior to these teachers—it is not I, but the Gospel that I preach that is superior; and I was not entrusted with this Gospel on account of any merit in me, but only on account of God's infinite grace—a thing altogether unaccountable, since I am the chief of sinners, and yet again not unaccountable, for it is God's gracious purpose to save sinners, and in whom could be more fully shown all His long-suffering than in me, the chief?" Thus, so far from verses 12-17 being wholly disconnected and strange here, they are psychologically in place, and, indeed, necessary for the completion of the train of thought entered upon in the preceding verses. Having begun this
letter in the frame of mind exhibited in the words of i. 1, Paul could not have written verses 3–11 without adding something like verses 12–17.

Paul has now pointed out why the Ephesian heterodoxy must be put down (5–11), and how it happens that he has the pure truth (12–17). But one thing more is needed: a justification of his selection of Timothy for this difficult and delicate task. This is what is given us in verses 18–20. "This charge," says the Apostle, "I have committed to thee, child Timothy, in accordance with . . ." This is the key to these verses. The reason assigned is twofold: first, Timothy had been long ago designated by certain prophesies as a suitable soldier for such a warfare (verse 18); and secondly, he was exhibiting just the graces that proved his hold on the true Gospel of God's grace to be secure, and pointed to him as the proper person to rebuke this teaching (19). These verses, of course, contain more than this. They are in their whole tone and expression an encouraging trumpet call to Timothy to play the man in this noble warfare; an expression of confidence from the Apostle; and a warning against the evils of the heresy he had to face. But their formal contents chiefly concern the designation of Timothy for this duty; and as such they visibly round out and complete the subject begun at verse 3, and leave the Apostle free to begin in the next chapter the new exhortations to convey which the letter was written.

II. CONNECTION AND MEANING OF 1 TIMOTHY II. 8–15.

The first of the new exhortations which Paul gives Timothy in this letter concerns itself with the proper ordering of the public worship of the Church, especially the public prayers. Here Paul begins by earnestly exhorting to universal intercessory prayer (verses 1–7), and then prescribes how the public prayers shall be conducted (verses 8–10), ending with a general caution to the women to keep silence in the Church (verses 11–15), growing out of the prescription as to the orderly performance of public prayer.

If we attend especially to verses 8–10, we will observe that this is (as we have hinted) a matter of prescription; "βούλομαι," says the Apostle, and the increased strength of the word over the TrctpaHaXdo of ii. 1 cannot be unintentional. In dealing with the way in which the prayers should be made, Paul allows himself to express his apostolical will. We notice next that the thing prescribed is how the public* prayers shall be observed. "I will, then, that there pray—the men in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing; likewise also women in seemly guise, with shamefastness and sobriety." It is not to be denied, indeed, that there is a prescription here as to the persons who are to do the praying. The order of words determines that the whole phrase βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι (not βούλομαι alone) is to be supplied after ἀδαιρών καί. But it must be remembered that more take part in public prayers than lead in their offering, and it must be observed that the men and women are somewhat pointedly distinguished.

* That public prayers are meant, see Weiss in loc. and at p. 107.
here. There is no insuperable difficulty in taking προσευχεσθαι in a somewhat more inclusive sense in verse 8 than in verse 9; and we are directed thereto by the presence of the article in verse 8 and its absence in verse 9, as well as by the different supplements in the two verses. The Apostle wishes that the men pray, and that women likewise take part in these prayers. He wishes that the men pray by lifting up in every place holy hands, without wrath and disputing; and that women join in these prayers in seemly guise, with shamefastness and sober-mindedness. The force of προσευχεσθαι in both clauses is mainly that of sharing in the public prayer rather than that of leading in it, but the implication of the expressions used certainly gives the men a more active place in it, and suggests that they might lead, while to woman's "seemly guise" belonged above everything that shamefastness which would lead her to shrink from publicity. That the Apostle understood this "seemly guise, with shamefastness and sober-mindedness," to exclude leading in the public praying is clear from the adjunction of verses 11-15, the point of contact being just the ἡσυχία, which looks back upon and takes up this element in the previous context. It would be an error, however, to make this negative element the main purport of this passage, and therefore an error to make the declaration of who were to lead in prayer the chief purpose of verses 8-10.

It is not the persons who are to pray, therefore, but the way in which prayers are to be made, that forms the main purport of these verses. We should guard ourselves, however, from taking too external a view of this prescription of how men should pray. There does seem to be an implication of external manner, even of external attitude: "I will, then, that the men should pray by lifting up in every place holy hands." Clearly here is a hint as to the attitude in which the Apostle would have men pray—an attitude that had come to him by inheritance, and that was suitable in itself and full of every expression of reverence. So, on the other hand, he equally wills that women when they come to pray should not "adorn themselves in plaits and gold, or pearls, or costly raiment." And we cannot doubt that the apostolic will thus extended even to the seemly attire of those who appeared at the public services (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 5). Both as to attitude and as to dress he had an opinion, and he expresses it. And yet this is apparently incidental to his main purpose here. The emphasis falls rather on what we may call the inner attitude and the inner attire. What he wishes is that when the men lift their hands to God they should be holy hands, and that they should not hold up with them to God angry and doubting hearts; that when women come in seemly guise they should come in womanly shamefastness and sober-mindedness, clothed on with good works, as is becoming in those that profess godliness. It is on these things that the emphasis falls; and this is how Paul would have the men and likewise women pray. Whether he prescribes the standing attitude with outstretched hands or not, whether he prescribes "quiet" clothing or not, he certainly prescribes holy hands, free from wrath and doubting, and shamefastness and sober-mindedness, clothed on, as becometh women professing godliness, with good works.

It is just because the emphasis falls on these words that verses 11-15 could be
added. If the mind had been on the external attitude and dress in prayer, a
general command of silence would not have been prepared for; it is because
the mind was dwelling on the seemly guise of shamefastness and sober-minded-
ness that the Apostle could pass at once to the natural and necessary result of
this shamefastness. This does not account for why the Apostle should adjoin
this sharp command to women of silence in all church services, but it does ac-
count for why he could. Had the freedom of the Gospel already, perhaps,
brought some unhallowed license with it at Ephesus, too, as well as at Corinth,
in this matter? Clearly the Apostle feels bound to speak with no doubtful
voice, even more decisively than in the similar passage in 1 Corinthians.

The fifteenth verse appears to be added with what may be called a consola-
tory purpose. Woman was created for man, and she brought man into trans-
gression; her place in this world is therefore one of subjection. Nevertheless,
before God there is no difference; in Christ there is neither male nor female
(Gal. iii. 28); "she shall, however, be saved." And more; she shall be saved
"by means of the child-bearing." It makes very little difference for the essential
meaning of the verse whether we take δια locally or instrumentally; in either
case what is asserted is that salvation comes to women in the docile fulfilment
of that very function which is hers as woman, in which the curse takes effect,
and on account of which her sphere of life is limited and circumscribed to
the precincts of home. The instrumental sense, however, seems too at-
tractive to be lightly given up, especially when there appears to be nothing
which can be decisively urged against it. In that case there is a distinct refer-
ence here to the Saviour of the world, who was born of woman; through Him
directly, and just because He was born of woman, through that child-bearing
which is woman's burden, but which is also, by reason of this its promised
fruit (Gen. iii. 15), her salvation, shall she and with her all men be saved.*
The general purpose of verse 15 is, therefore, similar to the consolatory pur-
pose of Eph. vi. 8 in a somewhat similar context; the words δια τῆς
τεκνογονίας are inserted to give this consolation point, and connect woman’s
chief function with the saving of the world and the glory of the Saviour; and
finally the last clause is added with an undertone of warning that the former
clause should not arouse pride, but every woman might be stirred up to work
out her own salvation with fear and trembling.

III. The Reference and Meaning of 1 Timothy iii. 10.

The commentators are divided as to the kind of testing or trying that is here
required before a deacon could be justly inducted into his office. Apparently,
however, the matter is settled by noting the necessary implication of the open-
ing words, καὶ οὕτωι δέ. The position of οὕτωι between the two particles
forbids us to take them together, and the necessary effect is to throw a very
strong emphasis on the οὕτωι: "But these, too"—"these as well as the
others." This, in this context, cannot mean anything else than that the

* Cf. e.g. Ellicott, in loc.
deacons no less than the bishops (iii. 1'–7) must be tried first, and then if found blameless, ushered into their office. And it is almost equally clear that Paul could not have so written here, unless he had in the preceding context commanded a like trying as prerequisite for the ordination of a bishop. We search in vain, however, in the preceding context for such a requisition, unless we find it in μὴ νεόφυτων of verse 6. It is to this, therefore, that the emphasized οὖσιν takes us back. And we learn thence that the trial required of the prospective deacons was neither a formal inquiry nor a probationary novitiate, but simply amounted to this: deacons must be chosen only from the tried and approved men of the Church. A subsequent passage (verses 24, 25) lends additional color to this interpretation; for, as we shall see later, these verses give the reason for the command not to ordain any one suddenly (verse 22), and the reason is simply this: "Time develops and exposes character." The three passages, iii. 6, iii. 10, v. 24, 25, may be paralleled as Paul's counsel against over-haste in ordination to church offices.

IV. The Implication of 1 Timothy iii. 11.

This exceedingly difficult verse is one of the veritable cruces of New Testament exegesis, and the question whether it refers to deaconesses or to the wives of the deacons remains still unsettled.

The similarity of structure here with iii. 8 naturally suggests similarity of government—i.e., that we should supply here, as there, δεῖ εἶναι from iii. 2. If this be done, it is scarcely doubtful that deaconesses are meant and not the deacons' wives, in which latter case we should certainly have had τὰς γυναικας or γυναικας αὐτῶν. On the other hand, it becomes immediately inexplicable that on reaching verse 12 we find that we have not passed at verse 11 to another class of church officers, as we did at verse 8, but are still, in verses 12, 13, dealing not with deaconesses, but with deacons. On this interpretation there seems no way out of the difficulty, except to say that the deaconesses and deacons constituted one, not two, classes, and therefore are treated together. On a careful scrutiny of the text this apparently would have to mean no less than this: that there were not two bodies of church officers in the apostolic days, "deacons" and "deaconesses," but one body, "deacons," who might be indifferently male or female. We naturally recoil before so far-reaching an inference from so small a basis.

And on observing the text narrowly, we cannot fail to observe that verse 12 treats of the deacons' family, and thus suggests that 11 had reference also to his family. Further, that γυναικας suggests "wives" rather than "deaconesses." Still further, finally, that we are not forced to supply δεῖ εἶναι with verse 11, but may take over εἴσοναι from verse 9, in which case we would expect neither τὰς nor αὐτῶν with γυναικας. In this case, doubtless, verse 10 is semi-parenthetical, explanatory of the requirement in verse 9, while verse 11 adds the next new requirement: "The deacon must have the mystery of faith in a pure conscience—and must not be accepted until his life has shown this possession—and a wife, like him grave, and full of other virtues;
he must be the husband of one wife, and rule well his children and household."

This explanation, which is essentially Bengel's, appears to bring verse 11 into such excellent relation to both the preceding and succeeding contexts as to deserve our acceptance. The chief difficulties that face it are the apparent parallelism of verse 11 with verse 8, and the failure of like mention of the requisite virtues for bishops' wives in the foregoing section (verses 2–7). The former is not fatal, for the regimen derived from verse 9 seems to intervene in order to break the parallel. And the latter is plausibly explained by the circumstance that women could take no part either in ruling or in teaching (ii. 12), which constituted the functions of the bishop (v. 17), whereas the deacon's wife could and should be a helpmeet to him in his official work.*

V. THE MEANING OF 1 TIMOTHY iii. 13.

Two mistakes are often made in reading this verse: καλὸν is taken in a comparative sense, and the correlation of βασιλὸν καλὸν with πολλὴν παρ-
ησιὰν ἐν πίστει is neglected. Nothing is said about purchasing a "'higher' office or a "'better' position. What is said is that the office of deacon is well worth having, for he who has exercised it well purchases for himself two things—"'a good standing" and "'great confidence in faith in Christ Jesus." We have, correlated here, the objective and the subjective reward that comes to him who well performs the duties of the office; objectively, he obtains a good standing in the estimation of the Church, and subjectively he obtains a large boldness of faith in Christ. He gets a high position in the trust, love, and estimation of the people he serves, and a growing strength of faith in his Lord.

There is obviously no question of comparison of offices here; certainly none to the disadvantage of the diaconate. The Apostle makes no reference to the deacon progressing out of so desirable an office. His whole purpose is to enhance the value of the office, just as at iii. 1 he enhanced the office of bishop; while between the two he places the requirements which stand as the sine quan non (not the qua) of the two offices. It is no doubt tempting to contrast rather than compare iii. 13 and iii. 1 in the sense that the Apostle speaks as if the bishopric was too eagerly sought, while his very enhancing of the diaconate shows it to have been liable to be despised. The inference, then, would be not, indeed, that the diaconate was a step to the bishopric, but certainly that it was the less desirable, probably the subordinate office. But this seems to go beyond what is written; the clauses seem parallel rather than contrasting, and the purpose of each is to enhance the office then under treatment.

VI. THE PROGRESS OF THE THOUGHT IN 1 TIMOTHY iii. 14–iv. 5.

The reference of the ταύτα, with which this paragraph opens, seems to be inclusive enough to embrace the whole of the preceding section of the epistle—

* Cf. Weiss in loc.
that is, from ii. 1. Thus the present paragraph is analogous in its own section to i. 18–20 in the first chapter. Having delivered his exhortations concerning the right ordering of the Church life at Ephesus, including the public services (ii. 1–15), and the choice of proper men for the Church offices (iii. 1–13), the Apostle now declares why he has thought it so important to commend them to his delegate now, even though he hoped soon to come to Ephesus himself. It was because he desired him in no case to be ignorant of "how it must be behaved in God's house." The language here used is worthy of our closest attention. There is a right way to order God's house; nay, there is a way in which it must be ordered. That way is the way which Paul has just laid down in his previous exhortations. And Paul has written these exhortations in order that whether he came quickly or delayed, Timothy might know this right way, and act accordingly. Already the importance of the previous section is apparent.

But in order that he might raise his reader's sense of this importance still higher, the Apostle proceeds at once to enhance the reason he has assigned for it. The stress is laid on the words "God's house," and the succeeding ἵνα, in accordance with its character, assigns the natural reason why it is important that God's house should be properly ordered: "seeing that it is no less than the Church of the living God." No wonder one must be careful fitly to order it! By "church" the Apostle means, in accordance with his teaching elsewhere, a community belonging to God, and which as such must receive its ordering from God alone (1 Cor. xiv. 33); and the epithet "living" is added still further to enhance its value in this context, and thus still further to exhibit the importance of ordering it by God's and not man's models. He now piles Pelion on Ossa, by adding that this Church of the living God is "the pillar and ground of the truth"—i.e., apparently the support and stay of the truth that has been brought into the world with the opening of the new covenant, without which it could not be retained in purity or be spread abroad. The Church is thus described as God's instrument for the preservation of the truth and for keeping it pure, and His engine for propagating it in the world. The effect of so describing it is still further to demonstrate its importance, and the necessity of properly organizing it. It is to raise this new sanction of his assertion to its full value that he next proceeds to enhance the truth, the support and stay of which the Church is. He calls it here "the mystery of godliness"—i.e., the revelation which underlies and produces all the godliness that comes to light among men—and he declares of it that it is great, and immediately illustrates its greatness by (verse 16b) a summary of part of its ineffable contents. The order of thought thus far may be briefly recapitulated thus: "It is important that God's house be rightly ordered, because it is the Church of the living God, the support of the truth, and this truth is confessedly great, as any one who will give ear to it may at once perceive." Still more concisely stated, these verses vindicate the importance of the ecclesiastical directions Paul has been giving, by asserting that the Church of God is His engine for the preservation and propagation of saving truth in the world, and that therefore its
proper organization and direction is an important duty of His chosen Apostle.

That the opening paragraph of the fourth chapter is closely connected with this discussion seems to follow from its contents, which appear to be prepared for by the words “pillar and ground of the truth” in iii. 15b, to which they are an echo. It is not likely to be wrong to see in iv. 1-6, therefore, an additional reason for the importance of rightly organizing the Church, drawn now not so much from the greatness of the truth it has to guard, as from the greatness of the danger which is impending over it. This great truth is, according to the express declaration of the Spirit, to meet in somewhat later times most serious attacks from unprincipled men under the influence of spirits of deceit. How necessary, therefore, that its pillar and ground on which it rests—God’s engine for its preservation and extension—should be rightly ordered, “according to the plan shown in the Mount”! This negative incitement comes to the help of the positive exposition of iii. 15, 16 with immense force.

It would be difficult to frame a stronger argument than that the Apostle here outlines for the importance of the Church of God or for the necessity of its right organization and direction. And yet everywhere he subordinates it to the truth of which it is but the guardian, and argues its importance from the greatness and the necessity of the preservation of this truth. It might also be added that this passage tells in favor of those who seek what is called a jure divino system of Church organization and Church service in the New Testament. The appearance at least is very strong that the Apostle imposed such a system on the churches he founded, and clinched it with this exposition of its importance. Is there or is there not a duty laid upon us of to-day to govern our Church services and conform our Church organization according to the pattern deducible from the two sections ii. 1-15, iii. 1-13, to which these solemn words refer? Is the Church still God’s house, the Church of the living God? And is His or our way of ordering it best fitted to make it the pillar and ground of His great and inestimable truth?

B. B. Warfield.

Allegheny, Pa.
EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

This history properly begins in sacred Scripture. The Scriptures, indeed, furnish the only valid basis and authority for a doctrine of the intermediate state.

But further, there is a history or growth in the Scriptural doctrine itself. And still further, this Scriptural doctrine has, by right and in fact, more or less influenced the historic creeds of Christendom and affected even its speculative thinking through all the intervening centuries.

Here, then, we have an outline for the task before us. But to traverse so vast a field in a brief essay, "Hic labor, hoc est opus."

At the outset we must trace rapidly the Scriptural history of the doctrine of the intermediate state.

Sheol in the Hebrew, translated Hades in the Septuagint, implied this doctrine, and indicated at once the place and the condition of the intermediate state. It was the realm of the dead; the unseen underworld; the hidden, invisible abode of the departed. Thither went the souls of the dying.

There was the gathering-place of human spirits departing from the body, departing from the earth, departing from the visible world into another place, into another environment, into another experience. This experience or condition is the chief characteristic of the intermediate state. However, while state or condition is the chief thing relevant to the disembodied, departed spirit, yet locality cannot be utterly irrelevant. If the Infinite Spirit is everywhere, the finite spirit must be somewhere.

The whole conception was, however, obscure and vague. In the dimly dawning revelation the place could only be descried and described as the invisible world—the hidden abode; while the paramount reality—the state or condition—could be but faintly conceived. In this dawning revelation Sheol seemed a common receptacle of the good and the bad—the pious and the impious dead. At best, the anticipation of the dying would be comparatively dim and dismal. But the clearer revelation, reflecting ethical and spiritual light on the observant soul of Seer and Psalmist, disclosed an ethical distinction in the state of the departed—a real distinction, at least, if not a separation, for "the righteous hath hope in his death"—the hope of redemption. Still the
outlook is vague and obscure. But as the light increases, there appears not merely a real distinction, but a separation: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness." "Gather not my soul with sinners."

And now, as the old is passing into the new, and the true light cometh into the world, there is revealed in his presence and prophecy not only a survey of the place of departed spirits, as apart from this visible world, but also of distinction in the state or condition of the departed good and bad, and of separation — real and broad separation. In the words of the Christ, the rich man seeth Lazarus afar off in Abraham's bosom, and between him and them there is a great gulf fixed; and while Lazarus is comforted, Dives is compelled to remember and is tormented. That this is a lesson concerning the intermediate state is evident from the prayer of Dives and the answer to his prayer (Luke xvi. 27–29). In such solemn and significant terms is the doctrine of the intermediate state reaffirmed by the great Teacher, and intensified.

By this object-lesson concerning the intermediate state, with its twofold distinction of personal character, and personal experience, and personal abode, good and bad, we are the better prepared to understand the blessed promise of the dying Saviour to the penitent thief: "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." The sinless One, dying on the Cross for sinners, and passing thence into the experience and place of the righteous dead, bore with him the penitent thief, even that very day, into Paradise. Inspired Apostles take up the theme. Peter records this descent of Christ into the realm of the dead, making proclamation (ἐκνηπεύετε) there to the spirits in prison (1 Pet. iii. 18–20). At Pentecost, he quotes from the inspired Psalm xvi. 10 concerning Christ, that neither was his soul left in Sheol (Hades), nor did his flesh see corruption — whom God raised up (Acts ii. 23+), and exalted at his own right hand. In the triumphant words of Paul (Eph. iv. 7–11), Christ ascending up on high, led captivity captive and gave gifts to men. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. Henceforth, as Paul says on behalf of every true Christian (Phil. i. 23), "To depart and be with Christ is far better" (2 Cor. v. 8); "Absent from the body, present with the Lord"; and as John (Rev. xiv. 13) receives and repeats the assurance from Heaven: "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth."

Such, in rapid outline, is the Scriptural history of this doctrine of the intermediate state.

And now we advance into the patristic period. In the light of this fuller revelation which we have just traced, the Christian Fathers contemplated the intermediate state. They believed that the risen Christ had gone to prepare a place for his followers, that he might receive them unto himself. They believed with Paul that to be absent from the body was to be present with the Lord. They believed that hitherto the pious dead could not have been with Christ in this new place of his abode. They argued this, because the incarnation had not taken place, nor the death of Christ, nor his resurrection. They argued that until the resurrection neither the crucified Christ, nor the penitent thief, nor the pious dead could have entered the heavenly Paradise.
They argued that his death wrought a great change in the condition of all his saints; that in Paradise to which the dying Redeemer went, "that day," with the penitent thief, to those believers who waited for his coming, Christ proclaimed his finished work on Calvary, and sealed their redemption; and by his resurrection and ascension exalted them to be with him—absent from the body, present with the Lord. The distinction between the dying believer and unbeliever was intensified; the experience grew more unlike; the separation was greater. Deliverance of Christian captives—liberation of the pious dead then and thereafter—this was the common view: Justin Martyr (Dial. cc.100, 101), "Our Fathers hoped in Thee . . . and Thou didst liberate them;" Dial. c. 72 ("That he might announce to them his salvation"); Irenæus (Cont. Hæres. iv. 33, 53, 56, 65, 66; v. 31), "The Lord remembered his dead saints . . . and descended to them to draw them out and to save them." Similar statements are made in the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas, c. 5; Ignatius (Smaller Greek) to Mgnesians, c. 9; and (Larger Greek) to Trallians, c. 9; Hermas, Similitude 9, c. 16. After these specimen statements, I need only add that in the second and the third centuries this liberation of the righteous dead seems to have been universally taught, unless Tertullian be a possible exception (De Anima, c. 55), although later he appears to teach it (Adv. Judæos, c. 13).

Thus far, the patristic view in reference to the righteous dead who in Sheol (Hades) had awaited the coming of their Saviour and Deliverer.

In regard to the unrighteous dead and a probation in the intermediate state, we can also ascertain the patristic view or views. The writings of the Christian Fathers (Ante-Nicene, Nicene, and Post-Nicene) are not only preserved for us in the original tongues, but they are now placed within reach of the general reader by recent trustworthy translations into the modern languages. By a large generalization, reaching into the fifth century, we find one view which may be styled the prevalent, though scarcely the uniform, certainly not the universal view of the Christian Fathers.

(I may remark, parenthetically, that on the narrower question, To whom did Christ proclaim or preach in Sheol (Hades), Steiger, as quoted in Lange (i Pet. iii. 18-22), p. 69, has classified the views and their advocates: I. To the good; II. To the good and the wicked; III. To the wicked. Steiger, notwithstanding his own peculiar views, places the great majority of the Fathers in the first class.)

But our question takes a broader range—viz.: Human Probation, is it limited to this life? Negatively and affirmatively, what say the Fathers? The Recognitions of Clement (Clement of Rome, according to Rufinus, and quoted by Origen), Bk. V. c. 27, 28, says: "For the patience of God waiteth for the conversion of men, as long as they are in this body. But if any persist in impiety till the end of life, then as soon as the soul, which is immortal, departs, it shall pay the penalty of its persistence in impiety." Barnabas, Epistle of ("written about 120 A.D., at the very latest, and perhaps much earlier," Bishop Lightfoot), c. 20, contrasts "the way of light" with "the way of darkness or evil." "This is the way of eternal death with punishment."
Hermas, Pastor of (quoted as Scripture by Irenæus, Cont. Hæres. iv. 20, and read publicly in the churches), says sinners until the close of life are not then received, unless they repent. "You see that repentance involves life to sinners, but non-repentance death" (Similitude, viii. c. 6). Cf. Coteler, Patres Ap. T. I. p. 80. The view of Irenæus, of Barnabas (Epistle of), and of Ignatius is indicated in the references already made as unfavorable to the theory of future probation. Justin (Apol. i. 8, n. 21) says to the Roman emperor: "We Christians believe that all who live wickedly, and do not repent, will be punished in eternal fire." In his "Dial. cum Tryph." he would include those who "did things by nature universally and eternally good" as among the saved through this Christ of ours in the resurrection, while he declares that "souls never perish, for this would, indeed, be a godsend to the wicked." Tatian, who, as a disciple of Justin, wrote his "Address to the Greeks," says (c. 14): "As we, to whom it now easily happens to die, afterward receive the immortal with enjoyment, or the painful with immortality, so the daemons, etc." Theophilus of Antioch (ad. Autolycum, i. 14), Tertullian (Apol. c. 45, n. 18), indicate a similar view. Of the Fathers to the end of the century, Clement of Alexandria will conclude the list. As is well known, Clement taught that as Christ had preached to the spirits in prison (in Sheol, Hades), including, as Clement assumes, "the righteous heathen," so the Apostles, like the Master, must have preached there, and likewise to the heathen, but both only to the good—i.e., those who had lived in righteousness according to the "Law and Philosophy," and as "confessedly of the number of the people of God Almighty, ending life not perfectly but imperfectly, should yet be saved, each one according to his individual knowledge." Thus, according to Clement, may the salvation of God "extend to all that turn to him, whether here or elsewhere" (Strom. Bk. VI. c. 6).

This view of Clement (about 200 A.D.), referring especially to 1 Pet. iii. 18-20 and iv. 6, and argued chiefly upon ethical grounds, and afterward styled "the larger hope"—this was accepted by his pupil Origen, and taught in the third century on Scriptural and ethical grounds, such as those claimed by Clement, but more especially on philosophical grounds. The enlarged view of Origen, based especially upon his philosophical notion of the will as forever free and forever mutable, and hence including the possible penitence and reformation of every sinner, even of Satan, has since been styled "Eternal Hope."

This view of Origen was rejected by the other Christian Fathers of the third century, such as Hippolytus, and Minutius, and Cyprian, etc., and vigorously opposed by counter-teaching: "It is here that life is either lost or saved. Once gone forth from hence, there is no more place for repentance" (ad Demetrium, et al.). Even the gifted Arnobius confronted Origen's philosophical and ethical theory of "Eternal Hope" with his own ethical and philosophical theory of "Conditional Immortality or Annihilation of the Wicked."

Patristic writers multiply in the fourth century. Great names appear both in the East and the West, such as Lactantius, Eusebius, Athanasius, Maternus, Julius,
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Cyril, Hilary, Zeno, Epiphanius, Basil, the two Gregorys, Ambrose, Jerome, Ruffinus, Augustin, Chrysostom. Of all these (not to mention others perhaps their peers), I recall but one who clearly endorsed and advocated the view of Origen. This was Gregory of Nyssa. Accepting some of the philosophical and ethical notions of Origen, he asserted the theory of universal restoration. This theory he asserted as the logical and inevitable resultant of Origen's philosophical and ethical premises, and supported by some Scripture texts. This process of restoration might begin in this life, be continued in the intermediate state, and be perfected in eternity.

Among these Christian Fathers, I do not recall any supporter of Arnobius. Even Lactantius, his admiring pupil, rejected the theory of Annihilation or Conditional Immortality. With the writings of Didymus, and Diodorus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Pelagius, we are far on in the fifth century, nearing the limit we had set to the patristic period, amid the yeasty waves of controversy, threatened by conflicting heresies—Nestorian, Eutychian, Pelagian, Sabellian, and deafened by the din of these new departures. These we need not trace, since they have little or no relation to the doctrine of the intermediate state.

Along the line of our advance we have discovered incidentally some views, vague and ill-defined, which before the close of the fifth century took definite form, and were at length wrought into a system by the Roman Church. To this many a Christian Father wittingly or unwittingly contributed. Some pervasive mysterious fire or the final conflagration of the last day was inferred from 1 Cor. iii. 12, 13 to be discriminating (Clement of Alexandria), remedial (Origen), cleansing (Gregory of Nyssa), friendly or expiatory (Gregory Nazianzen), avenging or corrective (Basil), etc. This vague notion was concretely defined by Augustine (as "a private opinion") to be ignis purgatorius. According to Cæsarius of Arles, it was to be applied not to capitalia crina, but only to minuta peccata, which alone could be expiated by the purifying fire in the intermediate state. In the sixth century it was declared an article of faith by Gregory the Great (Dial. iv. 39), who is styled "the inventor of the doctrine of Purgatory," including priestly oblations and intercessions for the dead. In the thirteenth century Alexander Hales perfected this elaborate invention by fabricating a scheme of supererogation, and penance, and indulgence.

In the sixteenth century this was formulated as a doctrine and promulgated as a Decree by the Council of Trent, and by fearful anathemas imposed upon the Roman Church. This doctrine of Purgatory, with its flagrant abuses, for a thousand years of Papal rule in Europe held the West in purgatorial bondage, and combined with other causes to necessitate and precipitate the Protestant Reformation. And after three hundred years this immutable Decree of the Roman Church still binds the conscience and the common-sense of every submissive Romanist, and it is designed to perpetuate this bondage. This Papal doctrine—it hardly need be said—includes: "A Decree concerning Purgatory;" "A Decree concerning Indulgences;" and "The Sacrifice of the Mass as a propitiation not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and
other necessities of the faithful who are living, but also for those who are departed in Christ, and who are not yet fully purified." To those beyond it does not reach. Thus it is at once inclusive and exclusive—making precise and permanent distinction in the intermediate state. For the departed in Christ not yet fully purified there is a purgatory, with its fiery pangs, its purification, and its promise of liberation; for the departed not in Christ there is no deliverance and no hope. Gracious opportunity has passed with this lifetime. Probation is ended. The case is closed. After death cometh judgment. (Papal saints go at death direct to Paradise.) See "Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent," XXII. Session, held September 17th, 1562, and XXV. Session, December 3d and 4th, 1563.

This, in brief, is the history of the doctrine of the intermediate state as held by the Church of Rome.

On the contrary, the Greek Church, vying with the Roman Church in antiquity and in numbers, and claiming to be less mutable and more orthodox—the Greek Church (with some individual vacillation and exception) has never entertained the fiction of purgatorial fire for burning out sin from the soul in the intermediate state. It has firmly and steadily rejected from its creed this Papal patent of purification.

In accord with the Greek rather than with the Roman is the view of the Syriac Christians as represented by Ephraem (the Syrian), whose hymns were used by all the Syrian churches: "Both the just and the unjust shall pass through the fire, which is to try them, and shall be proved by it; the righteous pass, and the flame is quiet; but it burneth the wicked and snatcheth them away" (Can. 42, etc.). This poetic but realistic thought of Ephraem recalls the mystic but no less realistic thought of Clement (Alexandria)—a discriminating fire which searches the very soul.

The Protestant Reformation had to withstand the assumptions and errors of the Roman hierarchy—faults both in faith and practice. Some of these had relation to the intermediate state, especially the false doctrine of Purgatory and the shameless practices associated with the doctrine. The Reformers protested against both doctrine and practice as false to sacred Scripture and Church history—as fatal to good order and good character. The protest was unanswerable and successful. The Reformation as it spread established churches adopting a reformed creed, eliminating the doctrine of Purgatory, forbidding the sale of indulgences, teaching the doctrine of Justification by faith, repudiating the fiction of "opus supererogationis" and of a "thesaurus meritorum sanctorum," reaffirming, in common with the Greek and the Roman Churches, the doctrine of an earthly probation, and repeating—emphasizing the Saviour's declaration—"He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned," and the Apostolic warning—"Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." In common with the preceding creeds of Christendom, both East and West, even to the Apostolic period, Protestantism regards the impenitent and unbelieving dead as lost, and the penitent and believing dead as saved, teaching that since Christ has died and risen again, and ascended up on high,
and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, the pious dead depart to be with Christ, which is far better—absent from the body they are present with the Lord. So that "henceforth, blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."

In regard to those on earth have never heard of Christ, or those who are incapable of receiving the Gospel call to believe in Christ, whether they be infants dying in infancy, or adult imbeciles, or uninstructed heathen at home or abroad, one prevailing view has marked the historic creeds through all the Christian centuries. This view, drawn (as it is claimed) from Scripture, especially Rom. ii. 11-16, restated after Paul even by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. Bk. II. c. 9), which he confirms and illustrates by his quotation from Hermas (Simil. p. 49)—this has been substantially the restatement in the historic creeds of Christendom. Tacitly, if not expressly, all such cases have been remitted to the righteous judgment of God, "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel." This Confessional view has perhaps been vague and indefinite. It has at least been expressed in terms that seem to many persons rather general than specific, rather safe than satisfactory, conservative rather than clear and convincing.

It is in this direction especially that recent research and solicitude are tending. Such research may be deemed as extra Confessional rather than contra Confessional. The motive is often friendly, perhaps oftener friendly than hostile. But to this we may return, if space permit.

We have thus far noted the general history of this doctrine of the intermediate state in the four great religious periods—viz.: The Scripture (the Old and the New Testaments) to the close of the first century, A.D.; the Patristic (Ante-Nicene, Nicene, Post-Nicene), first to sixth century, A.D.; The Medieval or Scholastic (Roman and Greek Churches), sixth to sixteenth century, A.D.; the Reformation or Protestant (sixteenth to nineteenth century, A.D.); or, rather, beginning with the Scriptural history, we have traced the subsequent history along these great ecclesiastical lines (or Church creeds)—viz.: The patristic or Æcumenical; the Roman or Western; the Greek or Eastern; the English or Anglican, together with the other Protestant evangelical creeds.

Besides these, there have been some local creeds, as Sabellian, Eutychian, Nestorian, Pelagian, with special and minor variations from the representative church creeds of Christendom, but with little or nothing that is noteworthy in reference to the intermediate state.

Besides these, there have been divergent individual speculations or special theories in regard to this doctrine, appearing within the patristic period and reappearing in the course of subsequent history, in the same or similar form and features. These individual speculations or special theories we noted as we traversed the patristic period—e.g., the theory of Clement of Alexandria, in his hope embracing the heathen who as righteous in this life would accept Christ as revealed to them in the intermediate state, styled in modern phrase, "the Nirger hope." (The differentia of this theory we have already stated.)

Again, the theory of his pupil Origen, in his hope embracing any and all who would repent and receive Christ in the intermediate state—indeed, any and
all who would repent in time or in eternity, styled in modern phrase "eternal hope." (The differentia of his theory we have already stated, and we need not repeat.)

Holding that punishment is reformatory, and that the will is forever free, and therefore character is forever mutable, it was argued on philosophical, ethical, and theological grounds that not only "the larger hope," but "eternal hope" could be entertained—indeed, was authorized. This was at that time argued broadly and ably, so broadly and ably, as well as originally, that the modern disciples and advocates seem to suffer in the comparison.

"New Theology," as it is styled in our day, or "Progressive Orthodoxy," may cherish as fervent a wish for the validity of such a theory, and may more uniformly and vigorously repeat the hope; but we think it has failed to present more cogent arguments. We have read Dr. Dorner and other writers in this direction, and we are quite sure that as between the later and the earlier advocacy our judgment is, at least, impartial.

We should have said, in passing, that neither the theory of Clement of Alexandria nor the theory of Origen was ever endorsed and inserted in the creeds of Christendom—Greek, Roman, Anglican, Papal, or Protestant. On the contrary, "Origenism," as it was styled, was not only resisted by many Christian Fathers, but was formally condemned in several Synodical councils whose action was never reversed by Ecumenical Church authority, and hence stands approved. (It is claimed, indeed, that the Fifth General Council reaffirmed the condemnation of Origen.)

Again, the theory of Conditional Immortality, or Annihilation of the Wicked, either in the intermediate state or in the eternal state, was brilliantly and forcibly advocated by Arnobius. (The differentia of his theory we have already stated.) Holding that punishment is retributive and not reformatory, and that naturally involved in "the lot of mortality" the impenitent dead have not by faith in Christ attained to immortality, on varied grounds Arnobius maintained the doctrine of Annihilation in the hereafter.

This theory has been conspicuously restated by Rothe and White in our day, elaborated, indeed, and expanded without being greatly re-enforced—perhaps weakened rather than invigorated by the expansion. It should be remarked that in the time of Arnobius this theory of Annihilation was sternly resisted, as it is in our day; and that even Lactantius, the admiring pupil of the brilliant and vigorous Arnobius, rejected this theory of his master.

Together with this theory of Annihilation of the impenitent dead is commonly, though not necessarily, associated the theory of trichotomy—body, soul, and spirit. Then by certain writers, as Pettingell and Constable, it is said that "the soul is midway between" the body and the spirit, neither one nor the other. "The soul is the life of the body, and the spirit is the life of the soul" (Pettingell's "Tritreuma," p. 112); or, the soul is the life which man possesses in common with animals, while the spirit is the Divine essence or spirit which produces the life or soul. In death, according to Mr. Constable, the spirit is withdrawn, the soul vanishes, and man becomes non-existent.
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Whatever may occur of resurrection or restoration for the final judgment during the intermediate state, however long that may be, the soul has ceased to exist. Such psychologists assert that Delitzsch and Heard do not understand trichotomy, and that White errs in admitting the survival of the soul in the intermediate state. Yet they assert that although annihilated all must appear at the judgment to receive their final doom! (See White's "Life in Christ.")

There is still another phase of Conditional Immortality, or Annihilation. Rector Warleigh, differing from Prebendary Constable, teaches that "the Divine Spirit becomes a distinct individual spirit of the Christian who thus survives in Paradise until the resurrection, when spirit, soul, and body are reunited. (This reminds one of the Valentinian vagaries, with a similar abuse of trichotomy and theology, for which Valentinus received and deserved the condemnation of Christendom.)

Another and final phase of this theory, represented by Dr. Ives ("Bible Doctrine of the Soul"), with no slight following, would make the soul a mere organism. So Dr. Ives defines it (p. 106). The body dies. The soul is thereby extinguished. The man ceases to be. Yet after this cessation of being during the intermediate state, the impenitent dead, by some Divine recreation, come back to be condemned, for the deeds done here in the body, to a second and final Annihilation. To such base uses can theoretic speculation descend.

Over against this multiform theory of Annihilation stands the old theory of Gregory of Nyssa (fourth century), revived in our day. Gregory, the pupil of Origen, transformed the inquiry, or speculation, or hope of his teacher into a positive dogma, and asserted universal Restoration. This restoring process might be going on, would be, during the intermediate state; might be, would be, going on after the final judgment.

On the philosophical, ethical, and theological grounds stated by Origen, with slight pretence to any Scriptural authority, Gregory contended that the logical resultant must be universal restoration. This resultant Origen had avoided by the equally logical possibility of choice of evil or choice of good in the intermediate state and, also, in the eternal state. Rev. Mr. Jukes ("Restitution of All Things") recently argues that "the destruction (or death) of sinners is not the extinction of their existence, but is the means of their blessedness." While Dr. Ives, or Pettingell, or even White would say that the sinner, either in the intermediate state or in the eternal state, is annihilated by death and in death, Mr. Jukes is apparently fond of teaching that "the sinner is saved not from death, but by death and out of death." In all this he assumes the reformatory principle of punishment and the psychological principle of the will forever free and forever mutable.

Origen, we presume, saw that his philosophico-psychological postulate, which might suggest the possibility and so the hope of the restoration of any and every sinner, even Satan, to holiness and heaven, would also suggest the possibility and the everlasting dread that any saint in Heaven might fall into sin and hell. Such antagonistic theories should at least teach reserve and modesty in speculating upon the intermediate or the eternal state.
We pause to mention a view advanced by Dr. Love in his treatise (1883) on "Preaching to Spirits in Prison" (1 Pet. iii. 18-20). These were in Ward (according to Clement), on the lookout (as Calvin puts it. Insts. Bk. II. c. 16) for the promised deliverer, the Christ. For various reasons the great catastrophe of the deluge was specified, in which probably many died in penitence who had been aforetime disobedient. To these, as to other similar cases, Christ preached at his descent into Sheol (Hades), whither he went, "making proclamation of his finished work." This view Dr. Love promptly retraces to Clement, and remarks that it does not extend probation to the intermediate state, but places it rather in this life (p. 122). Dr. Cremer, in his monograph, "Beyond the Grave," introduced to the American public 1885, discards both Annihilation and Universal Restoration, and regards Sheol (Hades) previous to the descent of Christ (1 Pet. iii. 18-20) as "the vestibule of Heaven for the penitent dead, but the vestibule of Hell for the impenitent dead. Thence the penitent dead ascended with Christ to Heaven; the impenitent dead were repelled from Hades to their more definite place and experience. Thither now go the impenitent rejectors of Christ. Those who receive Christ go at death to be with Him. Those who have neither accepted nor rejected Christ go to Hades, the intermediate abode. The question of the possibility of conversion for those in Hades Dr. Cremer considers with great caution. His conclusion is expressed as a conjecture or hope of such possibility, rather than as a dogma (p. 109).

Still, if any of the impenitent dead should come savingly to know Christ, "they must wait for deliverance from Hades till the great resurrection and judgment day" (p. 109).

A view similar to this in several respects is presented by Dr. Kliefoth in his "Christliche Eschatologie" (1886). Yet Kliefoth's view differs from Cremer's in at least two noticeable particulars: (1) Dr. Kliefoth would say of those who are in Hades, that they are not in psychopannychia, or soul-sleep, nor, on the other hand, are they in responsible, productive moral activity, but that they are absorbed in introspection and recollection, having ceaseless but timeless experience, waiting and still waiting. Thus Kliefoth excludes from his view the receptivity and susceptibility, and hence the possibility, of conversion in Hades, which Cremer's view includes. (2) On the other hand, the possibility of conversion for those in Hades, which Cremer would limit to the intermediate state, Kliefoth would postpone till after the intermediate state—i.e., until the second coming of Christ—the revelation to them of the Lord at his coming. Kliefoth's thought (1) is also expressed in these words of Martensen ("Christian Dogma," p. 458) : "The departed find themselves in a condition of rest, a state of passivity; they are in 'the night wherein no man can work.'" While the words of each recall the thought so tersely expressed by Irenæus almost seventeen centuries ago: "Making sin to cease by the interposition of death" (Contra Hæres. 3, 23). The view of Cremer, as well as of Kliefoth, that the appearance and proclamation of Christ in the realm of the dead was the occasion of decisive movement in Hades, in which the penitent and believing dead were attracted to Christ and exalted with him, even from Hades to Heaven,
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while the impenitent and unbelieving were repelled, even from Hades to Gehenna—this view (which may seem new and original) recalls the question of Evodius (Epis. to Augus. 163) "whether Hades was then completely emptied;" and the elaborate answer of Augustine, in which he animadverts upon the speculation which had suggested the question (Letters of Augus. 164). It remains no less a speculation to-day than when it was indulged by Origen, in the earlier patristic period. As it was not then adopted into the Christian creed, so to-day it is repeated as an individual speculation or personal conjecture, but is not found in the creeds of Christendom. The modern postulate of "Progressive Orthodoxy" (restated from Dorner)—viz.: the absoluteness of Christianity and the correlated ethical demand that the historic Christ be offered to every one, seems at first to be original with the "New Theology;" but a reference to the patristic writings of the third century will promptly dispel such an illusion (see Arnobius, "Adn. Gentes," ii. 63). Of the heathen complaining that the benefits of Christ's redemptive work are not extended to them, Arnobius says: "To them also royal mercy has been imparted, and the divine benefits have equally flowed on all." Origen ("In Lib. Regum, Hom. 2, Opp. 2," ) emphasizes this thought by an interrogation, "Why should you fear to say that every place has need of Jesus Christ?" (See also Origen contra Celsum, ii. 43.) This, indeed, during all the Christian centuries has not been adopted into the creeds of Christendom; but evidently the speculation is not "new" to the Christian world nor original with modern "progress."

If in tracing the history of this doctrine in the patristic period we have found that it not only antedates but anticipates well-nigh every individual theory of our day, Christian truth will not thereby suffer any detriment; while theorizers may learn the Christian lesson of humility, and modern Christendom may be taught the more properly to estimate the claim of "Progressive Orthodoxy," and be relieved from terror at the name of "New Theology."

R. B. WELCH.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF DIVINE JUDGMENT.

THE conception of judgment seems to follow necessarily from the nature of man as described in the Bible. He is a moral being, placed under law, and subject to rewards and punishments. There must therefore be an adjudication upon his conduct. Whether this will be present or future, or both, whether it is partial or complete, whether conditional or final, whether national or universal, can be determined only from the statements of the Word.

The fact that God is a judge pervades the Old Testament from beginning to end. In the opening of Genesis the sentence pronounced upon each of the parties to the first transgression, and the solemn words to the first murderer, are judicial utterances, assigning the appropriate recompense to sin. So the tremendous flood which swept the earth in the days of Noah was a visitation
of judgment, and the same is to be said of the fearful overthrow which extinguished the cities of the Plain. In the intercession of Abraham on their behalf for the sake of his nephew Lot, there is a striking recognition of this characteristic of the Most High. "Shall not," asks the father of the faithful, "shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" God is judge, nay, he is universal judge; the same sentiment which is found in the Song of Hannah:

Jehovah is a God of knowledge,
And by him actions are weighed . . .
Jehovah judgeth the ends of the earth.

The dreadful plagues which devastated the Nile Valley are expressly declared to be judgments upon the king, the people, and the false gods of Egypt (Ex. xii. 12, Num. xxxiii. 4). Such judgments are represented to be not capricious or hasty, but the results of wise discrimination and impartial equity. The seed of Abraham did not obtain possession of the promised land in the days of Abraham, because the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full (Genesis xv. 16), but centuries afterward the cup became full, and then by divine direction almost the whole population was cut off by fire and sword. So after the conquest, under the Judges and under all the Kings, the whole dealing of God with his covenant people is represented as a continuous act of judging. Were they faithful, then his smile rested upon them; or did they go astray, then he sold them into the hand of their enemies. Thus was fulfilled the utterance of the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 4, 36):

The Rock, his work is perfect:
For all his ways are judgment.
Jehovah shall judge his people.

In the poetical books this truth is asserted in a variety of ways, as it took hold upon the experiences of the sweet singers of Israel. They declare (Ps. xc. 2, lxxxix. 14):

Clouds and darkness are round about him;
Righteousness and judgment are the foundation of his throne.

Nor does this perfection lie dormant. It comes forth again and again in a way that compels acknowledgment. As in the ninth Psalm,

Jehovah hath made himself known, he hath executed judgment:
The wicked is snared in the work of his own hands.

In another Psalm, after speaking of God's providential retributions as certain to occur, the poet adds,

So that men shall say, verily there is a reward for the righteous:
Verily there is a God that judgeth in the earth.

And when this ongoing process seems to be for the time interrupted there is a new and vigorous appeal, as in the ninety-fourth Psalm,

Jehovah, thou God to whom vengeance belongeth,
Lift up thyself, thou judge of the earth:
Render to the proud their desert.
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In one Psalm (the fiftieth), there is a vivid and solemn representation of a great judicial procedure which heaven and earth are summoned to witness. In the course of it Jehovah first deals with his professed followers who substituted ritual observances for love and obedience, and then turns to the openly wicked, who are severely rebuked for their forgetfulness of God.

But in other lyrics the scope of the adjudication is extended so as to include all men without exception. In Ps. xcvi. and xcvi., the hills are bidden to sing for joy

Before Jehovah; for he cometh,
For he cometh to judge the earth:
He shall judge the world with righteousness,
And the peoples with his truth.

The prophet Isaiah (xxx. 18) says that Jehovah is a God of judgment, and Jeremiah (xi. 20) addresses him as "Jehovah of hosts, that judgest righteously, that triest the reins and the heart." But the clearest statements of the Old Testament as to a general assize or judgment are found in the later portions of the book. Daniel (vii. 9, 10) recounts a theophany of wondrous sublimity and glory at which in the presence of ten thousand times ten thousand "the judgment was set, and the books were opened." Long after this impatient Israel cried out, "Where is the God of judgment?" to which Malachi made answer (iii. 1-5), announcing the advent of a forerunner who should be as refiner's fire and fuller's soap, after whom, the Lord said, "I will come near to you to judgment." And that this will be a specific and individual inquiry we learn from the conclusion of Ecclesiastes, "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." And hence the solemn warning is given to those most inclined to recklessness, "Rejoice, O young man in thy youth, and let thine heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." Mention is made in several of the prophets, Isaiah (ii. 12), Jeremiah (xlvi. 10), Ezekiel (xiii. 5), Joel (i. 15, ii. 1), Obadiah (15), Zephaniah (i. 8), Zechariah (xiv. 1), and Malachi (iv. 5), of the day of the Lord as at hand or coming, in connections which indicate a visitation for judgment, as appears very plainly in the words of Amos (v. 18):

"Woe unto you that desireth the day of the Lord! wherefore would ye have the day of the Lord? it is darkness and not light."

Now, although many, if not all, of these utterances had reference to some special manifestation of Jehovah's retributive wrath on earth and in time, yet they seem to have fostered among the Jews living between the Old Economy and the New, a persuasion that there was a day coming in the end of the world when Jehovah would institute a complete and final judgment for the entire race. Certain it is that we find our Lord referring to such a day in a way that seems to have been perfectly understood by his hearers. Thus, in Matthew (vii. 23), "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophecy by thy name, etc. And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you," and again (xii. 41), "The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judg-
ment with this generation, and shall condemn it." But whatever be the explanation of the fact, we find in New Testament times a well-developed doctrine of future judgment. Thus, when our Lord said to Martha (Jno. xi. 23), "Thy brother shall rise again," her answer was prompt, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day."

Nor does one trace in the Greek Scriptures a progressive disclosure of truth on this point, such as is apparent in other doctrines of the Christian system. On the contrary, the tenet of a final judgment seems to have been full-orbed from the beginning. All the features of it that are of specific importance, such as when it is to take place, who is to be the judge, who are to stand at the bar, what is to be inquired into, and what are the issues of the decision, are set forth as plainly by our Lord himself as by any of his disciples. So that the statements of the later books are only cumulative or such as give additional vividness to our conceptions.

Thus our Lord, in reproving those who rejected his messengers, said, "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city" (Matt. x. 15). Here the reference is to a fixed point of time, apparently well understood by those who heard it, and requiring no further description. The same thing appears in his familiar use of the term "that day" (Matt. vii. 22, xxiv. 36, Luke x. 12, xxi. 34, John xiv. 20, xvi. 23, 26).

The time of the judgment is variously depicted as the "end of the world" or consummation of the age, as in the parables of the Tares of the field and the Drag net of the sea (Matt. xiii. 40, 49), or as "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory" (Matt. xxv. 31), or "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mark viii. 38). These words can mean nothing but the close of the present dispensation. It is the time meant by the Saviour when he said of whosoever believeth in him, "I will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 39, 40, 54).

The person of the judge is set forth with equal plainness, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," again, "hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man" (Jno. v. 22, 27). So, in the solemn account in Matt. xxv., it is the Son of Man who divides the sheep from the goats and decides human destiny. He is to purge the threshing-floor, and gather the wheat into his garner, and burn the chaff with fire unquenchable (Luke iii. 17). Again, the judgment is to be strictly universal. "All nations" are to be gathered before him (Matt. xxv. 32), Nineveh and Sodom as well as Jerusalem and Capernaum are to appear.

The scrutiny is to take in all things as well as all persons. "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his deeds" (Matt. xvi. 27). "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment" (Matt. xii. 36). If words and deeds are thus subjected to examination, one can hardly doubt that the secret motives and thoughts from which they proceed will in like manner be investigated.
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The issues of the proceeding are stated with equal plainness. In the Sermon on the Mount our Lord speaks of the Gehenna of fire and also of a reward in heaven that is great. He speaks also of a destruction of the body only, and of a destruction of both soul and body in Gehenna (Matt. x. 28). And in the elaborate statement in Matt. xxv., he declared that the righteous shall go into life eternal and the wicked into eternal punishment. The decision therefore is final and irreversible. There is no appeal from the sentence. But the words of the Apocalypse seem to apply, "He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still; and he that is righteous let him do righteousness still" (xxii. 11). Character and condition have both received the stamp that is never to change.

These teachings of the Master were faithfully reproduced by his apostles. When Paul preached before Felix and Drusilla he reasoned not only of righteousness and temperance (self-control), but also of the judgment to come (Acts xxiv. 25). And he closed his profound and eloquent discourse on the Areopagus by assuring the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers that God had "appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained" (Acts xvii. 31).

In his great doctrinal Epistle to the Romans the same apostle refers, as if to a fact well known to his readers, to "the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his works;" and again, to "the day when God will judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ" (ii. 5, 16). Afterward, in noticing an objection brought against one of his positions, he indignantly sets it aside, exclaiming, "For how then shall God judge the world?" as if the certainty, the necessity of such a judgment were undeniable. In a subsequent chapter (xiv.) he uses the same fact as a reason why Christians should not undertake to judge or condemn one another; "For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God. For it is written, As 1 live, saith the Lord, to me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God." In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, after stoutly asserting his own fidelity as a steward of the mysteries of God, he frankly admits that a man is not justified by his own convictions of innocence, and therefore adds the appropriate direction, "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall each man have his praise from God" (iv. 5). In like manner, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he assigns the same great fact in the future, as the reason why he made it his aim at all times to be well-pleasing to the Lord. "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (v. 10). In Galatians he impliedly indicates the same thing, declaring that "Every man shall bear his own burden," and that "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap" (vi. 8, 9). In the Epistle to the Ephesians (vi. 8, 9), and in that to the Colossians (iii. 24, 25), he
enforces the reciprocal duties of masters and servants by reminding both of the solemn truth that "Whatsoever good thing each one doeth, the same shall he receive again from the Lord, whether he be bond or free."

In the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, the apostle speaks of a recompense to be made "at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus." An exact counterpart to this statement of wrath for the ungodly in the great day is found in Paul's confident hope for the godly expressed in Second Timothy (iv. 8), "Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day: and not only to me, but also to all them that have loved his appearing."

In the Epistle to the Hebrews there are three references to this subject, all of them clear and precise. One is in vi. 2, where, enumerating the first principles of Christ, the writer closes the list with the teaching "of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment," i.e., a judgment the consequences of which are eternal. A second is found in ix. 27, where we are told that "it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment." Once more, in x. 26, 27, it is said of a certain class of sinners that for them "there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment."

The Apostle James in his epistle reminds his brethren that "One only is the lawgiver and judge, even he who is able to save and to destroy," and subsequently he adds, "Behold, the Judge standeth before the doors" (iv. 12, v. 9).

The Apostle Peter in his First Epistle assumes as a matter of course that his brethren call on God "as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man's work" (i. 17), and on the other hand, says of those who speak evil of believers that they "shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead" (iv. 5). In his Second Epistle he says of the angels who sinned, that God "committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment" (ii. 4), and in almost the same language he speaks of "the heavens that now are, and the earth" as "being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men" (iii. 7). The Apostle John has but one reference to the subject in his epistles, but that one is very clear, "Herein is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment" (iv. 17), where he seems to mention it as a thing universally understood and accepted. The Apostle Jude repeats the sentiment of Peter in regard to the fallen angels, whom God "hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (6).

In the Apocalypse, besides manifold references or allusions to the final assize scattered all through this wondrous galaxy of symbols and visions (i. 7, ii. 23, iii. 11, vi. 12-17, xi. 15-18, xiv. 6, 7, xv. 2-4, xix. 1, 2, xxii. 12), there is in xx. 11-13 an ample and detailed description of the whole scene, set forth in terms of unequalled simplicity and grandeur. "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat upon it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, the great
and the small, standing before the throne; and books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and Hades gave up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works.

The summing up of the whole subject may be thus stated:

1. God is judge all the time, but as clouds and darkness are round about him, and the present condition of man is one of probation, the fact is not always made plain to human observation.

2. Yet in every age and generation there are occurrences which compel men to believe that God distinguishes between the righteous and the wicked, showing favor to the former and overthrowing the latter.

3. This fact leads us to anticipate in the future what the Scripture distinctly announces, viz., a full disclosure of the retributive justice of which partial instances are seen in the present world.

4. This disclosure is to take place at a fixed and definite time, and will be strictly a judicial assize, not a varied providential process running through a series of ages.

5. All that we know of the time is that it will be coincident with that of the Second Advent of our Lord when he comes in the glory of his Father.

6. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, will be the Judge who separates the wheat from the chaff and decides every individual case.

7. Just preceding the assize there will be a general resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.

8. The entire human race, without a solitary exception among the living or the dead, will be arraigned at the bar.

9. Everything that has been hidden on earth will then be brought to the full light of day.

10. The judgment will be without respect of persons and rigidly impartial.

11. The apportionment of reward and punishment will be in exact accordance with the law and the facts in each case, and will compel the assent of every man's conscience.

12. The results of the assize will be final and without appeal, and therefore eternal and unchangeable.

T. W. Chambers.
I accept the part assigned to me in the discussion on the salvation of infants, but not with much promptitude; because it seems to me that our light is not sufficient to warrant dogmatic conclusions on the subject. What I shall have to bring forward is rather in the form of presumption than proof; considerations bearing in a certain direction, but with a haze upon them that makes definite outlines impossible.

But before doing so, I must crave leave to offer some remarks on Dr. Briggs's paper in the last number of this Review.

1. I have a conviction that his argument, founded on the phrase in the Minutes of the Westminster Assembly, "elect of infants," is founded on a mistake. It was the phrase made use of, he says, in the report of the third Grand Committee, November 13th, 1645. He refers to it three times, and attaches to it the greatest importance. I have examined the passage, as contained in Mitchell and Struthers's edition of the "Minutes," and I find that it runs thus: "Discussion continued on the elect of infants;" and that there is nothing more on the subject. Nor am I aware (though here I may be wrong) of any other place where the phrase occurs. My conviction is that elect here is a contraction for "election." What is printed is not the Minutes as revised for the press, but the Minutes with the abbreviations found in the original ms. In the same page I find scandal for scandalous; L and Comm. for Lords and Commons; and near it, not for notice and frequently be for because. Dr. Briggs has an elaborate theory as to how the phrase "elect of infants" came to be dropped. My theory is, that it was never used. It is a phrase unknown to theologians, and at the best awkward. In this discussion it appears to me that it must count for nothing.

2. With respect to the opinions held by contemporary divines, some of them members of the Assembly, some of Dr. Briggs's quotations are not very relevant. There are really three questions on one or other of which these quotations bear: (a) Is there a possibility of salvation apart from the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit? It is this question that is so emphatically and so truly answered in the negative in the quotation from Anthony Burgess, p. 317. (b) Is salvation possible where there can be no knowledge of Christ, where the persons are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word (infants and incapables)? To this question our standards answer, Yes, but with expression affirmation that such persons are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit. (c) Are all infants actually saved? Undoubtedly some of those whose opinions Dr. Briggs quotes held that they were not, but the quoted passages are not all so decisive as he seems to think. The very painful extract from Samuel Rutherford (which surely might have been spared) affirms nothing on the question. "Our dear children" there spoken of as in hell are not presumably infants, but may be responsible children who have rejected Christ.

3. I do not think with Dr. Briggs that the phrase in the Confession "elect
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infants' must mean selected infants. It may quite fitly mean "infants as elect," or, as the theologians would put it, infants qua elect, infants on the ground that they are elect. This, I think, is a very natural meaning, because it is immediately afterward affirmed that they partake of regeneration and salvation by Christ through the Spirit; and it is the doctrine of the Confession that only elect persons can enjoy these benefits.

On the whole, I differ from Dr. Briggs in his criticism of the Confession as it stands. Whatever may have been the views of the compilers, the language actually employed leaves it an open question whether or not all infants are elect, and therefore regenerated and saved.

Dr. Briggs is undoubtedly right in maintaining that even among Calvinists opinion on this interesting question has swung round of late years toward the more favorable view of the subject. Undoubtedly, in these days, we are much more disposed than our forefathers were to look on the brightest side of truth. In itself this is matter for rejoicing, provided always it does not blind us to the terrible retribution which is denounced against sin in the eternal world. Some would do away with hell altogether. On the other hand, I remember to have lately seen, even in so amiable and anti-Calvinistic a writer as George MacDonald, a very eloquent and powerful passage affirming both the need and the reality of hell.

Yet it would not be correct to say that Calvinistic divines of former days all maintained that some infants were lost. That many have held this is undoubtedly; and that some have expressed their belief in it in very painful terms is quite true. But not all. President Dickinson, of Princeton College, in his "Reflections on Mr. Wetmore's Letter in Reference to Dr. Waterland's Discourse on Regeneration" (A.D. 1745), asks, in reference to a charge that had been brought against him, "How have I made myself famous for infant-damning opinions? Has anything that I have ever written, preached, or spoken given the least handle for such an accusation? I challenge this gentleman to produce the shadow of an instance of this kind to justify his charge."

And in discussing the five points, Dickinson says (Decree of Election, ch. iii.): "He who has told us, 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven,' knows how to give them a title to it, and does doubtless qualify them for salvation by the sanctifying influences of his Spirit." Dr. Lyman Beecher, in dealing with a statement by Professor Norton, "indignantly denied the charge against Calvinists of believing and teaching that infants are damned, and that hell is doubtless paved with their bones." He declared that he had never seen or heard of any book which contained such a sentiment, nor a man who believed or taught it. Professor Norton replied to this note, maintaining the charge that "the monstrous doctrine" is found in Calvinistic writers of the highest authority, and is necessarily a part of the Calvinistic system. (See the Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. xviii., 1861, p. 384.) It may be well to give here a note subjoined by the late Rev. Thomas Scott (the commentator), in his edition of the Heidelberg Catechism, to the part of the catechism which says, "Pious parents ought not to doubt of the election and salvation of their children whom God hath called in
infancy out of this life’ (ch. i., § 17). On this Scott remarks: ‘The salvation of the offspring of believers dying in infancy is here scripturally stated not to be limited to such as are baptized. Nothing is said of the children of unbelievers dying in infancy, and the Scripture says nothing. But why might not these Calvinists have as favorable a hope of all infants dying before actual sin as anti-Calvinists can have’ (p. 119)? Evidently Scott did not hold that belief in infant perdition, in whatever degree, was an essential part of the Calvinistic creed.

Calvinists are well used to be made scapegoats of, and to be made to bear the brunt of unpopular dogmas. But, in point of fact, it is Roman Catholics (and probably Anglican Catholics) who openly avow the non-salvation of the great majority of infants. As Dr. Charles Hodge remarks (System of Theology, iii., pp. 746, 747) : ‘The doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject is, that infants dying without baptism are not at death or ever afterward admitted into the kingdom of heaven.’ Authorities are given, and he continues: ‘The Council of Trent anathematizes those who say that baptism is not necessary for the expiation of original sin.’ It is remarkable, however, that while Calvinists are well rated for the inhumanity of their supposed opinion, no great indignation has been expressed at the undoubted doctrine of Romanists and Anglicans.

The subject has not been much discussed on this side the Atlantic. The two writers among us who have given most attention to it happen to be Independents—Dr. Harris and Rev. David Russell, of Dundee. Mr. Russell (in 1823) wrote an elaborate essay ‘On the Salvation of all dying in Infancy.’ The ground on which he maintained that all infants are saved was that (as he interpreted 1 Cor. xv.) the resurrection of the body is not included in our natural constitution, but has been conferred on mankind solely by Jesus Christ. The penalty threatened to Adam for disobedience, and descending from him to those implicated in his guilt, could not extend to a resurrection body, inasmuch as that was not at the time included in the constitution of human beings. In the case of those who reject Christ and his benefits, the risen body necessarily participates in the punishment to which they become subject. But as infants have not rejected Christ and his benefits, they necessarily share in the gift of a resurrection body, and this is a proof that all of them are saved. The argument is ingenious; but even if it should be allowed to be logically justifiable, it is too subtle for practical impression, and cannot be regarded as contributing much to the belief now more general, that all infants are saved.

I have not been able to refer to Dr. Prentiss’s article on the subject; but, indeed, the prevalent grounds for the belief now prevalent are those brought forward by the two Hodges—Dr. Charles Hodge in his Systematic Theology, and Dr. A. A. Hodge, in his notes on the Confession of Faith. Beginning with the latter, who states the case in a compendious form, we find him thus explaining the passage on ‘elect infants’: ‘The phrase is precise, and fit for its purpose. It is not intended to suggest that there are any infants not elect, but simply to point out the facts (1) that all infants are born under righteous
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condemnation, and (2) that no infant has any claim in itself to salvation; and hence (3) the salvation of each infant, precisely as the salvation of each adult, must have its absolute ground in the sovereign election of God. This would be just as true if all adults were elected, as it is now that only some adults are elected. It is, therefore, just as true, although we have good reason to believe that all infants are elected. The Confession adheres in this plan accurately to the facts revealed. It is certainly revealed that none, either adult or infant, is saved except on the ground of a sovereign election; that is, all salvation for the human race is pure grace. It is not positively revealed that all infants are elect, but we are left, for many reasons, to indulge a highly probable hope that such is the fact. The Confession affirms what is certainly revealed, and leaves that which revelation has not decided to remain, without the suggestion of a positive opinion upon the one side or the other.

Dr. Charles Hodge's view in favor of the salvation of all infants is founded upon his exegesis of Romans v. 18, 19, "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many (οἱ πολλοί πάντες) were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many (οἱ πολλοί πάντες) be made righteous." "We have no right," he says, "to put any limit on these general terms except what the Bible itself places upon them. The Scriptures nowhere exclude any class of infants, baptized or unbaptized, born in Christian or in heathen lands, of believing or unbelieving parents, from the benefits of the redemption of Christ. All the descendants of Adam, except Christ, are under condemnation; all the descendants of Adam, except those of whom it is expressly revealed that they cannot inherit the kingdom of God, are saved." The principle which underlies this glorious manifestation of grace is, "that it is more congenial with the nature of God to bless than to curse, to save than to destroy. If the race fell in Adam, much more shall it be restored in Christ." "This much more" is repeated over and over. The Bible everywhere teaches that God delighteth not in the death of the wicked; that judgment is his strange work. It is, therefore, contrary not only to the argument of the Apostle, but to the whole spirit of the passage (Romans v. 12-21), to exclude infants from "the all" who are made alive in Christ.

"The conduct and language of our Lord in reference to children are not to be regarded as matters of sentiment, or simply expression of kindly feeling. He evidently looked on them as the lambs of the flock, for which, as the Good Shepherd, he laid down his life, and of whom he said, They shall never perish, and no man could pluck them out of his hands. Of such, he tells us, is the kingdom of heaven, as though heaven was, in great measure, composed of the souls of redeemed infants. It is, therefore, the general belief of Protestants, contrary to the doctrine of Romanists and Romanizers, that all who die in infancy are saved" (Systematic Theology, vol. i., pp. 26, 27).

To sum up what may be regarded as views of those who favor the position that all infants shall be saved:
1. This position is not founded on the denial of the fact that "the covenant was made with Adam not only for himself, but also for all his posterity," or of the fact that his posterity are all implicated in the results of his fall. It is admitted that the relation of the whole human race toward God was changed by the fall, and that the door of the kingdom of heaven was thus barred against them. Those who hold the views just stated would never claim for infants admission to the kingdom of heaven on personal grounds, nor join in the thoughtless charges of injustice and barbarity often brought against divines who hold themselves bound to accept the teaching of holy Scripture on the consequences of the Fall.

2. Belief in the salvation of infants rests on the ground of that view of the infinite riches of the grace of God in Christ which is the great revelation of the Bible, and which is brought out with special clearness and fulness in such a passage as Romans v. It is no figure of speech to say of God that he is love, that he delighteth in mercy, and that even where sin abounded he has made grace much more to abound. When we consider how many persons reject the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it is somewhat difficult to see in what manner it will be found, not only in its design, but in its effects, to be so glorious a monument of grace as such passages imply. Consequently it becomes us to form the most exalted conceptions of the operations of grace wherever the way is open for us to do so. We should be ready to take advantage of every legitimate means by which the magnitude of the actual results of grace may be widened out to correspond with the amplitude of such Scriptural statements. Now, the salvation of all infants is a quite legitimate source of contribution to this result. If we are not positively told (as we are not) that infants shall not be all saved, we are required to believe that they shall.

3. Infants are not subject to any of those specific grounds of condemnation to which adults are liable. When the Scriptures specify the particular grounds on which men will be rejected in the judgment, they do not bring forward their connection with Adam, but they bring forward grounds to the justice of which the individual conscience is constrained to bear witness. In particular they dwell on two grounds—impenitence and unbelief. Sin not repented of; an offered Saviour rejected—these are the specific grounds on which, on the day of judgment, it is represented that public condemnation will ensue. On neither of these grounds will there be any basis for the condemnation of infants. Will the judge, then, depart from the method by which he justifies to themselves and to the world his condemnation of adults, and resort to another method more subtle, more stringent by far, for justifying his condemnation of infants? Can we suppose that God will take this course when the other alternative is possible—of accepting for Christ's sake all who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression—making them trophies of his grace in Christ Jesus?

4. To these considerations may be added the interest which our Lord took in little children, and his memorable words, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." It is a vague consideration, but it has considerable weight, espe-
cially in the case of those who have themselves got lessons from infants; who have admired and coveted some of their gentle qualities, and have often thought what an interest and attraction these qualities, refined even to a higher pitch, would impart to the society of heaven.

The subject is not without difficulties. If you estimate the number of infants who have died before the age of responsibility, including all nations and tongues, you get a number far in excess of the number of adults in Christian lands, that even the widest charity could place among the children of the kingdom. You get a view of things that would make it a more favored lot to die in infancy than to grow up to maturity. You elevate the thought of the poet into a ruling consideration:

"For the blood thou might'st have slighted
Hath now made thee pure within;
And the evil seed is blighted
That had ripened into sin."

You almost take away the idea of this world as a scene of probation and preparation for the life to come. You seem to lower the value of ordinances or means of grace, for you admit to heaven an immense proportion of its inmates who have been saved directly, without the use of means. It cannot be denied that there is much in these difficulties. It is not possible to grapple with them effectually. We must leave them to a large degree unsolved. It seems as if God designed to try our faith in connection with this whole matter. And therefore I conclude as I began; there are many considerations of great weight and power that point in the direction of the salvation of all infants; for these let us be grateful; nevertheless a haze rests on the subject; and here, as on so many other points, our wisdom is not to seek to be wise above that which is written, but commit the matter to God, who will, beyond all doubt, in this as in other dark matters, fully vindicate his claim to do all things well.

W. G. Blaikie.

Edinburgh.
X.

REVIEWS OF

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

I.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.


In his short, earnest preface Dr. Godet expresses his anxiety regarding his interpretations because of the practical character of the book he has expounded and because "the results which he obtains are fitted to exercise direct influence on the solution of questions which are now occupying the Church." These very facts, however, in the light of what we already so fully know of our author's clear, penetrating, illuminating exposition, seen in his "John" and "Epistle to the Romans," cannot but give a deeper interest to his study of this epistle. And they do. This volume carries the exposition to chap. viii. 13, and includes the following subjects: The Address, the Parties, Discipline, Lawsuits, Impurity, Marriage and Celibacy, and a few verses of the discussion regarding "The Use of Meats Offered to Idols." The introduction to the work is brief, but satisfactory, giving the date and plan of the epistle, together with a description of the founding of the Church and its conditions at the time of the letter. Two points are here noteworthy: (1) The placing of the second visit to Corinth between the two epistles, and (2) the statement of the underlying thought of the whole epistle as "the historical, ever-living Christ."

The method of the book is to analyze carefully each subject, giving appropriate headings to resultant sections, and under these to translate and comment upon the work. Either side of the work—whether the presentation of the unities of thought and its order and progress, or the unfolding of single words or phrases—shows fine insight, spiritual sympathy, and marked independence, also a rare power of simple, clear, forceful statement. No words are wasted. The exposition moves straight forward, and all extra discussions are placed in appendices at the close of the subjects. The aim of the work is simple exposition, hence opinions are reviewed only in so far as an independent judgment on any given point needs defence. Whether in point of nice discrimination, as in case of ἐγγιασμένος (i. 2), or in that of the degrees of authority (vii. 40); of grammatical analysis (vii. 14, v. 45); of clear, compact definition, as in case of δοκεῖ (ii. 8), μετατρήσεως (ii. 7), or of apt illustration, the work is but another evidence of Dr.
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Godet’s great power as an exegete. This is not to signify agreement with all his interpretations or to find no reason for objection. The interpretation, for instance, of vi. 18, “he that committeth fornication sinneth against his body,” puts a forced meaning upon the word “body.” Whatever the peculiarly disastrous character of this sin may be, it is not made clear by assuming that body here means “the inner wrapping,” “the body within the body,” which in some way fornication fatally affects. This unusual meaning for “body” runs through the whole discussion (vi. 12–20), and is far from satisfactory. So, too, objection might be justly made to the grammatical explanation of ii. 9. It may be questioned, especially in view of the context, whether ἐνεργεῖσθαι does not refer to the decree of eternal predestination. Again in iv. 7, the answer to the second question, “nothing,” does not require the negative and rather forceless answer “not thyself” for the first. In iv. 2 the reading ἐν δὲ λοιπῶν ζητεῖται is taken against the weight of external evidence because it gives a better sense. These instances may be easily offset, however, by the clear, helpful explanations regarding the four parties (i. 12), by the just interpretation of ὁν πάντως (v. 10) as a restricted negative; of πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες; “appropriating with discernment spiritual teachings to spiritual men;” of ἵνα in iv. 7 by denying its adverbial force; of χρήσαι in vii. 21 by completing its meaning from the previous clause. The chapters on Marriage and Celibacy are especially helpful alike from their historical explanation and the sound discriminating exegesis. Under the subject Discipline the conclusion (based upon the interpretation of v. 12, 13) is reached that the Church can go no further in the matter of dealing with an untrue member than to humble herself with prayer to God for His intervention, to avoid privately—i.e., on the part of each member—all intercourse with such. This conclusion is examined in the light of all the New Testament teaching on the subject and given as the only true one. If a wilfully sinful member persists in coming to the Lord’s table there is no help against it. The interpretations regarding divorce are clear and decided, and a warning is sounded against following any other than the Pauline teaching in this matter.

Among noteworthy theological doctrines brought out in the way of the exposition are (1) the doctrine of substitution (p. 81) and that of inspiration (vii. 12), and in regard to the sacraments the doctrine of Infant Baptism (p. 346).

It remains for us to speak of the excellence of the translation and the attractive way in which the book is put before us. The former is exceedingly happy, and gives the full enjoyment of Dr. Godet’s vigorous, vivacious style, while the large, distinct print and the convenient form of the work make it a pleasure to read. We may, indeed, rejoice that this Epistle to the Corinthians has during the past few years received such worthy and helpful explanation, and that to the strong suggestive works of Henrici, Edwards, and Beet we may now add that of the great French exegete Godet.

J. S. RIGGS.


The learned author has earned the thanks of Biblical scholars as well as the general public by this excellent piece of Higher Criticism. The Wisdom Literature of the Hebrews is in some respects the most difficult and the most interesting section of the Old Testament. The authors were of a very different type from the sacred penmen who gave us the Psalter and the historical and prophetic books. They are ethical and speculative in their tendencies—they represent the rational type in theology. They were little appreciated in ages when scholasticism prevailed. They are better appreciated by modern students, and a large amount of fresh work has been done in their study in recent times. All this
work has been mastered by Professor Cheyne, and he has given us the results in a very interesting and attractive form.

The book is really made up of four essays upon Job, Proverbs, the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach and Koheleth. We miss the Song of Songs and the Wisdom of Solomon. Professor Cheyne would entitle Job "the book of the Trial of the Righteous man, and of the justification of God."

He thinks that the book was of gradual growth. There was possibly a prose story of Job based on tradition. This was, in part, taken up into the prose prologue when the colloquies were written, early in the exile. Subsequently several different sages at different times added to the book: (1) The praise of Wisdom (xxviii.); (2) the words of Jahveh (xxxviii.-xl. 14, xlii. 6); (3) the Elihu section; (4) the description of behemoth and leviathan (xl. 15-24, xli.); and (5) the Epilogue was appended by the final editor. All these opinions are sustained by valid reasons, and balanced against the reasons adduced by other scholars for other theories that have been advanced to account for the difficult problems connected with this wonderful book. There is a tendency among recent scholars to put the composition of Job in the period of the exile. I feel the force of many of the reasons, but, on the whole, it seems to me that the book is pre-exilic.

In his study of the Book of Proverbs, Professor Cheyne reaches the conclusion that the Discourses of chaps. i.-ix. were written toward the close of the kingdom of Judah, and that the two great collections of the sages were made some time earlier. Chapters xxx. and xxxi., however, were added after the return from exile. I cannot agree with Drs. Davidson and Cheyne in their view that there is a considerable development in the doctrine of wisdom between Prov. i.-ix. and Job. I am more impressed with the resemblances than with the differences.

The Wisdom of the son of Sirach is briefly but carefully treated.

Professor Cheyne rightly agrees with Ewald and Delitzsch in assigning Koheleth to the last years of the Persian rule. He thinks that the difficulties of the book are in great part removed by the theory of Luzzato that an editor "inserted three qualifying half verses of an orthodox character" (xi. 6 b; xii. 1 a; xii. 8 b), and that the Epilogue was a subsequent addition. Removing these, "the author now appears not indeed thoroughly consistent, but at least in his true light as a thinker tossed about on the sea of speculation, and without any fixed theoretic conclusions." Dr. Cheyne accordingly rejects the theory of "alternate voices," which has been a favorite in recent times to account for the varying moods of the author. In this we cannot agree with him, for the change of mood, as it seems to me, is regular; the dark and the bright sides of experience alternate in an ascending series until the climax is reached. Koheleth represents the conflict of a speculative mind with doubts of every kind, and his victory through the fear of God. It maintains the same religious and ethical principle that is commended in the entire Wisdom Literature, and that is the distinguishing feature of the character of Job and the source of his triumph.

Professor Cheyne gives us some fine specimens of criticism in this work. We are glad to see that he makes a discriminating use of the work of Bickell, which is too little considered by scholars, doubtless on account of prejudice against his peculiar views of Hebrew Poetry.

Professor Cheyne is also one of the few European scholars who gives attention to the works of American scholars, and makes full recognition of them. We doubt not that American students will give a hearty welcome to this valuable and interesting work.

C. A. BRIGGS.
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.


This is the first volume which has appeared of the Old Testament portion of this commentary. The design of the series is to present in brief outline the approved results of modern exegetical study with a unity of spirit, so as to stimulate the study of the Bible as a whole, rather than to treat exhaustively the critical questions of each book, or to furnish a compendium of exegetical opinions. The names of Drs. Strack and Zoeckler, and of their fellow-laborers, though some of these are not as well known as the editors, guarantee at once the evangelical position and high scholarship which may be expected to characterize this entire work. Significant in this connection is Dr. Strack’s statement, in the general introduction, of their position respecting the lower and higher criticism of the Old Testament.

"A glance at the larger editions of the New Testament shows that the earliest MSS. present very different readings, so that even early the transmission of the text was attended with error. The MSS. of the Old Testament are absolutely five hundred, relatively at least seven (some also many more), years younger, and in general present one and the same text—that declared correct by the Massorites. Therefore for the Old Testament, with all due recognition of the labors of the Massorites, the older versions (especially the Greek, the Targums, and the translation of Jerome) must be used more frequently than in the case of the New Testament, for the investigation of the original text; hence also conjecture cannot be entirely dispensed with.

"With regard to the higher criticism also the Old Testament and the New are not alike. That in the Old Testament we have the Word of God and a sufficiently trustworthy account of the history of revelation, is the fixed belief of all the expositors of the Old Testament parts; but the traditional views of the origin of some Old Testament books and parts of books are without tenable proof, as an earnest investigation, only truth-seeking and unbiassed, has always proved and will prove. The exposition of the second part of the book now bearing the name Isaiah, and further on the appendices to Zechariah, will prove that the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament lose nothing in dignity, but, on the other hand, become more intelligible, and hence more valuable to the reader, when the sure results of earnest science take the place of views which, indeed, have existed for centuries, but have no adequate proof."

The external form of this work, as illustrated by the volume before us, is most happily conceived. There is first an original translation of sections in paragraphs, followed by an analytic contents, and then a general corresponding exposition. In double columns, in smaller type, below the translation are given the exegetical notes on the Hebrew text. These are just what an Old Testament student desires who does not care to make minute investigation, but needs assistance in reading and understanding passages of length. Thus this commentary for its purpose is a model in form, and well might be imitated by American scholars; for such a standard work as this is needed for students reading the
Old Testament in the original—something less encyclopaedic and cumbersome than "Lange," more adapted to the reader of Hebrew than the "Speaker's," with a better arrangement and clearer notes than "Keil and Delitzsch," and without the homiletical matter of the "Pulpit."

When we now turn to the work of Dr. von Orelli, it is just what might be expected from the author of such a valuable treatise as his Old Testament Prophecy. A specialist in this department of study, he successfully presents the full and true significance of the Word, based upon a rigid historical interpretation, drawing also with a firm hand the distinction between that which lies open in the text as belonging to the thought of the prophet, and that which is seen genetically unfolded by fulfilment in the New Testament. He is eminently fair and just also in his statements, cautious and conservative, not seeking after novelties of interpretation, or to present mere speculations, yet ever ready to profit by recent discovery and research. We notice a few interpretations of passages or words in Isaiah. The "Sprout of Jahveh" (iv. 2) is an expression "mysteriously indeterminate, to be understood neither of the personal Messiah, nor yet without him, neither simply of earthly blessings, nor yet to be limited to spiritual ones," but comprehending all these. The "Virgin" (vii. 14) is the true church of God (comp. Mic. iv. 9, f. v. 2). The "Conspiracy" (viii. 12): "The people, Judah, see with terror everywhere conspiracy (2 Chr. xxiii. 13) against the house of David, but these compacts, as that between Syria and Ephraim, exist for God not at all, therefore they are harmless." "This passage (xxvi. 9) is most important, since it for the first time teaches with certainty and clearness a personal resurrection of the righteous." The "Cornerstone" (xxviii. 16) is "the Messianic salvation (Heil) which the Word of God has joined to the house of David and the sanctuary upon Zion." On lii. we read with pleasure: "That it cannot in earnestness be questioned that it speaks here of expiatory vicarious suffering. As plainly as human speech can make it, here is expressed and repeatedly emphasized (v. 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12) that the guiltless has freely borne the punishment which otherwise must have fallen upon the entire people." "The 'Servant of Jahveh' is the mediator of the redemption of Israel and the establishment of the kingdom of God upon the whole earth."

Dr. von Orelli assigns chaps. lx.-lxxvi. to a great unknown, but regards all of the earlier ones Isaiahic. In translation he departs only in a few instances from the Massoretic text. The principal ones to be noted in Isaiah are: xvii. 9, where the LXX is followed; xxiii. 13. Canaanites instead of Chaldeans; xlv. 12, the LXX; iii. 9, "and with the rich his tomb." In Jeremiah the number is larger, yet small considering the text. Jeremiah I., ii. are regarded genuine oracles of the prophet.

A high compliment is paid to Dr. Briggs's Messianic Prophecy by making it one of the two English works mentioned in the list of the important literature on Isaiah.

Edward L. Curtis.


These Notes were originally prepared for the Sunday-School Times. After the earlier ones had appeared the editor of that paper decided not to publish more. This decision is based, of course, upon the editorial judgment as to what is best for a particular circle of readers. I myself am inclined to think that the higher criticism can hardly be helpful to the average Sunday-school teacher. It may prove positively harmful to the scholar in the hand of an indiscreet teacher.
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

With the position of Dr. Driver we are in substantial accord. His introductory article on the indications of different documents in the Pentateuch ought to be read and pondered by all our ministers. It is a sober and clear account of the facts with which critical study must deal. It contains besides a protest against the assumption that "the critical view of the formation of the Pentateuch is framed in the interests of unbelief." Dr. Driver himself stands on distinctly Christian ground as a believer in "the fact of a revelation embodied in the Old Testament."

The Notes are devoted almost exclusively to the literary analysis. They make the impression of being too exclusively analytic. This is, of course, accounted for by the fact that other writers were expected to treat the lessons in other aspects.

H. P. SMITH.


The tenth edition of Gesenius's well-known Hebrew Lexicon is the third prepared by the Dorpat professors. It is a decided improvement over the other two. The improvement begins in the title, where "Aramäisch" is substituted for the time-honored but erroneous "Chaldäisch," shows itself in the Preface, particularly in the avowals that the preceding editions "etymologized" too much, and gave too much relative prominence to the Arabic, and continues to make itself evident, page after page, throughout the work. After the scathing and, in some cases, contemptuous criticism called forth by the previous issue (1883), it is pleasant to find the editors in the best of temper. Their preface is extremely amiable, and the Latin verses from Scaliger which they prefix indicate that the situation is not wholly without humor for them. We are prepared to find, then, as we do find, that no false pride has forbidden them to learn from their critics. One of the chief of these, Friedrich Delitzsch, was unfortunately not represented, for their work, by his "Prolegomena," which appeared too late.

Even a hasty glance shows important gains. We are freed from a mass of biliteral conjecture and improbable developments of meaning, and have, in the space thus gained, a much greater fulness, not only in kindred forms from cognate languages, but also, what is still more important, in the exhibition of Hebrew forms in actual use. There are frequent indications of an employment of the revised Massoretic text of Baer. The hand of Professor Müller is often to be detected, particularly in references to the Sabean and the Phœnician, and that of Dr. Löw in the use made of post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. The editors have done wisely to avail themselves of the aid of specialists like these. A little close examination shows corrections in very numerous details, and the endeavor to profit by criticism in cases where more than simple correction of errors was demanded. In addition to these, mistakes are removed, and statements modified for the better, in cases which, so far as we know, were not made the object of public criticism. These various improvements appear, as already said, throughout. They affect the literature given in the Treatise on the Sources of Hebrew Lexicography, the correct indication of the use and non-use of forms, and of complete citation, right spelling and pointing, accurate Scripture citations, and all kinds of remarks, of both primary and secondary importance. We call special attention to the treatment of the Biblical Aramaic, as showing great gain. On
the whole, then, the book is more trustworthy, and therefore more praiseworthy, than either the eighth edition or the ninth. The editors have been spurred to very considerable effort by the severe condemnation of their previous editions, and have succeeded in fortifying themselves in some degree against such sweeping attacks, although it will be difficult for them ever to regain the position held earlier by this Lexicon.

For it would be quite too much to say that they have approached the limit of the possible in the gain over previous work. On the contrary, side by side with their improvements are many defects, some of them grievous. These are partly retained from the older editions, partly new. Many of them, at least, could have been avoided. We admit, at once—and this has not been sufficiently considered by the critics—that the enormous difficulties of preparing a lexicon, difficulties which no one can appreciate who has not had some practical experience, are increased in the present case by the demand practically made upon the editors to make a book which shall at once answer the needs of students and be a sort of condensed Thesaurus. But with all allowances for pardonable differences of judgment, there are faults in the work which should not be overlooked.

If the editors, e.g., had been more wide awake to the real needs of the time they would have paid much more attention to improvements in the text. Of course no Hebrew Lexicon can slight the Massoretic tradition, but it ought to give more attention than has yet been done to the sober, well-grounded emendations which have been supported by reputable scholars. The editors had not the advantage of Cornill's Ezekiel, but they had Lagarde, Wellhausen, Merx, and the work of others in the same field. There is much more matter of this sort well deserving the attention of a modern lexicographer than they have indicated. There is need of much more careful and thorough history of the usage of words, based on a clear view as to the relative age of different books of the Old Testament. This is particularly difficult just now, but far more can be done than these editors have attempted. The number of citations has been in some cases increased, but we are still far from gaining out of this Lexicon a true idea of the relative frequency of different words, and in numerous cases not even the most characteristic illustrations are given. The definitions and the treatment of synonyms are still behind the fair requirements of our day, and the Biblical theology of the Old Testament gets comparatively little light from word-studies which ought to be most productive in just this direction.

It would be too much of a revolution to expect that the arrangement by stems, or the separation of the Aramaic from the Hebrew, should be adopted, therefore we merely repeat (cf. PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, January, 1885, pp. 114 sqq.) that these things are most desirable. As appears from the foregoing, the one general, characteristic defect which marks this revision of the Lexicon is that it lacks thoroughness. We notice one or two special points:

While Phænician words are to a much greater degree than heretofore given with references to the inscription where they are found (and in the case of languages whose lexicography is backward this is the only proper method), the same course has not been adopted where it is much more necessary—namely, in the Assyrian. The result is that the Assyrian parallels and etymologies are an arbitrary collection, beyond the control of scholars. At least one unquestionable reference to a phonetic writing in a standard published text should accompany each Assyrian word cited for comparison or argument. Since the lexicon is to be a condensed Thesaurus, this is not too much to ask—at least until the Assyrian Lexicon appears.

The mode in which corrections have been made is too mechanical. One can take the criticisms published by well-known Hebraists and compare the new edition with the old, in view of these, and find in case after case that the editors
have limited themselves to points made by the critic, even when a little study and reflection would, it might seem, almost of necessity carry them farther along on the same road. This dependence upon the critic has made them exasperatingly reluctant to express any view in many instances; they content themselves with merely registering different opinions, and leave the student to flounder among them.* Undoubtedly it is often necessary to reserve a decision, but when a decision is so often reserved, one is led to wonder whether Hebrew is so different from other languages that its lexicon must be non-committal.

As an instance, in the case of a whole class of articles, of negative emendation—emendation by omission—may be cited the articles on the letters of the alphabet. Fault was found with the antiquated representation of early forms of the letters. These were not all given before (ed. 9), but are now all removed, with the unaccountable exception of י. The palaeographic hints of the critics have, however, not borne positive fruit. In some cases the removal of the archaic sign leaves the text rather unintelligible (e.g., י), but only in the case of ג and of ס has there been any considerable change in this connection, and here only to shorten the paragraph. A fine opportunity has been lost to utilize the Mesha and Siloah Inscriptions.

We turn to the numerals. Why, amid all the parade of citing Assyrian parallels, should they be omitted in such an interesting class of words—especially when the editors have taken pains to add the numerals of the other Semitic languages? (ן ש ת י פ) forms here a mysterious exception? A similar question is in place with regard to the personal pronouns, although here there is less attempt at cited parallels, and under רכ ת we do find Assyrian anahu, Egyptian anek, and Coptic anok thrown together, in a somewhat suspicious association, at the end.

Besides these, there are still a great many defects and errors of detail which it is not worth while to classify.†

* Cf. ב ש ת, כ ש ת, מ ש ת, ק מ מ ק, מ ק, etc., etc.
† We mention a very few, almost at random:—אמ (partic.) does not mean "unglucklich," in Job xxix. 13, etc., but "on the point of perishing," cf. Dillm. ad loc. in Prov. i. 10 is not like that in Is. i. 19, but as in Jud. xi. 17, 1 Sam. xxxxi. 4, is used absolutely. הקסניק is given as perhaps corrupted from הקסניק, when the latter is the actual reading in both passages where the word occurs (v. d. Hooght, Hahn, Theile. Cf. Kennicott, who gives the variant, and Walton, who has one reading in 1 Ch. ii. 29, and the other 2 Ch. xi. 18). Why should היהי be א on in a class of articles, of negative emendation—emendation by omission—may be cited the articles on the letters of the alphabet. Fault was found with the antiquated representation of early forms of the letters. These were not all given before (ed. 9), but are now all removed, with the unaccountable exception of י. The palaeographic hints of the critics have, however, not borne positive fruit. In some cases the removal of the archaic sign leaves the text rather unintelligible (e.g., י), but only in the case of ג and of ס has there been any considerable change in this connection, and here only to shorten the paragraph. A fine opportunity has been lost to utilize the Mesha and Siloah Inscriptions.

We turn to the numerals. Why, amid all the parade of citing Assyrian parallels, should they be omitted in such an interesting class of words—especially when the editors have taken pains to add the numerals of the other Semitic languages? (ן ש ת י פ) forms here a mysterious exception? A similar question is in place with regard to the personal pronouns, although here there is less attempt at cited parallels, and under רכ ת we do find Assyrian anahu, Egyptian anek, and Coptic anok thrown together, in a somewhat suspicious association, at the end.

Besides these, there are still a great many defects and errors of detail which it is not worth while to classify.†

* Cf. ב ש ת, כ ש ת, מ ש ת, ק מ מ ק, מ ק, etc., etc.
† We mention a very few, almost at random:—אמ (partic.) does not mean "unglucklich," in Job xxix. 13, etc., but "on the point of perishing," cf. Dillm. ad loc. in Prov. i. 10 is not like that in Is. i. 19, but as in Jud. xi. 17, 1 Sam. xxxxi. 4, is used absolutely. הקסניק is given as perhaps corrupted from הקסניק, when the latter is the actual reading in both passages where the word occurs (v. d. Hooght, Hahn, Theile. Cf. Kennicott, who gives the variant, and Walton, who has one reading in 1 Ch. ii. 29, and the other 2 Ch. xi. 18). Why should היהי be א on in a class of articles, of negative emendation—emendation by omission—may be cited the articles on the letters of the alphabet. Fault was found with the antiquated representation of early forms of the letters. These were not all given before (ed. 9), but are now all removed, with the unaccountable exception of י. The palaeographic hints of the critics have, however, not borne positive fruit. In some cases the removal of the archaic sign leaves the text rather unintelligible (e.g., י), but only in the case of ג and of ס has there been any considerable change in this connection, and here only to shorten the paragraph. A fine opportunity has been lost to utilize the Mesha and Siloah Inscriptions.

We turn to the numerals. Why, amid all the parade of citing Assyrian parallels, should they be omitted in such an interesting class of words—especially when the editors have taken pains to add the numerals of the other Semitic languages? (ן ש ת י פ) forms here a mysterious exception? A similar question is in place with regard to the personal pronouns, although here there is less attempt at cited parallels, and under רכ ת we do find Assyrian anahu, Egyptian anek, and Coptic anok thrown together, in a somewhat suspicious association, at the end.

Besides these, there are still a great many defects and errors of detail which it is not worth while to classify.†

* Cf. ב ש ת, כ ש ת, מ ש ת, ק מ מ ק, מ ק, etc., etc.
† We mention a very few, almost at random:—אמ (partic.) does not mean "unglucklich," in Job xxix. 13, etc., but "on the point of perishing," cf. Dillm. ad loc. in Prov. i. 10 is not like that in Is. i. 19, but as in Jud. xi. 17, 1 Sam. xxxxi. 4, is used absolutely. הקסניק is given as perhaps corrupted from הקסניק, when the latter is the actual reading in both passages where the word occurs (v. d. Hooght, Hahn, Theile. Cf. Kennicott, who gives the variant, and Walton, who has one reading in 1 Ch. ii. 29, and the other 2 Ch. xi. 18). Why should היהי be א on in a class of articles, of negative emendation—emendation by omission—may be cited the articles on the letters of the alphabet. Fault was found with the antiquated representation of early forms of the letters. These were not all given before (ed. 9), but are now all removed, with the unaccountable exception of י. The palaeographic hints of the critics have, however, not borne positive fruit. In some cases the removal of the archaic sign leaves the text rather unintelligible (e.g., י), but only in the case of ג and of ס has there been any considerable change in this connection, and here only to shorten the paragraph. A fine opportunity has been lost to utilize the Mesha and Siloah Inscriptions.

We turn to the numerals. Why, amid all the parade of citing Assyrian parallels, should they be omitted in such an interesting class of words—especially when the editors have taken pains to add the numerals of the other Semitic languages? (ן ש ת י פ) forms here a mysterious exception? A similar question is in place with regard to the personal pronouns, although here there is less attempt at cited parallels, and under רכ ת we do find Assyrian anahu, Egyptian anek, and Coptic anok thrown together, in a somewhat suspicious association, at the end.

Besides these, there are still a great many defects and errors of detail which it is not worth while to classify.†

* Cf. ב ש ת, כ ש ת, מ ש ת, ק מ מ ק, מ ק, etc., etc.
† We mention a very few, almost at random:—אמ (partic.) does not mean "unglucklich," in Job xxix. 13, etc., but "on the point of perishing," cf. Dillm. ad loc. in Prov. i. 10 is not like that in Is. i. 19, but as in Jud. xi. 17, 1 Sam. xxxxi. 4, is used absolutely. הקסניק is given as perhaps corrupted from הקסניק, when the latter is the actual reading in both passages where the word occurs (v. d. Hooght, Hahn, Theile. Cf. Kennicott, who gives the variant, and Walton, who has one reading in 1 Ch. ii. 29, and the other 2 Ch. xi. 18). Why should היהי be א on in a class of articles, of negative emendation—emendation by omission—may be cited the articles on the letters of the alphabet. Fault was found with the antiquated representation of early forms of the letters. These were not all given before (ed. 9), but are now all removed, with the unaccountable exception of י. The palaeographic hints of the critics have, however, not borne positive fruit. In some cases the removal of the archaic sign leaves the text rather unintelligible (e.g., י), but only in the case of ג and of ס has there been any considerable change in this connection, and here only to shorten the paragraph. A fine opportunity has been lost to utilize the Mesha and Siloah Inscriptions.

We turn to the numerals. Why, amid all the parade of citing Assyrian parallels, should they be omitted in such an interesting class of words—especially when the editors have taken pains to add the numerals of the other Semitic languages? (ן ש ת י פ) forms here a mysterious exception? A similar question is in place with regard to the personal pronouns, although here there is less attempt at cited parallels, and under רכ ת we do find Assyrian anahu, Egyptian anek, and Coptic anok thrown together, in a somewhat suspicious association, at the end.

Besides these, there are still a great many defects and errors of detail which it is not worth while to classify.†
To sum up: The new edition of Gesenius's Lexicon is much better than the eighth or the ninth, but it is not by any means so good as it ought to be, and might be.

FRANCIS BROWN.


There are clusters of scholars now at work in England, whose learning and research revive the best traditions of English scholarship in the seventeenth century. Prominent among these are the groups devoted to the textual criticism of the New Testament, and of such students none deserve closer attention than the Bishop of Salisbury and his associates in scientific work. They are just now preparing the way for the recovery of the text of the oldest Latin version of the New Testament, by editing various important MSS. In 1883 the Gospel of Matthew, from the St. Germain MS., was published, and now we have a still more important book. The MS. (k) formerly at Bobbio, now at Turin, is believed, with good reason, to be "the oldest living representative of the African version of the Gospels" (about the beginning of the sixth century?), and is therefore, even in its mutilated condition, an invaluable witness. It contains Mark viii. 8 -- Matt. xv. 36 with the exception of five leaves and a few lesser mutilations, some 66 intermediate verses in all being lost. Mark ends with xvi. 9. Mark, it will be noticed, precedes Matthew, and the editor believes the original order in the MS. to have been John, Luke, Mark, Matthew, and reckons the probable number of leaves at 415, only 96 being now extant.

The MS. has been published twice before; the present issue, however, is not only more accurate than the preceding, but it is also accompanied with introductions and appendices which largely increase its value. Besides the strictly descriptive matter, we have discussions of extreme interest. Such are those by Dr. Sanday on the relation of k to other old Latin texts, and particularly to that of Cyprian, in connection with which the appendix on the Oxford MSS. of Cyprian should be noticed, and the incidental defence of the genuineness of the Testimonia. There are also treatises on the style and diction of k and on its paleography, and a most suggestive appendix (by Sanday) on the Greek text implied by k. The two most striking results of these discussions are: (1) that k is at length connected, doubtfully, with Assy. maharu, but is it then still necessary to explain קָרָה, 'to-morrow,' as contracted from קָרָה? The meaning of קָרָה, 4.) Is. lxvi. 12, Gen. xxxix. 21, is incorrectly given; Eng., 'to extend favor to' is to be compared. קָרָה is still said to mean 'elephant' in Assyrian, and סָרָה, 'horse,' is apparently unknown. 'Pot' and 'thorn' are still explained from one קָרָה, the plural of which is said to be used poetically for godless men. Nah. i. 10, when it really is a simile. קָרָה is said to mean 'schwanke Rute,' 'whence קָרָה, baskets,' and only this form is given (as derivative) under קָרָה; yet the singular קָרָה occurs twice in Gen. xl. 17. The catholicity of the editors should have led them at least to mention C. Taylor's discussion of קָרָה in the Journ. of Philol. III. Under קָרָה, 2 Ki. xxiii. 17 would have illustrated the meaning 'Grabmal' better than Ezek. xxxix. 15. On Inf. csstr. קָרָה, from קָרָה, Jos. ii. 16, cf. König. I., 444. קָרָה means 'whip,' Nah. iii. 2. קָרָה was hardly the king 'who put an end to the northern kingdom,' and of שְׁלוֹן קָרָה the editors appear not to have yet heard. Under קָרָה, still derived from קָרָה, there is no explanation of the way it is formed, and no mention of Dvorak. Moreover, 'Opferherd' is surely not the meaning in Is. xxxxi. 9.— These are specimens. We simply allude, in this connection, to the great class of proper names, where there is still need of much sifting. Archeological words (in the narrow sense) are often very inadequately treated. Geographical articles are better.
and the text used by Cyprian have a close affinity, "the common archetype of \( k \) and Cyprian" being "if not quite, yet very nearly the most primitive form that we can trace" in the history of the old Latin version; and (2) that the Greek text implied by \( k \) frequently agrees with what Westcott and Hort call the "neutral" text represented by \( \pi \) and \( B \). While these results are not put forward as establishing any theory, they are derived from careful tabulation, and the lists of agreement and disagreement from which they come are printed, and offer a fruitful object for detailed study. They must be considered in view of other equally important facts not all of which have been as yet elucidated. Even these interesting results are only a portion of the great stock of materials for textual criticism, but they are a very valuable and useful portion.

The book contains, in addition to \( k \), fragments of (all) the Gospels from six other MSS. In the editing of these Mr. White takes his share. They had been in part printed already, but the work here done is to a considerable extent independent of earlier editing. Matthew xvii. 25–xviii. 7 is given in fac-simile form from one of these fragments (at St. Gall), while, as a frontispiece, we have Mark xvi. 6–9 in the same form from \( k \).

All in all, the book calls for hearty commendation and the welcome of all scholars. The editors have gone into a field too little worked, and their labors are bearing good fruit. They are careful to avoid premature questions and mere side issues, and are contributing, by patient erudition, to that stock of accurate knowledge which, in intricate problems like those of ancient texts, is the necessary condition of sound progress. No. III. of the series, "The Four Gospels from the Munich MS. (q) of the Sixth Century," is in press. It is to be earnestly hoped that this third volume will not be the last. FRANCIS BROWN.


As this is an American issue of a book published in London last year, it is rather humiliating that it should be thought necessary in New York to describe New Jersey as in the U. S. A., and that Princeton is not sufficiently well known there for its name to be properly spelled. So far as credit for the work is reflected on the institution with which its author is connected, it belongs to Allegheny, as the original edition correctly shows.


The treatise claims to be only a primer, introductory to more elaborate works on criticism, but its discussion of principles is so thorough that one who masters them will be ready for their application practically to any question that may arise. Such an introduction has been imperatively needed, because of the remarkable difficulty of Dr. Hort's method of presenting his subject. Beginners cannot profitably use his second volume without unnecessary discouragement and loss of time. Not only theological students, but all Bible students, will find this a guide precisely suited to their wants. Nothing is taken for granted; each principle is led up to in a practical way, and abundant illustrations show the method to be clear and convincing. An admirable introductory chapter unfolds the nature of the problem, and the absolute necessity for its solution. Chapter I., on the Matter of Criticism, exhibits the evidence contained in the various monuments of the text and their relative age. Chapter II., on the Methods of Criticism, occupies half the volume, and discusses under the internal evidence of
readings, the intrinsic and transcriptional evidence; under the external evidence of readings, comparative criticism and the internal evidence of documents, the internal evidence of groups, the genealogical evidence, with its superiority and its limitations. Chapter III., on the Praxis of Criticism, applies these principles to the facts regarding some of the most important variations of the text. And Chapter IV., treats of the History of Criticism. This chapter is very brief, and the criticism has been made justly that the beginner especially needs to have a historical view of the whole field in order to appreciate the scope of questions under discussion, and their practical necessity. Probably the size allowed for the volume is accountable for this, for nothing could be spared from the other chapters to make room for it. About a page and a half of corrigenda have been issued, which are not yet incorporated in the edition.

Dr. Warfield writes with admirable vigor and clearness, with affluent and apposite illustration from other departments of literature, with absolute mastery of detail, and thorough insight into the principles of a difficult subject. The reader finds abundant help at all points, but is necessarily led to give his closest attention and repeated effort in order to follow the argument.

A reverent spirit toward the text is everywhere apparent, and the author’s conservative position is shown in the recognition of the necessity of criticism in order to vindicate the authenticity of what is undisputed, much more than to settle the comparatively small residuum of readings where the evidence cannot lead to certain results. "The autographic text of the New Testament is distinctly within the reach of criticism in so immensely the greater part of the volume, that we cannot despair of restoring to ourselves and to the Church of God his Book, word for word, as he gave it by inspiration to men."

C. W. HODGE.

The following works in Exegetical Theology deserve mention:

_The Pharaohs of the Bondage and the Exodus._ Lectures by Charles S. Robinson, D.D., LL.D. Pp. viii., 199. (New York : The Century Co., 1887.) These lectures attracted some attention when they were delivered last winter, as a Sunday evening course, in the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church. The author has visited Egypt more than once, and has studied diligently to keep himself abreast of recent discovery and debate. He has woven together personal observation, statements in books, and religious teaching in such a way as to make a succession of forcible and attractive public discourses. Mooted points he, of course, cannot stop to discuss. He adopts the view just now prevalent among us, that Rameses II. was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and Menephthah (II.) the Pharaoh of the Exodus.—_Ancient Cities, from the Dawn to the Daylight._ By William Burnet Wright, Pastor of the Berkeley Street Church, Boston. Pp. xii., 291. (Boston and New York : Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886.) Under the above title are collected popular sketches of a dozen or more famous cities. They are the work of an intelligent minister who lays no claim to the knowledge of specialists, but seeks to derive practical lessons from history. Some of his titles are rather fanciful, and one or two do not seem to suggest the contents of the chapters that follow, but the book is pleasantly written, and breathes a generous, sympathetic spirit.—_Cursus Scripturae Sacrae Auctoribus R. Cornely, J. Knabenhauer, F. De Hummelauer alisque Soc. Jesu presbyteris._ Commentarius in Libros Samuelis seu I. et II. Regum Auctore Francisco de Hummelauer, S. I., pp. 462. (Paris : 1886.) It is a matter for congratulation when Roman Catholic scholars apply their learning and their acuteness to continuous exegesis. In Germany, of recent years, Scholz, for the Old Testament, and Schanz, for the New—to name no others—have done much to advance our understanding of the books on which they have commented. The volume now before
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

us is the third issue in a series of commentaries by French Jesuits (Job and the Minor Prophets having preceded), and this series is the second part of a still larger work, the first part being devoted to Biblical introduction, archæology, and lexicography. Of this but two volumes have yet appeared. The commentary on Samuel is careful and learned, with references to patristic literature more detailed, if not more frequent, than we are accustomed to in other commentaries, and with constant attention to recent expositions and theories. Toward radical views of text and interpretation it is, on the whole, rather non-committal. The introduction, where the structure of the books of Samuel is considered, is worth attention for several reasons.——People's Commentary on the Gospel According to Matthew. By Edwin W. Rice, D.D. Pp. 316. (Philadelphia: American Sunday-school Union, 1887.) The most characteristic feature of this commentary is its endeavor to bring out the Oriental coloring of the Gospel, by statement and by pictorial illustration. It contains a map of Palestine, two topographical plans, and numerous additional wood-cuts. At the bottom of each page are the verses commented upon from the Authorized Version and American Revised Version in parallel columns. The Introduction gives brief statements in regard to the New Testament Canon and Text, as well as concerning the date and authorship of the First Gospel. Dr. Rice has had long experience in writing for Sunday-school teachers and scholars, and, of course, has these particularly in view in his present work. The expositions seem to be in general careful and sensible. We hope to see the time when such popular commentaries will pay more attention to the distinctive literary features of the separate Biblical writings, but for its practical object this book will no doubt be received with a welcome equal to that accorded to the author's " Pictorial Commentary on Mark." It " has been prepared and issued," we learn, " under the provisions of the John C. Green Income Fund," which makes such arrangements for compensation to authors that the book can be sold at a low price.—Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students. St. Luke's Gospel. By Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D. Chaps. I.-XII., pp. 171. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, n. d. [1887]. New York : Scribner & Welford.) Dr. Lindsay, who is a professor in the Free Church College, Glasgow, gives in this little volume a good practical (not homiletical) exposition of the earlier chapters of Luke. We cannot agree to the early date set by the author for the composition of Luke's Gospel. But the volume has most of the unassuming and solid merits of its predecessors. The general editorship of the series remains in the hands of Drs. Dods and Whyte.—Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Revelation of John. By Friedrich Düsterdieck, D.D. Translated by Henry E. Jacobs, D.D., Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa. Pp. viii., 494. (New York : Funk & Wagnalls, 1887.) This well-known final volume of " Meyer's Commentary," not included in the Edinburgh translation, appears now in an English version from the third German edition (1877). Besides the not altogether simple task of turning Düsterdieck's sentences into reasonable English, Dr. Jacobs's work has consisted in removing references to the bottom of the page, prefixing a list of books on the Apocalypse, adding one hundred notes, chiefly excerpts from recent commentaries, etc., and in adding Westcott and Hort at the proper places to the textual authorities cited. We observe no allusion anywhere to Vischer's recent and startling theory.—Kurzgefasstes Wörterbuch zum Griechischen Neuen Testament, bearbeitet von F. W. Stellhorn, Prof. d. Theol. an der Capital University zu Columbus, Ohio. Pp. vi., 153. (Leipzig : Dörrfling & Franke, 1886; New York : B. Westermann & Co.) A New Testament Lexicon that one may slip into an overcoat-pocket, and yet not a mere glossary, but a careful, scholarly work, designed to help the student to understand the New Testament Greek, as well as to read this
or that verse. Care is taken with etymology, with the usage in different periods, with the synonyms. Simple abbreviations and signs are so employed as to keep the whole within narrow limits. New Testament passages are not cited, except in rare cases. The book is not a substitute for the larger New Testament lexicons, and is not meant to be; but it can be used in circumstances where they cannot, and its clear, brief, comprehensive statements will in many a case give the student a basis and a stimulus for the more detailed examination of words. The type, both Greek and Latin (the German—we wish it were English—not being printed in German type), is neat and attractive. We are interested to learn that the author contemplates a grammatical commentary on the New Testament that shall be, like this dictionary, at once detailed and compact.

On a Syriac MS. belonging to the Collection of Archbishop Ussher. By the Rev. John Gwynn, D.D. (Extract from Trans. of Royal Irish Academy, xxvii., 1886.) In this treatise Dr. Gwynn describes a MS. in the possession of Trinity College, Dublin, which contains the Syriac Antilegomena, the Pericope de Adultera, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse, bound up with some tractates of Ephrem, and hitherto so wrongly described and catalogued as to have escaped recognition, although it was known that Ussher had a MS. containing these parts of the Syriac New Testament; this was supposed to have been lost. Dr. Gwynn's identification of the MS. seems satisfactory. He concludes that it was copied in 1625-26, in the Maronite Monastery of Kenobin, in Mt. Lebanon, by the same scribe who copied a Syriac Old Testament now in the Bodleian. The original Syriac version of the story of the adulterous woman he believes to have been made by Paul of Tella, contemporary and kindred with Thomas of Harkel (A.D. 600+); the text of the epistles closely resembles Pococke's. Dr. Gwynn discusses the materials for reconstructing the Syriac text of these epistles, which he believes to be Philoxenian (A.D. 500+). As to the Apocalypse, he inclines to think that this was translated into Syriac by Thomas of Harkel. He refers frequently to the publications and opinions of Dr. I. H. Hall in this particular field, and shows in general careful study and knowledge of his subject. Two matters not of strictly scientific importance we notice as curiosities. One is that Jesus' words to the woman (John viii. 11) are in the startling form: "Go, and sin more"! The other is that the scribe calls himself, in his colophon to Susanna, in the Bodleian MS., "a man sinful and vile, dust of the highways and dirt of the dunghill, the miserable Joseph, son of David," and that Dr. Gwynn remarks (p. 19): "The disparaging epithets which . . . 'Joseph, son of David,' so freely takes to himself are proved by this (Ussher's) MS. to be by no means unmerited." It appears that of the nine tractates of Ephrem, the ninth is left incomplete, because the quire came to an end, the first and second are repeated, to swell the bulk, and a tenth stops abruptly at the end of the second page, the excellent Joseph presuming on ignorance of Syriac on the part of Davies, who had the transcript made for Ussher.

FRANCIS BROWN.

II.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.


This new volume is a worthy continuation of the series to which it belongs. The preceding volumes have already claimed our attention in this REVIEW. The professors who had borne their part in winning for Current Discussions a valued
place among the helps to students and pastors here continue the survey and criticism of another year, with the exception of Professor Hyde, whose place in these pages is temporarily occupied by Professor Scott. The new professor in the New Testament chair, Professor Gilbert, brings from his previous studies in this country and in Europe a reputation which warrants the expectation of good things from him hereafter.

In the present volume the survey which Professor Scott gives us in the department of Historic Theology is specially broad and minute. We recall nothing of value in the literature of the year that has escaped his notice. Dr. Curtiss, in dealing with the present state of Old Testament studies, very naturally lays the chief stress on Old Testament Introduction and Old Testament Theology. With characteristic appreciation and fairness he sketches the latest representative works of the critical school, recognizes the temporary popularity of their views, yet cautions us in regard to the dominant theory (p. 33) that "American and English scholars should not be swept off their feet by the number or standing of the scholars who accept it on the Continent." At the same time, while recognizing the strong positions of conservative scholars, he does not hesitate to indicate the points at which in his judgment they have failed to deal adequately and decisively with the views which they are opposing. His hints should be useful. His general statements and definitions in regard to Biblical Theology and in review of the recent works of Piepenbring, Kayser, and others are no less worthy of consideration. Manifestly he is not one of the enthusiastic novelty-mongers in this department. In the department of Systematic Theology Dr. Boardman, with characteristic sobriety and strength, puts his estimate upon late alleged improvements in theology, and the books of Van Dyke, Abbot, and Fiske in Theism. Our Chicago brethren will surely not willingly withdraw their hand from a line of service the value of which has been so widely recognized.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.

LES HEBRAEUS, EIN JUDISCHER PHILOSOPH DER RENAISSANCE; SEIN LEBEN, SEINE WERKE UND SEINE LEHREN. Von Dr. B. ZIMMELS. Breslau: 1886. Pp. 120.

The subject of this interesting book was a Jewish philosopher of the Renaissance period, whose principal title to fame is his Dialoghi di Amore. His proper name was Don Judah ben Isaac Abarbanel. His father, Don Isaac Abarbanel, is far better known by reason of his Herald of Salvation, an elaborate presentation of the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah, in which he freely vented his hatred of Christ and Christianity. Cf. Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia (revised edition, 1887), Vol. I., p. 15, sub. Abarbanel. The son was born at Lisbon about 1460, and tenderly nourished in his father's house. In 1483 the family fortunes sadly changed. The good king Alphonso V. died in 1481, and Don Isaac, who had been minister of finance, two years later fell into disgrace under his successor, and was compelled to flee. His property was confiscated, and for a while he was poor. Don Judah followed his father to Toledo, and there, about 1490, when Don Isaac had regained wealth, married. In 1492 Ferdinand and Isabella issued a decree offering to the Jews either conversion to the Christian faith or banishment. The family of Don Isaac chose the latter, and went to Naples; there Don Judah became physician to the king. At a later period he went to Genoa, Venice, and other cities in Italy, and finally died, probably at Ferrara, between 1520 and 1535.

His chief work, The Dialogue on Love, was written in Italian, rather a remarkable circumstance, and published first at Rome in 1535. It enjoyed great popularity, and was translated into French, Spanish, and Latin. Between 1535 and 1607 nine editions appeared in Italian, five in French, three in Spanish, and
two in Latin. In 1871 was published at Lyck a Hebrew translation, made from the Italian, but when and by whom is unknown. The Dialogue is a presentation of Platonic and Neo-Platonic views upon the subject of love. The model is plainly Plato's Banquet. It is interesting to find that although a firm believer in astrology, Don Judah is free from the superstitions of magic and alchemy. He is a mystic, holding to the universal over-soul, which animates the organic and the inorganic alike, and to the union of the soul with God through faith and love; but to these ideas as modified by Neo-Platonism. He claims to be extremely orthodox, yet he treated many matters in a right heterodox fashion. Thus he rejected, for five reasons which he states, the doctrine of the creation of the world in time. He distinguishes three kinds of love: (1) the natural, which is manifested even in stones and plants, being merely the juxtaposition of elements; (2) the sensuous; (3) the intellectual. He found evidence of the existence of the first kind of love in the attraction of the magnet for the iron, and in that of the centre for heavy and the periphery for light articles. Universal love springs, he maintains, from these five causes: (1) lust; (2) the effort to support one's progeny; (3) benevolence, which generates not only love on the part of the receiver for the giver, but also in high degree that of the giver for the receiver; (4) equal natural endowments in the same species, or a similar one; (5) habitue arising from uninterruptedly living together. These causes he finds operative in inorganic matter. "How great," he says, "is the love of stones, plants, roots, and trees for Mother Earth, and what mother is tenderer toward her children than the Earth toward hers?" In man love has three objective points: pleasure, use, and goodness. God's love is the love of the complete for the incomplete. Through it all things exist. In order to gratify His entire completeness and beauty and manifest His infinite power, He called the world into being. Hence His love in creation was self-love. But God loves the world as made, and makes His creatures complete and happy by causing them to flow back like a stream into His eternity.

Don Judah then passes on to answer the question, How does love fill the universe? In the course of his answer he expatiates upon the loves of the angels and of the spheres. Here he brings in his astrology. Next he takes up the love of man for God, which he calls "the divine love." In it he mixes two originally opposed elements, the religious and the purely philosophical. The former, according to the Bible command (Deut. vi. 5; x. 12; xi. 1, 13; xxx. 16, 20), leads to virtue, and therefore to blessed immortality through obedience to and imitation of God; the latter puts the true purpose and blessedness of life in the immediate perception of the Divine, the complete Beauty. The love of God to us effects at last our entire love to Him. Our love is not sufficient of itself to reach so high a degree of completeness. But when our intellect is supported and penetrated through and through with the divine might and beauty, then the desired end is attained. The spirit in man is united with God.

This survey necessarily omits many points of Dr. Zimmels's analysis of Don Judah's book. But enough has been given to call attention to that singular product of philosophy. Don Judah has been supposed by some to have become a Christian, but one looks in vain in his book for any evidence of such a conversion. The way to soul-peace so carefully set forth is not the way of Christ. He who would attain to blessedness and immortality can find it surely by following Jesus. Mystical Judaism goes down before practical Christianity.

Samuel M. Jackson.

The Bampton Lectureship was intended by its founder to furnish contributions to the literature of Apologetics. "The authority of the writings of the primitive Fathers as to the faith and practice of the primitive Church," is specified in Mr. Bampton's will as one of the subjects to be treated. Dr. Bigg has, therefore, complied with the terms of the trust so far as his choice of a subject is concerned, though we cannot see that the lectures serve any definite apologetic purpose.

We learn, for example, that in the time of Clement of Alexandria the Bishop was not sharply distinguished from the Presbyter, and that the Eucharist was not disjoined from the Agape. But what attitude we are to take toward these undeveloped doctrines Dr. Bigg does not say. Shall we take the earlier as the more Scriptural doctrine, and, therefore, the true doctrine? Or shall we take the later and more developed as the more Scriptural because better understood doctrine, and on this account the doctrine to be defended? Or shall we recognize the principle of development as justifying extra-biblical beliefs, and on this ground stand with the later rather than the earlier fathers? These questions ought to have been answered; in other words, Dr. Bigg should have told us, as Harnack has tried to tell us, what we are to understand by "dogma," and on what grounds a dogma is to be received.

This is the more important because his volume is really a contribution to the history of dogma, in some respects very interesting, certainly very learned, but nevertheless suggestive of serious criticism. An historical narrative that simply tells us what Clement and Origen held on the great loci of theology—and with the exception of the opening lecture on the attempt of Philo to mediate between Greek and Jewish thought this is all that the volume does—is really of very little use. The memory cannot hold loose scraps of opinion, and unless they were rubricized under some generalization they would be very unprofitable, even if they were remembered.

It would have been interesting to show, as Harnack does in his Dogmen-geschichte, the place of Clement and Origen in the development of Christian doctrine. But this could be done only by showing that they were the first to use religious philosophy to develop and give form to belief, just as Justin and Tertullian had used it as a weapon against heresy. Moreover, in dealing with Clement and Origen there was a fine opportunity to show the relation that philosophy ought and ought not to sustain to theology; and in this way it would have been possible to make the discussion of the Alexandrine Platonism bear upon the Ritschlian development of the present day. Or yet again, in dealing with the contents of the two systems with which the lectures are mainly concerned, it would have given a sort of present-day interest to them if the author had availed himself of his opportunity to deal with living questions a little more fully than he has done. He might have said something, for example, on "the Higher Life" when dealing with "the two lives" of Clement's Stromata; and he might have given us something on the development of doctrine a little more satisfactory than an interrogation.

"Where does this process of expansion, governed as it is not by Scripture but by philosophy, cease to be wholesome and necessary?" Truly, where? Here again is a paragraph that stimulates inquiry, but is followed by nothing that will satisfy inquiry. "If we compare the creed of the fourth century with that of the second, we cannot deny that there has been development. There has been no demonstrable change, if by change we mean shifting of ground or alteration
of principle. Yet doctrine is not the same as sentiment, nor technical formularies as implicit belief. The church of Origen is no more the church of the Athanasian Creed than the Parliament of Charles I. is the Parliament of Queen Victoria."

We know, however, that it is Victoria’s Parliament and not that of Charles I. which makes law for Dr. Bigg;—what we want to know is whether it is the fourth century or the second that makes his dogmas, and whether we are to find the rule of faith in the Bible, the Fathers, the infallible church, or in the so-called Christian consciousness.

F. L. PATTON.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF LIVING DIVINES AND CHRISTIAN WORKERS OF ALL DENOMI-
NATIONS IN EUROPE AND AMERICA, BEING A SUPPLEMENT TO THE SCHAFF-
HERZOG ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. Edited by the Rev.
Dr. SCHAFF and the Rev. SAMUEL M. JACKSON, A.M. New York: Funk
& Wagnalls. Royal 8vo, pp. 271.

This handsome volume includes a few names inadvertently omitted in the Religious Encyclopaedia, but is mainly occupied with notices of living divines. It is extremely complete and wonderfully accurate. In turning its pages we miss no name that ought to be there, and the information given, which in some cases we could test by personal knowledge or observation, appears to be entirely trustworthy. Much of it is accessible nowhere else. We understand that even German professors and divines have been astonished at the accuracy that is shown, and freely acknowledge that no publication of their own country contains what is to be found here. Of course this is due to the fact that direct application was made by the senior editor to the parties concerned for exact facts and dates, and their replies were used in constructing the work. Where these were not attained recourse was had to the best authorities, European and American, respecting which no man living is better able to judge than Dr. Schaff.

The result is a most serviceable manual of authentic information, for which the best thanks are due to both editors. Hundreds if not thousands of scholars in various lands will feel themselves under great obligation for a work so well conceived and executed, which will often save them a world of pains and trouble by giving in a single volume what otherwise would need to be sought not only in many libraries, but by extensive personal correspondence. Such labor-saving volumes are a great boon.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

HENRI DE COLIGNY, SEIGNEUR DE CHASTILLON. Par le Cæ Jules Delaborde.
Paris, 1887. 8vo, pp. 143.

The venerable Count Jules Delaborde has spent many years in laborious re-
searches in connection with the history of the famous Châtillon family. During the evening of a life the earlier part of which was in great measure devoted to the advocacy of the rights of religious liberty on the floor of the French legisla-
ture and in the courts, he has become a voluminous writer and biographer. His life of Admiral Gaspard de Coligny, in three volumes, is probably the fullest work on the striking career of the great hero of Protestantism and the great victim of the massacre of Saint Bartholomew’s Day. Twenty years ago he published a pamphlet on the last days of the widow of Coligny and, a year since, an able and exhaustive account of the achievements of the admiral’s worthy son, François de Châtillon, one of Henry the Fourth’s best generals, who died in con-
sequence of a wound received under the walls of the city of Chartres. In the treatise now before us Count Delaborde proceeds to the third generation, and discourses about Henry, the son of François and grandson of Gaspard, who promised, had his life been spared, to rival the glory of both of those remarkable men. A love of martial adventure, together with singular fitness to command
bodies of soldiers, seems to be hereditary in some families. In the family of the Colignies an additional part of the transmitted inheritance was a sincere and unaffected piety. The Coligny of the third generation bade fair to prove himself as trustworthy and exemplary a member of the Reformed Church and as firm a defender of that church's cause as the admiral himself. The present biography suffers somewhat from the disadvantage of a paucity of recorded facts; but it contains not a little that is interesting and instructive. The subject of it was only a lad when he was instantly killed by a stray ball from one of the cannon of the Spaniards early in the protracted siege of Ostend. To the reader who is familiar with the singular practice pursued by some monarchs of rewarding their princely supporters by conferring military and other titles upon children quite too young to discharge the duties apparently inseparable from the distinction, it may not be startling to be informed that the King of France appointed Henry of Châtillon to the office of Admiral of Guyenne when the boy was not quite eight and a half years old. He will be more surprised at the genuine precocity of the lad of eighteen who was placed by Prince Maurice of Orange in the responsible command of the troops set to defend the Dutch trenches at the siege of Rheinberg, and who actually succeeded in repulsing the enemy in three several attacks. Most of all, however, must he realize that Henry of Châtillon was no ordinary youth, when he finds him designated, by the common voice of the officers on duty within the walls of Ostend, to lead the general sortie of which he had been the chief advocate and, indeed, the proposer. It is, perhaps, not saying too much to conjecture that had he lived a few weeks longer the celebrated siege with whose operations Motley has rendered us so familiar, in the last volume of his United Netherlands, might have had a speedier and a very different issue.

A private letter from the author brings the information of Count Delaborde's purpose to conclude his histori cal labors by the publication of two volumes, of a larger size than the present one, on Charlotte of Bourbon, Princess of Orange, and on Louise of Coligny, who subsequently bore the same title. They will be enriched, it is stated, by new facts drawn from interesting documents discovered by Count Delaborde in the archives of Holland and other countries.

HENRY M. BAIRD.

CATECHISMS OF THE SECOND REFORMATION, WITH HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION AND BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES. By ALEXANDER F. MITCHELL, D.D.


Dr. Mitchell has rendered a great service to the Presbyterian world by the publication of this book. The Westminster symbols were the product of a long doctrinal development reaching from the first Reformation in the sixteenth century until the so-called second Reformation in the seventeenth century, and they can never be thoroughly understood apart from this history of doctrine that preceded them and that reached its culmination in them. Dr. Mitchell has studied these sources deeply in the true historical spirit, and with an honest, straightforward, and truth-loving purpose to state the facts as they really are. His aim in this volume is to set the Westminster Catechisms in the light of the numerous catechisms that preceded them and that surrounded them in the middle of the seventeenth century. It is surprising to find so large a number of catechisms in this period. Dr. Mitchell gives a careful list of these catechetical writings from the chief libraries of Great Britain, amounting to more than one hundred, and yet he has by no means exhausted the number; for the Union Theological Seminary has no less than twenty catechisms of this period that are not mentioned in these lists, and there are doubtless very many more.

Professor Mitchell reprints several of the most important of these catechisms, such as those of Archbishop Ussher, William Gouge, Herbert Palmer, John
Ball, Ezekiel Rogers, Robert Austin, Samuel Rutherford, Thomas Wyllie, and a few lesser ones. We very much regret that Thomas Cartwright's invaluable catechism has been omitted. It is of more importance, in my judgment, than several that have been given in the volume. The most of these catechisms are exceedingly rare, and not to be had by scholars apart from a few libraries.

One of the most important parts of this volume is the brief illustration of the Shorter Catechism by citations from a considerable number of "its Puritan precursors." This is so valuable that we have only to regret that more space was not given to it. Dr. Mitchell prefers to refer to the Latin Catechism of Calvin. It seems to me it would be better to build on the English translation of 1568, which was familiar to the Puritan divines. Dr. Mitchell also gives brief biographical notices of Ezekiel Rogers, John Ball, Archbishop Ussher, William Twisse, John White, Henry Wilkinson, William Gouge, Herbert Palmer, Daniel Cawdrey, Thomas Gataker, Antony Tuckney, John Arrowsmith, and Samuel Rutherford, all of which are models of their kind.

We thank the author for the great pains he has taken in the work. It will render valuable help to any one who would understand the real meaning of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, which has too often suffered violence by dogmatic methods of interpretation and by disregard of its historical and grammatical sense. C. A. BRIGGS.

The following works in the department of Historical Theology have been received:

*Aus Süd und Ost. Reisefrüchte aus drei Weltteilen.* Von Max Strack. 2te Sammlung. (Leipzig: H. Reuther.) This is a bright and interesting volume of travels in the Adriatic, Palestine, and Egypt, edited by the son of the author, the esteemed Biblical scholar, Prof. Hermann Strack, of Berlin.—*A History of the University of Oxford.* By the Hon. G. C. Broderick. (London: Longmans; New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co.) This brief sketch of the ancient University of Oxford contains an immense amount of information. It traces the development of the University and its colleges from their origin until the present time. It gives a clear view of the growth of academic studies. We have been greatly impressed with two things in the study of this volume: (1) that ecclesiastical influences have narrowed the range of the University and exercised an unfortunate restraint upon its healthful development, and (2) that there has been too much meddling with political affairs on the part of the professors and students, and, consequently, unfortunate political interferences with the internal affairs of the University. It is greatly to be desired that the University of Oxford should be broadened in every respect, so that there shall be no ecclesiastical, political, or social restraints upon the higher education of England. It might become the resort of scholars from all parts of the world. But, in order to this, the range of studies must be widened, the number of professors increased, ancient restraints removed, and the highest reaches of truth made the object of earnest and zealous pursuit.—*The Early Tudors.* By the Rev. C. E. Moberly. (London: Longmans; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.) The series of little volumes on the Epochs of Modern History, under the editorship of Edward E. Morris, is an excellent series. This additional volume will be warmly welcomed. It covers one of the most interesting periods of British history. It is written in a clear and interesting style, is impartial, and full of valuable information.—*Collections of the Huguenot Society of America.* Vol. I., 1886. The Huguenot Society of America is of recent origin. It represents the descendants of the Huguenots who sought refuge in America from the cruel persecution that they had to endure in France. This is the first volume of Historical Documents to be published by the Society. It was fitting that it should begin with "Registers of the Births, Marriages, and
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Deaths of the Eglise Françoise à la Nouvelle York from 1688 to 1804," edited by the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer. Besides these there are a number of Historical Documents relating to the French Protestants in New York, 1686-1804. These have not been selected with sufficient care. There were no sufficient reasons for printing several of them.—The Emancipation of Massachusetts. By Brooks Adams. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887.) This is a bold and vigorous book, based upon a study of the original documents of history. But it is essentially the work of a partisan rather than a historian; for polemic against the Puritan ministers dominates the whole. This is greatly to be regretted, for there is little doubt in thinking minds that there has been an indiscriminate laudation of the early New England ministers. Their grave faults have been overlooked, and the serious evils that were the product of their principles and methods have been ignored, and, consequently, they have been idealized as if they were great heroes. We are glad, therefore, that a bold hand has rent the curtain of the shrine of these idols and brought them in their bare reality to the light of history. But the author has gone too far. He has not written his book in the interest of historical truth, but with a hostile spirit. He delights in exposing the weaknesses and sins of these leaders of early New England. He does not treat them fairly. He fails to appreciate their motives and their purposes. He does not see them himself, and, therefore, cannot present them to others in their true historical setting. And so he is indiscriminate in his laudation of the Anabaptists and Quakers, and is ever ready to excuse their faults and to cover over their railing words, their violent deeds, their violation of the proprieties and decencies of life, and their persistent resistance to civil law and public order. There were great wrongs committed on both sides. We can now afford to look the truth in the eyes and deal with all parties with justice, and also with Christian charity. This rigorous polemic will stimulate others to write in defence of their heroes. It is greatly to be desired that a true historian should examine into all the facts and give us the real history of the political and religious development of New England.

C. A. BRIGGS.

III.—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.


A long and laborious career has made Professor Ebrard one of the best known of German theologians. His versatile mind has attempted a great variety of subjects, critical, exegetical, historical, dogmatic. In each of these departments of theological study he has written to good purpose. Natural science, too, has engaged his attention to a larger extent than is usual with the divines of Germany. His acquaintance with the results and pretensions of physical research, as it has widened with his years, has also deepened his conviction that, if the anti-Christian currents of the age are to be successfully met, much more regard must be had to the natural sciences by Christian ministers and theologians. This conviction induced him to give a course of Academic lectures in Erlangen in the winter of 1872-73. The outcome of these lectures is the System of Apologetics, of which we have now the first part in an English dress. The translators, we may say at once, have done their part with a very fair measure of success. There is a tendency to strain after a very literal English rendering for
everything, even for the names of familiar German streets. Awkward render-
ings also occur at times. But these are not to be greatly wondered at when we
consider the style of the original. That style is much superior, it is true, to
that of other theologians who might be mentioned. Nevertheless it has peculiar-
ties of its own which make it difficult to do justice to it. As a general rule the
sense is correctly reproduced. The translation of the last hundred pages is par-
ticularly well done.

This book of Professor Ebrard's was severely handled in some quarters when
it first appeared. It found much acceptance, however, and passed soon into
a second edition. It made a somewhat notable system at the time. It broke off to
some extent from the prevalent modes of Apologetical discussion. It combined
subjects which were usually kept apart. It made considerable use of the data
furnished by the physical sciences and by Comparative Religion. These and
other peculiar features secured for it a distinct place then. The lapse of time,
brief as it is, has taken something from its novelty and value. It would have
been more informing to English readers, and would have obtained a better place
among the more familiar systems, had it been translated ten years ago. It is,
nevertheless, a book which deserves notice, and will be read with profit. It bears
everywhere the stamp of an acute mind that has read largely, reflected carefully,
and sedulously cultivated a first-hand acquaintance with the writings which it
criticises.

Professor Ebrard is by no means unversed in philosophical speculation. He
gives us, perhaps, rather too much of that, even in the present volume. But his
idea is to start with observed facts and not with any metaphysical conception of
things or any a priori principle. His whole nature, he tells us, is "most
heartily opposed" to the latter method, and entirely in sympathy with the real-
istic, so that his object is to "proceed from observed facts and with painful care,
step by step, forwards." An honest attempt is made to carry out the method thus
described. It is not, however, altogether a successful attempt. In his psycho-
logical discussions it is especially difficult to admit that he adheres at all points
to the severe way of waiting upon facts. But he cannot be denied the credit of
amassing a vast number and variety of data drawn from many different sciences,
and bringing these into suggestive relations to the problems of revealed religion.

Christianity is to Professor Ebrard at once an eternal truth and a fact of his-
tory. The Apologist's task consequently is twofold. He has to defend and
substantiate both the eternal verities and the historic form. In the defence of
the former the instrument he has to use is the measuring-rod of nature and con-
science. In the defence of the latter he has at his service the measuring-rod of
history. In the one case he has to look especially to the presuppositions of
Christianity—the existence of a living, holy God, a divine law, free will, a state
conflicting with law, an incapacity in man to effect his own redemption. The
question to settle here is whether these presuppositions are consistent with the
voices of nature and conscience. In the other case the appeal is taken from the
court of nature and the natural consciousness into that of the general history of
culture and religion. The question there becomes this—"Whether in the his-
tory of the human race a constant development from beneath upward, or an in-
cessant entangling of a constant degeneration from above downward, can in fact
be historically established" (p. 10).

In dealing with the first part of his subject the author feels it necessary to
enter into a somewhat minute discussion of the problems of consciousness, our
knowledge of an external world, the nature of instinct, reason, will, and the
like. Much of this is of considerable merit. Many of the physiological and
psychological questions which agitate the scientific world are touched in a way
that indicates at least a respectable measure of knowledge. Professor Ebrard's
studies have penetrated indeed into some of the remoter corners of these subjects. His temptation is to turn perhaps too fondly to the curiosities of these investigations. We feel at any rate that much of this could well be dispensed with, and that a good deal of what he gives us in the shape of analysis of our relation to the outer world might also be conveniently spared. Nor is it to be concealed that his entire line of argument in this section of his subject would have been greatly improved by a less dogmatic spirit. He often sadly overshoots the mark by the scornful and extravagant phrases which he hurls against Darwin and other men of the highest eminence.

We follow him with much more interest in his statements on the great ethical and doctrinal questions. This is the case with what he has to say of the moral law itself. There is some difficulty, it is true, in getting his views on this subject in their completeness. We have to go from section to section of the volume in order to reach this. This is owing to the somewhat cumbrous plan of the treatise, the first part of which is divided (so far as the present volume goes) into two books, each with so many sections and sub-sections. The first book, which deals with the Positive Development, starts at once with the question of the moral law, its origin and the kind of necessity which is expressed in it. But it passes at once from that to discuss at great length the facts of consciousness, the categories of causality, conditionality, reason, natural law, and many other kindred subjects; and only after the lapse of above two hundred pages does it return to the Ethical Law, and consider it in its further connections. When we come at last, however, to the author's views of the moral law in their final statement, they are found to be in most points sufficiently satisfactory. He insists with particular decision and clearness on its innate character. Its origin cannot be found within natural law; the "unconscious life of nature" cannot be the author of its existence. On the contrary, what is so organized as to be self-conscious, self-determining, and able to distinguish between good and evil, "raises itself above the entire sphere of natural necessity." Neither can it have its origin or ground in convenience, in prevailing custom, or in popular opinion. For an "appeal from custom to ethical law is possible." Nor again can its origin lie in the will of the individual; for "it raises itself, even in a condemning manner, against the will and contradicts it." What we chiefly miss here is any adequate discussion of the evolutionary theory of morals. There is no criticism of that as it is expounded in its most authoritative form by Herbert Spencer. But otherwise there is much that is well considered and acutely put.

In the section devoted to the questions bearing on the knowledge of a Deity, the scholastic arguments for the existence of God are briefly examined. Their logical invalidity is fully recognized, while at the same time it is admitted that there lies a truth at the basis of each of the three well-known lines of proof—the teleological, the cosmological, the ontological. It is doubtful whether Professor Ebrard does complete justice to these proofs. He fails to point out how far each is capable of carrying us, to what particular point each is properly applicable, or what their cumulative force amounts to. Neither does he seem to apprehend quite clearly the relations in which the teleological argument and the cosmological stand to each other, or the different aspects of the universe on which they respectively fix. But perhaps the most remarkable thing in this part of Ebrard's system is his accepting the line of argument by which Dr. F. Pfaff shows that natural science itself "leads with necessity to the assumption of a volitional, regulative power, standing above natural laws," and his adhesion to K. P. Fischer's definitions of the truths which underlie the formal inadequacy of the scholastic proofs for the existence of a Deity.

To many minds, however, the most interesting section will be the last fifty pages. These deal with systems opposed to Christianity. The mechanistic
theory is very fairly criticised, and a concise statement is given of the position of the question of design in nature. We cannot say that Professor Ebrard is by any means so competent a guide through these problems as some others who might be named. He ranks far beneath M. Janet, for example, in the rare combination of the practised physicist with the keen metaphysician. Hence we do not find in the German professor anything to match the skillful exposition of the whole range of the teleological principle which we have in the Causes Finales of the French savant. Dr. Ebrard's method of looking at it, however, has its own characteristics and its own merits. What he has to say on the "Achilles of the materialistic theory of Nature and his heel," on the moot question of rudimentary organs, on the presumed absence of design in nature, and on the proof of teleology and its witnesses, is said with great decision, and makes some points which deserve consideration.

S. D. F. SALMOND.


This is the initial volume in what promises to be a very valuable series of little books to be published by Thomas Whittaker under the general title of "The Theological Educator." The author's apologetic position is indicated in the following passage from his Introduction: "Let us, then, follow the example of our military generals, and concentrate our defence on those points which are vital to its truth as a Divine revelation; and if there is a single key which commands the entire Christian position, let us order our entire argument so as to occupy it with our utmost strength. The question, therefore, naturally arises. Is there such a key? I answer, Yes. It is the historical truth of the person, work, and teaching of Jesus Christ our Lord, as it is depicted in the Gospels. If he was such as the Gospels depict him to have been, then it follows that his character was a superhuman one, and consequently that Christianity is a divine revelation. But if, on the other hand, we cannot prove that the great outline of the character depicted in the Gospels is historically true; if, moreover, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is a fiction, and not a fact, then the proof of every subordinate position would fail to establish the truth of Christianity as such a revelation."

The author considers, first, the moral evidences of Christianity, and, secondly, the miraculous attestation of Christianity. Under the first head he presents very clearly the moral arguments that have been made familiar by the apologetic literature of the last twenty years. From the position that Christ occupies in the world as the Light of the world, from the divinely attractive power that resides in Christ, from the moral teaching of Christ, from the apparent weakness of the agency through which the Church was erected, and from other considerations of a similar nature, the author leads his reader to the conclusion that Christ was a supernatural being.

This conclusion, however, is supported by specific miraculous attestation, the consideration of which constitutes the second part of the volume. In a brief, but very clear and satisfactory way the author discusses the question of our Lord's resurrection, dealing especially with the theories that trace the original belief in the resurrection of Christ to "some kind of mental hallucination." The volume does not realize our idea of what "a Manual of the Christian Evidences" ought to be; for while it is true that the doctrine of a crucified and risen Christ is the main thing to be defended, the value of this doctrine consists in its claim to be a doctrine of salvation. Christianity as the revealed way of salvation is what we are to defend; and while the moral elements in Christ's teaching and the
RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

historical truth of Christ's resurrection are very important contributions to the
defence of this position, there are other considerations that should also be taken
into account.

In a volume that claims to be a manual of Christian evidences, however small
it may be, some place should be found for the argument founded upon the consonance
between Christianity and our religious natures; for the argument founded
upon the relation that Christianity sustains to other religions; for the argument
founded upon the specific witness of Paul to Christ; and also for the argument
founded on the organic character of Scripture, and the place which the Christ
occupies in the Old and New Testaments.

It produces an impression of apologetic poverty when, by the misleading impli-
cations of a title, what is only a very small part of the argument for Christianity
goes forth as substantially embodying the whole case. Mr. Row has done good
service, however, in the preparation of this volume, and we earnestly hope that
it may be widely read.

F. L. PATTON.

We call attention to the following books in addition to those already men-
tioned:

of the First Presbyterian Church, Brantford, Canada. (Brantford: Watt & Thur-
ston, 1887.) Dr. Beattie is one of the rising theological thinkers of Canada. The
present volume shows that he has made himself acquainted with the recent liter-
ature of the theistic controversy, and that he can defend the faith with ability.
His essay is clear, discriminating, and thoughtful. But in both the form
and matter of his discussions the author is more manifestly influenced by
the opinions of living writers than perhaps he would have been had he pondered
longer and printed later. —__Religion: A Revelation and a Rule of Life_. By
Rev. William Kirkus, M.A., LL.B., University of London, Rector of the Church
of St. Michael and All Angels, Baltimore, Md. (New York: Thomas Whittaker,
1886.) The author of this volume does well in trying to instruct his people in
fundamental doctrines. There is far too little doctrinal preaching in the pulpits
of our own Church. The Advent sermons at the beginning of this volume are
strong and earnest presentations of the claims of revealed religion. The author
does not hold as high a theory of inspiration as we could wish, but he sets forth
very ably the fact and the need of an objective revelation. He needlessly goes
out of his way to speak slightly of the Westminster statement of the doctrine
of original sin. His views of Absolution are very sacerdotal. But his book is a
timely protest against prevailing naturalism. The author need have no anxiety
lest, as he says in his Preface, he may seem to have gone beyond his depth in his
references to Maudsley. One need not wade far in following Maudsley. —
__Universal Beliefs; or the Great Consensus_. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D.D., author
of "Ecce Coelum." (American Tract Society.) "Does one feel that a doctrine
must be uncertain if it is respectably disputed? Would it take a stumbling-
block out of his way to find a realm of religious belief in which practically all
were at home? Here is such a realm. Here is a sea on which one is not beaten
about by conflicting winds of doctrine." These words from the author's preface
indicate the purpose of the present volume. Dr. Burr is one of the best-known
writers on popular apologetics, and the book that has just come from his pen is a
well-written, helpful volume. There is no parade of learning, and no pretense
of erudition. It is a book written for the people. The scope is indicated by the
table of contents. Among the beliefs constituting "the great consensus" the
author includes Superhuman Beings, Supreme Deity, Earthly Providence, Rel-
igious Worship, Infallible Oracles, etc. —__Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott
im A usch luss an Luther dargestellt. Von Dr. W. Hermann, Professor in Mar-
burg. Verlag der I. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, Stuttgart, 1886. The
author is one of Ritschl's disciples, and in the present volume he tries to shelter
Ritschlian ism under the wing of Luther. Hermann wages war against meta phy-
sic in theology and is in danger of throwing out the baby with the bath. The
dogmatic of the new movement seems to be a union of Pietism and Naturalism.

F. L. Patton.

IV.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Memorials of William E. Dodge. Compiled and edited by D. Stuart

William E. Dodge was born September 4th, 1805, at Hartford, Conn., and
died in New York February 9th, 1883. His remarkable career as a merchant
and philanthropist is known the world over. He participated in almost all the
great benevolent movements of his day, and in not a few of them he was a
leader. Take him for all in all and it is doubtful if the whole country furnished
at the time another instance of such abundant, long-continued, and fruitful activ-
ity in so many different spheres of Christian beneficence and reform. The ver-
satility of his efforts for the best good of his fellow-men was as striking as their
extent and persistency. He saw how closely the progress of the kingdom of God
is connected with secular and social causes, and this impelled him to that
catholicity and largeness of view which marked both his charities and his per-
sonal efforts. He possessed in a very unusual degree the true enthusiasm of
humanity. His joy in seeing the work of God go forward in the world was un-
bounded, and nothing so delighted him as to have a hand in it. He cherished
a profound conviction of the reality and desirableness of "revivals of religion;"
he constantly prayed for them; and when he found himself in the midst of one,
his whole mind and heart were stirred by the spiritual excitement and gladness
of the scene. The evangelistic labors of such men as Nettleton, Finney, and
Moody met his warmest approval and sympathy. It would be hard to say which
was nearest his heart—the cause of home missions, foreign missions, education
for the ministry, the elevation of the colored race, temperance, or the rescue and
religious training of neglected, paganized children of the land; all these, and
others still, were objects of his deep interest, his efforts and his untiring bene-
factions. Such a man was William E. Dodge; and in this beautiful memorial
volume, prepared by filial piety, we have him drawn to the life. All the varied
phases of his character and the many lines along which he moved in the service
of his Master are here depicted in a simple, straightforward manner, without
exaggeration or vain eulogy. The volume is compiled and edited in excellent
taste, and cannot fail to be read with great pleasure by Mr. Dodge's old friends.
It deserves also a wide circulation, especially among men of business, for the
noble example it presents of eminent mercantile talent, skill, energy, and
wealth, all devoted to the best interests of mankind. George L. Prentiss.

James Hannington, First Bishop of Eastern Equatorial Africa. A
History of His Life and Work, 1847-85. By E. C. Dawson, M.A.
Oxon., Incumbent of St. Thomas's Church, Edinburgh. Author's Edition.
Randolph & Co., 1887.

James Hannington was born at Hurstpierpoint, near Brighton, September 3d,
1847. He entered St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, in October, 1868, but did not take
his bachelor's degree until June, 1873. A gay, impetuous, whole-souled youth, fond of fun and of all sorts of athletic sport, he had reached his twenty-sixth year before finding out the real purpose of life. He then resolved to take holy orders, but at the bishop's examination suffered a mortifying repulse, which almost broke his heart. After several months' delay he was ordained deacon, and at once began to exercise his gifts among a scattered population on the wild north coast of Devonshire. In September, 1875, he was instituted curate of St. George's, Hurstpierpoint. Here he gave himself up to parochial and home mission work with great zeal and energy. Early in 1882, at the age of thirty-four, he offered himself to the Church Missionary Society for service in Africa. The offer was accepted, and in May he sailed for Zanzibar on his first missionary journey. After passing through manifold labors and perils, and broken down in health, he returned to England in June, 1883. A year later he was consecrated bishop of Eastern Equatorial Africa, and in November, 1884, again started for the Dark Continent. On the 29th of October, 1885, while on a journey to Uganda, he was seized and put to death by the very men whom he regarded as his friends. It is one of the saddest incidents in recent missionary annals, and the tragical story is told in the closing chapter of this volume with wonderful simplicity and pathos.

From this sketch it will be seen that James Hannington's missionary career was very short—shorter even than that of David Brainerd. What gives to his memoir its special interest and fascination, as in the case of Brainerd's, is the noble quality of the man. He was a true hero of faith. No one can read Mr. Dawson's graphic history of his life and work without receiving the impression of a character remarkable for spiritual strength and beauty. It is a biography eminently fitted to stimulate Christian zeal, and deserves a place beside that of John Coleridge Patteson, the missionary bishop and martyr of Melanesia.

GEORGE L. PRENTISS.

THE PSALMS IN HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY. By the Rev. JOHN KER, D.D.


The thirteen editions through which Dr. Ker's volume of sermons, entitled "The Day Dawn and the Rain," has passed in the old country, and its popularity among us for nearly twenty years, give sure token of the welcome that awaits the second series of his selected sermons, which was some months ago announced as "nearly ready." Meanwhile the volume before us has passed through six editions within a few months; and no one will wonder who loves the Psalms, and who learns more fully from these testimonies than ever before, by the author's loving and diligent gleanings from the pages of Church history and Christian biography, what a place they have held, and what a power they have exerted in the experience of Christ's people. This volume was the last prepared by its lamented author. These testimonies are gathered from all periods, from all lands, and from all branches of Christ's Church. No one will criticise the frequency with which the author resorts to the history of the Scotch Covenanters, or the enthusiasm with which, as a United Presbyterian of Scotland, he vindicates for the Psalms a lasting place in the worship of the Church and of private Christians, or the admiration which he entertains for the version of Francis Rous. His illustrations refer in detail to more than three quarters of the Psalms. An interesting section of the book gathers up from many widely scattered sources general tributes to the preciousness of this portion of God's Word, while another treats of the chief metrical versions. The work is done in the admirable style and spirit which were so characteristic of the Scotch pastor and professor.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.
Books for Practical Edification:

**The City Youth.** By J. Thain Davidson, D.D. (A. C. Armstrong & Son.) This is a series of discourses intended to give guidance and warning and encouragement to young men placed amid the temptations and dangers of great commercial centres. They are written in a plain, direct, and vigorous style, and are well adapted for their purpose; and what is a prime requisite in such a book, they are not hard to read. The author has considerable power of illustration, and he uses it well. Persons in search of a good book to give to a young friend pushing his way in a busy crowded city will find this volume well suited to their aim.—*Creed and Character.* Sermons by the Rev. H. S. Holland, Canon of St. Paul's. (Charles Scribner's Sons.) The object of this volume is to show the intimate relation, the identity of Christian creed and Christian character. It contains a series of sermons grouped under the general heads Apostolic Witness, the Church in the Gospels, Conversion, Newness of Life, the Christian Life here on Earth. The author writes in a clear and forcible style, is fresh and vivid in his statements of truth, and while doctrinally sound goes out of the beaten track in his modes of presenting truth. Doubtless there are many to whom the Canon's discourses will prove helpful and stimulating, yet to us there is often a vagueness of conception and of statement which mars the total effect. Sometimes there is a curious slip, as when he speaks of "the wicked pretence that drunkenness is amusing." There is good Scripture authority for allowing that there is such a thing as "the pleasures of sin" (Heb. xi. 25), and we see no gain in denying it. The true point is that such pleasures are low, transient, and followed by the sting of remorse.—*Pulpit Themes and Homiletic Undergrowth.* By the Rev. Thomas Kelly. (Funk & Wagnalls.) This volume contains nineteen sermons, followed by twenty-five shorter pieces, called "sermonic saplings." The character of the whole is well expressed in the first one, entitled Spiritual Telegraphy, founded upon the question in Job, "Canst thou send lightnings?" etc. They are "smart." They abound with life and animation, and often convey a sharp hit in a few pointed words. But they sorely lack a doctrinal basis, and are a good specimen of much of the preaching that is popular in our day, sacrificing everything to the aim of an immediate startling impression, and taking no pains to lay a solid foundation in the exposition of the divine word. In one place (p. 144) Mr. Kelly, while holding the Church doctrine as to Retribution, says, "The Bible does not teach that men are punished eternally for sins committed in time." But this is just what the Bible does say over and over. It is true that the lost sin on forever, but their doom is a recompense for "the deeds done in the body."—*The Bird's Nest, and Other Sermons for Children of all Ages.* By the Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D. (Thomas Whittaker.) The author of this volume is well known as a scholarly English divine, who has published several exegetical works of value. The present book shows him in a new field. It contains the sermons preached on the successive anniversaries of the Sunday-school of his congregation, and Dr. Cox did well in complying with the request of his hearers to put them in print. They are expository discourses, designed to explain and enforce a given portion of Scripture, and adapt it to the needs of the young. This is a difficult work, and it is well done. The book will prove valuable not only directly to the youthful readers into whose hands it is put, but to many others in indicating how preaching or expounding may be made attractive to the young without sacrificing solidity and instructiveness. One may well doubt whether any pastor does his whole duty who does not learn this difficult yet most important art.—*The People's Bible. Discourses upon Holy Scripture.* By Joseph Parker, D.D. Vol. V., Joshua—Judges V. (Funk & Wagnalls.) This new volume of what is called Dr. Parker's "great work" is constructed on the same lines as those that preceded it. There is little
or no attempt at exegesis, but salient portions are selected for homiletic treatment, while at intervals direct practical teachings are summed up under the head of "Handfuls of Purpose." Each homily is preceded by the usual soliloquy or meditation called a prayer. Dr. Parker is generally interesting, and certain parts of his undertaking will do great good by drawing men's attention to those portions of the Bible which they are accustomed to neglect, especially if it be true, as some say, that even among Christians the steady reading of the Word is almost a lost art. Any book that has a tendency to send men with eager interest to the living oracles is a great acquisition.

—Pleading for Prayer and Other Sermons Preached in 1886. By C. H. Spurgeon. (New York: Carter & Bros.) This new volume from the pulpit of the London Tabernacle resembles those that preceded it. It is not brilliant nor profound, but it is sensible and vivacious, and thoroughly evangelical. It is pleasant to think of the multiplication and wide circulation of discourses in which the preacher never strikes a false note. But we observe one curious slip. The volume contains a sermon on the text, John xvii. 24, "Father, I will that they also whom thou," etc., in the course of which Mr. Spurgeon quotes the Revised Version, "Father, that which thou hast given me, I will that, where I am, they also may be with me," which, he says, "sounds very like nonsense," and repeats what he has said before, that the Revisers are excellent Greek scholars, who would have done better "if they had known a little more English." But lo and behold, after this vigorous condemnation, what does the preacher do but proceed to animadvert upon the very point which led the Revisers to render as they did, viz., "that there is here a something in the singular as well as persons in the plural." And he makes a very edifying use of the fact that the Church is one and at the same time many—which is just what the exact rendering of our Lord's word teaches, and was intended to teach. We submit that Mr. Spurgeon refute himself. If the text bears the rich suggestions he draws from its form as revised, then that form cannot be "of small use to the general reader," or "words without any meaning in them." And the preacher should either have taken no notice of the Revisers' version, or else have abstained from censuring it so severely. It should be added, however, that in the case of another text, Rom. viii. 1, Mr. Spurgeon declined to treat of the last clause, "Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," as it stands in the Common Version, declaring that it had been properly stricken out by the Revisers, and then stating how he thought that the unauthorized addition to the true text came to be made. It is pleasant to see the authority of this distinguished preacher given to the practice of using in the pulpit the Revised Version, and thus training the people to the knowledge of what is genuine Scripture.—Philosophy of Ritual, Apologia pro Ritu. By L. P. Gratacap, A.M. (New York: James Pott & Co.) This book is accurately described by its title. It is a thoughtful and good-tempered defence of Ritualism in its extreme forms. It does not rest on Scripture, and hence makes small use of the sacred volume. It is really a philosophy. The author thinks man's nature requires a system which addresses the imagination through the senses. Three principles are involved, viz., Art and Decoration, Symbolism, and Commemoration, and the author traces these as they are illustrated in the Irvingite, Greek, and Roman Churches. Having thus proved Ritualism to be universal, he proceeds to show its reasonableness on various grounds. The work shows a good deal of reading and of reflection, but, starting as it does from a wrong basis must needs go far astray. No man can determine a priori what should be the form of worship. A positive religion must needs shape its ritual according to its own principles; and, therefore, there must be a recurrence continually, not to corrupt human nature, but to the uncorrupt and infallible word for suggestions and guidance. Mr. Gratacap does not under-
stand the position of Protestant churches. He speaks of their doctrine of the
Eucharist as "simply commemorative," which is the view of only a small
segment of the Protestants. All the Lutherans and all the symbols of the Re-
formed teach a widely different doctrine. But the intense spirituality of their
views is something widely different from the external, sensuous, and imaginat-
ive conceptions of the whole tribe of Ritualists.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

V.—PHILOSOPHY.

SOME PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHY. By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, Professor of

This is a paradoxical book, and, like most books of its class, it is stimulating
rather than satisfying. The author is a keen dialectician, and a lover of scholastic
methods. He is also a man of severe literary taste, and his style seems to be a
compound in equal proportions of Thomas Aquinas and Matthew Arnold. Dr.
Alexander lays bare the difficulties of philosophy, and thereby does good. His
readers, however, will regret that he has not been more constructive in his aims,
and they will have some reason for their regret when they see his capacity for the
latter kind of work in his chapter on the Doctrine of a First Cause. However
scientific he may be elsewhere in his treatment of the Problems of Philosophy, he
is speculative there; and if there is good ground for the dogmatic state-
ments that exhibit "the real Theism of Atheism," there does not seem to be
good reason to be agnostic in regard to matters that are more commonly ad-
mited among the articles of philosophic belief.

A man does philosophy a service when he shows that its difficulties are not
masted by going over the commonplaces of Psychology in a text-book on
"Mental Philosophy," or when he puts a notice of "No road this way" at the
beginning of certain philosophical by-paths that lead nowhere. It is a service to
religion also to deliver it from bondage to metaphysics. With much that Dr.
Alexander says we sympathize, but we should make a more determined stand
than he seems to make for a natural as distinguished from a revealed Ethic.
He seems to relegate too many topics to the domain of religion, and is more
ready than we should be to say of certain questions like immortality and moral
obligation that we can get no answer to them from philosophy. Revelation,
it is true, secures us everything; but it must be remembered that our certitude
regarding Revelation depends upon some of our philosophical beliefs. We can
afford to throw overboard the deck-load for the sake of keeping the more valuable
portion of the cargo. But we must be careful not to make jetsam and flotsam
of fundamental truths.

The author begins his volume with a clear presentation of the difficulties of
philosophy, which is followed by an able discussion of the Problem of the Ulti-
mate Nature of Matter. We are specially pleased to notice his position respect-
ing the Problem of Physiological Psychology. Dr. Alexander has made this
subject a matter of special and experimental study, and has a specialist's right
to be heard. We commend his cautious and conservative tone to the notice of
those ardent advocates of the "New Psychology" who think that it is to show
us a more excellent way.

The author's reasoning is always acute, but it does not uniformly command
our assent. Thus in "Reason in Contradiction to Reason" (VII.) we should say: "No; for when I decide that it is rational to believe a certain authority, I also decide (implicitly) that it is rational to believe what is stated by that authority. Or vice versa, when I decide that a certain belief is irrational, I decide that it is irrational to believe the authority teaching that belief." Dr. Alexander's position would seem to imply that I may believe a thing to be rational and irrational (though on different grounds) at the same time. The case supposed is not one of reason in contradiction to reason, but of a belief which at first seemed irrational, appearing rational afterward on the ground of higher reasons for it. It is analogous to the conflict between Will and Desire, where, as Dr. Alexander shows, we do not will contrary to desire, but really at the moment of willing have another desire. Passing now to another topic, it is proper to say that the doctrine of Immortality is "outside of theoretical philosophy," if we include within this sphere only apodictic certitudes. But inasmuch as the difficulty of disproving Pessimism is alleged to be the drawback to the moral arguments, we must conclude that but for the pessimistic alternative, the author would allow the doctrine of immortality to keep its place in theoretic philosophy. It is fair to say, we think: Accept immortality as the postulate of our moral nature, or else accept Pessimism. But this is very much like saying: Accept Theism, or else admit that reason is bankrupt or insane. It does not seem to us, therefore, that we are bound to wait for a revelation to justify our beliefin immortality, or that a belief justified on the ground of rational probability can be properly regarded as "outside of theoretic philosophy."

Speaking on the subject of Obligation and Moral Knowledge, the author says: "Having shown that the perversion of knowledge and feeling is inconsistent with any necessary universal or original moral standard, I infer that if the will be perverted, the conclusion reached is that there is a form which we loosely call a feeling of obligation; that there is no matter which has an absolute moral claim." And in the chapter on the Ethical Conflict, he says: "But suppose it be denied that the most pleasurable course of action is the most moral course, why should one be moral? There is no answer to this question except the religious answer." The chapters in which these passages occur are full of clear thinking, and they make it apparent (what every student of ethics must know) that the difficulty which besets the intuitional philosopher is to show clearly what moral truths are known intuitively. Dr. Calderwood would reply, we think justly, to Dr. Alexander, that different judgments as to what is right or wrong do not prove that there are no a priori moral ideas. But what are these ideas? It would not shake our confidence in intuitive morality if it were shown that some duties are subsumed under a more generic duty—veracity under benevolence, for example, though we do not believe that Dr. Porter is right here—but Dr. Alexander goes in the way of Kant, and reduces intuitive morality to form without content. It would follow, then, that Philosophy has no commandments, and man must wait until Revelation gives them to him. But must not the command, Keep God's commandments, condition any proper use we may make of the decalogue? and where do I learn that I ought to obey God's commands, if Reason can only say "ought," without being able to say what I ought to do?

It is true that there is no answer to the question why I ought to be moral except the religious answer, if the author does not mean by the "religious answer" the answer of revealed religion; for the only adequate explanation of the obligation to be moral, irrespective of pleasurable consequences, is the hypothesis of theism. This is a "religious answer," but it is also a philosophical and metaphysical answer.

The eighth chapter deals with the Relations of Belief to Knowledge in a
manner so masterly and satisfactory that we cannot withhold an expression of hope that the author will at some future time discuss this most difficult subject more fully, and with reference to the religious problems involved in it. He has shown that in a great many instances belief and knowledge are identical; and that belief in the probable and possible may also, by slight change of phraseology, be stated as knowledge of the probable and possible. We agree substantially with his positions; but we still ask, What is the difference between knowledge and belief?

The volume concludes with an instructive chapter on the Doctrine of Cause and Effect, tracing the history of the doctrine, and concluding with some very just criticisms of the theory of John Stuart Mill, which identified Causality with the Uniformity of Nature. The author notices the view which finds the type of causation in human agency, but does not make as much of it as it deserves, considering the number and the ability of its advocates.

F. L. Patton.


The several pamphlets comprising this series were noticed in THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW at the time of their appearance. It will not be necessary to repeat in detail what has been already said. We are glad to see them in the handsome form in which they are now presented, and under the title of "Realistic Philosophy." Though not a systematic exhibition of the author's philosophy, they contain a pretty comprehensive statement of it both as to its contents and the principles that underlie it. They contain Dr. McCosh's theory of Knowledge and his theory of Being. Dr. McCosh is naturally in sympathy with English tendencies of thought. The inductive spirit is strong in him. He goes as far in the direction of empiricism as his Scotch intuitionalism will let him. Hence his readiness to appreciate Mill, though seriously differing with him on many points. Hence, too, his appreciation of the merits of Spencer, though antagonizing his agnosticism and his utilitarian ethics. But he has no sympathy with German idealism. He opposes Kant as the prince of agnostics, and he has no sympathy with the recent alliance that some have been trying to make between Scotch philosophy and Hegelianism. This alliance, however, is likely to be of short duration, judging from what Dr. Calderwood says in a late number of the New Princeton Review; and from the fact that Professor Seth—as we were told the other day—is bidding good-by to Hegel in his second course of lectures on the Scotch Philosophy.

There is, therefore, a special timeliness in the appearance of these volumes just now, and we wish, for the sake of sound thinking, that they might be widely read on both sides of the Atlantic.

Dr. McCosh believes that we have an immediate knowledge of the external word. He is a dualist. He believes in mind and in matter. Philosophy in the comprehensive sense employed in the title of these volumes embraces not only Psychology but Cosmology. "What development can do and cannot do" comes in, therefore, for a place in his pages. Dr. McCosh is withal a devout Christian. His philosophy is a religious philosophy, and takes cognizance of Providence, Prayer, Sin, and Moral Obligation.

The papers in these volumes are all written in the lucid and popular style which is the charm of Dr. McCosh's writing. The discussions have enough polemic flavor to give them relish, and are so related to contemporary philosophic thought as to be a commentary upon it.

Volume I. is "expository," and deals with such topics as Criteria of divers Kinds of Truth—a defence of intuitionalism; Energy,—Efficient and Final Cause—an
RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE.

admirable essay, in which Simon Newcomb's celebrated *ignoratio elenchi* on the subject of final cause meets with very effective exposure; and Certitude, Providence and Prayer, in which the author's well-known positions on these subjects are exhibited in opposition to the skepticism that is fostered by rival schools of philosophy.

The second volume is "historical and critical," and is really a presentation of the growth of agnosticism from Hume to Spencer, with elaborate criticisms of the systems of its leading representatives.

Locke's relation to Hume and Berkeley called for a discussion of his philosophy, and the admirable essay on his *Theory of Knowledge* opens, as one on Herbert Spencer's *Ethics* closes the volume.

F. L. PATTON.

Brief mention: *History of Modern Philosophy*. By Kuno Fischer. Des Cartes and his School. Translated from the third German edition. By J. P. Gordy, Ph.D., Professor of Pedagogics in Ohio University. Edited by Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.) It would be difficult to imagine a more important service that could be rendered to the cause of Philosophy in America than the translation of Kuno Fischer's History. It is not only true that there is no history like it in English; there is none that approaches it in German. It occupies the place in regard to Modern Philosophy that Zeller's history does in regard to Ancient. Morell and Bowen are readable, but not complete. *Ueberweg* is admirable as a book of reference, and is worth a great deal for its bibliography; but Fischer is both readable and masterful. It is to be hoped that the publishers will be encouraged to complete this great undertaking. Their purpose for the present is to publish two volumes, embracing the author's treatment of Des Cartes and his school. We reserve a fuller notice of the work until the appearance of the second volume. The present volume is a handsome octavo of 589 pages, printed in large, clear type.— *The Philosophy of Religion on the Basis of its History*. By Otto Pfeiderer. I. History of the Philosophy of Religion from Spinoza to the present day. Vol. I., Spinoza to Schleiermacher. (Williams & Norgate, 1886.) The department now known as the Philosophy of Religion is every day attracting a larger number of the choicest minds; and the literature of it is assuming large proportions. Evangelical Christians should not leave it in the hands of rationalists, but should use it, as it can be used, in defence of truth. Pfeiderer's book, of which about one quarter appears in the present volume, is recognized as a standard work in this department—though anti-supernaturalistic, of course. In this and the following volume the author treats of the history of religious philosophy, dealing with writers like Spinoza, Wolff, Leibnitz, Kant, Herder, and Schleiermacher. In the latter half of the work (iii. and iv. of the translation) the philosophy of religion is "treated genetically and speculatively." We reserve a fuller notice of the historical portion until the appearance of the second volume of the translation.— *The Anatomy of Negation*. By Edgar Saltus. (New York: Scribner & Welford, 1886.) The author says in his prefatory note that this book is "intended to convey a tableau of anti-theism from Kapila to Leconte de Lisle." English writers are not dealt with, being generally accessible. Under such headings as the Revolt of the Orient, the Negations of Antiquity, the Dissent of the Seers, the author gives us a series of somewhat brilliant essays on anti-theistic forms of thought, his sympathies being evidently with anti-theism. The Pessimism of the closing words reveals the unrest of unbelief. "In the sepulchre of the pale Nazarene humanity guards its last divinity. Every promise is unfulfilled. There is no light, save perchance in death. One torture more, one more throb of the heart, and after it nothing. . . . The one consolation that we hold, though it is one which may be illusory too, consists in the belief
that when death comes fear and hope are at an end."—"Outlines of Æsthetics."

Dictated portions of the Lectures of Hermann Lotze. Translated and edited by George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale College. (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1886.) We are glad to see that, notwithstanding the large amount of original work that Professor Ladd is doing, of which his recently published work on Physiological Psychology gives such evidence, he finds time also to carry out his project of translating Lotze's Dictate. We are happy to add this volume on Æsthetics to those on Metaphysics, the Philosophy of Religion, and Psychology, which have already appeared. F. L. Patton.

VI.—GENERAL LITERATURE.


From prehistoric times down to the work of living artists the author draws upon all the representative forms of art for the historic facts that call for interpretation. All the chief phases and all the leading types of the world's development and culture come directly or incidentally under review. Mr. Van Dyke's object is not to propound a theory and search for facts that will support it, but to draw out the principles that underlie the historic art of the world. At one time it is naturally architecture, at another sculpture, and again painting that occupies the foreground in his studies; and of course literature is often found to furnish signal illustrations of the artist spirit whose work he is endeavoring to interpret.

Mr. Van Dyke has produced an attractive and interesting book. His own manifest enthusiasm communicates itself to his reader. Where criticisms in detail are almost numberless, there is often enough room for difference of judgment between author and reader. Yet in the main his conclusions are so eminently just and so well supported by the high authorities of whose support he makes judicious use, that dissent must, we think, restrict itself to individual judgments here and there expressed.

Mr. Van Dyke's style is bright and vigorous. In a treatise on art we would rather see more deference paid to the highest and best standards, and a little less exemplification of the rights of individualism. Infelicities, inaccuracies, innovations in style, are somewhat too common for our taste. His main work is exceedingly instructive and helpful, and many will acknowledge themselves his debtors for guidance and incitement. Charles A. Aiken.


These letters, with the exception of the first two, belong to the years 1827–31, the closing years of Goethe's life. In 1824 Carlyle had translated Wilhelm Meister, and the opening letters in this interesting series are occasioned by that publication, which brought the great German and his greatest English interpreter into a communication which continued until broken by the death of the master early in 1832. Goethe thoroughly appreciated his English admirer and
friend, and no less the service which was undertaken by him as the first great expounder of modern German literature to the English-speaking world. Such translations Goethe regarded as of great possible value to the people from whose language the translation might be made, and not to those only who were directly in the translator's eye (p. 102). When Carlyle's *Life of Schiller* had appeared in a German translation in 1830, with a most complimentary Introduction, written by Goethe himself, Carlyle expressed his appreciation of this high distinction in this thoroughly representative sentence (p. 238): "That I should see myself, before all the world, set forth as the Friend of Goethe, is an honor of which, some few years ago, I could not in my wildest flights have dreamed; of which I should still desire no better happiness than to feel myself worthy." The period covered by these letters is that during which Carlyle's whole strength is put into the study, criticism, and reproduction for his own countrymen of the great German masters and masterpieces. At the close of the period *Sartor Resartus* is slowly taking form.

In one of the earliest letters of this series (pp. 63 sq.), Carlyle announces the act that he is a candidate for the Professorship of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrew's. His conception of the scope of such a chair is thus given: "The qualifications required, or at least expected, are not so much any profound scientific acquaintance with Philosophy properly so called, as a general character for intelligence, integrity, and literary attainment; all proofs of talent and spiritual worth of any kind being more or less available." Goethe most heartily gave him the testimonial that he solicited; before its reception the appointment had, however, been given to another, and Carlyle is thrown back upon a more strictly literary career.

Each letter of Goethe's is given in the original and also in an admirable translation, which, with all the other editorial work of Mr. Norton, is, as might be expected, of the highest order. A few letters from Mr. Carlyle and from Eckermann diversify the collection, which brings a welcome addition to our knowledge of the personal relations and the co-operative work of the two men who were so powerfully influencing the thought of that period.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.


**A HEBREW GRAMMAR.** By the Rev. W. H. LOWE, M.A. 16mo, pp. 59; tables, 34. New York: Thomas Whittaker.

Professor Strack responds promptly to the expressed desire that the wants of less advanced students should be more fully met than was done by the nine pages of severely condensed paradigms which he had deemed sufficient for the purposes of his Hebrew Grammar in the *Porta Linguarum* series. The hints which he had there given to guide and stimulate study he here expands into fuller tables, which will expedite the work of beginners, while they are nevertheless so constructed as to illustrate broadly and pertinently common variations, and even some of the less frequent exceptions in Hebrew inflection. In his Preface we note an example of the Anglicized Latin which occurs now and then in the English of German scholars: "Confer, page 8, the n behind," etc., instead of, "Compare the n after," etc.

Mr. Lowe's Grammar is one of the series edited by Rev. W. R. Nicoll, of the *Expositor*, under the general title of *The Theological Educator*. It professes to give simply a sketch. Its full and well-constructed tables are its most valuable feature. The successive sections of the text follow and interpret these tables in their order. In a sketch that is constructed for beginners we question the wisdom of introducing so many novelties in nomenclature. No beginner can con-
tent himself long with a Grammar the text of which occupies less than sixty 16mo pages; and as soon as he takes in hand a larger grammar, he must re-adjust both his conceptions and his terminology. Secant and linking shva (in place of silent and vocal shva), the complete and incomplete tenses (instead of Present and Future, or Perfect and Imperfect), illustrate our point. And even in Table I. we fail to see why the aspirate element should be disregarded in the final consonants of "Yud" and "Lamed" any more than in those of "Caph" and "Kuf." The change of the vowel in Yud and Kuf we cannot regard as necessary. Grain, the designation of the sixteenth consonant of the alphabet, furnishes another specimen of the same tendency. The few syntactical elements to be found in the book are so effectually hidden that a beginner coming to the study of Hebrew under Mr. Lowe's guidance, and bringing with him the idea that syntax is one of the main divisions of grammar, will wonder what sort of a language is to occupy his attention. Mr. Lowe might relieve this perplexity by a sentence or two introduced into his Preface to explain his conception and his method. The extreme condensation of the book and the constant use of symbols add to the difficulties of a beginner who is already sufficiently embarrassed by the many peculiarities of a Semitic tongue.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.

REPRESENTATIVE ENGLISH PROSE AND PROSE WRITERS. By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph.D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Language in the College of New Jersey; Author of "The Principles of Written Discourse," etc.

New York : A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1887.

Professor Hunt has compressed into the 527 pages of this volume the results of years of patient reading, thinking, and teaching. His book is intended chiefly as a text-book, and we hope that it will find, as it richly deserves to find, a place in many of our colleges; but it is also a book which the general reader can enjoy whenever he is in a mood to "sit down in a cool hour," as Butler would say, and learn a lesson or two in the history of English prose. The author's style is simple, clear, and precise, but devoid of ornament. His method is logical. He illustrates very well the qualities he commends in others, and indulges in no rhetorical conceits. This rule of his is proved by a single exception, where, speaking of a certain period of prose literature, he says that it runs "into the present English queenship," instead of saying "into the reign of Queen Victoria." A text-book must be elementary, and the general reader must remember this when he is tempted to resent the instructiveness of a heading like this: "The words expansive and expressive as here applied"—where, by the way, the epithets referred to should have been printed with inverted commas.

Professor Hunt discusses, first, Representative Historical Periods, adopting what seems to be a very good classification, according to which English Prose Literature falls into four periods—that of Formation, Transition, Final Settlement, and Expansion. The treatment of this part of the subject is very satisfactory.

Part II. deals with Representative Literary Forms, which the author distributes under five heads—Historical Prose, Poetic, Philosophical, Oratorical, and Miscellaneous or Periodical Prose. The division is faulty here, the first four heads being based upon attributes of style, and the fifth upon an attribute of the form of publication. As the expression "periodical prose" occurs frequently in this volume (it is justified by good usage too), there should be some way to distinguish the word periodical in this connection, when used as an adjective, from the same word when used as a noun, and intended to signify prose occurring in periodicals. We should write it thus: periodical-prose. The discussion of the different forms of prose writing is very thorough and satisfactory, though with Hobbes and Martineau in our mind we could give only a
qualified assent to the statement that philosophical prose never descends even to "justifiable pleasantry or humor."

In the third part the author deals with representative writers and their styles. The following names are selected, and the wisdom of the choice is obvious: Bacon, Hooker, Milton, Addison, Swift, Johnson, Burke, Lamb, Macaulay, De Quincey, Dickens, and Carlyle. We regret that Professor Hunt's admirable criticisms are not accompanied by more liberal quotations from the authors; but we suppose that this mode of illustrating the principles of criticism is part of the work of the lecture-room.

Professor Hunt is evidently at home in the literature of his subject. He has read the masters of bygone days, and their masterly critics of the present day. He has dealt with his subject in a philosophic spirit, and according to a philosophic method.

F. L. PATTON.

ARABIC GRAMMAR, PARADIGMS, LITERATURE, CHRESTOMATHY, AND GLOSSARY. By Dr. A. Socin, Professor in the University of Tübingen. Carlsruhe and Leipzig: H. Reuther, 1885.

This grammar is a new edition of Petermann's Elementary Grammar of Classical Arabic, the second edition of which appeared in 1876. Professor Socin the more readily acceded to the publisher's request to bring out a new edition because in his teaching he had felt, as many others have felt, the need of a brief handbook of this description. He had noticed that beginners are often deterred from continuing their Arabic studies by the amount of matter contained in the larger grammars of Caspari-Müller and Wright. He attempts, therefore, to present the most important rules of the Etymology and Syntax in the briefest possible form; but only as an introduction, for which a complete grammar, he says, is indispensable. His grammar should be criticised, therefore, not as to its completeness, but as to its accuracy and its adaptability to the end in view. We noticed but two inaccurate statements. One is on page 9, line 4, where we have "the Alif is left," instead of "the Alif is left out." This is an incorrect translation of the German "ausgelassen." Again, on page 15, line 4, it is said, "In Arabic two Alifs cannot stand together." In the Chrestomathy, page 66, line 15, two Alifs do occur together, one being the Alif interrogative and the other the preformative of the first person of the Imperfect. Besides these we noticed a number of infelicitous expressions and several ambiguities which are faults of the translators. For example, would it not be better to give us the English equivalents of the Arabic vowels and letters rather than the German?

As to its practicability, there is scarcely a grammatical principle which is necessary for the perfect understanding of the Chrestomathy which is not explained somewhere or other in the grammar. The usefulness of the book would be much enhanced—the student's progress accelerated and the teacher's labor lessened—if the author had trebled his references to the sections of the grammar where these principles are explained.

The second part of the Chrestomathy, which contains exercises for translation from English into Arabic, the author regards as an experiment because of the difficulties which the correction of them will afford to the teacher, and the writing of them to the learner. But would not these difficulties be largely overcome if the author had based his English exercises upon his Arabic Chrestomathy, or if he had made more frequent references to the grammar, and had added a few more notes?

The bibliography of Arabic Literature which was inserted in the earlier editions is retained here in a revised form, in order to direct the student in his further study. While interesting as a bibliography and useful perhaps to Ger-
man students, most of it will be of no practical benefit to American students, as
the works will be inaccessible to them.

The "Remarks on Syntax" are especially worthy of commendation, being a
model and a marvel of clear, succinct, and logical presentation, the equal of
which for students, and in some important particulars for advanced scholars,
can be found in no other work yet published. R. D. WILSON.

Agriculture in Some of its Relations with Chemistry. By F. H. Storer, S.B.,
A.M., Professor of Agricultural Chemistry in Harvard University. 2 vols., 8vo,
pp. 529, 509. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.) Agricultural chemistry
may well be in a mild way one of the subsidiary studies of the readers of the Re-
view; not of rural pastors only, with their possible gardens and farms, but of
dwellers in town or city, who care for a few square feet of lawn, or a flower bed,
or even for house plants within the narrow precincts of a city flat. Professor
Storer's excellent work is constructed upon the basis of broad and thorough sci-
entific knowledge, while in its form and method it is not beyond the range of the
intelligent amateur, and keeps such readers constantly in mind. It is based on
long experience in the lecture-rooms at Harvard.—The Essentials of Perspec-
tive, with Illustrations, etc. By L. W. Miller. Pp. 107. (New York : Charles
Scribner's Sons, 1887.) Within the family of the minister or elder, if not in the
theological or homiletic or ecclesiastical work of the head of the household, this
book also may well find its place. We have no right to speak of anything be-
yond its clear and progressive method and its adaptation to further the studies
and guide the practice of those who want such help. It comes from the Princi-
pal of the School of Industrial Art of the Pennsylvania Museum in Philadelphi-

The Latest Studies on Indian Reservations. By J. B. Harrison. i6mo,
pp. 233. (Philadelphia : Indian Rights Association, 1887.) Here we come
nearer to the responsibilities of every good American citizen. The Indian Rights
Association is doing a greatly needed work in stirring up the conscience of the
nation, and presenting before the Government and the people the facts which
must in the end, if there is a vestige of righteousness in us, secure to the rem-
nant of our Indian countrymen a better future. Mr. Harrison spent six months
of last year in visiting some fifteen of the most important Reservations between
the Missouri and the Pacific. He tells us what he saw, and adds the reflections
that suggested themselves to him on various matters that are most central to the
Indian problem. His spirit will be indicated by this judgment in regard to the
Klamaths and Modocs—"They have not enough of the beast or the savage in
them to make them successful in the struggle for existence with the civilized
white men of our country. They are too honest and conscientious, and have too
high a moral endowment and development for a prosperous life in the environ-
ment that awaits them in contact with our civilization, and they will probably find
that 'the Indian's country' is mostly underground."—The Buchholz Family.
Second Part. Sketches of Berlin Life. By Julius Stinde. Translated from the
forty-second edition of the German original by L. Dora Schmitz. 12mo, pp. 243.
(New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.) The full title which we have here
transcribed will justify the attempt which the translator has made to bring these
humorous pages before English readers. The task is by no means easy, and we
cannot deem it a perfect success. More or less of the quiet humor of such an
original evaporates in the process of transfer even under the most skilful hands.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.
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ISAAC AUGUST DORNER.*

SCHWABEN or Swabia is the heart of Germany, and Württemberg is the heart of Schwaben. What the best Germans unconsciously or consciously mean when they speak or think of specifically German nature and character, is found there at its fullest and truest. Not in the North or East or West; scarcely in the South as a whole—for in Bavaria, on the Rhine, and in Baden, the folk-character includes different and in part discrepant elements; not even in Sachsen—Sachsen as it used to be understood—though there are points of affinity between it and Swabia; but in Schwaben are to be found the Germans of the Germans. No part of Germany has contributed anything like the proportion that it has contributed to the highest life of the nation, as reflected in its mysticism, theology, philosophy, poetry, not to mention other departments.

The typical Schwabe combines in marked degree caution in action, sobriety of judgment, sympathy with mysticism, and bold-

* For most of the biographical and other details embodied in this paper, I am indebted to the following German sources: Dem Andenken von Dr. I. A. Dorner, von Dr. Dorner. Professor in Wittenberg, Gotha, 1885, Article on "Dorner," by his son, in Herzog's Realencyclopädie: Erinnerungen an Isaak August Dorner, von Professor Heinrici (Marburg), in Deutsch-evangelische Blätter, September, 1884: I. A. Dorner, von H. Jeep: Dr. Isaak August Dorner, von Dr. H. Weiss: Dem Gedächtniss Isaak August Dorner's, Rede von Dr. P. Kleinert, Berlin, 1884: I. A. Dorner und E. Herrmann, Eine Gedächtnissrede, von Herrmann Frh. v. d. Goltz, Gotha, 1885: Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung, October 11th, 1885, Article by Professor B. Pünjer: "Zur Erinnerung an Dr. I. A. Dorner" (Funeral Discourses, etc.), Tuttlingen, 1884.

I am very sensible of the inadequacy of this endeavor to give an account of the life and work of one whom I so greatly revered as teacher, writer, and friend.
ness of thought. He is rather inward-minded than outward-minded. Though in the main of a conservative tendency he is opposed to hard and fast lines, especially in matters of faith; very tenacious of his own individuality, he is no less tolerant of that of others; nay, he rather rejoices in living freedom and variety of movement. A certain democratic jealousy of clerical claims and supremacy seems to have characterized him from the very first—even in pra-Reformation times. It is said of Graf Eberhard im Bart* that, when Pope Sixtus IV. reproached the Würtemberger with putting on the roofs of the churches priests that came with a papal warrant, and, when they fell off from hunger and weakness, either giving them the papal bull to eat or throwing them into the water, he replied, "Under my rule these things have not been done; but if I were to tolerate such intruders, my subjects would count me a bastard." So, too, the Catholic duke, Karl Eugen, in 1753, when the hint was given him that he should kiss his Holiness's slipper, answered, "If that is a mere fashion, I see no reason for falling in with it; if it is a form of devotion, it is a bad custom."

Nowhere in Germany is more sincere respect paid to earnest and godly ministers than in Würtemberg, yet nowhere do the laity act with such independence and is the universal priesthood of believers such a reality. The religious life is accordingly less clerical and formal, more lay and natural than elsewhere. Witness the great number of Bible conferences, meetings for edification, prayer-meetings, societies for theological inquiry, and the like, that exist in the country; and nearly all within the borders of the State Church. Nor is, perhaps, any section of German Protestants better prepared for full Church freedom than those of Würtemberg, though, as a rule, they are far from wishing to snap the links binding the Church with the State authorities.

The type of Lutheranism that prevails in Schwaben is scarcely deemed thoroughly correct by the hot Confessionalists of Hanover and Mecklenburg. In fact, its tendency from the first was Unionistic; and the gulf dividing it from the Reformed Church never was so broad as in the North. It has loved rather to dwell on the points of agreement than on the points of difference between the two great divisions of Protestantism.

Now, Dorner was a genuine son of his stem. It would have been difficult to find a more typical Schwabe. The characteristics just sketched were found to an unusual degree in him: and he gloried in being a Schwabe.

ISAAC AUGUST DORNER.

His father was the pastor of Neuhausen-ob-Eck, a village not many miles from Tuttlingen, situated high enough up on the Swabian Alps to afford views even of the distant Swiss mountains. The church and manse are primitive, simple; the latter looking exactly like one of the high-roofed, timber-framed farm-houses common in the district. But father and mother alike would seem to have been singularly devout, intelligent, faithful; and their distinguished son never mentioned them without showing how he cherished and revered their memory. Isaac August was born June 20th, 1809—the sixth of twelve children. For many years a private tutor was kept in the parsonage for the instruction of the children. So far as I know he is the only son who has entered the ministry; but he would seem to have been intended for the Church, or, as people say in Germany, for the study of theology, or to become a theologian—whether practical or otherwise, time was to show—from earliest childhood—probably because of the quiet, earnest, meditative tendency, which early showed itself in him.

When the tutor had done with him, he was sent to the so-called Praeceptor-School at Tuttlingen; whence he proceeded in his fourteenth year to Maulbronn, one of the four lower theological seminaries, through which youths intended for the Church pass to the University. There he remained till he was eighteen—i.e., till the year 1827, when he was entered a student at Tübingen, and became an inmate of its celebrated Protestant or Evangelical Seminary or Stift. The only one of his teachers at Maulbronn who exerted any special influence on him was Professor Osiander, author of a well-known commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians.

It may interest some of my readers if I here give a brief account of the celebrated institution—the Stift—into which Dorner entered. Approached from the railway, the town of Tübingen is seen rising very strikingly from the banks of the Neckar, and if one looks some distance to the left of the bridge over the river one can see a long, many-windowed building, several stories high, of exceedingly plain architectural character—in fact, more like a factory than anything else. It is reached by one or other of two narrow streets just after crossing the bridge, one called Bursa, the other Neckarhalde; and is entered by large gates opening into a courtyard. The interior is as plain as the exterior—everywhere yellow-washed walls, certainly not artistic and liable also to look not remarkably clean; the simplest of woodwork and the homeliest of fittings. A story devoted to what Germans call the "Economy," is reached from the courtyard, down steps. Here the Housemaster, as he is named, lives, with the various servants; here, too, the cooking for the Stift is done.
Between the building and the river is a not very broad strip of land, cultivated as a fruit and vegetable garden. The edifice is a sort of irregular quadrangle, of which the north wing—which is the oldest part, having once been an Augustinian monastery—owing to the conformation of the site, stands higher than the south, which is next the river. The three upper stories of the lower block, from the windows of which are beautiful views toward the Rauhe Alp, are appropriated to dining-hall, studies, and sleeping-rooms—between them a corridor—the latter lying to the north, the former to the south. The north wing, which can also be entered by a bridge from the Neckarhalde, contains studies, bedrooms, library, and three lecture-rooms, which latter are also used for the University theological lectures. This circumstance, in fact, rendered the bridge necessary. There are in all twenty-two students' studies and bedrooms, each intended to accommodate from five to seven men, according to the season—fewer in summer; and between each pair of such rooms is one for a Repetent, who has the supervision of the men on each side of him. It must not be supposed, however, that his relation to them is like that of a master in a school; or that windows open into the studies and dormitories. Nothing of this kind would be or is tolerated or intended. His duties are to direct and assist the studies of his students by means of lectures, discussions, examinations, conversations; to watch in a friendly way over their conduct; and to promote as far as may be their moral and religious welfare—the latter duties, however, being discharged without any approach to the inquisitorial procedure of the Romish seminaries. The whole Stift is governed by Inspectors and an Ephorus.

Normally the Stift contains from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and thirty-five Seminarists and ten Repetenten.

A curious combination of bookcase and writing-desk, so constructed that the user is half concealed from his neighbor, and generally so placed that he shall have his back to the window, with a wooden chair, is all the furniture provided in the studies; though the students are at liberty, and, as I observed in some cases, use it, to introduce something easier to sit on. Each student brings, also, his own bedding, though an iron bedstead is supplied him. Discipline, intellectual and otherwise, is strict. No one is allowed to be out without permission after 10 P.M., and the restrictions in other respects—at all events on paper—are pretty severe. Every one has to be out of bed by half-past six o'clock in winter, by six in summer, and in bed at 10 P.M. Two meals per day are provided by the Hausmeister, and taken in the Refectory. I was not a little amused by the names given to the various studies, but could get no clue to their
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origin—perhaps they arose like other nicknames. One is styled *Elysium*; another *Luginsland* (Look Out, perhaps), a third *Zion*, a fourth *Quadrat*, a fifth *Mulatto-room*, a sixth *Schwärzloch* (Black, or Blacking, or Ink-Hole), and so on. I tried to find out where Dorner and one or two others had lived, but my guide, and a student whom I asked, were uninformed.

The inmates of the Stift receive stipendia or bursaries, which I believe with care pretty well cover the expenses of their residence at the University; but into these details I need not further enter. Such are the main external features of the institution of which Dorner became a member, and where he passed his five student years. Judging by his allusions to the Stift, and by the efforts he made both in Göttingen and Berlin to establish similar *Convicta* or Residential Halls for Theological Students, with Repetenten or Inspectors, he entertained a high opinion of the value of the intellectual and moral discipline it furnished. As is natural, different men form different opinions on the subject; and this much must be allowed, that comparatively few students are constitutionally so fitted to profit by such surroundings as Dorner. To him discipline from without answered so completely to inclination within, that it was felt to be not a limit or restraint, but a sort of line of least resistance along which his energies could work; and so pure and right was his mind, that influences which might be detrimental for others did but invigorate him.

The course of study pursued in his day was probably in its main features, certainly in its method, substantially what it is still.

Its most characteristic feature was the thorough attention given at the very outset to the Latin, Greek and Hebrew languages, on the one hand, and, on the other, to Philosophy, including Logic, Metaphysics, Psychology, Ethics, History of Philosophy, Philosophy of Religion, and History of Religion. In other respects, it followed the lines usually prescribed for theological students in Germany, means, however, being taken, especially by regular examinations, such as are ordinarily out of the question, to secure all possible thoroughness.

The time at which Dorner entered Tübingen was emphatically one of great ferment and transition—transition from the Germany of the eighteenth to the Germany of the nineteenth century. The University had rather lagged behind the rest of Germany, especially as to the study of philosophy.* As late as 1826, even Fichte and Schelling were studied only by the more enterprising and able, and

---

* See Klüpfel, *Geschichte der Universität Tübingen*. 
Hegel was scarcely known by name; the teachers either ignored or barely mentioned him. Between 1828 and 1832, however, a change came over the spirit of the scene, specially promoted from the latter year onward by D. F. Strauss, who had been to Berlin for the purpose of studying Hegel and Schleiermacher,* and then returned as Repetent to the Stift, full of the new wisdom—drunk, one might say, with the new wine. Professors, therefore, began to notice, criticize, and warn against Hegel's system; but the keener students plunged headlong into its depths, and that all the more eagerly because it was regarded as an esoteric doctrine, which only the aristocratic and gnostic few could appreciate.

At first Dorner seems to have been greatly drawn to Eschenmayer, who in a sense represented the philosophy of Schelling. But stimulating as was his teaching, and beneficent his personal influence, his own philosophy lacked the force and stringency necessary to keeping firm grip of young men of Dorner's calibre. He rendered him, however, the great service of introducing him to Schelling and Jacobi, both of whom exerted a determining influence on his philosophical development. How much he owed to the former it is, of course, impossible to say; but even a superficial comparison of Dorner's *Glaubenslehre* with Schelling's writings brings to light numerous points of affinity. Schelling's words—"the first idea of Christianity is therefore necessarily the incarnate God, Christ as the crown and goal of the gods of the Old World," might almost be the germ out of which grew his own central idea of the cosmic position of the Incarnate Logos; and one of the chief features of his doctrine of God—to which I shall afterward refer—might have been suggested by Schelling's description of the negative philosophy as "the apriorism of the empirical, while the positive philosophy is the empiricism of the apriori."†

To Jacobi, again, he may fairly be assumed to have been indebted for the notion of faith as the specific organ for the divine and of the affinity between the activity by which we attain to certainty regarding the external world, and that which brings us certainty as to the spiritual world; though his own use and application of the notion is marked by special characteristics.‡

Sigwart, the second Professor of Philosophy, brought him under

---

* Hegel he never heard personally.
† Dorner interested himself in Schelling's system to the last;—witness his article "Die Potenzlehre Schellings" in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, Vol. V.; and the very careful and sympathetic estimate of his influence on the development of Protestant Theology in his *Geschichte der prot. Theologie* (see pp. 777 ff.).
‡ See *Glaubenslehre*, I., 3, 60; Jacobi's *Von den göttl. Dingen*, etc., p. 153.
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the influence of Kant, of whom he himself was a sort of eclectic follower. The ethical earnestness, the stringency of method, and the conscientiousness of thought which characterized Kant's system stirred him profoundly.* And cold as was Kant's relation to Evangelical truth—a thing not to be wondered at when one considers the form under which he made its acquaintance—Dorner discerned, at first vaguely, later on distinctly, in his manly yearning after certitude as to the highest concerns of human life and in the ethical bent of his system, an inner affinity with the central principle of the Reformation, such as neither he himself nor his followers, whether philosophical or theological, had discerned. Is there not, asks Dorner,† a profound rapport between the emphasis laid by him on conscience and on the personal certainty of the essential goodness of the good and the stress with which a true Protestant urges the personal appropriation of salvation? With the most prominent of Kant's properly philosophical doctrines Dorner had no sympathy; though the study of them helped, at all events negatively, to determine his own final position. To some of the problems, however, which Kant left unsolved or pronounced insoluble, as, for example, that of the possibility of knowledge of the objective world and of the absolute; that of the validity of the ontological argument for the existence of God; and that as to whether the supreme good is merely an imperative or has objective real existence, he devoted prolonged and earnest attention.

Hegel must also have laid profound hold on him, though whether during his student days, or after he became Repetent in the Stift, does not appear. In Hegel's principle of the objectivity of thought—though carried by him to a point which Dorner regarded as extreme—a much-needed corrective—and supplement was supplied to the subjectivism of Kant and the scepticism of Jacobi; and the speculative and dialectic method of the same philosopher not only evoked a sympathetic response in his Swabian nature;‡ but seemed to him, rightly used—used, that is, with due recognition of experience—to be in fuller accord with the constitution and actual procedure of the human intellect than the one-sided, reflective method of Kant and his followers. But to taunt Dorner with being an Hegelian is a mistake; for he refuses to identify thought and being, altogether repudiates pure apriori speculation; and is as far as possible from constructing history according to any scheme of abstract prin-

* Geschichte der prot. Theologie, p. 763.
† See Gesch. der prot. Theol., p. 742. Compare also the Vortrag über die Rechtsfer- tigungslehre, p. 22.
‡ Both Hegel and Schelling were Schwaben, and both studied theology at Tübingen.
principles. A comparison of his Christology with that of F. Ch. Baur or of Biedermann's *Dogmatik* with his *Glaubenslehre* will make the difference between his procedure and that of professed Hegelians clear enough.

Theologically, Tübingen was just beginning to move when Dorner entered the University. Till the reorganization of the Faculty in 1826, and the appointment of Professors Schmid and Baur, both men of massive mind, things had been in a very unsatisfactory state.* The Supernaturalism of the close of the eighteenth century, with its external antagonism to, but real affinity with, Rationalism, still held almost undisputed sway. Steudel, the principal theological teacher—a man of sincere piety, moral uprightness, eminent industry, and wide reading—was thoroughly under its influence, and regarded it as his great business to stem the tide of speculation and criticism which threatened, as he thought, to sweep away all that was precious in Christianity. Hegel and Schleiermacher were the special objects of his attacks, though he did not hesitate to recognize them as "elect spirits." One can well imagine what a ferment must have been set up under such circumstances by the study of the latter's *Glaubenslehre*, to which Baur took pains to draw the attention of students. Nowhere in Germany could a soil have been found better prepared for its peculiar seed than in the Stift; and no member of the Stift was in a condition to be influenced by it alike philosophically and theologically like Dorner. Judging by the loving manner in which he always refers to Schleiermacher; by the painful care which he devotes to the elucidation of his system; by the anxiety he shows to establish the Evangelical character of his fundamental principles; † by the high place he assigns him in the development of Christian theology; by the numerous and broad traces of his influence in his own thought; and by the ungrudging recognition of his indebtedness to him, the study of the *Glaubenslehre* must have stirred him to his deepest depths. It is, of course, impossible to determine the exact nature of the change evoked or produced in his views, but there is good reason for tracing to this source, at all events, the germs or beginnings of his conception of the independence of religion, of the distinction between faith and theology, of the necessity for the theologian's starting with experience, and of the central significance of the person of Christ. From the subjectivism or agnosticism of Schleiermacher with regard to the

---

* Compare Klützpfel, *Geschichte der Universität Tübingen*. The chapter on this subject, having been written by Baur, must be taken *cum grano salis.*
† See especially the *Geschichte d. prot. Thol.*, pp. 795 ff.; compare 756 f.
objects of Christian faith or the causes of Christian experience, however, Hegel and his own healthy religious nature preserved him.

To Baur he scarcely seems to have owed much save an awakening to the importance of the history and philosophy of religion; but Ch. F. Schmid’s* influence was altogether healthy and invigorating. To him he owed his first impulse to that thorough study of the New Testament, both exegetically and theologically, on which he ever afterward laid such stress; he strengthened the ethical element in him and widened his ethical outlook; and he did much to enkindle that interest in the manifold practical tasks of the Church by which Dorner was so distinguished. All his allusions in after life to this teacher betray a deep sense of obligation and the highest appreciation of his work.

Remarkably, though also naturally, enough, one of the problems with which he specially occupied himself as a student was that of the freedom of the will—a point as to which he early took up a very decided position, under the conviction that it supplied the key to the true appreciation of the biblical view of God and the world. He also wrote two prize essays, one philosophical, the other theological. The latter on the theme—"What are the causes why theology is now turning its face again toward the standpoint of the Reformation," became the basis of the first independent course of lectures which he gave as Repentent; out of which again eventually grew his great work on the "History of Protestant Theology."

Though by no means what the Germans call fertig—finished, made up—when he completed his University course, there seems to be little doubt that he was unusually ripe, and that the main lines of his future development, the leading principles of his future system, and the chief problems to whose consideration he was to devote himself, were already more or less distinctly defined.

It may occasion surprise to learn that as a student, Dorner should have held himself aloof from the meetings for prayer and spiritual edification that students of a pietistic turn were in the habit of holding. Whether it was that they were associated with intellectual feebleness and a certain sentimental goody-goodiness, as is too often the case; or whether he scarcely felt the need of such special modes for the culture of piety; or whether, as may easily be the case, such means of grace rather evoked the spirit of criticism than of devotion, it is impossible to say. One thing, however, is certain; neither then nor later did he despise or neglect the public ordi-

* Schmid’s New Testament Theology and Christian Ethics have been translated, and are remarkably rich in living thought.
nances of religion; and about his godliness as an all-pervading, all-controlling power there could be no doubt. He himself was a "living epistle of Christ," even though the name of Christ were not, in pietistic fashion, constantly on his lips; and though possibly some means of edification were rather a hindrance than a help.

Having completed his University course and passed the Stift examinations with distinction, he became assistant (Vikar) to his father at Neuhausen, where he remained two years. Even then he began to evince the desire to translate theory into practice, which so eminently characterized him all through life; and took a very active part, first, in promoting a petition to the Consistory in favor of the introduction of the Prussian Liturgy into Württemberg, as a preparation for one common to the entire Evangelical Church of Germany; and then in one to the House of Representatives that a constitution might be granted to the Church—steps to which he was impelled by the hold which the idea of the Church had already taken of him. It was in pursuance of this practical bent, which, as I remarked before, had been almost awakened, and certainly fostered by Professor Schmid, that he gladly, somewhat later, availed himself of the opportunity which a travelling bursary given by the Consistorium of the Church afforded him of spending some time in Holland and England, where, besides making many friends, he acquired information and formed impressions with regard especially to ecclesiastical matters, that were of material service to him in dealing with similar questions when he became a "man in authority."

In 1834 he was appointed Repetent at the Stift, in Tübingen, and found himself associated with a number of men who afterward made for themselves honorable positions either in science or practical life. Among them was D. F. Strauss, then engaged in writing his celebrated Life of Jesus. As might have been expected, controversy not a little, and not always mild, raged between the members of the Repetenten-Collegium; but it was loyally kept within the circle. One can scarcely help fancying that the two chief figures would be Strauss and Dorner, who differed probably as much in outward appearance and mental constitution as in the views they advocated. Of Strauss, Dorner himself says, "Like an Apollo with shining countenance, confident of victory, the young Repetent appeared to me, when first I met him, myself a shy new-comer, in the Tübingen Botanical Gardens."* If the later outward appearance of the two men was prefigured at this time, one may imagine the one to have been of spare, erect, well-knit, well-formed, even elegant figure,

* Professor Heinrici, in Deutsch-Evangelische Blätter, 1884, p. 636.
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with sharply-cut features; while the other was loosely built, of fuller habit, inclined to stoop, of rather shambling gait and round features and altogether more homely-looking; but of a winning, modest gentleness of expression that was in marked contrast to the colder, somewhat sarcastic and repellent look of Strauss. Dorner himself, indeed, used to speak of Strauss as amiable and refined; but one who was acquainted with both men told me that the latter was not very agreeable nor much liked, though respected for his acuteness, learning, and literary skill; while Dorner won his way to all hearts and wielded a greater intellectual and moral influence than he himself dreamed of or understood.

The attitude he took up toward Strauss after the publication of the "Life of Jesus" was alike characteristic and prophetic. Neither he nor Strauss's other colleagues felt the alarm that was excited in the minds of so many others. He says himself: "Though we were consciously opposed to him, we did not allow our kindly relations as men and colleagues to be disturbed, and were as far as possible from desiring that he should suffer any inconvenience on account of his views; as, for example, by removal from the Stift. On the contrary, scientific freedom seemed to us to demand that he should be let alone; and the blow which removed him from his post [in July, 1835] filled us with genuine regret—a regret which I personally expressed to him. Without unfaithfulness to my Christian convictions I believed this course to be right; because I saw the possibility of a scientific defence of Christian truth over against even the mythical theory."

These circumstances had, however, the effect of concentrating Dorner's thought and study on a subject which had already begun to engage his attention while assisting his father—namely, the history of the doctrine of the person of Christ, the firstfruits of which took the form of two articles in the Tübinger Zeitschrift. They were afterward expanded, first into one volume (1839), and then into the great work known as his Christology. His aim in undertaking this treatise was to do something toward the confutation of Strauss's position. Starting with the fact of the experience of Christ's redeeming activity and of the existence of the Church as the fellowship of believers whom Christ has redeemed, he saw that Christ could not be the mythical product of that of which he is the sole explanation. He then went on to show that the image which the Church formed of Christ throughout all the centuries of its existence, was of such a

* See notice by his son in Herzog's Realencyclop., p. 756.
† Heft 4, 1835; Heft 1, 1836.
nature that it could not have been the product of those who confessed him as their Redeemer, and must, therefore, be of real historical value. Not that Christian truth is to be guaranteed by the Church as a substitute for the Scriptures; but that its history as a whole, and especially that of its doctrine of the person of Christ interposes a scientific problem in the way of the mythical theory, which this is quite unable to solve.

One cannot help asking one's self how it came to pass that the same surroundings should develop such differences of character, tendency, and views as we find between Strauss and Dorner, not to mention others. Both were Schwaben; both received much the same early education, though Strauss's father was a tradesman and Dorner's a clergyman; both attended the same lectures at the University; and yet how divergent the results! Why did Strauss become one of the most deadly assailants of historical Christianity, one of the bitterest foes of the Church; while in Dorner both found one of their ablest advocates, expositors and upbuilders? Dorner's inner life had its struggles; doubts and difficulties beset him: why may we say of him,

"He fought his doubts and gathered strength,
He would not make his judgment blind,
He faced the spectres of the mind,
And laid them: thus he came at length
To find a stronger faith his own"?

Was it due, or was it not, to the utter moral loyalty with which he approached every problem and all the professed contributions to their solution? I cannot help thinking that his very candor, his very open-eyedness, was his safeguard. It is true, none lay claim to candor—Voraussetzungslosigkeit, to use Strauss's word—with such emphasis and assurance as the men who negative the traditional beliefs of the Christian Church; but whether the candor is as genuine as it professes to be may fairly be doubted. To Dorner the finding of truth, the using of all means to that end, and the treating of all who claim to have discovered it with sincere respect, seemed a sacred duty. Too many of the so-called advanced and enlightened lack the modesty, the self-distrust, the kindly sympathy and considerateness toward what may be summarily termed "orthodoxy," that are the indispensable conditions of its due appreciation.*

He remained Repetent till 1838, when he was appointed Professor

* Perhaps some of the difference was due to the early influence which Baur and Kern had on Strauss at Blaubeuren. Strauss's own account of the men at Tübingen in his controversial pamphlets must be taken cum grano salis. He could be very cynical, savage, and one-sided.
Extraordinarius at the University for Old Testament Theology and Dogmatics. In 1839 he received a call to a Professorship in Ordinary both from Kiel and Rostock. The Senate wished to retain him at Tübingen; but as the Ministry at Stuttgart declined to fall in with their recommendation, Dorner left, never to return. Good perhaps for himself, certainly good for his influence as a man and theologian; but a blow for Tübingen; though a teacher was secured for the vacant post who became in his way as great a power as Dorner himself and, in some respects, on similar lines—namely, J. T. Beck.

In 1838 he married the lady who survived him, and whose genial hospitality hundreds of visitors from all countries gratefully remember. They had only three children—all sons; one died young, another, August, has been for some years Professor of Theology at the Theological Seminary, Wittenberg, and were he not handicapped by bearing so eminent a name, would find fuller recognition of his ability and learning than has hitherto officially been the case; the third, a most promising and interesting youth, was early laid aside by a hopeless affliction, to the great grief of his loving, expectant, yet wonderfully patient parents.

Dorner accepted the invitation to Kiel, where his life would seem to have been, in both a scientific and a social respect, one of unusual richness. Friendships were there formed with men of like tastes, kindred pursuits and eminent ability, that lasted through life. Among these may be specially mentioned the jurist Herrmann, with whom he was afterward associated at Göttingen, and who eventually rejoined him in Berlin as President of the Oberkirchenrath—probably at Dorner's own suggestion; Chalybaeus the Philosopher; Waitz and Droysen the Historians; and Claus Harms the celebrated popular High Lutheran preacher. In a letter written after his friend's death by the first-named, he says, "Dorner's lectures and personal intercourse soon made him the most popular and influential professor in the theological faculty, and he was a constant source of stimulus to his colleagues, whom he so inspired by his own selflessness that they cheerfully seconded his efforts for the welfare of the University."* During the residence at Kiel, Claus Harms celebrated the twenty-five years' jubilee of his pastorate; and to show his appreciation of the spiritual benefit he had derived from his ministrations Dorner dedicated to him a dissertation entitled, "The Principle of our Church according to the inner relation of its two sides"—in which are the germs of important chapters of the His-

ory of Protestant Theology and of the Pisteological Section of the Systematic Theology. He then also formed a close friendship with Martensen, which continued unbroken, notwithstanding differences of opinion as to political and other questions, till terminated by death.*

Attached as Dorner became to Kiel—an attachment which was never materially weakened and which inspired the manly words spoken by him on behalf of the Schleswig-Holsteiners at the Stuttgart Church Congress in 1850, and the active help he rendered to the ministers and Professors who were then driven from their posts by the Danes—he yet felt it to be his duty to accept a call to Königsberg in 1843. What, however, specially influenced him was, first, the conviction that if his favorite idea of a great national German Evangelical Church was ever to be realized, it must be through the medium of Prussia; secondly, that special steps were about to be taken to give the Prussian Church an organization, which would open the way for that participation of the laity in its government and activities, which he then, as ever afterward, deemed supremely necessary to its healthy life and development; and, thirdly, that the Prussian Cultus-Minister Eichhorn told him of his plans and specially desired his co-operation in carrying them out. Dorner accordingly became a member of the Consistory in Königsberg, and in 1846 represented the Theological Faculty of the University at the General Synod summoned for the purpose of grafting Presbyteries and a Synod on the existing Consistorial organization of the Church.

Whether any special reason, beyond the natural desire to return from the bleak north to the sunnier south, determined the removal to Bonn in 1847, does not appear; though it may be that he was influenced by the prospect of becoming practically acquainted with the working of ecclesiastical institutions similar to those for whose general introduction he wrote and labored. If so, opportunity was afforded him in the Rhine Province, where he became member both of the Presbytery and of the Departmental and Provincial Synods, as well as of the Consistory.

Though the plan of giving the Church a constitution had been set aside by the disturbances of 1848, Dorner did not cease to interest himself on its behalf, and accordingly addressed to Karl Immanuel Nitzsch in Berlin, and Julius Müller in Halle two Letters on Reform of the Evangelical State Churches in connection with the Establishment of a National German Evangelical Church. He

* It is to be hoped that the highly interesting correspondence between the two so gifted men, which is in the possession of Dorner's son, may in due time be published.
there expounded the views to which he remained substantially true to the last—namely, that the State by giving the Jews equal political rights had in principle dissolved the alliance with the Christian religion; that the Church cannot allow itself to be governed by a State which is on principle indifferent to religion; and that the changed circumstances therefore impose on the Church the duty of organizing itself. In consequence of the events that had happened it seemed to him to be further necessary to aim at a union of the divided Churches into one great National Church. As to the Confessions of the various Churches, he was of opinion, that while each might retain its own historical creed, the united Church ought to frame for itself a new creed embracing merely what is fundamental; and that though at Ordination ministers should be pledged solely to the Consensus, at Vocation they might be pledged to the Confession of the particular Church with which they connected themselves. As may be imagined, cherishing these plans, he gladly hailed the establishment of the "Evangelical Church Congress," of whose constitutive assembly, held at Wittenberg in 1848, he was a member. Though it failed to realize the hopes which he and others set on it, he kept up his connection with it to the last and ever showed the liveliest interest in the "Society for Inner Missions," which grew out of the eloquent appeal then made by Wichern. Indeed, he became one of the most valued members of its Central Committee. During his residence in Bonn he also took a personal share in Christian work among prisoners and in other directions.

As is well known, the events of 1848 were followed in Germany, and especially in Prussia, by a period of reaction alike in Church and State. Confessionalism in the former gained the upper hand and a decided blow was struck at the moderate measure of Union between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches that already existed. Under the conviction that the hopes he had cherished with regard to Prussia were for the present futile, and influenced also by the desire to escape impending serious struggles, he accepted, in 1853, a previously declined invitation to the University of Göttingen.

There, as in a refuge from the storms which had arisen, he spent nine vigorous, useful, and, on the whole, happy years. Conflict, however, was not spared him; nor was it to be expected, considering, on the one hand, the all-embracing charity which he was ever ready to display alike in his private and official relations; and on the other hand, the bigoted Lutheranism of the Hanoverian leaders. A paper which he wrote on behalf of the Theological Faculty, under the title of The Present Church Crisis, specially the Relation of the Evangelical Theological Faculties to Science and the Church,
became the occasion of a sharp controversy. But, indeed, peace-loving and gentle as he ordinarily was,* the position he took up his life through exposed him to constant attacks both from the right and the left; for while, on the one hand, he refused, as in the case of the Free Light Rupp at Königsberg, to sanction direct attacks on the Church confessions from the pulpit; on the other hand, holding it to be the duty of the Church to maintain its rapport with the intellectual movements of the age, and to see that its clergy share the best culture of their time, he therefore insisted that they should be treated with the broad considerateness which such a training inevitably renders necessary. Besides, with the profound respect he ever cherished for the personal, he hated hard and fast lines, red-tapism and officialism, wished every case to be judged on its own merits, individual character and circumstances to be taken into full account; and set his face dead against the evil custom of stamping men with party names. Accordingly, so far as his influence went, mere divergencies of tendency of thought were never allowed to stand in the way of appointments either in the Church or at the Universities. In some cases, he seemed to lay himself open to fair criticism from the positive side; the course he pursued, however, was dictated not by indifference or ignorance, but by a profound conviction that truth in the long run must prevail, and that a free field and no favor are the conditions of speediest victory.

The issue of the controversy referred to was that his colleague Ehrenfeuchter and he became members of the Consistory, which they did their utmost, though with small result, to inspire with the spirit of union. His relations to his colleagues in all the faculties were friendly, to some intimate; and here as elsewhere his readiness and ability to serve, soon and naturally gained for him the position of leader.

While at Göttingen he was the means, as was already remarked, of establishing a Stift or residential hall for students, resembling that of Tübingen, though on a freer basis; and of enlarging an already existing body of Repetenten. He also anonymously presented the institution with a library, and out of regard to its interests, declined an invitation to the University of Halle.

A new and brighter ecclesiastical era having dawned in Prussia under the leadership of von Bethman-Hollweg as Cultus-Minister, an old friend of Dorner's, he decided in 1862 to yield to the pressure put upon him to go to Berlin, where he was to occupy Schleier-

---

* He could, indeed, fire up; but rarely, if ever, did he do so save at bigotry, intolerance, injustice, and what seemed wilful misrepresentation.
macher's chair at the University, and to become a member of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council (Oberkirchenrath). The twenty years spent here were years of almost uninterrupted activity. He discharged the duties of his offices with all the zeal and faithfulness that might have been expected. To his labors as a writer I shall refer further on. The exact nature and extent of the part he took in the work of the Oberkirchenrath it is, of course, impossible at present properly to estimate. In all probability, however, the influence he wielded was greater than that of any other member, with the sole exception, perhaps, of his friend, President Herrmann. With so little of the bureaucrat in his composition, one may be quite sure that his great concern was to foster life and evoke activity, without being jealously anxious that it should take just the directions he might personally prefer.

In one practical service rendered by him, all English-speaking Christians will feel a special interest. Sunday-schools, as is well known, were introduced into Berlin by an American, Mr. Woodruff. After they had gone on growing for some three years or thereabouts in face of the passive and active resistance of the clergy, it occurred to me* that if I could get Dorner actively interested in the movement, he might induce the Supreme Council in some way to give it their official sanction. Accordingly I secured his consent to go with me one Sunday afternoon to the school held in the Vereinshaus, Oranienstrasse, and we had long conversations on the subject. There were no prejudices against lay activity in him to be overcome; on the contrary, he had always been eager to open up spheres in which laymen could labor; but still he needed to see this particular mode of work for himself. The result of the visit was a definite indorsement and recommendation of Sunday-schools by the Supreme Council, which I have little doubt Dorner himself drew up; and to this the subsequent rapid growth of the institution has been, I believe, mainly due.†

But after all the true Dorner was the professor. He was a born teacher. Berlin has been the ruin of many a theologian; their true academical and literary activity have alike been terminated by its officialisms and distractions. Dorner escaped that peril. The very unselfishness which led him to be so ready to help and serve were

---

* I was then living in Berlin, and pledged by Mr. W. to do what I could to promote the cause he had so much at heart.

† He also did all in his power, especially through a Pastoral Letter (as one might term it), written by himself, but issued in the name of the Oberkirchenrath, to stem the tide of Sabbath desecration in Prussia. Indeed, he was first and foremost in every good word and work.
ever and whenever he could was his safeguard. He was not one of those who read and re-read old lectures till their matter is as stale as the paper on which they are written is yellow and worn. A many-sided and eager student himself, he delighted to communicate his best and newest.

But by way of giving an idea of what he was as a professor alike in the lecture-room and in private, I cannot do better than quote from the reminiscences of one of his German pupils—reminiscences whose perfect accuracy hundreds, both Germans and foreigners, would, I doubt not, cheerfully confirm.* He writes:

"Dorner's name had drawn me to Berlin. I hoped that the great speculative theologian would help me over the perplexities into which I had fallen while endeavoring, earnestly enough, but apart from faith, to arrive at a glad conviction with regard to Evangelical truth. In an excited mood I went to his house, taking with me a letter of introduction from an old friend. Conducted into a large room, whose walls were covered with books, I found myself in the presence of the man from whom I was expecting so much. But how different had I represented him to myself:—his was no tall, stately figure, no high and vaulted forehead. Simply and friendly he gave me his hand, saying, **Grüß Gott!** and while he read the letter a gentle smile lit up his face. Then bending his head, in the way peculiar to him, a little to the left, he looked at me with his eyes so clear and kindly, dispelled my embarrassment by sympathetic questions, and soon had me telling him all about myself—my difficulties, my efforts, my plans, my hopes—as though he were an old friend, and as though his time were of no consequence. He dismissed me overjoyed, full of the best resolves, and with 'Spinoza's doctrine of God and Man' as a theme for an essay.

"In the summer of 1863, when he was lecturing on Ethics—a course which 'drew deep furrows through our souls'—a great crowd of students from all parts of Germany, from America, England, France, Switzerland, filled his auditorium. It was a source of great satisfaction to us theologues, that our revered teacher should need Number 1, then the largest hall in the University; and when he ascended the chair for the first time we received him with the usual marks of applause. Never shall I forget, however, the peculiar movement of the head with which he acknowledged the ovation—a blending of joyous surprise and modest refusal. Then he began with the sonorous tones which rose and fell with a certain regularity like the waves of the ocean when unruffled by the wind. He sat; his manuscript lay before him. But with such warmth of conviction did he read that it had all the effect of extemporaneous production. And when he tarried in the higher heights, as, for example, when describing Schleiermacher as 'the Copernicus of Ethics,' in virtue of his discovery of individuality as a fundamental ethical principle; or when tracing moral principles to their roots in the love of God; or when depicting the glory of a character begotten of love to God and manifesting itself in unselfish love to man—then our youthful souls were filled with devotion and holy resolve. Involuntarily our pens halted while we surrendered ourselves to the flow of thought, and we felt that the occupant of the professor's chair was a man who ungrudgingly communicated to us all that was most precious in his investigations, reading, and thought."

In the estimation of many, however, he was seen at his best in

* Professor Heinrici, of Marburg, in the **Deutsch-Evangelische Blätter** for September, 1884.
the Seminar or Societät: and there can be no doubt that there he developed his highest qualities as a teacher of youth. The following further extract from Professor Heinrici's Reminiscences will best show the man and his manner:

"It was esteemed a great honor to be a member of Dorner's Societät. No one was admitted who would not pledge himself to regular attendance, and to show his scientific zeal by bringing an essay once in the course of the Semester. Notwithstanding these restrictions, there were always more candidates than vacancies, and his large study was almost overcrowded. The master sat at a small table in the middle; round about him the students in small groups—friends with friends. A cup of tea lent a social color to the meetings. The mode of treatment varied with the subject; but his aim always was to secure as general a discussion as possible. Sometimes the subject was Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre or Christliche Sitte, and then each one had to come with the section assigned to him thoroughly digested and mastered. The chief points were then elicited and tested, and the arguments weighed in the form of question and answer. At another time Augustine's City of God would be taken up. In this case, select chapters were read together, and the grandiose outline of a Christian system of the world which the great Church Father had sketched on the basis of a criticism and utilization of the ancient culture was made clear. On other occasions comparative essays on the Augsburg Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism were read, and in connection therewith the ecumenical character of the Protestant faith pointed out. Dorner, also, after first examining the essays presented gave his judgment on them, and indicated the direction which further inquiry should take. For any sound elements in them he gave the writers full credit; and even when the essays were very scanty and second-rate, he had not the heart to say what he felt, though we divined his opinion from what he failed to say.

"In the choice of themes for these essays, we were left pretty much to ourselves. Each one was expected to let his particular interests and inclinations have free play. At the first sitting, it was Dorner's custom to propose a number of subjects, by preference from the domains of New Testament and Systematic Theology, as also from that of philosophy—the study of which he always pressed upon us. Among the problems which were discussed, I recall the following: The Essence of Religion; the Doctrine of God; Christian Freedom; the Principles of Protestantism; the Idea of the Church; Social Questions; the Doctrine of the Resurrection; the Investigations into the Life of Jesus Suggested by the Works of Renan and Keim. Their purpose was rather to inform the writers as to the state of the question, than to promote detailed and special inquiries. We were, however, always encouraged to propose a subject of our own; and the least evidence of independent scientific effort was greeted with satisfaction and fostered.

"A more patient moderator and admirable fructifier of discussions could scarcely be imagined. How frequently did men of glib tongues betray lack of insight into the considerations which were advanced by him, and keep repeating the same thing in other forms; yet never did he lose the thread of argument, and always did he do his utmost to untie the knot, till sometimes the rest of us impatiently stopped the pertinacious disputers. Delicate cases were settled in the gentlest manner—such, for example, as the demand once put forward by one of our number that, before treating of the subject under consideration, the existence of God, which he had reason to doubt, should be proved."*
Though never myself one of Dorner's students, I gladly sat as a learner at his feet; and am certain from my own experience of his readiness to communicate, of his delight in fostering independent thought and studies, of his anxiety to learn even from the humblest, and of his patience with minds of less grasp and knowledge than his own, that the description I have quoted must be true to the letter.

My first introduction was characteristic. Having sent in my card I was requested to enter the study. There I found Dorner in the hands of the barber who came regularly to shave him. How undignified! exclaims some one. What a slight! says another. Neither, felt I then and say I now. True courtesy, rather, not to keep me waiting; true dignity, rather, to let sweet simplicity have its way; nay, true flattery to credit me with the capability of rising above small externals. And I must say that the profound respect I had for the theologian* was at that moment transfigured into a personal regard which all my subsequent intercourse only intensified. It was my pride and joy and profit to see him pretty frequently during my six years' residence in Berlin, and I shall perhaps never know the greatness of the debt I owe him for spiritual and intellectual stimulus and aid. He was always accessible; however busy he might be I was never made to feel that I was an intruder. None of that stiffness, stony staring, and freezing silence that one is apt to encounter in small great men, especially among my own countrymen. If he could help in any way he showed that he regarded it as a kindness done to himself, a privilege conferred on himself. And that modesty, unassumingness—well, it was incomparable. When he was occasionally my guest this characteristic was especially manifest; and it almost pained me and mine to be prevented by it from showing outwardly the respect and regard which we inwardly felt. Though after my removal to England my opportunities of intercourse with him, whether personal or by letter, were naturally restricted, his death created a blank in my life which will never be filled up.

"He was a man, take him for all in all
I shall not look upon his like again." †

His affection for his relatives and native place remained undiminished to the last, and none of his nephews and nieces, still less their parents, were ever made to feel that his visits were the visits of the man of world-wide reputation. He was as gentle and considerate with the least of them as with the greatest of his peers. During one

* As the translator of nearly the whole of his Christology I had good reason for it.
† Dorner's relation to the Evangelical Alliance, his visit as a Delegate to New York, and various other matters, space compels me to pass over.
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of his last visits to Neuhausen, he conducted the afternoon service—a sort of catechization of the young—and the spectacle of the celebrated theologian moving to and fro among the stolid village children, asking them simple questions and endeavoring to make Christian truth plain to their untrained minds, must have been one of unusual impressiveness and loveliness, though perfectly characteristic of the man.

The end came somewhat unexpectedly. In 1881 ill-health compelled him to ask to be relieved from all official responsibilities—which he did with a sad heart.* But as long as he could work he worked; and while sorely suffering in body put the finishing strokes to his Glaubenslehre, edited a volume of essays and proceeded with the preparation of his Ethics for publication. After spending a few weeks with his son in Wittenberg, he left to travel about for his health and came to the neighborhood of Wiesbaden. There he resolved to see for himself the noble Niederwald national monument. It was the last thing he did, and the effort would seem to have been too great, for on the way he broke a blood-vessel. The relatives who accompanied him hastened with him to Wiesbaden, but the end had come. On the 8th of July he departed in peace to be with the Christ who had been the centre of his practical and scientific life. At his own express wish he was buried without pomp and ceremony in the village graveyard, where lay the bodies of his beloved parents.

"High nature amorous of the good
But touched with no ascetic gloom:—

"A manhood fused with female grace,
In such a sort the child would twine
A trustful hand unasked in thine,
And find his comfort in thy face.

"I would the great world grew like thee,
Who grewest not alone in power
And knowledge, but by year and hour
In reverence and in charity."

—TENNYSON, In Memoriam.

Dorner's chief works are the History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, The History of Protestant Theology, Systematic Theology, and Christian Ethics; but he also wrote a great number of dissertations, more or less elaborate, on historical, theological, and philosophical questions, which were issued either independently or in various journals, especially in the Jahrbücher

* On his retirement both the Emperor of Germany and the King of Württemberg conferred on him distinguished marks of their high appreciation of his worth and services.
für deutsche Theologie, of which he was one of the founders and editors. One of the last things he did was to edit a volume of these dissertations—among them the very valuable one on the "Immutability of God." Though each of these minor writings contains a good deal that is at once characteristic and valuable, the careful student of the larger treatises will find in them little that is really new.*

As the Glaubenslehre or Systematic Theology, besides being the last work prepared by the author himself for the press, is that in which the ripest fruit of his lifelong reading and thought has been deposited, I shall devote the rest of my limited space to an account of some of its most characteristic features.† This work, with the posthumous treatise on Christian ethics, constitutes together what their writer terms—following earlier examples—" thetic theology," theologia thetica, for which might be substituted "speculative theology," in the sense which Dorner gives to the word "speculative."‡ With regard to thetic theology in general he says, it is that branch of theology which undertakes to establish in scientific form the truth of the Christianity which is at first received by faith. The relation between the two great sections Glaubenslehre and Sittenlehre, which, in opposition to Nitzsch and others, he maintains demand separate treatment, is defined as consisting, not in their method but in their matter, the former dealing with God and His deeds, the latter with the sphere of human morality, which owes its existence to acts of human self-determination.§

* A pretty complete list of all Dorner's productions, or, at all events, references to where they are to be found, is given by his son in a biographical article in the new edition of Herzog's Realencyclopädie.

† I need scarcely say that this account cannot be other than of the most fragmentary character. Properly to review a work of upward of seventeen hundred closely-printed pages in the space to which I am restricted is impossible; well-nigh as impossible to estimate how Dorner has advanced the solution of the various problems with which systematic theology is concerned, or criticise all that in my humble view is open to criticism. I have thought it better, therefore, to limit myself to two or three of the features which are most marked by novelty or of chief importance—as to which it is, of course, very possible that others may form a different opinion.

‡ See Vol. I., pp. 6 ff. He rightly criticises the restriction of the term "systematic theology" to the one branch of theological science; seeing that all the branches, however designated, claim systematic character. It would be interesting, were this the place, to pass in review the various names given to this theological discipline, beginning with Melanchthon's Loci communes rerum theologiarum seu hypotyposes theologica, Wittebergæ, 1521. The first to use the word system was Calov, in his Systema locorum theologiarum, etc., 1655-77. Hollaz introduced the term thetic in his Examen theologicum acroamaticum universam theologiam thetico-polemicam complectens, 1707; but in a different sense from Dorner's. See Bretschneider's Systemat. Entwicklung, etc., p. 123 ff.

It is impossible to do justice to Dorner’s system without a careful consideration of his general theory of knowledge. Indeed, this may be said to be mostly the fact; it is, however, specially true in his case, for as might have been expected from the philosophical training and development through which he passed he not only gave the subject independent and thorough attention, but has also, as it were, thrust it under the notice of students of his work by the important and remarkable introductory section entitled “Pisteology.” Indeed, the influence of his theory permeates the entire treatment of theology and ethics.

It is not quite easy, indeed I must confess to have found it impracticable, to reduce all his allusions and uses of terms to consistency. This is especially the case with the two, Verstand and Vernunft (Understanding and Reason), as to which there seems to be a certain vacillation between the points of view of Kant, Jacobi, and, perhaps, Hegel. Nor have I been able quite clearly to make out how far he holds, or goes in holding, that the intellect generally, or the reason specially, is an independent source of ideas; that is, whether or no, as the microcosm, it enfolds within itself in latent form, waiting to be evoked by the action of the fitting environments, all the ideas of the macrocosm.* Leaving, however, this matter on one side, I will endeavor to set forth the characteristic features of his theory, which in the main are clear enough.

As the definition quoted above declares, thetic theology aims at certitude—certitude of the highest kind possible to man—scientific certitude with regard to Christianity—i.e., God, Christ, and what God has done and is doing for the redemption of the world. Claiming the character of a science, it must clearly be ready to submit to the norms and laws which condition scientific certitude in other domains. The general mode of arriving at certitude is everywhere the same, though the subject-matter may differ.† Now, there are two stages of certitude, due respectively to experience and reasoning, which may be termed immediate and reflective or discursive. The latter, however, be it remembered, is conditional on our going back to axioms, self-evident truths; in other words, it cannot be arrived at unless

---

* As was taught by Cusanus, Leibnitz, and others. See Glaubenslehre, Vol. I., 48, 53, 55, 157; cf. Sittenlehre, p. 4, 115 ff. His words about ideas slumbering in the reason suggest Schleiermacher’s position that “Conceptions lie timeless in our reason just as the whole of a plant lies spacelessly in the seed. Not that they are present in a developed conscious form, but that reason is a living energy capable of producing all true conceptions.” See Sigwart on Schleiermacher in Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, II., 279, cf. 294 ff. Cf. also Weissenborn’s Schleiermacher.

† Glaubenslehre, I., 45.
experience be linked on to eternal truths.* All experience presupposes real objects; these objects may be material or spiritual. The external world, as such, affects our bodies, because our bodies are akin thereto; its laws and the ideas it embodies are knowable, because we have a corresponding spiritual nature; the invisible, divine world becomes known to us through a side of our nature which is turned toward, homogeneous with, it.† The organs by which we apprehend the sensuous world are our senses; the eye or medium or organ‡ for the spiritual is faith. Faith is not the witness for God, as is too commonly said, but the medium through which God witnesses to Himself. Our faith apprehends the divine self-attestation. In faith, therefore, we have to do, not with self-knowledge, but with the knowledge of God.§ At this point Dorner touches Jacobi, who used "Glaube" (faith) to denote the side or capability of our nature by which we apprehend the divine, though he afterward adopted "Vernunft" and "Gefühl" for the same purpose; in which respect Dorner seems sometimes to follow his example.¶ Contact of the homogeneous with the corresponding side of our nature is the condition of experience, and experience is attended by immediate certitude. But certitude even of this kind does not pass away with the cessation of contact, for the intellect makes for itself a thought-image or reflex of the object, which may be treasured up in the memory and be recalled for examination, and which shares in the original immediate certitude.¶¶ Elsewhere he speaks of the object "eliciting or drawing out the image of itself by contact" or of its "radiating impressions into us," which are known as "signs containing the truth of the object as the product of its power."** He even goes so far as to represent the living truth as dwelling in us, and the object of faith as working its will in us.†† So much for immediate or experimental certitude.

The contents of the intellect, thus evoked or introduced through contact with sense or through faith, it is the function of the understanding to analyze and combine as conceptions and judgments, according to its own innate laws; the result of which activity, however, is empty schemata or forms beyond which it is unable to advance. But we have also reason, of whose function the following

---

* Glaubenslehre, I., 58. † Ibid., 60.
† "Оργανоν ηστικών für den Erlöser," as he terms it in his paper, Das Princip unserer Kirche, etc., 1841. Compare an interesting article on the "Ontological Argument," by Professor Shedd, in The Presbyterian Review, No. XVIII., especially p. 224.
§ Glaubenslehre, I., 162. ¶ See Ethik, 122 f.
¶ Glaubenslehre, I., 56.
** Ibid., 60. †† Ibid., 150 f., 152.
account is given: "While sense is limited to particulars, and the understanding to general concepts more or less abstract and empty, reason, with its capacity of effecting combinations, beholds or intuites the universal and the particular in one, the individual in living connection with the whole by which it is conditioned and in which it is rooted—sees in the individual the realization of the universal.* This may be termed "intellectual intuition;" † with it a beginning is made of true rational knowledge, without it advance beyond sensuous empiricism or empty concepts is impossible. Starting at this point, thought moves downward under the guidance of its in-born laws to conclusions which, if they are validly drawn from the premises, advance the domain of knowledge and of certitude far beyond that covered by contact.‡ Unlike Rothe, however, who, while taking much the same view of the matter, insists that the theologian, having got his starting-point, God, must speculate on without regard to or squinting at experience, as long as he is conducting the speculative process,§ Dorner insists most strongly on the necessity of maintaining a constant living contact with the objects of spiritual intuition, because without it our conclusions are very apt to be false—none the less so because logically reached. Fulfilling this condition and duly caring for accuracy, alike in reasoning and observation of details, our thinking will be a reflection and after-formation of the real thoughts of God—in a word, real truth.‖ From this very imperfect sketch it will be seen that Dorner combines the a posteriori and a priori methods of reaching certitude about what is given in experience; he does not believe in what is often confounded herewith—namely, reaching the concrete from the abstract. As a matter of fact, however, there is no true scientific certitude anywhere that is not arrived at in the same way.¶ Applying these general principles to the present subject, Dorner says, Through faith in Christ, God in Christ is veritably appropriated; He enters into the man—in this case, specially into the intellect; owing to our natural inherence in God,** an abiding closeness of contact between our reason or spiritual sensitivity and Him is possible, such as no experimentation or observation of the sensuous world can secure; experience of and certitude regarding Him are more complete than

---

* Cf. Hegel's words—"Der Verstand bestimmt und hält die Bestimmungen fest; die Vernunft ist positiv weil sie das Allgemeine erzeugt und das Besondere darin begreift."

Logik. Vorrede zur ersten Ausgabe, p. 7.

† Cf. Glaubenslehre, I., 152.  
‡ Ibid., 56 f.  
¶ Cf. George, Die Logik als Wissenschaftslehre, p. 632.  
** "In Him we live, and move, and have our being."
any other experience or certitude; scientific certainty depends alike as to compass and intensity on the place occupied in the hierarchy of being by the principle at which the process of deductive inference starts; God, as the supreme cause of all being, may therefore become the source of a scientific certitude regarding the world, far transcending that which can be secured in any other way; what is known in and through Him is really and truly known. To put the case in a nutshell:—The speculative method is the most suited to thetic theology; for its task is to rise from the momenta given in experience of God in Christ to their principle in God, and starting there, to deduce them step by step, with rational necessity, thus establishing their scientific truth, and producing a connected, organized system of knowledge.\* * 

One other point still needs to be noticed, specially because of its bearing on the question of what is called the "Christian consciousness." Recognizing with other thinkers that intellect begins its existence as a potentiality, and is always undergoing modification by what it assimilates; and with every sound biblical thinker confessing that the intellect of man is no "dry light," no unharmed and perfect eye or ear, but shares in the corruption and perversion of the whole man, he nevertheless holds that it is created for divine truth and divine truth intended for it; that when God in Christ enters into the intellect, a transforming, fructifying, enlightening process sets in, out of which is begotten a new self-consciousness;† that as the source of action is renovated and invigorated in such wise, that a life like that of Christ is more and more spontaneously lived, so the thinking power is renovated and invigorated in such wise as to produce from within thoughts after the mind of God; nay more, that the intellect may more and more come to see things in God and in His light. If this be so, the intellect of the regenerate man should stand in a very different position from that of the intellect of the unregenerate man. How far this makes him an independent authority with regard to concrete matters, such as statements or facts of the Scriptures, is another question, on which the next subject to which I shall call attention may possibly throw some light. Meanwhile, I must again remind the reader that Dorner lends no countenance to a priori efforts to construct the actual past, present, or to come; and that his speculation is really that deduction of what is given in and through experience, from the supreme principle given

\* Compare an article by his son, Professor A. Dorner, in the Stud. u. Kritiken, 1885, p. 425; and one in Herzog's Encyclopädie. Ed. II., p. 758. 

† Glaubenslehre, I., 140, 142, 148.
in experience, which every scientific reasoner at the present day, so far as he deserves the name, is constantly engaged in making.

The point touched last naturally suggests the consideration of the relation between faith and certitude on the one side, and the Church and Scripture on the other. An important part of the section on Pisteology is devoted to this subject. The view taken by Dorner, which has been and is shared, in substance, by some of the most eminent believing German theologians of the present century, is not, in his own case, of recent date. He first expounded it in the dissertation entitled Das Prinzip unserer Kirche nach dem inneren Verhältniss seiner zwei Seiten, published at Kiel in 1841,* and set it forth in elaborate form in his History of Protestant Theology; so that it may be said to have been before the theological world for nearly half a century.

He first passes in critical review the various forms and stages of faith for the purpose of ascertaining which of them is fit to be the source of immediate certitude and the starting-point for mediate or scientific certitude. According to Romanism, indeed High Churchism generally, the Church is the true source of certitude. The motto of Protestantism again has been more or less completely the celebrated saying of Chillingworth, "The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestantism." Passing over the trenchant criticism of the Romish position, we will consider his treatment of the relation of faith, certitude and the Bible. With regard to the Bible as with regard to any domain of phenomena, a thinker may, of course, arrive at a certitude of its own kind—historical, moral, religious. But that is not the question: No, what we here want to know is whether the Bible can give rise first to the immediate and then to the scientific certitude, which the soul of man needs and demands, and of which an enlightened Christian makes his boast?—certitude, namely, with regard to God, and all that is for us therein included.

To the first part of this question it was and still is the custom to reply, Yes, the Scriptures have the power of self-illumination; they are like light, and that not merely because they interpret themselves to the human mind, but because they certify themselves as a divine revelation.† This was the view of Gerhard, who uses regarding them the term αὐτόϕασι.‡ But those who held by this reply were

† Coleridge's position as set forth in the Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit is typical. See pp. 15, 16, 52, 70, 78 in Cassell's Edition. "Whatever finds me bears witness for itself that it has proceeded from a Holy Spirit," etc. As shown in the text, it is not so modern as some imagine.
‡ Glaubenslehre, I., 80.
gradually driven either to the position of the enthusiasts who exalted "the inner light," and thence to that of the Rationalists who made natural, i.e., empirical human reason the supreme arbiter of what could be true and real; or to the position of those who maintained the absolute inspiration of the letter of Scripture. One or the other alternative was then and still is a logical necessity.

In dealing with the second part of the question it became and is still apt to be the rule to endeavor to prove the divinity of Christianity by advancing proofs—proofs held to be appreciable by and stringent for natural reason—that the Bible is of divine origin and authority. These proofs were, as they still are, rational or philosophical, and historical. Passing over Dorner's argument from history and the necessity of the case, against making the rise of Christian faith and certitude dependent on the proof that the Bible is of divine origin,* I will go on to set forth very briefly his own view. He goes back to the Apostle Paul, whose procedure is instructive and regulative for all time. "The heathen to whom he went did not and could not bring with them a recognition, much less a certain conviction of the inspiration and truth of the evangelical narratives. Nor was faith in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, or in historical narratives having no relation to redemption, the first thing he demanded. What he did was to preach repentance, and to offer to the penitent forgiveness of sin for the sake of Christ. Those who believed, experienced the power of Christianity and became certain alike of the story of Christ and of the credibility and authority of the apostle."†

Now what the apostle was to his contemporaries, that the Scriptures, specially those of the New Testament, have been to succeeding generations—namely, the vehicle or medium or channel through which they have been brought to God. The apostles would have deprecated with all possible earnestness and energy being regarded in a different light. What did Paul write to the Corinthians? "My word and my preaching were not in persuasive words of human wisdom, but in demonstration of spirit and power, that your faith might be not in wisdom of men but in power of God."‡ God in Christ testified to Himself through them, and even so God in Christ draws nigh to us through the Scriptures. They are not themselves the ground and source of our certitude about Him, but He Himself in and through them as the witness, channel, and vehicle. Whosoever has been brought face to face with God through the Scripture, naturally and justly, however, ascribes to them the authority of divine messengers.
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* Glaubenslehre, I., 76-95. † Ibid., 134. ‡ 1 Cor. ii., 4, 5.
But, says Dorner, this character of the Scriptures is inferred from
the truth they bring, not the truth of what they bring from this char-
acter. And, accordingly, the doctrine of their inspiration is discussed
by him, not as usual in the prolegomena, but as an integral part of
the system.* There he maintains that the men who came into di-
rect contact with the incarnate Word and first believed, necessarily
stand in a unique relation to Him; that, as His first witnesses and
ambassadors, they are organs of universal significance; that either
they must needs have received Him and His Word in all purity into
themselves or He would have had to appear again and again in the
course of the ages; that, in a word, while the God-Man is the cor-
ner-stone, they are also part of the foundation.† Both by natural
endowment and by the influence of the Holy Spirit they were
specially qualified for the position assigned to them in the building
up, or in the development of the Church; and, as he adds, what-
ever held good of them as speakers, holds still more true of them as
writers. The Holy Ghost not only warded off error, but also gave
them, each in his measure, knowledge of divine things, and filled
them with concern that mankind generally should share the pre-
cious treasure. Through their new pneumatic man He worked in
them to record even what they knew by natural means, in such a
manner that the divine substance should suffer no prejudice.‡

It is natural and proper, therefore, for the Church—that is, the body
of believers—to affirm the divine inspiration and authority of the
Scriptures; if it cannot do so it must have neglected the duty of
attaining to mediate or rational certitude regarding its own spiritual
experience; but it is equally unnatural and improper to insist on the
recognition thereof as a condition of experiencing the saving grace
of Christ. For Christ is His own witness, and He has no need of
infallible witnesses to testify to Himself, even were such witnesses
in the nature of the case possible. As in general, so here, the only
infallible witness to any real object is the object itself. God alone can
give absolute certitude regarding Himself. Even if all the phe-
nomena of nature and history testified to God without a single
discordant word or sound the inference to Him thus warranted
would not give full certainty—not the certainty man needs, un-
questionably not the certainty that is at once enkindled by direct
contact.

In Dorner’s judgment this view of faith and its function as re-
lated to the Scriptures is the genuine doctrine of the Reformers and
of Protestantism. He allows, indeed, that the former did not see
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* Glaubenslehre, i., 163; cf. p. 664 ff. † Ibid., 665. ‡ Ibid.
it just as he puts it—that Luther, in particular, was in this as in
most other things far from careful about the formal or even some-
times substantial consistency of his utterances; but maintains that
their doctrine of the testimonium spiritus sancti, which had not at
first the purely practical bearing which in later times was given to
it, and the stress constantly laid by the Protestant theologians of
Germany, France, and Britain on the distinction between the fides
divina and the fides historica, the latter being most emphatically
subordinated to and treated as of a different nature from the former,
aliike warrant the assertion that this is its true kernel, however un-
like its husk may seem.

I can only make very brief reference to Dorner's method of deal-
ing with two further very important questions connected with this
part of theology. The first is, If the act of faith which assimilates
Christ is not to be arbitrary—a sort of leap in the dark—must not a
sort of prevenient assurance be possible? And whence is this as-
surance to come if not from the very inspiration which has been set
aside as an impossible or needless condition of faith? * He dis-
tinguishes here between the faith that lays hold and that which
possesses and experiences. For the exercise of the former sufficient
ground is furnished by such facts as, that the whole Church is agreed
in regarding Christ as its founder; that, according to the documents
from which our knowledge of Christianity is derived, Christ is ob-
vously its centre,† that He is confessedly the source of redemption
and perfection, that a changed world dates from His appearance,
that His image is depicted with sufficient distinctness and trust-
worthiness in the New Testament, and that that image has the
power of quickening all that is most ideal in man's nature and evok-
ing his devotion and trust.‡ In a word, any man with a conscious-
ness of ignorance, weakness and sin, yearning for righteousness and
truth, and humbly ready to be saved, will be so found by Christ as
presented in the New Testament, that he will feel it to be more
than a duty, yea, a privilege, to surrender himself, and in surren-
dering himself he will find himself and God.

The other question affects the relation of the Bible to the living,
progressive thought of the Church—that is, of such as have accepted,
are assimilating, and are being intellectually fructified, quickened, and
transformed by God in Christ. Here I can scarcely do better than
give a very brief abstract of Dorner's own statement: "The author-
ity of the first Christian witnesses and of those whom they directly
or indirectly commissioned, acquires normative character for the

* Glaubenslehre, i., 139. † Ibid., 133 f. ‡ Ibid., 721.
Church as a whole and for its individual members in all time, as soon as they are taken, not merely as individuals, but as members of the canon. Even if one of them needed correcting and supplementing—as James is frequently held to do relatively to Paul—it must come, not from the outside, but from within their own body, and it will certainly be found there. The canon is thus its own interpreter and judge,* it needs no foreign standard. Even so the Holy Spirit provides for Himself in believers, judgment, criticism, which is not subjective, but alike free and faithful. When faith criticises and interprets, it does not look at the object from without, either as a stranger or in a traditional, slavish manner, but from within. At the same time it must not be forgotten that although this collective canonical testimony must be amply sufficient to supply the place of the historical objectivity of the God-Man for later generations, yet none of His disciples must be put on a level with the God-Man Himself; for He alone had the Spirit without measure. A different view of the case would conflict alike with the original documents and with the conception which their authors must have entertained of themselves; nay, more, a false position would then be assigned to Holy Scripture relatively to faith. In other words, it would be constituted the mediator;† the God-Man and His Spirit as the source of certitude would be thrust into the background. If, then, defects should be discovered in writings that are worthy to belong to the canon, which do not affect its religious substance, and in such a writing cannot be essential, they should not indeed be irreverently sought out and magnified, but yet candidly recognized. This is the right course, partly because no detriment can thus ensue to the trustworthiness of the tradition as a whole; for otherwise God, in wise regard for the great ends to be served, would have prevented it; and, on the other hand, because defects which affect merely the letter and not the religious substance, and of which truth prevents the denial, supply a motive and stimulus not to rest in anything external and not to worship the letter. We must be on our guard against raising a new wall of separation between believers and the God-Man, as we unquestionably do if we ascribe to an impersonal object or a mere man an authority, still more a power of self-evidencing as true, which belongs alone to Him and His Spirit. True faith sees in the letter of the documents of revelation the objective and imperishable embodiment of a religious content, which has the power of commending itself as true through the Spirit of God, who can so
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* Italics Dorner's own.
† As in the case of the so-called Biblical Supernaturalism.
quicken the letter that it shall present the living God-Man to the eyes of faith."

The importance to Protestantism of the problems treated in this section of Dorner's work must be my excuse for the space I have devoted to his views. Whether his treatment of them be adequate or tenable, it is not my present business to determine.

It is time, however, to leave the porch and describe the edifice itself, which, by the way, reminds one rather of a Gothic cathedral, with its endless ins and outs, than of one of classic design. First, a few words on the ground-plan. It is divided into two great parts, termed respectively Fundamentals or Apologetic; and Special theology. Formally considered this division is not new, but the distribution of the subject-matter is certainly novel. So far as I am aware no other theologian has included among so-called fundamentals or prolegomena, the doctrines of God, of the Trinity, of the divine attributes, of creation and of the incarnation, as well as of religion, revelation, inspiration, the Scriptures, miracles, and the history of non-Christian religions. The second part embraces the doctrines of sin, of the person of Christ, of His offices and work, of His exaltation, of the Church in its rise through faith and regeneration, of its subsistence and continuation, of the prophetic, priestly and kingly activities of Christ and of the last things. What, now, is the rationale of this division? In point of fact, the system is in principle complete with the first part, and the second is but a kind of carrying out, development, unfolding, application of the first; the one presents as a concrete actuality with special reference to sin what the other presents in abstract, theoretical, germ form. A good many things may seem on the surface to be opposed to this assertion; specially, for example, the sections in the second part on the Incarnation and Eschatology, but even they admit of explanation.

The key to Dorner's procedure is to be found in the cosmic significance of the Incarnation. In his view, the idea of Christ, of the God-Man—in other words, the decree of divine love to effect an incarnation, reaches back into the very foundations of the world, for the world was created not merely by, but unto the Logos, who was to become man. The real ground of its possibility lay eternally in God Himself—nay more, there was in God an eternal self-disposition, or, as it were, arrangement of Himself unto, toward, for incarnation.

* Glaubenslehre, I., 667 f., freely rendered as to form, but without change of substance.  
† See Glaubenslehre, I., 168.  
‡ See what he says himself. Glaubenslehre, I., 167.  
§ Glaubenslehre, II., 2; I., 165; cf. I., 654.  
| Ibid., II., 245.
Incarnation was the real goal of His activity ad extra; and the activity ad extra was grounded in, and determined by, His activity ad intra—not, indeed, as by natural necessity, but yet by the free, ethical necessitation of love.* The work of objectifying the eternal thought of God reached its climax when He found in Christ the organ of His full mundane actuality, of His central revelation;† that organ being one that He provided for Himself, not one for which He was dependent on the mere will of the creature.‡ In the Son of Man who was capable of becoming Son of God, actual mundane image of God, the actuality of the world, in its distinction from, and contraposition to God, reached culmination. Creation was then for the first time completed; the world as an objective reality, capable of becoming absolutely valuable through its absolute susceptibility to God, was posited; and that, too, because the incarnation was the beginning of the personal union of the world with God, of the restoration of humanity back to God, in the full accomplishment of which work the Holy Spirit co-operates.§ When God began to create, He intended to complete the world; the world could not be completed without humanity; humanity could not be completed without fellowship with God; fellowship with God is conditional on His revealing Himself inwardly and outwardly; the incarnation is the completion of the divine self-revelation. Then, again, the idea of humanity being that of a perfect organism, its perfection depended on the realization of the organism; and that was inconceivable apart from the God-Man, its head,‖ who is at the same time also the centre of all creation and all rational beings, through whom God is manifest to and becomes the point of union for all spirits.¶ This being the general point of view, but for the fact of sin, which he stoutly denies to have been the ground of the incarnation, while allowing that it furnished an additional justification or reason for it, the second part of his system would have been devoted to showing how humanity—which till the incarnation had been merely psychical, and not as it was designed to be, pneumatic—and the world along with and in humanity, was gradually raised by the joint action of the God-Man and of the Holy Ghost, to the condition for which, according to the divine idea, it was created.

The aim of the first part, as defined by himself, is the scientific deduction or demonstration of the centre of the Christian faith, namely, Christ, the God-Man, who, as we have seen, is the centre at once of the history of humanity and of the world. The line of
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argument summarily stated is this. From the nature and constitution of God—specially the ethical, which is the supreme aspect thereof—may be deduced the first creation with its culmination in man; then religion, which is defined as a relation between two, or, as it is significantly designated in the Old Testament, a "covenant;" further, revelation, without which religion cannot exist, and the essence of which is a movement of God out of His hiddenness or the manifestation of His inward nature; finally, incarnation, which is the completion of revelation. Under the general head of revelation are discussed the subjects of miracles and inspiration: under that of incarnation the question of the preservation of the completed revelation, by means of a canon of Scripture.* In a further section, the chief heathen religions, Judaism and Mohammedanism, are briefly passed in review for the purpose of showing that in them all there are traces of the tendency to a union of God and man, which is the essential goal of religion; that Christianity is the key to the riddle of the religious yearnings and seekings of the non-Christian world; and that all these religions are a preparation and prophesy of Christianity. Were this not the case it could not be the absolute religion; for the absolute religion must comprise what is true and fulfil what is best in all religions.†

What, then, is the position of Judaism in this organism? He replies, "It is unique, because in it revelation, which elsewhere, though provided for, yet developed only in one direction, and sooner or later, even when it did not recede, came to a full stop, continuously progressed without relapse until it reached its goal. This was possible in the chosen people, because of the clearness with which they first distinguished the world and God from each other, and then, on the basis of the distinction, correlated them to each other. To them God revealed Himself as the Omnipotent Creator, Sustainer and Ruler of the world, and evinced His rule by ever new communications, especially, however, by the revelation of His holiness, which became the basis of legislation. Prophecy sprang up out of the soil of the consciousness of the divine holiness and righteousness."‡ A section on Christianity as the historical completion of religion and revelation closes the first part.

The second division, instead of going on, as I remarked it naturally would, to show how humanity and the world gradually realized their divine idea, begins with a long and careful discussion of sin, through the intervention of which the incarnation and work of the Logos, instead of having simply completion, had also salvation, deliverance,

* Glaubenslehre, I., 658. † Ibid., 671. ‡ Ibid., 696.
atonement for their end. This constitutes the first part; the second is devoted to Redemption. This again is divided into two great sections, treating respectively of Christ’s person and work as the objective realization of redemption, and of the Church or the Kingdom of the Holy Ghost as the subjective realization of redemption. What is in principle accomplished once for all in Christ becomes the possession of humanity through faith; whilst redeemed humanity—that is, the Church—becomes, in its turn, at once the result and organ of Christ’s activity, the germ and centre of the kingdom of God.

One is at first surprised to find the Incarnation so elaborately discussed in the second part after the position assigned to it in the Apologetic; the explanation is simply that, in the former its necessity is established, as it were, on speculative, a priori grounds, itself being expounded only so far as was necessary for that purpose; in the latter it is treated as an historical actuality, requiring to be understood as such.

Much attention has been called of late to Dorner’s eschatological views, or, rather, to just one point therein, namely, that in which he affirms that, as Christianity is the absolute religion,* no one’s final destiny can be considered settled who has not had an opportunity of accepting or rejecting it, that, consequently, all who have not had such an opportunity here must have it yonder. Singularly enough, too, this position is termed “Dornerism.” It forms no part of my present design to pronounce an opinion either for or against the view in question, but it is somewhat unfair to Dorner to treat him as though he were the originator of the idea. In point of fact, on various grounds this view has been held by not a few German theologians—some of them of a very orthodox type†—among whom may be mentioned even Moravian Brethren.‡ What is surprising, however, is that his critics have failed to see that it is a logical consequence of the position assigned to Christ,—as to which they agree with him. If, as Spurgeon says, “Christ is the great central fact in the world’s history, to Him everything looks forward or backward. All the lines of history converge upon Him,” it would seem very natural to argue that the final destiny of men would be determined in harmony therewith, and that if so, no man’s destiny will be finally settled till the supreme fact has been brought to his knowledge. Those who adopt and agree with the language now so commonly used with regard to the headship of Christ and His central significance, have no
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logical right to object to Dorner's position. To avoid the result they must raise objections at an earlier stage in the system; they must object to his view of the cosmical relations of Christ.

This latter is one of the points, too, on which I venture to think he is very open to criticism. As to it, indeed, I question his self-consistency. On the one hand he makes Christ the end of the ways of God, on the other he makes the kingdom of God the end, to whose realization Christ, as the incarnation of the Logos, is the means. He might reply, indeed, that Christ is both means and end; end, so far as His incarnation is the realization of the kingdom in principle, in germ, while the kingdom itself as an actuality is merely the full-grown tree, the actualization of the principle. But this only changes the venue. The real end is, after all, the kingdom, and the incarnation is as subordinate thereto as the seed is to the full-grown tree; He is swallowed up in the kingdom, or He and His subjects form co-ordinate parts of one great whole.*

It were well, I may be allowed to remark in passing, if those who introduce Dorner's name into this controversy would always keep in view the five theses in which he sums up his discussions of the subject, especially the last, which runs, "Blessedness is possible only where there is holiness; there can be neither a condemned penitence nor an unholy blessedness."†

Were it practicable, I should have not a little more to say in the way of criticism, both of the ground-plan and of some of the minor details of arrangement. One serious fault may be mentioned, namely, that each great division contains either too much or too little. As an example I may mention the subject of sin, which comes repeatedly under consideration in the first division, although rightly belonging alone to the second or to an intermediate place. But, indeed, Dorner himself felt the difficulty—a difficulty which could have been avoided, if it were avoidable at all, only by making the first division, far more exclusively than it is, a sort of logic of theology,‡ a system of principles, and by relegating altogether to the second division the consideration of actualities, whether historical or otherwise.

It will probably be found that Dorner's most important service to Systematic Theology has been rendered in connection with the
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locus de Deo, especially by the force and profound insight which characterize his assertion of the importance of the ethical element. Not a part of the doctrine is there, indeed, which he has not enriched, but into this he poured out the very life of his life, with the result that, whether his deductions are accepted or not, its treatment has been revolutionized for all time.

The subject early attracted his attention. His Christological studies brought him face to face with the defects which marked its form in the past. The opening pages of the great work on "Christology," which contain, as it were, the kernel of the System of Theology which we are examining, indicate that he was aware of what has just been noted, and later on in dealing with Gnosticism he makes the pregnant remark: "A religion is what it is through its conception of God."* He may be said, however, to have first formally taken it in hand in a dissertation on "The Immutability of God," † a dissertation characterized by his usual learning, breadth, and power of separating the husk from the kernel, of discerning affinities between views and tendencies superficially opposed, and of detecting in theories logical and practical issues of which their advocates never dreamed.

In this he was guided by a fine tact, such as might have been expected in one whose eye embraced both the general features and main details, of great tracts of the doctrinal history of the Church. There was no locus which so thoroughly needed discussion and revision as the one now referred to, nor any whose reconstitution would exercise a more fructifying and regulative influence on the course of theological thought. Indeed, as far as British and American thought in the main is concerned, we might speak in the present rather than in the past tense. Our theologians and preachers are still largely under the sway of a conception of God whose roots lie far back in Neo-Platonic speculations—possibly in those of India, with which we are now being made familiar—and which is certainly out of harmony with the great current of thought embodied in the Scriptures. With the fairness which marked almost all his historical judgments, Dorner points out in that dissertation how it came to pass that, at the Reformation, Protestantism took over the traditional doctrine of God almost unchanged from Romish theology, although the anthropological and soteriological sections at once underwent profound modifications at its hands. The leaders of thought at

* Christologie, I., 358.
† Jahrhücher für deutsche Theologie 1858, 1859. An abridged translation by the writer of this paper appeared in the Bibliotheca Sacra, some years ago. (Vol. XXXVI.)
that time, Luther above all, yea, even Calvin, were primarily and chiefly animated and guided by practical considerations. Unlike the recent Old Catholic movement, theirs had the pressing needs of sinful man, not the theoretical difficulties or needs of Christian theologians, for its fountain-head and motive power. Accordingly, their first independent theological efforts were directed to those aspects of the Christian faith which had been the source of peace, hope and life to their sin-burdened souls. The person and work of Christ, faith, and the justification which it brings, the means of grace, and especially the nature and authority of the Scriptures—these were the subjects which the theologians of Protestantism treated constructively. The history of Protestant theology is largely the record of endeavors to arrive at more and more satisfactory views as to them. But the real key to the position was left unassailed. Romish Anthropology and Soteriology and Romish Church practice grew out of Romish Theology—using this word in its narrower sense. And one of the reasons of the sense of inconsistency and insecurity that has haunted Protestantism has been, unawares to itself, this very fact; while, on the other hand, much of the security and wholeness which has marked the procedure of Rome has been due to the greater self-consistency of its doctrinal system, and the greater concord between its practice and its theory. Neither Romanists, however, nor Protestants have found the true key to the differences: both, therefore, have failed to understand each other, and their mutual polemics have, accordingly, in general fallen wide of the mark.

If, therefore, the Protestant, or, as following the example of Germany, we ought rather to say, the Evangelical Churches are to attain to a good conscience anent their position—in other words, to doctrinal and practical self-consistency, they must thoroughly revise their doctrine of God, and lay its foundations, as they have laid those of the other doctrines referred to, broadly on the rocks of biblical truth. When harmony is thus established between the basis and superstructure we shall go forth to the fight with doubt, criticism and sin, stronger and more confident than ever before. Not a few of the weapons wielded against Christianity are really drawn from our own armory. If a proof is wanted of this let reference be made to Herbert Spencer's "First Principles," where the arguments framed in supposed defence of orthodox Christianity by Dean Mansel are ably used in support of the Agnostic position. But Dean Mansel's arguments were the legitimate outcome of premises which had had the sanction of all the most prominent theologians of Protestantism. It was reserved for him to be the unwitting instrument of unveiling their inherent and necessary antagonism
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to biblical teaching, and specially to biblical Christianity. Dorner here, again, still pursuing one of his great aims, intervened with admirable insight, temper and ability by means of an article entitled "The Mansel-Maurice Controversy." * Correctly as Maurice divined and pointed out the chief danger in Mansel's position, theologically considered, Dorner's is incomparably the weightier contribution to the subject. He discusses it with a learning, grasp, keenness and clearness which cannot be claimed for Mr. Maurice's work on Revelation.

Neither there, however, nor in the important treatise on "Divine Immutability," mentioned above, did Dorner attempt an all-round examination and treatment of the great theme. This was reserved for his Glaubenslehre. The account I give of it can be, however, only of the very briefest kind, and must, in fact, restrict itself rather to indicating the method pursued than to reproducing the actual line of thought.

Dorner opens his discussion of the doctrine of God with a criticism of the traditional method of first advancing proofs of the existence of God and then investigating the divine nature and attributes; in opposition to which he teaches that the proof for the divine existence, and that for the essential constitutive divine attributes, are really one indivisible proof, and that they can be conducted only in conjunction with each other.†

Recognizing with the best modern theologians that the several arguments are really constitutive momenta of one great argument;‡ maintaining that, while both formally and materially our knowledge of God must always be limited—the former as being subject to growth, the latter because it can never compass the infinite richness of the divine nature and life—it is real—real because God really reveals Himself to human receptivity;§ and, further, opposing to the Spinozistic—which is the chief—criticism of the objectivity of the divine attributes, omnis determinatio est negatio, the truer apothegm of Baader, omnis determinatio est positio,‖ he goes on to treat of the proofs of the existence of God. These he distributes into two great classes, the one constituted by the proof which advances from the conception of God to the actual existence of the conception; the second by those which rise from finite existences to the being and conception of God:—¶ the former the ontological, the latter the cosmological, physico-teleological, juridical and moral arguments.

* Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, 1861.
† Glaubenslehre, I., 175.‡ Ibid., 437.
§ Ibid., 198; compare the article on the Mansel-Maurice Controversy in the Jahrbücher.¶ Ibid., 199.
Four features of Dorner's treatment of this *locus* deserve special
attention, namely, his putting of the ontological argument; his
effort to strike a bridge between the *a priori* and the *a posteriori* argu-
ments; the position assigned to the ethical in God; and the bearing
given to the Trinity on the problem of the existence of God. I will
endeavor in as few words as possible to indicate their characteristic
features.

After reviewing the forms given to the ontological argument by
Anselm, Des Cartes, Spinoza, Kant, and Hegel, and assigning rea-
sons for regarding them as rather mutually supplementary than
mutually exclusive, he formulates its aim to be the twofold one of
showing, *first*, that it is essential to the idea of the absolute, if
thought at all, to be thought as having necessary existence; and,
*secondly*, that the idea of the absolute, so far from being contingent,
is necessary, to rational thought.*

Stated more completely: *First*, if the Supreme Being is thought
at all, it must be thought as neither conditioned by nor dependent
on any other being, but as unconditioned or absolute, as being
through itself; consequently as objectively existent. *Secondly*, it is
not a matter of choice, but necessary, to think an absolute, which
must be thought as having being if it is to be thought at all. In
other words, whoso will think rationally and wishes so to think
that his thinking shall become knowledge—which, be it remembered,
is a moral duty imposed on thought †—must think an absolute. A
*rational* thinker, in other words, must recognize an absolute. The
absolute is intertwined with the very roots of rational thought and
is the condition of its possibility; intellect ceases to be intellect
without it.‡ It must be allowed, I think, that this mode of putting
the case is a decided advance on most, if not all, previous state-
ments, whether the case be established or not.

Given such an absolute, necessarily existent being or deity, we
can at once deduce from its absoluteness the predicates of unity,
solity, simplicity, and infinitude, which last, in the case of the exist-
ence of a world, would be positively defined as freedom from space
and time.

But thought in general cannot rest in a conception of the abso-
lute being so void of content, so empty, so utterly indeterminate,
as that to which the ontological argument leads, still less can thought

---

* Glaubenslehre, I., 201.
‡ *Ibid.*, 213. Compare Professor Flint's statement, which is akin to Dorner's, in his
valuable work on *Theism*, fourth edition, 1883, pp. 268, 291, 292. Also Caird's *Inter-
duction to the Philosophy of Religion.*
inspired by Christian faith. We turn accordingly to the remaining arguments with a view to supplying the lack. Here, however, the difficulty is encountered on which Kant especially laid such stress, that so far as they start from the empirical, finite world, they fail to rise to the absolute predicates which are the object of our search. By their means alone we shall never reach the being of God or the corresponding attributes in God. Can, then, the ontological argument be so applied to the empirical arguments that the two shall really supplement each other? Dorner thinks it both possible and natural. As a matter of fact, the same intellect that thinks the world and itself, thinks also the idea of the absolute:—shall we, then, pronounce the task of combining the two impossible, or are we condemned to intellectual dualism? He endeavors, accordingly, so to combine the a posteriori class of arguments with the ontological, that the latter shall establish the objective existence of the predicates which the former supplied, but whose existence they could not prove; nay, more, to demonstrate their necessary inherence in the absolute Being or in God.*

In fact, he aims at showing that as the ideas which answer to the various categories which lie at the basis of the several arguments—as for example, that of causality at the basis of the cosmological, that of harmony, purpose, beauty at that of the physico-teleological argument—are a priori inherent in mind, their recognition as appertaining to the absolute is a necessity of our rational nature.† This is the second special feature of Dorner's discussion.

The third, which is really a part of the last-mentioned, is the place assigned to the ethical in God. No other problem had anything like the fascination and interest for Dorner that the problem of the ethical had; and no theologian, perhaps few ethical philosophers, have investigated it with the like intensity and persistency, not to say profundity and success. In the view of many, his contribution to Christian ethics is his best; perhaps, however, not so much because it is really more valuable than the other works, but because it contains less that evokes criticism and contradiction.

With the juridical argument the domain of the ethical is really entered; yet, though the idea of the just and right, once conceived by reason, cannot again be surrendered and must be recognized as a necessary idea, to which belongs a seat in the absolute being, it cannot be said to hold the supreme place. In fact it is one side—the negative side of the ethical; it has its ground in the positive good or ethical of which it is, so to speak, the protector. For we are obliged

* Glaubenslehre, I., 234. † Ibid., 295.
to ask, What is just and right? And we must either reply, the just and right, or go on to something higher and broader still to which it owes its obligatory force.

Three questions, then, present themselves for reply: first, what is the ethical idea in relation to the non-ethical and to righteousness? second, whether it is a necessary idea of reason? and, third, whether it has merely ideal existence in the form of a law or imperative, or absolute reality in the absolute Being, God? To the first he replies, In its very nature it is supreme; all else is subordinate to it—absolute being, life, intelligence, will—it alone is the absolute end, the absolute \textit{causa finalis}, beyond which we do not ask to go, for whose reason reason does not ask, whose reason is in itself. To the second he answers with Kant, A rational being cannot please himself, whether he recognize it or not; it is duty to will the right, and inasmuch as it cannot be willed unless it is first thought, the fundamental duty is to retain the law in consciousness.* With regard to the third point, the conclusion arrived at is, that the ethical, which by its very nature unconditionally demands realization—for to represent it as an imperative which cannot be obeyed would be a self-contradiction—is realized, yea, perfectly realized, in the deity. In other words, the absolute being is through and through ethical, or the ethical has perfect reality eternally in God.

But granting that in God the eternally and absolutely ethical good is a reality and that this supreme ethical goodness is love—as is elsewhere urged—another problem presents itself. It is essential to the ethical to be at once necessary and free, to have being and yet to be freely willed to be. The solution of this difficulty Dorner finds in the Trinity, without the recognition of which, he holds, it is logically inadmissible to confess with the Apostle John and the Christian Church that “God is love”—nay, also, that God is life and light.

Though the task of criticism where there is so much to admire, as at once biblically correct, philosophically profound and practically weighty, is in itself disagreeable, especially to one who is sensible that any capability of criticism he may possibly have is largely due to the teacher criticised, yet as the \textit{in verba magistri jurare} is a thing Dorner would have been the first to reprobate, I should have endeavored, had space permitted, to indicate in one or two cases, what seem to me decided weaknesses of constructive reasoning. Among the points which are open to serious objection may be mentioned especially the Trinity and the Person of Christ.†

* \textit{Glaubenslehre}, I., 208.
† I single these out both because of their intrinsic importance, and because Dorner concentrated on them special effort.
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The *Trinity* holds a high and large place in his system; he attaches to the doctrine, one might almost say, supreme importance, so far as he considers it to be the key to the Christian conception of God; he has devoted to its elucidation the whole force of his speculative mind, enriched by extensive learning; it is no purpose of his to reduce the distinctions to those known as Sabellian, much less to deny them altogether; nor does its mysteriousness excite aversion, for that, he has too much sympathy with the mood of the mystic; and yet his treatment of the subject seems to me eminently unsatisfactory.

I am compelled also to pass the same judgment on his doctrine of the person of Christ, much as there is to admire in it of insight, subtlety, and practical significance; and certain as it is that his aim was to assert alike the full divinity and the full humanity of our Lord. Indeed, a defective view of the Trinity leads, of logical necessity, to a defective view of the person of Christ, and *vice versa.*

I ought to add, however, in passing, that his idea regarding the Headship of Christ—though I am unable myself to accept it—is very commonly misunderstood and misrepresented. Not very long ago I saw that Dr. Karl Schwarz's account thereof in his *Geschichte der neuesten Theologie*—a book whose cold, critical and negative spirit ought to render it *a priori* suspicious to an orthodox writer—was quoted as though it were correct, and yet a bare glance at Dorner's *Christology*, much more at his *Glaubenslehre*, would have shown the writer that he was doing Dorner an injustice. He himself characterizes the notion of a *homo generalis*, in the physical sense, as a monstrosity, and maintains that it would lead to panchristism instead of pantheism.† He asserts for Christ a true, veritable individuality, but an individuality whose essential characteristic is to be free from the one-sidedness which is chargeable on all other individuals; and he holds that one-sidedness is not essential to the idea of humanity, considered in itself. The true idea of humanity is arrived at not by abstracting what is common to all, but by a living combination of what is found in all, and pneumatically such was Christ. To this He owed His universal position; this constituted Him the progenitor and head of pneumatic humanity; in virtue of this He could be and is the Redeemer of all.‡

I have already made pretty frequent references to Dorner's more personal characteristics—the characteristics of the man; I will now conclude with a brief notice of some of his characteristics as a theologian and writer.

---

* Glaubenslehre, II., 407, 411, 426; I., 650 f. † Ibid., 424. ‡ Ibid., 425 f.
By competent judges of German style, though complaints are made of his fondness for Latinisms and Grecisms, he is held to have possessed in a remarkable degree the power of clear exposition. In his plastic hands the most subtle and complicated problems assume intelligible form; and yet there is a complete absence—perhaps, indeed, too complete an absence—of the cut and dried, formally logical method that to many seems necessary to clearness. Indeed, he wrote more after the manner of the essayist or *littérature* than after that of the professional theologian, allowing his mind to play freely round and on any subject he had in hand, though in reality he never lost sight of his goal and kept the spirit of the prophet in subjection to the prophet.* Until one has studied a work like the *Glaubenslehre* one is very apt to think that he has here and there ignored a consideration or overlooked a difficulty; but wait, and it will generally be found that he recurs to it in some other connection. While allowing this, I must confess, for my own part, that this letting the mind go its own sweet way results in something very like rambling, and leads to a good deal of repetition—a fault with which the *Glaubenslehre* is certainly chargeable.*

A characteristic of a large class of German theologians—if not, indeed, of them all—namely, that of personifying abstractions, is shared in a high degree by Dorner. It appertains, indeed, to theologians of other countries, yet I scarcely think to the same extent. This is especially the case with words that belong to the domain of ethics: The Ethical, the Good, the Right, Justice, are reasoned about, are represented as doing, forbidding and the like, exactly as if they had an independent, concrete existence. One finds oneself a good deal perplexed when one attempts to transfer the reasonings to a real world—to descend from the thin air of abstractions to mother earth. It were well, indeed, if all theologians—not to mention philosophers and scientists—would be on their guard against the same fault. “Justice,” for example, is sometimes reasoned about among ourselves, as though it were an objective force or power which must manifest itself in this and the other way.

One scarcely knows whether to describe Dorner as a speculative historian or a historical speculator. The two elements dominate his work in a remarkable degree. In this respect he greatly resembled one of his masters, Schelling. He must always plant his feet on history, and yet history is not a human herbarium or museum of dead facts. On the contrary, it is instinct with life and meaning to him; all history is the embodiment and development of principles. He

* See *N. E. Kirchenseitung* quoted in his son's article in the *Stud. u. Kritiken.*
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never was so much at home, even in private conversation, as when he was unfolding the significance of historical events; correlating those which seemed unrelated, discovering inklings of great truths even in practices, customs, rites, ceremonies, doctrinal positions, systems, that a less profound thinker would have simply passed by or treated as absurdities. Accordingly, on the one hand he looked to history for light on the problems awaiting solution, and for guidance as to the direction to be taken by investigation, while, on the other hand he felt that to break historical continuity was to render impossible the attainment of satisfactory results, either in theory or practice. In fact his whole intellectual life was one long protest against two opposed and equally mistaken tendencies: one, which self-sufficiently ignores history and sets out to construct the world in absolute independence of the thought of the past; another, which seeming to despair of the present generation or of the truth, would have us restrict ourselves solely to history.

Not that he was faultless in his dealings with history; on the contrary, he was sometimes swayed by prepossessions, and fell into the error of unconsciously seeing in facts only that which suited his immediate purpose. At the same time, there have been very few men less chargeable with this fault than he—specially few Germans.

His power of tracing historical tendencies and results to ideal causes was remarkable, and exercised to striking purpose. This is one of the most valuable habits which the careful study of his works may help to form or foster. It has been said often enough that ideas determine history, but it seems as though our own generation were singularly slow to recognize the law, at all events in the domain of theology. One of his favorite exercises, if one may use the word, is to point out how one extreme is sure to call forth another—an exercise which led to his being accused of following a quasi-Hegelian method. The idea, probably, was suggested by Hegel's method of antitheses, but there is all the world of difference between Dorner's application thereof and the application made of it by thorough Hegelians.

Another ruling idea of his—suggested, perhaps, by Hegel, though carried out in a different way from that of theologians of the true Hegelian type—was that the various phases of doctrine which have arisen in the course of the generations—whether of the person of Christ, or of the Atonement, or of the Trinity—represent so many momenta, mutually complementary, of a complete and perfect doctrine: they are not a mere series of deviations from some previously existent perfect doctrine. Within limits this is unquestionably true. Human thought, whether in the Church or outside it, whether on
divine or created things, is in constant flux. There never was, for example, a properly orthodox system of theology, one, namely, that was allowed to have realized the idea of a system—not even in the Romish Church. Alterations are made, even if it be only in method; and changes of method and arrangement always involve more or less changes of matter. Each succeeding thinker aims to present the truth more clearly and perfectly. This principle Dorner carries out: it is the intellectual correlate to his ethical large-heartedness.

Another feature of his thinking that deserves notice is the objectivity of its aim, method and results. Some have, indeed, accused him of subjectivity, but the charge is based on a false, or, at any rate, a widely divergent conception of what constitutes objectivity. This is not the place to discuss the two conceptions, but surely that method scarcely deserves the stigma of subjectivism which starts with a recognition of the necessity of direct experience of the objects of which a theologian treats; which affirms that God really has revealed Himself to man, and that the Christian thinker has not to do merely with his own states or fancies, but with God Himself in Christ; that the Scriptures are a real medium through which Christ is presented really to us and so forth. One of the great merits of Dorner's system is that it asserts for Christian knowledge the objectivity which is claimed in the present day almost exclusively for natural science. It is, of course, easy to say that that method is alone objective which starts with the New Testament regarded as the infallible source of knowledge about God; but it is surely a profounder and more real objectivity to maintain, as Dorner does, and as the older Puritan divines did, that it is God Himself who testifies infallibly to Himself through the Scriptures. For, as was remarked before, the only way to get objective, infallible knowledge of any object, divine or human, created or uncreated, is to go, not to a witness, however perfect, but to the object itself. And this is Dorner's objectivity.*

It would be most natural, I imagine, to class him philosophically as an eclectic. Greatly as he was influenced by the several teachers of whom mention was previously made, he cannot be said to belong to the school of any one of them. He was neither a Kantian, nor a follower of Jacobi, nor a Schleiermacherian, though, as we have seen, he assimilated elements from all three, for he held that the intellect can and should attain to true objective knowledge; nor, again, was he a Schellingian or a Hegelian, for, while recognizing the objectivity

* All that a witness can give us, even if his infallibility could be established—which it could not be, save by means of a comparison between him and that of which he witnesses—is inferential certitude; not direct, real—i.e., objective certitude.
of thought and the legitimacy of speculation, he could not identify thought and its object, and in opposition to pure a priorism insisted on the necessity of experience as the starting-point and constant corrective of all inquiry. He was not, however, an eclectic in the sense of having no definite principle of his own, or in that of constructing a system out of disparate elements gathered from other writers.

Theologically he may be regarded as the ripest and ablest representative of the Mediatory School (Vermittlungstheologie). It owed its rise to the influence of Schleiermacher, though all its members diverged from him more or less completely in one fundamental respect—namely, that they refused to restrict Systematic Theology or Glaubenslehre to a description of the states of believing Christians (fromme Gemüthsstünde), and held it to be its function to treat of the object of piety and the causes of Christian experience. One might, perhaps, arrange them as follows:* Twesten and Nitzsch stand nearest to Schleiermacher, alike in time and spirit; the rest may be divided into two groups—the right one consisting of those who approximated more closely, at all events in method, to the "Church" theology, as, for example, Müller, Plitt, Ebrard, Gess, and Reiff; the other marked by a stronger speculative element, Liebner, Lange, Martensen, Dorner, Schöberlein, and, perhaps, Rothe. There is, of course, much that is common between him and the rest of the school, especially in the treatment of the question of inspiration, but careful examination will show, I think, that there is scarcely a respect in which Dorner is not in advance of his predecessors.

I cannot do better than close this very imperfect account and estimate of the man and his work, by quoting a few sentences from the discourse which he delivered in 1864 as Rector of the University of Berlin, partly for their own sake, chiefly, however, because they bring out the remarkable range of his interests as a thinker and teacher. After referring to the fact of the growth of the reciprocal independence of the several faculties of the Universities during the present century, he goes on to say:

"The confusion of their several spheres and the attempts at domination over each other have been brought to an end, especially by the ever-growing necessity for division of labor. Not only have the several domains secured full freedom to teach both by word and writing, but by attaining insight into the essential principle of their life and activity, they have also made material advances toward inner emancipation. . . . This state of things, however, imposes new obligations—above all, the obligation that the several sciences shall not regard each other with hostility, or, still worse, with indiffer-

---

* I refer here exclusively to those who are chiefly known as systematic theologians.
ence. In proportion as they do this, in that proportion will the intellectual life of the nation be split up into factions, and sooner or later science itself fall a prey to a philistine practicality. . . . Although no science can lay exclusive claim to hegemony, it is necessary that the departments which promote general culture—namely, philology, history, mathematics, philosophy—should not only maintain their position, but even obtain larger attention. . . . Each individual science should esteem it its function to be and do something for the rest; for surely all parts of the universe are connected in their deepest depths by real and rational, even though secret, ties; and the ethical business of humanity is to bring this fact to light and give it vital actuality, and to confess that there is one God, one world, one humanity, yet in such wise that the boundary lines of the several domains shall not be blurred, still less be made impassable; that, on the contrary, bridges and transitions from one to the other shall everywhere be opened. It is no one’s business to prescribe or judge with regard to other departments of investigation as he may and must with regard to his own; but every one is bound, while cultivating with all his might his own section of the great field of science, to keep an open eye for all that is human. . . . Once this general duty recognized, philology will seek to incorporate her classical treasures with the culture of the nation and to make them common property; history will unveil the eternal moral laws which regulate the rise and fall of nations and kingdoms, and set before the rising generation examples of faithfulness in little as well as in great things—of the victories of patience as well as of heroism; philosophy will throw up a spiritual breastwork against materialism and scepticism, while helping to evoke the ideal and generous impulses of youth; the natural sciences will sharpen the eye for concrete realities and accustom the mind to surrender itself without prepossessions to the objective; jurisprudence, doing service to the eternal idea of law and justice, will foster the feeling for historical continuity, and from her, as from the elect fountain, will go forth the influences that develop manliness of character and give tone and vigor to the organism of the University; and, lastly, theology will marry all these forms of knowledge of the world and man with the knowledge of God; for its specific function is to direct the human mind, whether in or out of the Universities, with its multiformal interests and activities, and its noblest impulses, to Him who is the Author and Hope of the Universe, the Father of lights, who gives to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and from whom comes every good and perfect gift."

D. W. SIMON.

Congregational Theological Hall, Edinburgh.
II.

SCIENTIFIC SPECULATION.

LORD BACON'S best service to science is embodied in the rule that the observation of nature must be the referee and umpire for deciding all scientific controversies. But in making it the duty of science first to observe and register the facts of nature, and only subsequently and cautiously to generalize upon them, and thus to find out laws of nature, he reversed the only possible course of research; and his mistake is aggravated by those who would debar science from the privilege of speculation in any of its stages. (By the term science, used without qualification, is meant material science.) Nature is too complex an affair to be analyzed and registered wholesale; and before going to consult it we must see that we have some idea of the kind of information required. Many of the great discoveries have been made by means of one or a very few experiments: a single case of vivisection of a dog revealed the difference between motor and sensor nerves; a single observation of the brain of the lizard Sphenodon explained the pineal body of the brain as being the relic of a third eye in the vertebrate head (the trace of one that is lost, or the root of a suppressed incipient eye); and two observations on the oviparous reproduction of the Australian duck-bill and spiny-anteater have broken down the law that all mammals bring forth their young alive. A single case is often the basis of sound scientific inference. But in order to justify the inference there must be antecedent, and concurrent, and subsequent speculation; not vague guessing, but such shrewd guessing and inferring as can be attained by a trained scientific mind. Even when it is necessary to observe facts on a large scale, this is often best accomplished by non-scientific agents, who are not smart enough to falsify the returns, and best of all by dead machines, as photographic cameras and self-recording apparatus, without bias or personal equation.

The method which all successful investigators have followed is to find out problems which may be tested by experience (by observation, with or without experiment). They begin with speculation,
which they must confront with the phenomena of nature. Their success depends on (1) their ability to discover the right kinds of problems, (2) their shrewdness in finding and applying the test. Speculation normally leads the way, propounding the problem, devising modes of solution, and, when requisite, readjusting the problem, so that it may coincide with the verification. Experience of the facts of nature constitutes the jury before which speculations are sent for trial; and speculation again plays the rôle of judge, to receive the verdict, to adjust the sentence accordingly, and to apply it to like cases. The speculation concerns the facts of nature, occurs to a mind somewhat conversant by its habits and previous experience with natural phenomena, but yet is only a process of doubtful ratio-
cination, only a tentative hypothesis, until we give it a foundation in material nature itself; and science is the resultant of speculation compounded with experience.

Some of the hypotheses brought to be tested are new creations of the investigator's genius, or are suggested by his fellow-workers; and many of them with the ablest men prove still-born, being crushed by their authors' own criticism, or killed in the attempt to verify them. Absolute liberty must be allowed to start and examine all kinds of hypotheses, the only limit allowable being the discretion of the investigator. Hypotheses that conflict with recognized principles of science, of philosophy, or of theology are all legitimate subjects of examination. Just as an explorer in Palestine does not go under instructions to see only what will confirm Scripture, so an explorer in science is not bound to tie his speculations to current views of things. An investigator sometimes by following a wrong track reaches a right conclusion; or he may reach a wrong conclusion in such a way as to demonstrate the error at the start; and, at any rate, he may congratulate himself on making any start, knowing that in the end he shall get some result to repay his toil. The recognized maxim of testimony is that the friends of truth ought to welcome evidence from all quarters; and it is only those who desire to help a bad cause that will exclude evidence. Adverse as well as favorable evidence when well sifted ultimately aids the truth. As to the bearing of science on the Being and Providence of God, we should court scrutiny, with no misgiving as to the outcome. The danger is not in speculation, but in a bad bias; and we ought to encourage the right kind of men to unfettered investigation of branches of science, which are pushing their way into philosophy and faith, as well as affecting our secular interests.

The queries confront us, why is scientific theory so often astray, and so often hostile to the sober convictions of men? and what
security have we that anything scientific is established? and would it not be better to let science have its last word before men speculate upon it? It will not appear strange that science should sometimes err, if we consider its methods. It has, in fact, gained much solid knowledge; every telegram you receive or despatch implies a certificate of your confidence in it; during the last half century our knowledge of the structure and physiology of plants and animals has so greatly extended as to add largely to the health and comfort of the human race. Yet the only available scientific method is not logically sound; a general inference is drawn from particular premises, often only from a single fact (as where the experiment on the nerves of one dog was applied to all dogs, and to other animals, man included); and this is always done by what in formal logic is condemned as an illicit process. The conclusion is always too broad for the premises; and there is also involved an assumption of the uniformity of nature, an assumption which is probably true only within a limited compass. The argument is a process of experimentation, comparable to men's speculating on the rise and fall of stocks in the market; but with checks and correctives which do not pertain to the stock-broker. The flaw in the logic secures gain in the result, which is wider than the premises. It is the application of the old maxim ex uno (or ex paucis) discere omnes; and the results are only probable. Yet by the system of limiting and testing the results, human knowledge is greatly advanced, and a high degree of certainty may be reached. The frequent changes in scientific doctrines that appear are usually not signs of weakness, but stages of progress. Fairly verified scientific theories may sometimes be amended and put in new form, and are often limited by new discovery, but are not changed in substance. Even the emission theory of light was parallel with the truth; and as soon as the verifications were applied, its one defect was rectified.

The adequate verification of theories is not left to the discretion of their inventor; many eyes scrutinize his work, and are ready to detect his shortcomings. A common mistake with outsiders is to suppose that scientific men are a sceptical ring, banded together to help each other in ventilating and favoring their schemes. On the contrary, they are under pressure to find out each other's shortcomings, as this is the road to success; and they jealously watch each other. None except scientific men are competent in ordinary cases to detect or expose their errors; but science is its own censor; and every new discovery attests how promptly it seeks to repair its failures or transgressions. In 1871 Haeckel published his splendid monograph on the calcareous sponges, full of brilliant but poorly
verified phylogenetic speculations; and he has lived to see his work examined and condemned, and his system rejected by Polejaeff and others. Much of the work of Huxley has already become obsolete, some of it indeed condemned by himself; and there are few prominent scientists who have not frequently found the searcher unpleasantly detecting their errors.

Another office which occupies the time of scientific men, especially in the earlier stages of experimental research, is to sift the traditional doctrines of nature which were born in prescientific ages. Ancient and modern books, including the sacred writings of many nations, abound in theories which have been found false. Here science plays the part of iconoclast, confuting polytheism, Hinduism, Zoroasterism, Confucianism, Mohammedism, and the multitudes of speculations which mediævalism appended to Christianity. The Japanese student who learned so much science at his university as to make him an infidel, and who was afterward led by a book on Christian evidences to accept the religion of the Bible, is a typical instance; for modern science forces on us, as alternatives, either infidelity in some of its modifications or Christianity. It has also come to our aid by abolishing men's faith in necromancy, witchcraft, astrology, fortune-telling, the black art, and in healing by the royal touch; with many cognate delusions which kept mankind in terror, and which still dominate in semi-civilized nations. Medical practice is most largely indebted to science for its advance. The old system, with its jargon about ferments, and the association of sulphur, quicksilver, and salt, and its singular maxims (one of which, *similia similibus curantur*, is still inherited by a particular school), and its application of phlebotomy to nearly every case (to dead as well as living subjects), and its prescription of herbs, because of a fancied resemblance to diseases, was no better than the art of the Indian medicine-man. It was largely homicide in the name of science, as bad as judicial murder. Under improved methods the average duration of human life has been much extended within the last century in civilized countries.

The spirit of science in these matters has not been amiable; it has hurt many prejudices and made enemies. Nor is it strange if its destructive criticism should sometimes strike at the Bible. The usage of Scripture in accommodating itself (as we all necessarily do) to forms of expression, without regard to their original inaccuracy—as where love and knowledge are ascribed to the heart, emotions to the bowels, convictions to the reins or kidneys—and its liberal use of the usual figures and even extravagant metaphors of current language, make it an easy target for small critics. A good many
errors have been engrafted on it by commentators, as each man fancies he can discover his own speculations in its pages; and the modern commentators are sometimes as bad as the ancients. Kitto explains the survival of Jonah in the whale by the extraordinary principle that an animal stomach "has no power over substances endowed with vitality;" Dr. William Smith finds the curse of the serpent fulfilled by a fancied habit of serpents eating clay or ashes along with their food; and Whately's scheme of the tree of life rendering men immortal, and explaining antediluvian longevity by its physical power, has been adopted by some of our latest commentators. Commentators ought to know at least the rudiments of natural science.

The first chapter of Genesis has been a tempting field for this style of speculation. We there catch a glimpse into the unknown past, comparable to the more extended glimpse into the unknown future given by the seven seals of the Apocalypse. Both the seven days of creation and the seven seals of Revelation are a help to faith, as they indicate that all is from God, and all for God, that the world never was and never shall be a ship drifting about without helm or Governor. They have also in several important points received confirmation from without, the Mosaical record from Geology, and the Apocalyptic visions from History. But all attempts to furnish an expanded parallelism between Genesis and Geology on the one side, and between the seven seals and History on the other side, have proved unsuccessful. Perhaps we have not materials in the present state of our knowledge for the complete solution of these problems. This fact, however, has been a stimulus to men's inventive powers, and we have had schemes of forced conciliation, which are scarcely consistent with the reverence due to the Word of God, and are not conducive to piety. One man who held the dogma of spontaneous generation found it in the command that the seas should bring forth their monsters, and in the idea that Herod Antipas was destroyed by internal parasites (once supposed favorable, now deemed fatal, to the dogma). Those who believed in the transmutation of species, even so good an observer as Sir Thomas Brown (1641) assuring us that with his own eyes he saw a shell-fish barnacle turn into a barnacle-goose, found it in the transformation of a speaking quadruped into a hissing serpent that crawled on his belly. Less than a century ago the great authority of Cuvier placed before the world the dogma of the fixity of species, applying this to the many hundreds of thousands of species which have successively peopled the world during long geological ages. Without much inquiry the response of this French oracle was so completely en-
grafted on Scripture, that a shock was felt when it was assailed by the later speculations of Darwin. Once more, many of the friends and a few of the enemies of the Bible fancy they can find Darwin's Origin of species summarized in its exordium. Haeckel, though himself atheistical, is enthusiastic over the scientific genius of the old evolutionist Moses, and writes: "Although Moses looks on the results as the direct actions of a constructing creator, yet in his theory there lies hidden the ruling idea of a progressive development, and a differentiation of the originally simple matter. We can therefore bestow our just and sincere admiration on the Jewish law-giver's grand insight into nature, and his simple and natural hypothesis of creation, without discovering in it a so-called 'divine revelation'" (Creation, vol. i., p. 38, Appleton's translation). Romanes of the same school accentuates the harmony between Genesis and both Geology and Evolution; but neither of these authors suggests how it comes that Moses could anticipate by thousands of years the scientific views which have crowned the labors of our generation.

The Word of God is in no way responsible for the glosses which men may place on its statements; and science has rendered it a good service in clearing away an overgrowth of crudities. It is also sometimes cleared by the same instrumentality from charges of error; thus we were recently informed by religious writers that the Book of Proverbs is inaccurate in its account of the habits of ants, though several years ago Moggridge and our own McCook had confirmed its description. We have here a significant lesson in Scripture-evidence; a book produced among the ancient Jews, yet not partaking of the gross errors which abound in their other books, and in all other ancient books. There are many difficulties in Scripture which have not yet been elucidated, especially in those parts which we cannot test by contemporaneous records; but its references to natural phenomena are remarkably sober and truthful; and in this respect it is unique among ancient records.

This argument is re-enforced by reflecting on the influence of scientific speculation not merely on false views of religion, but on infidelity itself. The necessary policy of infidels is to be abreast of contemporary science, and to press into their service whatever branch of science is most popular. But science does not stand still, and the book which is up to the acquirements of to-day will soon be antiquated. Thus one phase of infidelity must give place to another. Not many years ago the favorite speculation favored a plurality of human species, the negro being regarded as not a brother of his white master. Darwinism gave this theory its quietus, and broached an opposite scheme, that man is scarcely worthy to be
called a distinct creature, being merely an offshoot of some of the catarrhine monkeys. Once more the scientific speculator started difficulties, alleging that even if we grant evolution for other beings, there are grave scientific objections to its extension to man; and Claus, himself a believer in evolution, says in our best book on zoology that the doctrine of man's evolution by natural selection is "only a deduction from the Darwinian theory." All attempts to find evidence for it have failed, and so far our science is in favor of the historical opinion that in man's creation there was something special. As to the world at large the article on "Geology" in the eighth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and that on "Cosmogony," in Chambers's *Encyclopaedia*, represent the world as probably without beginning or end, and as passing through an eternal round of cyclical changes. Later theories favor the notion that it is like a great clock that has been wound up (they know not how), that from a primeval nebula in unstable equilibrium it has been rapidly running down through the dissipation of energy, and will continue to run down to some unknown conclusion; and this view appears in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Nay more, even Scientific Infidelity is coming to amend its manners: it is not bold enough to say that there is no God, or that the world was not created out of nothing; but it trims itself in the presence of criticism, so as to go in the garb of monism, or pantheism, or agnosticism, doubting rather than denying the essentials of Christianity. Scientific research compels men to look behind what is seen and transitory, and to ask whether there may not be some higher and permanent existence of which these are the shadows.

When speculations broaden out into large generalizations they lose their susceptibility of verification, except by the aid of reasoning more or less remote from experience. Thus they drift from their scientific moorings, and become the playthings of fancy or of the personal animus of the author. Unless managed with rare ability such speculations are of small account within scientific circles. But they may gain an adventitious reputation among the laity; if of the apologetic kind, very poor productions may be received as valuable contributions to religion; if sceptical in tone, they may seem dangerous, and may excite prejudice against science, though in themselves they are not worth attention. It is necessary in such cases to draw a distinction between supposed errors in scientific deliverances and heresies in religion. The student of science is usually not conversant with theological questions, and cannot foresee all the inferences that you can draw from his opinions. Nor can you enact a scientific creed to limit his liberty of speculating.
Fidelity to revealed truth is essential to religion, and a religious creed is defensible; progress into the unknown is the aim of science, and the attempt to arrest its movements by a creed would be intolerable. Nor is it possible for any except scientific men to try cases of science; on the contrary, even among scientific men it is only the specialists in a particular department that can render a safe opinion. Errors here always reflect back on their authors.

The history of Darwinism is suggestive of the method to be avoided as well as of that to be followed. When the Origin of Species first appeared, every intelligent reader saw that it was crowded with unsolved problems; but notwithstanding these, it was recognized by the ablest men as a book of extraordinary scientific merit. I cannot pass sentence on the soundness of its main principle, but I know that it has reorganized science very much for the better. It at once gave easy solutions of perplexing problems, put classification on a new basis, and marshalled our disjointed knowledge into a consistent unity; and the lapse of time, while starting new objections against it, has fortified its claims as a working hypothesis that is fertile of new discoveries. Nor was it in any way opposed to religion, though some men, by putting atheism into their definition of evolution, are able to get it out again as part of the result. It was only an attempt to show Nature's (or God's) way of doing things.

There are two modes of dealing with a case of this kind. We may resist the new theory, and stake the authority of Scripture on its failure, and even reproach the masters of science because they will not surrender to our call. This course was adopted by some, and may be estimated from its fruit. "How comes it," asked a friend of ours of a biologist in one of the foremost universities of the Old World, "that nearly all the biologists of this place are sceptical?" "Because we were taught in school," was the reply, "that if Darwinism is right, then the Bible must be in error; and on coming to college, we found evidence that after all Darwinism is right, and we decided accordingly." The usual opinion among students in that place is that if a man aspires to be a biologist he cannot be a Christian. Infidelity took advantage of this juncture, both friends and enemies of the Bible agreeing that the success of evolution would be fatal to religion; and Christian young men were deterred from branches of science that portended ruin to their faith or exposed them to suspicion.

The other way of meeting the case is to acknowledge, so far as seems just, the merits of evolution, and the force of arguments in its favor, recognizing whatever weakness or objections may be charged
against it; to take advantage of the help that it can give us in our researches; to refrain from committing ourselves to or against it, till the way be clear; and above all to resolutely decline to place the authority of the Bible in either scale of an uncertainty. The scientific theory must be decided on its own merits, to be investigated by the usual ways; and the authority of the Word of God, which is guaranteed by its own evidence, does not appear to be greatly concerned with the fate of evolution.

G. MAGLOSKIE.

Princeton College.
III.

GIORDANO BRUNO.

NOTHING can be more saddening to one who wishes well for his kind than the conspicuous indifference and antagonism which man, in all time, has shown to truth, its seekers and preachers. Impatient Pilates, dismissing debate and justice with the cynical query "What is truth?" have been legion among men; and the sin of Jerusalem, which "killed the prophets, and stoned them that were sent unto her," has been repeated with such disheartening frequency in all lands and times, as to tempt one, in the presence of universal sword, and stake, and cross, to adopt Mr. Lowell's words following as a complete statement of the philosophy of history:—

"History's pages but record
One death grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the Word;
Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne."

Nor is it till history's atonements have been viewed, and we see the "scorn of one century develop into the doubt of succeeding days, the wisdom of yesterday, and the child's lesson of to-day," that we sympathize with conclusions more hopeful for truth's ultimate triumph, and gratefully accept Mr. Lowell's remaining lines as embodiment of the truer and more pleasing view:

"Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own."

Then we heartily subscribe both to the poetry and power of Signor Balbo's optimistic conception of History, "that science in which God Himself has not disdained to be a teacher,"* and, with a creed sanctioned as much by induction as by inspiration, *Magna est veritas et prevalebit*, confidently assert that time's process will ever indicate and vindicate the sacredness of truth and life.

To the formation of a faith so cheerful a study of the career and fate of Giordano Bruno will make valuable contribution.

---

*Quella scienza nella quale non isdegnò d'ottare Iddio stesso. Cesare Balbo: Pensieri della Storia d'Italia.
Two hundred and eighty-seven years ago the streets of Papal Rome were crowded with visitors from all quarters of the world. Clement VIII. was occupant of the chair of St. Peter, and had proclaimed observance of the Year of Jubilee, instituted three centuries before. Attracted by the liberal offer of a century's indulgence, three million loyal and enterprising Catholics, from all quarters of Christendom, undertook the expense of a journey to the Holy City, attesting by attendance and enthusiasm the power the Church yet wielded eight decades after Luther. To signalize the occasion special ceremonies were instituted in the Chiesa del Gesu, and conducted by the Pontiff in person, attended by a brilliant cohort of fifty cardinals. And, as if in direct evidence of the Church's undiminished power, and of her excommunicative attitude toward heresy, an object lesson, for many years in preparation, was given the multitude of visitors.

A recreant Dominican, weakened by nine years' imprisonment, is brought from his cell. Strong soldiers, in seeming ironical allusion to his weakness, guard him on all sides, and ecclesiastics, vested for a special occasion, accompany his dire convoy toward the Campo dei Fiori. Among the foreigners along the route it is whispered that Giordano Bruno, the heretic, who had sown poison in the world's intellectual capitals, is about to meet a merited fate.

Impelled by curiosity, many join the cruel cortège, and, anticipative of an appeal for mercy at the last moment, crowd as near as may be to the stake where the soldiery fasten the unresisting monk. But their expectation is disappointed; and the spectacle, designed by the Pontiff to intimidate the heretically inclined, becomes to some, mayhap, a stimulant toward loyalty to conviction, and to many, the birthplace of doubt. Bruno never falters: physical weakness is merged in moral strength; not a cry escapes him as fire consumes his quivering flesh; with thought centred on his convictions, he averts his face even from the proffered crucifix, and leaves the world with creed uncompromised by the surrender of a single article.

This was the first year of the seventeenth century, and one might have expected that Bruno's name, spoken by the returning pilgrims, would at once have gained wide celebrity and attention in Europe. But years passed away, and memory of the man and martyr seemed almost forgotten. His books became the 'black swans of literature;' thirty pounds sterling were paid for a single dialogue in England; and in the minds of many a luckless searcher for his works the belief was engendered that persecution extended even to his

* So Hallam; and Stringe in his Vita di Clemente VIII.
books. But retribution came with this century of rehabilitation. Schelling's christening one of his dialogues* with the name of the philosopher of Nola was a stimulus to the study of Bruno, and Hamann's vain inquiry, in three countries, for the dialogues *De la Causa* and *De l'Infinito*, started Wagner† on the search, resulting, in 1830, in publication of the Italian works. Four years later Grörer‡ issued a partial collection of the Latin works, and Bartholomess§ supplied a wide demand by publication, in 1848, of his two-volume work, giving erudite critical estimate of Bruno's system, and conjectural account of his life. The rise of the Venetians in revolt against Austrian rule in the same year provided material for a later biography, based on official, statistical sources. While Manin was President of the revived Venetian Republic, access was free to libraries closed during foreign domination. Cesare Foucard took the opportunity to copy in the archives of the *Savii sopra l'Ersia*, the original records of Bruno's imprisonment and trial, and upon these documents Signor Berti, the first countryman of Bruno to give him critical study, bases his masterly biography of 1868. The documents, strange to say, contain data for an account of Bruno's life more complete than we possess for that of any of his contemporaries, and mainly from his own lips.

Thus, in the process of two hundred and eighty-seven years, the personal evidence which condemned Bruno in the Inquisitorial court has become basis for his biography, and furnishes Berti with autobiographical excerpts ingenuous as true. A curious fulfilment, surely, of Bruno's own prophecy: "La morte in un secolo fa vivo in tutti gli altri!"

Nor did interest in Bruno die with publication of Signor Berti's first work.** Its favorable reception, on the contrary, warranted the issue, in 1880, of a brochure containing documentary evidence supplementary to that found in the appendix of the first work, and from the aggregate sources hereinbefore mentioned, and some others, not necessary to be detailed here, Brunnhofer†† prepared his book of

* Bruno: *oder üb. das göttl. u. nat. Princip der Dinge.*
†† *Opere Italiane.*
GIORDANO BRUNO.

1882—the third signal service and honor the German rage for rehabilitation has done Bruno's memory.

Nor had history yet fulfilled all her purpose toward Bruno. In his History of the Conflict between Science and Religion, written in 1873, Mr. Draper wrote with the mantle of true prophecy on his shoulders when, in speaking of Bruno's murder, he said: "Perhaps the day approaches when posterity will offer an expiation for this great ecclesiastical crime, and a statue of Bruno be unveiled under the dome of St. Peter's."* Three years before these words were penned, Victor Emmanuel entered Rome, and, by the plebiscite of October 2d, 1870, the city abolished the rule of the Pope within her walls. To the events leading up to this crowning achievement of the Italian War of Independence Bruno's name is not without a nexus. It was before his monument in Naples,* that the students of the University, in 1865, burned that encyclical letter of the Pope, with the syllabus condemnatory of eighty specific so-called "errors in religion, philosophy, and politics," which made revolting Italians whet their swords still sharper, and gave increased vim, and ultimate victory, to their protest against secular ecclesiasticism. Exultant in the success of intervening years, it thus became the ambition of free Italians to honor Bruno in Rome herself, the city of his martyrdom.

On a building in the Via Quirinale, where, sixteen years ago, a poster could not have been placed without preliminary inspection by a Papal officer, there was affixed till recently a flaming advertisement calling for subscriptions to the Bruno Monument Fund. In historical justice to Bruno's connection with countries other than his own, by the pilgrimages he made, and the influences of the philosophy he formulated, there were many foreigners on the committee having the fund in charge, and, on the 17th February last, thanks to generous responses to the call for subscriptions, Draper's prophecy was, in spirit at least, most wonderfully fulfilled, by the erection of a monument to Bruno on the day of his death, and the scene of his sufferings.†

The shaft over the spot of Bruno's martyrdom is a monument to many things: to justice done him personally; to the progress of Italian freedom; but it will not fulfil its whole purpose if, beneath

† "More than $6000 has already been raised for a monument to Giordano Bruno, and it is expected that the structure will be dedicated on February 17th next, the anniversary of his death. It will stand in the Campo dei Fiori, on the very spot of his martyrdom." New York Tribune, February, 1886.

A later issue of the same paper announced the completion of arrangements.
the inscriptions on its face, we fail to read the double truth of all history, that

"The thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."

and that, while

"The mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small."

Bruno's life was so largely a protest, his dialogues are so largely satire, his philosophy so much more controversial than constructive, that a review of the Italy of his day must precede the account of his career and creed.

The modern world, birthed by the capture of Constantinople by the Mohammedans, was almost a century old when Bruno was born in 1548. The Greek teachers, with tenets so alien to the faith of the prophet, fled westward, to find in Rome a city of refuge and in Nicholas V. an enthusiastic Mæcenas. The encouragement in high place thus given the Humanists, induced the addition of Greek to their curriculum, and in a short time Pontiff, prince and professor, were mutually emulative in study of the ancient classics. The power of quotation became the aim and fame of the literary and philosophic man; and agreement with the utterances of the past the touchstone of truth. Not even the discovery, by Columbus, of a new continent on the earth, with its immediate corollary so fatal to the physical conceptions of the time, nor the bolder announcement, by Copernicus, of great archipelagoes of existence in the heavens, could disturb the tendency of the day. America's existence, so far as favorable to increase of Papal revenue, was at once recognized, but cosmological inferences, fatal to Ptolemaism and prevalent philosophy, were scorned and scourged as apocryphal and heretical. With the teachings and traditions of the Church the philosophy and literature of Paganism gained parity of authority, and the mental map of the prominent and powerful continued to contain only "the world as known to the ancients."

Of the new St. Peter's, which Nicholas V. had begun, the gods of Greece and Rome took unchallenged possession, and made it a Pantheon, thoroughly Pagan in influence and endeavor. To the ears of many of the popes "Jupiter sounded better than Jehovah in their sermons;" the Christ of Art was Apollo, and the Virgin, Minerva.*

Meantime the vices of old Rome were imitated as successfully, if not as avowedly, as the roll of Ciceronian periods, and history repeated in many of the popes the combined cruelty and lust of Nero. Sixtus IV. anticipatively sanctioned murder committed in

the very midst of the holiest offices of the Church, and personally approved the intoning of the Incarnatus as signal for the sacrilege and crime.* Alexander VI. kept within the Vatican a harem which even the contemporary Sultan might have envied, and delighted a soul in which pity and purity were alike unknown, by adding murder and massacre to lust.† Leo X., generous patron of learning as he was, was yet an atheist in creed, and a diseased libertine in life. Adrian VI., who succeeded in 1522, possessed the learning requisite for election to the succession, but lacking the levity and lust indispensable to popularize his primacy, Rome, disgusted with his Puritanism, rejoiced that he died within a year.‡ Thus, while observant and reasoning men, such as Machiavelli, criticised the Papacy, declaring, in words like those of his diary, that, "In proportion as we approach nearer to the Roman Church, do we find less piety prevail among the nations," most Italians failed to notice "the irreconcilable incongruity between the popes' profession of the primacy of Christianity, and their easy Epicurean philosophy."§ If they noticed it, and were prudent, they were silent, like Machiavelli; if they noticed it and voiced their criticisms, they met the fate of Savonarola and of Bruno.

But coupled with the pedantry, the idolatry of antiquity, and aversion to research of this age, and associated with its incestuous conduct, was a zeal for creed and dogma with which Bruno was to come into more direct contact and conflict. Alexander VI., dead as he was to the spirit and interest of Christianity, "never flinched in formal orthodoxy, and the measures which he took for riveting the chains of superstition upon the people were calculated with the military firmness of a Napoleon."‖ It was he who established censorship of the press, and he but represented in this the deliberate policy of the Church, which at this time systematically anathematized every extender of man's horizon of thought. Eight years before Bruno's birth, the Order of Jesuits, with its peculiar mode of commending the tenets of the Church, was sanctioned by Paul III., in hope the new order might prop up the tottering authority of the Vatican. The Inquisition's operations, during the same Primacy, were extended to new areas; and, as if in unhallowed preparation and prophecy of Bruno's fate at its hands, Naples received this ecclesiastical Star Chamber, not without protest, but a year before his birth. But further measures seemed necessary to check the contagion of Protestantism, and, in 1559, when Bruno was but eleven

---

years old, and just entering upon his studies in Naples, the Council of Trent confirmed the *Index Expurgatorius*, supplying basis for the charge of reading prohibited literature later to be laid against the young monk.

Bruno's life, therefore, marks the contest between the faith of antiquity and scholasticism, of which Aristotle and Aquinas were standards, and the nascent faith of the newer world, of which Cusa and Copernicus were philosopher and founder.

Here, accordingly, we begin an outline of Bruno's life, will trace his attitude toward his age, review his system, and estimate his claims to gratitude and greatness as an advancer and anticipator of modern thought.

Filippo Bruno was born in 1548, at Nola, a city of Campania, distant about twenty miles from Naples. In imperial days the city had shared with Pompeii the prestige of Rome's holiday patronage; and it was the soft air of Nola that both Octavius and Augustus breathed in their last years. If Pompeii was the Nice, Nola was the Mentone of the Empire. Throughout the Middle Ages aristocratic memories clung about the city, and the recent name and fame of two eminent sons, Albertino Gentile, the jurist, and Merliano, "the Neapolitan Michael Angelo," made Nolan birthright, in Bruno's day, a heritage still prouder. Ambrogio Leone, the historiographer of the place, exhausts all the Italian diminutives of endearment and augmentatives of admiration in description of its clime, its history and society; and the late monograph on Bruno,* by Mariano, is little but a prose poem celebrative of the beauty of the region, with Bruno's growing name attached as advertisement.

From Bruno's own satire upon British boorishness, we know it was his lot to move among a society characterized by all the urbanity and elegance native to Nola; and it was this early association, and companionships as eclectic, mayhap, as that of his father for the poet Tansillo, that made the persecuted Dominican, in later years, a gentleman welcome in the courtly society of France and England.

An influence not less potent in the moulding of his mind was the natural beauty of the region. For him, so much of whose time was to be passed in learning, as a pilgrim, from sunrise and light, and sunset and night, and whose task it was, as the Wordsworth of his day, to call pedants from their dusty tomes into the study roofed by God's sky, there was infinite suggestion in that soft Italian South, where "God has driven every cloud from the sky, and all dissonance from the language," and sonnet and song are spontaneities of clime.

* Raffaele Mariano: *Giordano Bruno, la Vita e l'Uomo.* Roma, 1881.
Before Bruno's day, as Mr. Symonds so eloquently says, "Man had lived enveloped in a cowl. He had not seen the beauty of the world, or had seen it only to turn aside and cross himself and pray. Like St. Bernard travelling along the shores of Lake Leman, and noticing neither the azure of the waters, nor the luxuriance of the vines, nor the radiance of the mountains with their robe of sun and snow, but bending a thought-burdened forehead over the neck of his mule—even like this monk, humanity had passed along the highways of the world and had not known that they were sight-worthy, or that life is a blessing."* It was to be the great service of Bruno so repeatedly to reiterate his sympathy with the Psalmist's words: "Thou Lord, hast made me glad through thy works. I will triumph in the works of thy hands," as to call men forth to imbibe the "optimism of the breathing air," and that the neighborhood of Nola had much to do in inspiring this endeavor, his works and words admit no question. Nola is both standard of comparison and synonym of perfection to him: "Nolan," he christens his philosophy; London contents him because "kindness makes it Nola to him," and Nola, gradito dal cielo, e posta insieme talvolta capo e destra di questo globo, governatrice e sommitrice de l'altre generazioni, is, in his own grateful apostrophe, Maestra e madre di tutte le virtudi, discipline ed umanitadi.

With influences of Nola, those of Naples began to be joined when the boy was but eleven years old. Two teachers, one of them an Augustinian, gave him instruction in the customary curriculum,† and it was the influence of this Augustinian, Teofilo da Varrano, a metaphysician of renown in his day, which decided Bruno's bent toward metaphysical studies, and induced him to attend the public lectures of the University in that department. Mr. Lewes is undoubtedly wrong in his explanation of the next step of Bruno's life—entrance into the monastery of San Domenico—as a check purposely imposed on his ardent and already doubting disposition. It assumes a possession of prudence and knowledge impossible in a boy of sixteen; and Bruno has not left us without indication that he entered upon his novitiate with attitude thoroughly orthodox toward the philosophies and faiths of the day; and that, if his mind was pregnant with doubt, the doubts were birthed, at least, in San Domenico. He chose the Church because he was a believer, and

---

† Languages, dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, music, logic, poetry, astrology, physics, metaphysics, and ethics.
‡ History of Philosophy. Vol. ii. p. 92, "allured by the contrast monastic life offered to his own character."
study a delight; he chose San Domenico because philosophy was his passion, and the memory of Thomas Aquinas beckoned him to cloisters wherein the footsteps of the great schoolman had been wont to echo.

But if Bruno began his novitiate as an orthodox Catholic and schoolman, it was not long ere he developed doubts. In three years he gave evidence of kinship sympathetic with Thomas Didymus rather than with Thomas Aquinas. At eighteen a process was ordered against him, and avoided only through the leniency of his superior. The heresy consisted of advice to a young brother to read the "Fathers," rather than the "Seven Joys of the Virgin," and of disrespect shown some images of the saints. The doubter, who was in his last days to reject even the last and dearest symbol, the crucifix, had already taken his first steps toward beliefs alien and antagonistic to the Christian creed.

The process against Bruno, abandoned though it had been, exposed him to suspicion, and forced him, in the remaining years of his cloister life, to study in secrecy. He was not yet ready openly to attack Aristotle, "the Goliath of the age," and while we must not think of him as gaining support with absolute hypocrisy through the seven years of his monastic life, he certainly was indulging the freedom of a truth-seeker, in perusal of books condemned in the Index Expurgatorius. The quotations and references in Bruno's books betray an omnivorous reader. He did not neglect the Scriptures, but the imagination and audacity of his exegesis recall Rénan and Tolstoi rather than Augustine or Origen. Citations from the Fathers, from Parmenides, Plato, Aristotle, the Neo-Platonists, Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, Cardano, evidence acquaintance with a wide exegetic and philosophic literature.

Among the classic poets, Virgil, as a Pythagorean, was his favorite: Tansillo, as a Protestant in belief and a Copernican in science, among the modern. He had knowledge also of Arabic and Persian lore, mediated, probably, through Alexandria.

But there is a trio of thinkers as yet unmentioned to whom Bruno was under special obligations, and of whom mention must now be made. They are the three who, in his own estimate, left him largest legacies of truth, and if he cites most of the writers above enumerated, with criticism as main purpose, he mentions Raymondus Lullus, the Cardinal Cusa, and Copernicus of Thorn, only to commend them, and record his gratitude.

The life of Lullus is a romance which tempts the pen, but it must suffice here merely to outline his career and mention the nature of Bruno's indebtedness to him. Repentance for a youth as dissipated
as Augustine's was the inspiration of his mission. Reclaimed by the purity of his Majorcan home life, he left his family and all, to prepare, on the solitary top of Monte Randa, for the conversion of the infidel to Christianity. His untutored acquisition of Arabic and Latin was marvellous almost as the gift of tongues. Leaving his hermit hut he passed to Paris, and published his book, the Magna Ars, an arbitrary mnemonic for the unification and acquisition of knowledge, inspired by the design and hope of converting Islam to Christianity. From Paris, impelled by a voice within, he went, through many perils, to Tunis, and there personally strove to confute the followers of the prophet. Forced to flee thence for his life, he returned to Europe, and found followers in Naples, ere passing through France, Spain, and Italy, to establish, in rapid pilgrimages, schools for instruction in his great art. Returned to the soil of Islam, he continued to confute, with tongue and pen, the Mohammedan infidel, sending books to Europe for publication meanwhile, and preaching with enthusiasm amid privations and persecutions the most extreme, till, at eighty years of age, he reached Majorca in 1315, and died in intense agony from maltreatment at the hands of the Mohammedans of Tunis.

It was the fate of the imaginative Art of Lullus to be appropriated by both infidel and faithful after his death, and to incur at last the opprobrium and excommunication of the Church, which had primarily protected it. Its alchemistic ingredients attracted mystical minds, such as Paracelsus; its missionary inspiration continued its popularity among Church teachers, such as Domenico da Siena. With the logic of Ramus its dialectic secured equal favor, till the enthusiasm of its disciples elevated it to rank superior even to the mysteries of faith, and a Giunta of twenty masters recommended Gregory XI. to prohibit it.* The Council of Trent, in 1563, the first year of Bruno's novitiate, confirmed this decision, and perhaps stimulated the doubting Dominican to pry into its prohibited pages.

Bruno almost exhausts the superlatives in speaking of the "Art" of Lullus; and the adulation is so honest that Berti ascribes much of the turgidity and extravagance of his Latin style to familiarity with so faulty a model.

This, then, was one of the trio to whom Bruno gave hearty attention, and that his admiration was limitless, his imitations and appropriations of the Lullic system would leave no doubt, had we not the

* "Doctrina Raymundi Lulli excellit omnium aliorum doctrinam in bonitate et veritate etiam Augustini. Theologi nostri temporis nihil sciant de vera theologia." From the Directorium Inquisitionis.
phrase by which he characterizes Lullus in one of his books, *divinus certe genius rudi incultoque insinuavit eremita*.

While Bruno derived his dialectic from Lullus, he gained his metaphysic from the Cardinal Cusa—the fisherman from the Moselle—who received investiture with every honor of the Church, save the supreme tiara. Community of method in linking metaphysics and mathematics makes Cusa an anticipator of Bruno, as was Bruno of Leibniz. Bruno, therefore, in gratitude acknowledges indebtedness to him for ideas more fully developed by the third teacher he canonizes—Copernicus, the seer of Thorn.

Copernicus published his book but five years before Bruno's birth, and its ideas, mayhap, were a subject of conversation in the boy's home. But Bruno was slow to desert the traditional beliefs, and a passage from *La Cena de le Ceneri*, giving the history of his attitude to the new science, may be here inserted: "Years ago," he says, "I held Copernicanism simply true; when younger and less instructed I regarded it as probable; when I was but a novice in speculative affairs, I held it as so thoroughly false, as to wonder that Aristotle had not only deigned to make mention of it, but devoted more than half of his work on the heavens and earth to demonstrate that the earth does not move." *

The faith so slowly reached, however, Bruno held with unflinching tenacity, nor is there anything of the timid humility with which Copernicus introduced his system to Paul III., in the Brunonian apologetic for the new astronomy. Copernicus apologized for Ptolemy's errors by suggesting "the heavens had, mayhap, changed since his day;" Bruno impeaches the sanity of Peripatetics and Ptolemaists. Copernicus is the new Columbus who has shown there is no *Ultima Thule* to existence. While Bruno is thus grateful to Copernicus, however, he does not hesitate to criticise him for attention to mathematics to the exclusion of metaphysics, and the criticism may be taken as prophecy of the character of the Brunonian system. It will be a philosophic system founded on the new science, and in conflict, therefore, with Ptolemaism and Peripateticism. The metaphysical conceits of Cusa will be joined with the mathematical conclusions of Copernicus; and in much of the phraseology, as already intimated, influences of the Lullic dialect may be anticipated. In the scientific elements of the system, Bruno's imagination will leap where the mathematics of Copernicus were lame to carry him, and the universe will be widened.

Nor is it difficult to anticipate, to return now to Bruno's monastic

---
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life, that the Dominican, secretly studying prohibited Lullus, and science and philosophy in arms against the Church creed, will soon come to open rupture with his superiors. The expectation receives instant justification.

Bruno gained his full orders in 1572.* In San Bartolomeo, near Naples, he chanted mass in the same year; and, after a tour among neighboring monasteries, returned to San Domenico. He was now a confirmed doubter, nor could he longer restrain open avowal of his sentiments. In 1576 process was again instituted against him, and the distance he had gone from traditional landmarks may be estimated by the extent of the impeaching indictment, containing one hundred and thirty charges. Truth is, Bruno had already, in all probability, justified the charge made against him in the letter of Scioppius,† that there was no heresy, either of ancient or modern times, with which he had not expressed sympathy. Between him, a Copernican, and his Ptolemaic accusers, there was difference, wide as the universe, in science; between them, Schoolmen in philosophy, and him, a rationalist, there was no premiss for agreement; between them, blindly obedient to existent authority in religion, and himself, already inimical to all positive religions, there could be only war. Bruno himself openly declared the war by defence of Arianism, and when to this charge a formidable file of kindred heresies was added, he fled.‡

This was in 1576. Gregory XIII., the reformer of the calendar, was then pope; and from his professed interest in science Bruno hoped for something, and turned his fugitive footsteps toward Rome. But report of his heresies came from Naples; a new indictment was drawn up, and, warned by the fate of Carranza,§ Bruno fled again, and reached Genoa by sea. He now abandoned the Dominican habit, and reassumed his baptismal name of Filippo, exchanged for Giordano when he entered the priesthood.

Genoa offering no means of support, he removed to Noli, where persecuted Dante, three centuries before, had received hospitality;

* The following is the chronological order of Bruno’s cloister life: 1563, Vesture; 1564, Profession; 1569, Sub-diaconate; 1570, Diaconate; 1572, Priesthood.
† See infra.
‡ There was animus against the Schoolmen in the method of Bruno’s defence. His prosecutor called the Arians “ignorant” because they did not employ scholastic phrases: Bruno replied that though they did not they conveyed their ideas quite as clearly.
§ Formerly one of the most conservative Catholics in the Council of Trent and archbishop of Toledo, but from 1565 to 1576 a prisoner in the castle of St. Angelo. Prosecuted by the Inquisition, he was forced to abjure, and died, May, 1576, in St. Maria Minerva.
and there Bruno for five months taught grammar to a class of boys, and lectured on "the sphere" to some young men of the place. Thence he wandered through Savona to Turin; and Bertti draws an effective contrast between his life-path and that of Tasso, present in Turin at the same time: "Tasso, a Christian, and cantor of the cross; Bruno, averse to every religious symbol. The former, weary and worn by the world, finishes his days in conventual quiet; the latter commences in the convent, and dies at the stake with eyes averted from the crucifix."

From Turin, impelled by poverty, he moved on to Venice, and, with a view to self-support, published a book on the "Signs of the Times," after submitting it to inspection by a brother of his former order. If the book exists, it is now, with many other of Bruno's works, in the archives of the Vatican, and access to them has not yet been accorded. The money from this publication exhausted, Bruno again travelled in search of sustenance; and, in October, 1576, after short halts at Padua, Brescia, Milan, and Turin, while the pestilence was decimating Italy, took the mountain pass of Mont Cénis and reached Geneva. Calvin was twelve years dead, but the ecclesiastical republic he had founded was strictly and sympathetically administered by Galeazzo Carraciolo;* and Bruno was forced to divest himself of the Dominican habit, reassumed on advice of some liberal members of his order for purposes of travel. By economy and with charity, however, he managed to manufacture a fittingly sober outfit, and for two months and a half worked as a proof-reader in Geneva.

But Bruno was as little Calvinistic as Catholic; nor could he long remain in the city without being questioned concerning his creed. With the premises of the philosophy to which he was already committed, however, the choice of this earth as elect planet of the universe for display of the divine perfections could have no reconciliation. Insistence upon faith as the condition of salvation, and with seeming exclusion of good works, was as repugnant to him as a cosmological Calvinism, for Bruno's criticism and criterion of religions already proportioned their worth to their ethical incentive and effect. The "reformed" religion he, therefore, called "deformed," scorned all proselytizing overtures, and in 1577 left Geneva for Lyons.

Here he hoped for employment in the printing-houses where

---

* One of the most remarkable of the Reformers, by birth Marquis of Vico, and a relative of Paul III. A sermon by Pietro Martire Vermigli, on the Pauline doctrine of justification, converted him to enthusiastic Protestantism. He voluntarily disinherited himself, left Italy, and refused even his father's solicitations to return.
Henry Stephens and Servetus had worked in the capacity of proof-readers. But no employment offered, and Bruno bent his steps toward Toulouse, the second university of France. Ten thousand students were there; and, under a regency which had admitted the agnostic Sanchez to lecture it was not difficult for Bruno to gain a hearing.* In two months a chair was vacated, and Bruno was successful enough to exchange the Master of Arts degree, taken on entrance, for that of Doctor, and to secure the position. For two years, therefore, he lectured here on the *De Anima* of Aristotle, the theme of the age, imposing on himself, however, certain debating limitations lest he should too openly provoke the authorities,† Vanini's fate, a few decades later, warranted this caution.‡

In 1579 he removed to Paris and utilized the privilege of his doctorial degree by teaching in the Sorbonne. Here he took as theme "thirty divine attributes," selected from the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas,§ and was soon made extraordinary professor by King Henry III., whose favor he further acquired by a book on the Lullic Art, dedicated with extravagant servility.‖ An ordinary professorship offered him he refused, as it entailed the celebration of mass. The refusal is not less creditable to his courage than to his convictions, for St. Bartholomew was but seven years back, and the cry "*La messe ou la mort!*" had but lately ceased to echo through the streets.

It was with Bruno's arrival in Paris that his publications of importance began.¶ The *De Umbris Idearum*, already referred to, is mingled Neo-Platonism and Lullism; but we defer reference to the passages indicative of Bruno's creed to a later period of this paper. Two other Lullic books ** followed. The *Il Candelai*, "a comedy by Bruno the Nolan, academician of no academy," published in 1582, is a dramatic satire upon Bruno's age. Astrology and avarice are strongly satirized in the persons of Bartolomeo and Bonifacio; but it is upon Manfurio, the pedant, that the whole weight of Bruno's
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* The era was a sceptical one in France. Montaigne was yet living, and was visiting Tasso as Bruno was leaving Italy.
† *Conditiones disputatorius*, from Lullus.
‡ Julius Caesar Vanini, Neapolitan, burned, 1619, at Toulouse, for atheism.
§ It is curious to note that the new edition of Thomas Aquinas, issued by the Papal press, has kept pace with the progress of the Bruno Monument Fund.
‖ "Excellent luminary of the people, reflected through pre-eminence of mind and loftiness of genius most renowned!"
¶ The Lullic books all claim the attention of an esoteric circle. The *De Umbris* has the dedicatory caveat: *Umbra profunda sumus, ne vos vexetis, inepti. Non vos sed doctos tam grande quarit opus.*
** *Cantus Circaus*, and *De Compendiosa Architectura et Complemento Artis Lulli*. 
invective and sarcasm is expended. Here, as in his philosophic dia-
logues, Bruno is merciless on the "prolegomenists, glossers, com-
posers of books deserving well of the republic, constructors, adden-
dists, methodicians, scholiasts, translators, interpreters, compendi-
arists, new dialecticians, appeasers with a new grammar, a lexicon,
a varia lectio, approvers of authors, an authentic approved—with
epigrams Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, prefixed to their books,
wherefore this one and that one are alike consecrated to immortality
as benefactors of this and future centuries—unfortunate centuries
thus obliged to dedicate them statues and colossi in the Medi-
terranean seas, in the ocean, and other uninhabitable places." *

In passages such as this Bruno pours out the Italian Billingsgate
on the pedantry of the time, and declares himself enemy of the
worship of antiquity at the expense of the present. That he re-
garded pedantry as the greatest vice of the day, the retention of
Manfurio, under other names,† throughout all his dialogues, abun-
dantly proves. If the marquis was the "plastron of Molière," the
pedant was the plastron of Bruno.‡ The comedy gives insight also
into Bruno's familiarity with the religious insincerity of the time.
Here his sarcasm borders on blasphemy, and the obscenity of the
whole plot, which turns on adultery, was possible only to mediaæval
Italian comedy.§ It was the day of the prostitution of literature to
such infernal purposes as Leonardo Bruni's "Hermaphrodite," and
we need not marvel, perhaps, that a page of Bruno's play could not
be presented in these times till its phrasology was wholesomely
fumigated. Happily, however, between Bruno as a dramatist and
Bruno as a philosopher, there is divergence as wide as between the
Shakespeare of "Venus and Adonis" and the Shakespeare of
"Hamlet." Yet even many of Bruno's philosophic dialogues would
need expurgation ere they could be placed in tender hands; and
Berti's assertion is well founded that, "In all the philosophic works
the writer of comedy is present, as the author of the philosophic
works is present in the comedy."

† E.g. as Prudenzio in La Cena de le Ceneri; as Polinnio in De la Causa; as Fracas-
toro in De l'Infinito. And the Cabala del Cavallo Pegaseo is a tremendous satire upon
classicism.
‡ Démogot, Histoire de la littérature Française, p. 422.
§ The astrologist, e.g., manufactures a pulvis Christi and sells it at an enormous profit.
He thus speaks of money, A chi manca il danno, manca la vita istessa. Questo da la vita
temporale e l'eterna ancora, etc. Sanguino says of one of the rogues un scelerato come
costi sarrebbe predicatore se avesse studiato. Scaramore defends prostitution on
Church grounds. Ascanio suggests annual absolution. When we recall that the comedy
was partly written in Bruno's cloister days its familiarity with sexual vice is suggestive.
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We now pass to Bruno's connection with England. He lived for over two years in London as the guest of Signor Castelnuovo, ambassador of France. This was almost the only time in Bruno's life wherein there was leisure to formulate his system. His polemic pilgrimages from land to land largely disturbed constructive labor. In the vicissitudes of precarious boarding life, he was liable to relapse into Lullism. The London visit was his freest and clearest period. Contact with refined society in Castelnuovo's home was no doubt of great service to him. Sir Philip Sydney and Fulke Greville were his intimate friends, and before the execution of Mary Queen of Scots disturbed the amity existent between France and England,* he saw something, too, of the court of Elizabeth. Had he understood English he might have met yet more leaders, but with the accomplished Sydney, studious as Spenser of Italian literature, he needed only his native tongue; and the playwright Shakespeare, working his way upward while Bruno was in London,† had not yet made the acquirement of our language a literary aim. Bacon, too, was just beginning his marvellous career.

Though Bruno's host was a zealous Catholic, his guest was allowed plenary option to attend or neglect the domestic mass, and the option is eloquent both of Bruno's character and of Castelnuovo's liberality. Castelnuovo resolved religion into the two constituents of "humility and simplicity," and seems to have been averse to "fixing the faith of ages with a show of hands."

Bruno had two controversies on his English visit. One was at Oxford. Immediately after reaching England he had directed a Lullic book‡ to the Chancellor of the University, and, with application for permission to lecture, grandiloquently announced himself "the awakener of the dormant, and conqueror of presumptuous ignorance, who is neither Italian nor British, male nor female, bishop nor prince, professor nor day laborer, monk nor layman, but a citizen and resident of the world, child of father sun and mother earth." Bruno gained admission, however, and passed into halls where a five-shillings fine was imposed for every whisper against Aristotle,§ to lecture on the "immortality of the soul," and "the quintuple sphere."

That the ideas advanced here were anticipative of Darwin, we shall see when we come to review the books of the period. There could not but be conflict, and when the Polish Prince, Alberto di Alasco, came to visit England, the contest reached its climax. In

* Castelnuovo was an ardent sympathizer with the unfortunate queen. She was godmother of his daughter Marie de Castelnuovo.
† 1584. ‡ Explicatio triginta Sigillorum, etc. § Lewes, Hist. of Phil., p. 93.
the intellectual combats instituted in honor of the Prince, Bruno threw down the gauntlet in defence of Copernicus, and fifteen times, he tells us, brought his opponent to the dust. This astronomical debate was resumed in London at the house of Fulke Greville, and here again Bruno claims to have silenced his adversary.

But we must now hastily outline the remainder of Bruno's life and return to review the books* of the London period, which chronicle the statements of belief he advanced both at Oxford and at Fulke Greville's table.

Castelnuovo quitted London in 1585, and Bruno with him. Conscious of the power acquired in his English sojourn, he again rushed into the lists of controversy in Paris. The later confessor of Ravillac the regicide was then University regent, and to him Bruno directed one hundred and twenty theses against Aristotle. His friend Hennequin undertook a defence of his position, and attracted great attention by the rhetorical glow of his presentation of the new astronomical metaphysic. On this Parisian visit Bruno applied for readmission to orders, and the fact reads strangely. It means, however, not that he was Catholic in creed at this time—phrases of the Spaccio destroy this theory—but that there was a languid desire within him to replace, by the quiet of conventual life, the freedom from care he had known in the London home. And while Catholicism had ceased to have evidential value for him, it had ethical recommendations reconciling it with his theory of religion. The application was, however, refused.

Girding himself anew, therefore, and summoning courage by the motto of his hardships: "Ne malis cede, sed contra audentior ito!" he passed into Germany, and asked a hearing at Marburg. The request was discourteously refused, and Bruno was aroused sufficiently to make wrathful comment and reply.

In Lutheran Wittenberg more hospitable treatment awaited him, and for two years he lectured there with full liberty.† But, with prospect of the Calvinistic rule of Christian I. of Saxony, Bruno feared interference, and voluntarily resigned his chair. In a eulogistic adieu he called Wittenberg the "Athens of Germany," and Luther the "Hercules of reformers."

Bruno now went to Prague, a Catholic city, and conciliated the

* These are: La Cena de le Ceneri; De la Causa Principio ed Uno; De l'Infinito; Universo e Mondi. Dedicated to Castelnuovo. Spaccio de la Bestia Triomfante, Cabala del Cavallo Pegaseo; Degli Eroiti Furori. Dedicated to Sir Philip Sydney.
‡ Wittenberg books: De Lampade combinatoria; De Lampade venatoria; Adversus Aristotelicos.
favor of Rudolph II., who was addicted to alchemistic and astrological study, by two Lullic books. To these, with a view to self-support, he soon added a long thesis* against the mathematicians and philosophers, and Rudolph rewarded the issue with a handsome honorarium.

No opportunity for teaching offering, he next removed to Helmstadt, and took advantage of the death of the duke to pronounce an extempore oration, and secure favor, and a liberal fee, from his successor.† On this he lived for some time, but the local pastor rose in church within two months after his arrival, and placed him under such ecclesiastical bann that he was forced to leave.

To Frankfort, centre of the book trade of Germany, he now bent his way, with publication in view. Arrived there he found lodging in a convent, and issued two books with dedications appreciative of the Duke of Helmstadt’s kindness.‡

Bruno’s Frankfort residence of six months was characterized by such literary activity as to link it with London in the history of his constructive work. In London all the Italian books (stamped with the Venetian seal to increase their sale) were published; Frankfort’s presses printed the most important Latin works. The intellectual commerce of Bruno with the frequenters of Frankfort’s book-fairs now hastened the tragedy of his life.

In 1591, Ciotto, a Venetian bookseller, came to Frankfort with a commission to engage, if possible, a certain Bruno of Nola, to teach a young Venetian noble, Giovanni Mocenigo by name, the principles of the Lullic art. Lullism had already impaired Bruno’s literary style; it was now to be responsible for the loss of his life. Bruno accepted the invitation, and reached Venice and his native land after five Wanderjahre as a knight-errant of truth participant in the tourneys of Geneva, Toulouse, Paris, London, Oxford, Marburg, Wittenberg, Prague, Helmstadt, and Frankfort. Arrived in Venice he at once began work with his pupil, moved freely in the literary and philosophic circles of “the city of the sea,” and, in the neighboring Paduan University, supplemented his income by delivery of a few lectures. Unfortunately, however, it was as little Bruno’s nature to conceal his sentiments now as in Neapolitan days. The timid and truthless Mocenigo, under control of his confessor, charged Bruno with falsity in fulfilling his tutorial contract, demanding that

---

* Centum et sexaginta articuli adversus hujus tempestatis mathematicos atque philosophas. 1588.
† Oratio consolatoria. 1589.
‡ De triplici minimo et mensura; De monade, numero, et figura, liber consequens quinque de minimo, etc. 1591-98.
he be instructed in all his teacher knew. Bruno replied he had not come to impart his whole system, but merely his mnemonic art. Mocenigo again demanded information in all that Bruno knew and believed. Bruno refused to comply, except on the basis of a new contract, and ere he was aware of any hostile intent, was seized at Mocenigo's direction, robbed of his books and pamphlets, and sent to the dungeons of the Piombi as a suspect of the Inquisition.

This was in 1572, six years before Galileo began lecturing in the Padua Bruno had left. The process, with Mocenigo as complainant and prosecutor, was speedily ordered and begun, and its outset was marked by an appeal for mercy on the part of the prisoner. When interrogated, however, concerning the truth of the charges made against him, he assumed the defensive, summed up as a statement of his creed the scattered teachings and tenets of his books, and refused surrender of the principles of his philosophy, even while knowing this would entail the loss of his life.

After a year's imprisonment in the Piombi, frequent renewals and adjournments of the trial, and as frequent assertions on the part of the prisoner that he had stated his whole creed, Rome demanded his extradition. Venice seemed anxious to comply with the request, but the *jus gentium* was sacred and severe, and it was some time ere an adequate excuse for the outrage upon justice could be invented. It was only when Rome demanded Bruno as a prisoner against whom were still pending proceedings instituted in Naples and Rome seven years before, that Venice consented to the extradition, "in evidence of the readiness of the Republic to justify the Holy See." *

Bruno now passed into the hands of the San Severina, who, in his diary, characterizes the day of St. Bartholomew as "the merry day of Catholicism," and in the hands of this ecclesiastical butcher it is not hard to predict Bruno's fate. Seven years passed, however, (1593–1600) ere sentence was read and recorded against Bruno, and that, during all this time, he refused to surrender or compromise his creed, alike when threatened and when cajoled, is evidence not the least satisfactory of the strength of his soul. In all these years he persistently pointed to his books as record of his mature and enduring belief, and the time is opportune for us to open them, as well to gather his creed for ourselves as to gain materials for inductive prophecy of his fate.

The books from which an outline of Bruno's system shall be taken are mainly those already mentioned, but they may be re-enumerated and recalled here.

* Come segno della continuata promessa della Repubblica a farle cosa grata.*
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1. Scientific and metaphysical works: *La Cena de le Ceneri; De la Causa, Principio, ed Uno; De l'Infinito, Universo, e Mondi.* These from the London period.—*De Imaginum, Signorum, et Idearum Compositione; De Triplici Minimo; De Monade, Numero et Figura.* These from the Frankfort period.—*Summa Terminorum Metaphysicorum.* Posthumous.

2. Ethical works: *Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante; Degli Eroici Furori; La Cabala del Cavallo Pegaso.* All these from the London period.

As a truth-seeker, Bruno has full confidence in the credibility of reason's conclusions. Religion itself he founds upon reason rather than on authoritative revelation. "Theologians as learned as religious have never entertained prejudice against the liberty of philosophy; and truly religious and well-conducted philosophers have always favored religions, for both know that FAITH is necessary for the instruction of coarse peoples who must be governed, and DEMONSTRATION is demanded by the contemplative who know how to govern both themselves and others."* But he further claims that philosophy's teachings are grander than those of current theology. It is the task of philosophy "to free the mind from imprisonment," "to teach it to regard the infinite universe," and "liberate it forever from the pseudo Mercuries and Apollos descended from the skies, who have filled the world with multiform impostures, and infinite foolishnesses, bestialities and vices, smothering that light which made the souls of our ancestors heroic and divine, and confirming the caliginous darkness of sophists and asses; hence, time it is that philosophy should leave the earth and mount toward heaven, *per riportarne lo perduto ingegno.*"†

These passages sufficiently indicate the trend of Bruno, and we may anticipate no exhibition of alarm on his part if reason leads him to tenets directly contrary to those of the time. He will read new meanings into Scripture phrases, and explain passages contrary to his scientific and philosophical conclusions, as designed to teach ethics to common people, in language they would comprehend, rather than give instruction in scientific language, which they could not appreciate.‡

Opening now his books we shall find how far he was removed from his time, and how near he is to our own.

* * De l'Infinito, p. 27. Compare Lullus—" hoinines grossi ingenii et illiterati facilium trahuntur ad veritatem per fàdèm ; sed homo subtilis, etc."

† *Opere Italiane*, vol. i., p. 125.

‡ This was the defence he made at Greville's table when charged with falsifying the Bible.
The science of Bruno asserts, with Copernicus, the existence of the solar system in the sense of modern astronomy, but goes beyond him in the following particulars. He is the first to assert the rotation of the sun about its own axis, and with Cusa believes in the movements of the fixed stars about one another. But to him this means more than to Cusa. He believes in sun systems: in other words, that the fixed stars have planets circling about them, invisible to our eyes, and that, in the infinite reaches of space, a fixed star, with all its attendant, unseen planets, revolves about another whose family is to us alike invisible. Space is infinite, and in its limitless expanses shine these flaming orbs, "ambassadors annunciate of the glory of God." In space we need hope for no Alcyone, the centre of existence, for in infinity every point is a centre, and there are as many centres, therefore, as there are points in infinity. Earth is therefore neither the centre of the universe, as Catholicism taught, nor conspicuous among its members, as Calvinism, through a localization of Deity’s operations, inclined to teach.*

In some elements of his astronomy Bruno has, therefore, anticipated the most signal discoveries of our century. The Brunonian biology is also akin to theories of our time, though upon a different basis. Comparative anatomy has established modern evolution; Bruno’s evolution, while not void of anatomical evidences, rests mainly on metaphysical grounds—the theory that the universe is an existence-mode of God, the Life. The earth to him is a _sacrum animal_, "participant by its revolutions and performances, conservative of its existence, in the universal intelligence of the universe." Instinct is different in _degree_, therefore, and not in _kind_, from intelligence. "Water-drops assume globular shape not without a certain degree of sensation or knowledge. Everything is thus in a certain degree participator in experience, a mode of utterance of the universal intellect distributed through the universe." The first stage of expression, in the vegetable kingdom, is dim and dull. The second, in the animals, is clearer; the third and highest is in man—the apex of the pyramid. One species is point of departure for another. "Nature prophesies every species before birthing it."† Man, dowered with intelligence as he is, rules, not through his mental power, but by his hand, "the organ of organs."‡

* See Brunnhofer, pp. 158–74, for an account of Bruno’s astronomy vindicated step by step by quotations from his books. This is, indeed, the great value of Brunnhofer’s work. Historically and critically Berli’s is far better.
‡ "It is to the possession of two limbs which are freed from any organic duty other
“Could a serpent’s head form itself to the shape of a human head, and its bust expand to the volume of a human breast; could its tongue lengthen, its shoulders broaden, and be ramified by arms and hands, and where the tail terminated, a twin growth of legs grow and agglutinate themselves, the serpent would understand (with its new head), would breathe (with its new lungs), would speak (with its new tongue), would work and walk (with its new arms and legs), not otherwise than man, for it would not be other than man.”* This passage both identifies intellect and instinct, and anticipates the announcements of anatomical evolution.

We purposely prefix this outline of Bruno’s science to our account of his metaphysic. Astronomy was the point of departure for his metaphysic. Convinced of the existence of great continents in the ocean of space, he formed a philosophy intuitive rather than inductive, poetic rather than methodic, and in presence of the stars lost sight of his soul. Space is peopled with infinite worlds, and is itself infinite, because nothing less than its infinity would be worthy of the creative power of an infinite God. Infinite, it is an eternal entity where God has revealed Himself. An eternal entity, it is revealed in the phenomenal world as Number, Quantity, and Idea. “Nature is substance and source of all art, and mistake is an unknown word in the economy of the universe. Truth is not only physically present in things, but is itself the creative might of life and Nature.” Nature is therefore the great revealer of secrets, “itself the fire Prometheus stole from heaven, itself the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, itself the exact image of the Idea.”

But Bruno passes from this nature concept to a concept of God, allowing no dichotomy in the universe. “The act of divine cognition is substance of the being of all things,” and Bruno formulates an expression of the All Unity to which Spinoza might have set hand and seal.

“1. Divine existence is infinite.

“2. The consequence of the mode of being is the mode of possibility.

“3. The consequence of the mode of possibility is the mode of activity.

than attack and defence, and which are adapted to grasp weapons and tools, that man owes his enormous advantage over the lower animals. It opens to him possibilities which do not exist beneath him. The first club or spear he grasped, the first missile he threw, inaugurated a new era in the history of life and opened the way to man’s complete mastery.” Charles Morris, “The Making of Man,” American Naturalist, June, 1886. Nihil sub sole novum est!

* Cabala del Cavallo Pegaso, p. 277.
4. God is the simplest existence in which there is neither composition nor divergence.

5. Consequently Being, Possibility, Activity, Will, Power, and all that can be predicated of Him are in Him the same.

6. Consequently, the divine Will is not only necessary, but necessity itself, whose antithesis is not only impossible, but impossibility itself.

7. In simple being there can be neither antithesis nor dissimilarity—i.e., Will and Power are neither opposed nor unlike.

8. Necessity and freedom are the same."

But Bruno passes to more decided pantheism. "Nature is nothing but God manifested in things."† If he uses both phrases, Deus et Natura and Natura et Deus, his whole system writes equation marks between them. "God and Nature are one and the same material." But what is material? "The source of actuality," Bruno answers; and "The act of divine thought is substance of the being of all things" seems to make material, in Bruno's view, pure spirit. The universe to him, therefore, is but the existence-form of God, and contraries in the ultimate estimate are coincidences in a substrate reality where contrariety cannot exist.

Bruno's ethic is outcome of his metaphysic, and pushes it to its last conclusion. It is formulated, polemically, in the Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante and in the Cabala del Cavallo Pegaseo; and, constructively, in the Eroici Furori. In the two former Bruno's cynicism reaches its climax.

The "Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast," as the title of the dialogue indicates, is proposed by Jove himself in the council of the gods.‡ Declaration of his intention is made after a heavy dinner in the dining-hall of the gods, when he becomes suddenly repentant and resolves to efface from the heavens the constellations, bookkeepers of their crimes.§ From the pole of the heavens the "Great Bear," memorial of Jupiter's incest, must therefore be removed.¶ Truth, by vote of the syndic, is put in its place. In such a manner Bruno no doubt voiced a criticism of the impurities consequent upon

* De Immenso. Bk. I., chap. ii., p. 189.
‡ Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante proposto da Giove, effettuato dal Consiglio, svelato da Mercurio, recitato da Sofia, udito da Saulino, recitato dal Nolano.
§ "Men after dinner sit and talk of what they are pleased to call—their sentiments."
—Thackeray (I think).
¶ A rechristening of the constellations, on similar grounds, was proposed by the Venerable Bede.
the old beliefs, and puts Truth as pole of the Copernican system and core of the Brunonian belief. Similarly all the other constellations are replaced by virtues such as Courage, Prudence, etc. Proposals for the disposition of the expelled divinities give Bruno an opportunity to betray the observing traveller and sarcastic humorist, as when, for instance, Momus proposes to send the Great Bear to the "bears" of Great Britain, to the Orsini faction of Rome, or to the people of Berne. Aquarius should go to Germany and "temper the native beverages." Throughout the book, Momus, by consent of the gods, is allowed to exercise all the causticity of his tongue, and the "satiric Momus among the gods, and the misanthropic Timon among men," is, no doubt, Bruno himself. The Papacy receives frequent and undisguised scourge.

Apocryphal beliefs and the most sacred verities are treated alike. A "relic of the animal that carried Christ to Jerusalem" is spoken of as exhibited at Genoa, but is questioned by Bruno as much as by any one of the present day. Similar criticism is applied to biblical records. "Let Aquarius go," says Jove, "and ask how a flood could have been general, when it is impossible that all the waters of the sea and sky could have covered both hemispheres. Let him bring back also the true report that the real migration was from Olympus, not from Armenia. Besides, how could there have been a flood as recent as the time alleged when the newly-discovered part of the earth, called the new world, has records dating more than ten thousand years back?"

Parallelisms, suggesting the falsity of both, are formed between biblical and pagan fables. "Let Aquarius further determine," says Jove, "which is the original, Noah lying naked, and covered by his two sons walking backward, or the Thessalian Deucalion, to whom, with Pyrrha, his wife, the stones were pointed out as the principle of human reparation, whence two people, walking backward, threw them on the uncovered breast of mother earth? For both cannot be history, and which is fable? And if both are fables, which is mother and which daughter?" The whale of Jonah is spoken of as "galley, coach, and tabernacle" to the prophet, and the prophet as "food, medicine, and emetic" to the whale. He says that the story "of the sending of the raven from the ark to see if the earth was dry, that time when men drank so much that they burst, is wonderfully unlike the story of sending a raven from heaven, when the gods were almost dying of thirst," and so scatters sarcasm over the whole biblical record.

* Spaccio, p. 235.
Throughout the book there is a strong attempt to explain the Hebrew religion on naturalistic grounds. He makes much of the worship of the serpent in the wilderness, and even attempts to connect the statement that Moses had horns (Latin Vulgate),* with previous worship of beasts, on the part of the Hebrews, in the land whence they had come.

Yet he does not find this reprehensible; on the contrary, the worship of the Egyptians is not to be ridiculed, for all the things they adored are referable to "a divinity of divinities, and fount of ideas, above nature."

The only religion, indeed, which Bruno finds totally unworthy is the "reformed religion." He names as "vile and absurd the fancy of those esteeming themselves kings in heaven and sons of the gods, who yet believe more in a vain, bovine, asinine faith than in a useful, real, and magnanimous action and effect." They are "poltroon-esque pedants (poltronesca setta di pedanti), who, without doing good, according to divine and natural law, esteem themselves, and wish to be esteemed, as pleasing to the gods, and say to do good is well, and to do wrong is ill, but not through good that is done, or evil that is not done, does one come to be pleasing to the gods, but through hoping and believing according to their catechism."

Whence, then, shall come an ethic to replace the destroyed biblical ethic? we may well ask of Bruno. That it cannot come from Catholicism the criticisms of the Spaccio, and the severer characterizations of the Cabala, wherein Catholicism and asinity are identified, abundantly prove.

The last line of the Spaccio and the constructive Eroici Furori furnish Bruno's answer and alternative. "I go to my nocturnal contemplations," says Wisdom, as the discussion of "The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast" closes; contemplation is the ethic and religion Bruno advances in place of all he has demolished.

"The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast" meant removal, through proof of the Copernican system, through criticism of the Papacy, through overthrow of all positive religions, of all obstacles in the way of building up a new ethic, founded on the scientific beliefs of the new age. Characterization of devotion to Catholicism in the Cabala as asinine meant reflected heroism on the principles, ethical and religious, of the Eroici Furori.

But the ethic is really mysticism—an absorption of the soul in contemplation of deity. "Unworthy the love of Petrarch for Laura,"

* The Vulgate is responsible for the horns on Michael Angelo's Moses in S. Pietro in Vincoli also.
cries Bruno, "when he might have poured out expressions of affection for supreme truth and infinite deity."

From what has been here so sparsely and imperfectly outlined it is easy to see that Bruno could hope for no mercy from the Inquisitors. Belief in an infinite universe was repugnant to a science which placed the Ultima Thule no farther from the earth than modern science holds the sun to be, and to a theology which made the heaven of the superior beings so near that the angels ascending and descending the ladder need not have wearied on their errand to the patriarch Jacob. The Church of the time decreed that "the earth constituted the universe, that the heavens were made for it, that God, the angels, and the saints inhabited an eternal abode of joy, situated above the azure sphere of the fixed stars, and they embodied this gratifying illusion in their illuminated manuscripts, their calendars, and their church windows."* In a chart of the Middle Ages, representing the authoritative astronomical system, we find in the heaven of Jupiter and Saturn the words, "Seraphim, Dominations, Potestates, Archangeli, Virtutes Coelorum, Principatus, Throni, Cherubim, all derived from the time's theology. A veritable muddle! The angels placed with the heroes of mythology, the immortal Virgin with Venus and Andromeda, and the saints with the Great Bear, the Hydra, and Scorpion!"†

For one who, with his terrific Spaccio, had cleared space of such superstition there could be no mercy; much less for one who took the crown from earth, and made it but one of infinite worlds wherein infinite vicegerents of God might hold court and conscience.

Criticism of the Church and of all positive religions could no more be brooked. Sentence was therefore passed with the horrible euphemism "to be punished without shedding of blood" *(sine sanguinis effusione)*, which meant—death by fire. "In pronouncing sentence," said the unintimidated Bruno, "you experience more fear, perhaps, than I in receiving it."‡

It was no idle boast; Bruno died courageously; and if the flames, in the satiric words of Scioppius, did not "take him to the worlds which he imagined," Bruno at least did not fear immortality, for to

---

† Ibid., p. 188. The plan of the great Catholic religious paintings embracing heaven and earth, therefore, is cosmological miniature, not artistic imagination. The Disputā, from the altar to God the Father, was dictated in arrangement, by the science, as well as the theology, of the Church.
‡ Gaspar Schopp or Scioppius wrote to Conrad Ritterhausen a letter dated 1600, describing as an eye-witness the execution of Bruno. See Berti, p. 401. Forsan majori timore sententiam in me fertis quam ego accipiam. Letter of Scioppius. Perilī, renunciaturas credo, in reliquis illis, quos finxit mundis.
him there was no death, no heaven, no hell in the universe. Metempsychosis links him with Brahminism, as does his contemplative ethic.

As we stand in imagination before the funeral pyre of this great thinker, anticipator of Haeckel and Darwin in evolution; of Herschel in astronomy; of Spinoza and Schelling and Leibnitz in philosophy, we cannot but regret he was embryo also of the most vulgar of the rationalists. His greatness was his weakness. Aglow with the new astronomy he did not see that

``Two worlds are ours; 'tis only sin
Forbids us to descry
The mystic heaven and earth within,
Plain as the sea and sky.''

That he widened the universe there can be no question. But as from the Spaccio he goes to his "nocturnal contemplations," we hear from him no words of moral grandeur such as those of Kant:

``Two things fill the soul with wonder and reverence, increasing evermore as I meditate more closely upon them; the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me.''

Bruno's astronomy was nurtured at the expense of psychology, and true metaphysical science did not begin till Descartes took knowledge both of the world within and the world without. With the eloquent utterances of De l'Infinito yet resonant in our ears, a voice that spake of old is heard asking, with utterance succinct and sad: "What shall it profit a man if he gain a whole universe and forfeit or lose his own self?''

WALTER LAIDLAW.

West Troy, N. Y.
IV.

ELEMENTAL EMBLEMS OF THE SPIRIT.

AIR—WATER—FIRE.

According to the Ancients, there were four elements—Earth, Water, Air, Fire. These formed an ascending scale, from Earth (which stood for all that was heavy, gross, dark—in a word, "earthy") to Fire, which seemed a thing of Heaven. Water and Air held an intermediate position between Earth and Fire, but had their associations with the higher rather than the lower. Earth alone was positively gross. All the rest were refined, and had, moreover, refining and purifying power. Water was much less gross in texture than Earth, more mobile, more alive, and had besides the power of giving to Earth whatever life it had; for waterless earth is always desert. Then it was pure, except where Earth mixed with it and stained it, and it had the beneficent power of washing earth-stains away.

Air, again, was still more refined than Water, lighter, more ethereal; more mobile, pure, and invigorating, except when charged with earthy particles—soot or smoke or dust, or something foreign to its native purity; and then it was specially associated with life—for man lives in the Air and by the Air, and only when he is ready for the grave does Earth receive him to itself. Fire, as we have said, was highest of all. It seemed a thing of Heaven come to Earth. Hence the old theory of Prometheus stealing Fire from Heaven—a fable which, like many of its kind, is more than fable—for is not the Fire element heavenly in its origin as none of the others are? Our water and our air even are our own, all contained within earth's envelope or sphere; but our light and heat, our fire, comes to us from another orb, far away, is stolen, as it were, from Heaven. And this is even more true than it seems, as science has made plain by teaching us that the hidden fires of coal and all inflammable substances are "imprisoned sunbeams" of long ago. See, too, how much of the heavenly nature is in this Fire element. It shines with its own light, it is full of life and action—life and
action not given to it as when you throw a stone or set a stream of
water running down a slope, but life and action which seem to come
out of its own being; and then see how it diffuses the warmth and
light of Heaven through the darkness and cold of Earth; and, while
all other things tend downward, it always soars, as if struggling to
get back to its native Heaven.

We know, of course, that these old world ideas were not scien-
tifically correct; but there was, and there is, a great deal in them.
They give at least phenomenal truth; and then they are full of that
poetry which is, after all, the deepest truth; and so looked at they
help us to appreciate the wealth of Scripture imagery, especially in
relation to the Holy Spirit and His cleansing, quickening, and re-
fining power. Man as a sinner is "of the earth earthy"—dull,
heavy, dark, dead. God's Spirit comes to him like water, like the
wind, like fire (for these are the three great symbols of the Spirit;
the others are subordinate to these, as, for example, the oil which
feeds fire, or the dove which is the visible embodiment of the light
and air-like visitation of the Spirit), bringing life, and purity, and
refinement, and all good things, from the heavenly sphere. Earth,
dark as it is, and dead as it is when left to itself, is yet stored with
abundance of life germs, remaining dormant and to all appearance
quite dead, till "the scent of water makes them bud;" and then up
into the air they grow; on it and by the water they feed, every leaf
a lung, and every rootlet a mouth, while by the grace of light and
heat they come to lovely flower and luscious fruit. Is there not a
whole world of wealth of poetic imagery in these old elemental em-
blems? We can do little more than show the way to some of it.

I. Let us begin with the wind or the AIR, as the first and simplest
—first, for the very word for "Spirit" in the language of the Bible,
as in almost all languages, means breath, or air; and simplest, as
containing the most elementary conceptions of the Spirit's person
and work, and therefore used by our Lord in giving to Nicodemus
his first conception of the higher things of the new dispensation. At
first, indeed, it seems disappointingly negative in its suggestions.
Air cannot be seen, it cannot be felt, and when you seem to hear it
coming as wind, it is only "the sound thereof," it is known only by
its effects; and then it "bloweth where it listeth," having appar-
ently no law but its own arbitrary will, and "thou canst not tell
whence it cometh or whither it goeth"—all negative and disappoint-
ing—it starts in the unknown, it leads to the unknown, its ways are
unknown, it is itself unknown; it is all unknown, unknown; why
not be an Agnostic, then, and have nothing to do with it?

But you cannot. Notwithstanding all its mystery, there it is, and
you cannot get away from it. Though you do not see it, and even when you do not feel it, it is all about you, in close relation to you, and your very life depends on it. It is true we are in the habit of treating it as if it were nothing. We use it as a symbol of unreality and emptiness; and yet nothing is more real, nothing more vital to our well-being, more necessary to our very being. And, again, we use it as a symbol of fickleness and inconstancy; and yet there is nothing in all nature on which we can more certainly and absolutely depend. Though we can never tell "whence it cometh or whither it goeth," we are always sure of it wherever we go, into whatever treeless desert or waterless waste—when everything else fails us, air fails us never—we are always sure of it just when and where and in what quantities we need. It amounts to this, that so long as we make a mere study of this subtle breath that breathes around us, it is full of mystery and of insoluble difficulty, and the more we try to enter into it and understand it, the more lost we are and ready to take refuge in the convenient retreat of the Agnostic; but when we cease to perplex ourselves as to whence it cometh, or whither it goeth, or what it is, and just take it as it is, open our windows and doors and let it in, or go out into the fields and let it blow around us, we find it all we could desire, and in it life, and health, and satisfaction.

"So is every one that is born of the Spirit." The Spirit cannot be seen, nor grasped by the hand, nor comprehended by the intellect; but He is near, He is all about us. It is seldom that His presence makes itself felt in any startling way. Once in a long time it seems as if there came from Heaven a "mighty rushing wind;" but usually it is more like the soft wing and quiet footsteps of the dove. It is like the gentle breeze which finds a tongue in the murmur of the leaves, so that its voice is easily missed. But at any time we have only to get away from the noise and bustle of the world, and, having hushed to rest all the uneasy motions of our own spirit, to wake up our hearts to listen, and we shall certainly hear the voice of God—it may be in awful tones, like the moaning of the pine-tree in the dark, or even terrible, like the rush of the tempest, so as to compel the cry, "What must I do to be saved?" or in its more familiar tones of gentlest whisperings, like these: "Come unto Me and I will give you rest," "Thy sins are forgiven thee; go in peace."

"At any time?" But the "wind bloweth where it listeth," and how can I make sure of it when I list? Look at the symbol once again. Little as we know of the motions of the wind, and impossible as we find it to control its currents, there is one thing we know for cer-
tain, that wherever we make space for it, in it will come. The house a man lives in may be full of the most noxious gases, and so long as he keeps open drains beneath it, and these never cease to send up their noisome exhalations, there must be death in the house; but if only he will close these drains, or have them flushed and cleansed, and then open up his doors and windows, death will be driven out and life and health will come in. He does not need to know all about meteorology to be sure of this; he may be totally ignorant of ventilation, or even thoroughly sceptical about it; but common-sense will tell him that he has only to trust the wind; let it blow as it list, no matter "whence it cometh or whither it goeth," he has only to let it in; and presently the house will be clean, and sweet, and wholesome, and will remain so, if he in the first place has thoroughly cleansed it down to the very foundation, and in the second place opens the windows often enough to let in a fresh supply. Is it not then a good thing, after all, that "the wind bloweth where it listeth"? So long as it always listeth to bring such blessings on its wings to all who make it welcome, let it blow on, however little we understand about it, however helpless we may be when we try to command it otherwise than as it listeth.

The supply is unfailing. For while the air we breathe is the most valuable and indispensable of all the gifts of God to men, it is the one of all others that has been given in greatest abundance. The supply is inexhaustible; and the poorest is as welcome to it as the richest. Men may buy and sell the earth on which we tread. Even water must often be bought with money; and there are places where it is not to be had at all. Light is bought and sold, heat is bought and sold; but atmospheric air never. Men have to purchase horse-power, water-power, steam-power; but the power of the wind is free to all. Free as the air we breathe or the wind that blows around us is the Spirit's quickening grace. None can buy it, none can earn it, but all may have it in rich abundance if only they will ask it—in unmeasured quantity one might say, for it is true, just as it is true of the air, with this qualification, that the measure is limited only by the capacity of that which is open to receive it. "Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it." Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ for the royal bounty of His Spirit's grace as set before us in the, at first sight disappointing, but in the end most satisfactory and encouraging, symbol of the air.

II. We now pass to the symbol of water. But before doing so let us endeavor to get some idea of how the two symbols of air and water stand related to each other. The research of modern science has brought out the fact that this air which breathes around us,
even when it seems most utterly transparent, is laden with germs of life; and wherever there is susceptibility for their development, nothing more than contact is needful to secure it. Take off the seal from the infusion, expose the surface, and life will spring up at once.

Now, the susceptibility for development of which we have spoken consists especially in the presence of water. Without water there can be no springing up of life. We know how absolutely necessary it is to all forms of vegetable life—waterless land is always desert. And we have learned from recent experiments that in the same way it is only when a watery surface is exposed to the air that the germs with which the atmosphere is stored awake to life. Bearing this in mind as the link of connection between air and water as to the development of life, let us now proceed to consider the truth concerning the Spirit as set forth in the water symbol.

There are so many passages in which the Spirit is set forth under this symbol that it is not necessary to refer to them further than to call to mind that just as the word "spirit" suggests the symbol of air, the way in which the Spirit is most frequently promised suggests the symbol of water: "I will pour out My Spirit." Perhaps, however, one very definite passage may be referred to, that in which the Lord Himself, after speaking of Himself as the fountain, refers to the flowing of the waters, and adds, "This spake He of the Spirit." More of this anon.

We have seen that the emblem of the air applies readily to the universal presence of the Spirit of God in all places and at all times; but this one of water suggests some manifestation of the Spirit which is not equal everywhere and always, but is found here and there, like fountains and springs, and, instead of moving hither and thither, like the wind, which "bloweth where it listeth," flows in certain channels, like our streams and rivers. Accordingly, we find that whenever the symbol of water is used, the reference is to the Spirit of the Lord—not as everywhere present, but as present in some particular man or men who have thus become fountains of living waters. The well-known prophecy, "a man shall be as rivers of water in a dry place," is fulfilled first in Christ (the anointed One, anointed with the Spirit), who receives the Spirit without measure, and who is therefore the fountain-head of all living waters; and next in those who have received of His Spirit and who thus in their turn become fountains or rivers.

The symbol is even more appropriate than at first appears. We have learned from chemistry that between air and water there is one element in common, and that the great life-giving element of each
—viz., oxygen. But there is this difference, that the oxygen of the air is free—i.e., uncombined with any other element; while in water it exists only in combination with another element. It is oxygen that gives value to water as well as to air; but in the air it does its work immediately and directly, in its own name, so to speak; in the other case it does its work mediately—not as oxygen, but as water. Now let us think, alongside of this, of the ways in which the Spirit of God reaches us. First, His presence is diffused everywhere, like the air, and we have only to open our hearts to Him to have Him come to us immediately and directly, as the Spirit of God, like the wind which "bloweth where it listeth." But besides this, He has entered into combination with the human spirit, so that human life and thought and feeling have been, so to speak, saturated with His grace. Thus it was that "the prophecy came not of old time by the will of man" merely, but "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." This speaking in the Spirit is the flowing of the waters; and hence it comes to pass that this water symbol is so constantly associated with the Word; as, for example, when the Church is spoken of as "sanctified and cleansed with the washing of water by the Word." The Word is the water, but what is the oxygen that gives it its value? It is the Holy Spirit’s grace. He does not come in His own name, but He comes through the medium of the Word; just as the oxygen, which in the air is free, comes, unrecognized perhaps, but really comes, through the medium of the water. Thus in the water, which, unlike the omnipresent air, springs from a particular point and flows in certain well-defined channels, we have a fitting emblem of the Spirit of God as poured out upon men, who become, as it were, channels of divine grace, flowing forth from them to others. And just as oxygen in both its forms is necessary to life—for we cannot live without water any more than without air—so in order to spiritual life we must have the Spirit in both His manifestations: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It will not do for a man to shut his Bible, and turn away from Christ and His apostles and prophets, and say, "Why should I trouble myself about what Moses, or David, or Isaiah, or John, or Paul, or even Christ has said? Is not God’s Spirit present everywhere, and cannot He speak to me directly? My temple is this great universe, my God is the God of great Nature, who can speak to me as well in the green fields, or on the purple hills, or in the light of setting suns, or in the moaning of the lonely sea, as He can speak to you in your little church, or from your Bible, or through the life and lips of Jesus of Nazareth." Perhaps that might have
sufficed if it had not been true that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," while only "that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." It might have been sufficient if we had been not carnal at all, but spiritual, our souls in closest touch with the omnipresent Spirit of God, ourselves pure and holy, with no earthliness or sin to hinder our receptivity of the divine. But manifestly it is not so. None of us is so exceedingly receptive of the divine. Hence we must have the divine brought nearer to our capacities as men, mortal men of flesh and blood. So the Word must become flesh and dwell among us. We cannot reach God in any independent fashion. We cannot "by searching find out God." The result of any such quest must be, as we find in these days it is, the void of Agnosticism. We must find a point of contact, of vital contact with the Spirit of God, and this is found only in His Son Jesus Christ. He was filled with the Spirit of God, and when we are united to Him by a living faith, by the loving trust of the Spirit, the contact is established—and then, like the rush of healing, cooling, refreshing, life-giving waters, the Spirit of God flows in upon our souls.

And now we can see how it is necessary to welcome the Spirit in both His manifestations in order that we may be quickened and refreshed. There must be first the Word, saturated with the Spirit's grace, the Holy Scriptures which testify of Christ the living Word; but this is not sufficient; for how often are the Scriptures read, even read with attention and interest, without any saving result! and that not only when the Gospel is scornfully rejected, but even when it is respectfully listened to. What is wanting? Is not the Spirit there in the Word? True; but He must also be welcomed immediately and directly, coming as the air or breath of God. As we read or hear the Word, we must lift up our souls in prayer for the coming of the Spirit directly to our own minds and hearts that He may quicken Into life the seeds of truth it carries. "The Spirit breathes upon the Word," and it becomes living waters to our thirsty souls.

But the symbol of water carries us further than this. It has important teaching, not only as to the way in which life is received, but as to the way in which it is communicated to others. On that great occasion when the waters from the fountain of Siloam were poured out beside the altar, and amid the rejoicing throng, Jesus stood and cried, "If any man thirst let him come to Me and drink." He did not stop there, but went on to say, "He that believeth on Me, out of his inmost life shall flow rivers of living water. This spake He of the Spirit which they that believed on Him should receive." Already this had been realized in the case of those "holy men of old,"
who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" but the time was coming when it should be a promise for all: "It shall come to pass in those days that I shall pour out My Spirit upon all flesh." Every believer in Jesus was now called not merely to drink himself, but to become a fountain of living water to others. As the prophet Joel put it in a less known portion of his great Pentecost prophecy, "It shall come to pass in that day that . . . all the brooks of Judah shall flow with waters." In the olden time there had been here and there a man "like rivers of water in a dry place"—a Moses, a David, an Isaiah; but now "all the brooks" are to "flow with waters."

For an illustration of the fulfilment of the promise on the largest scale we cannot do better than look at the great change that passed over the disciples at Pentecost. They had been drinking of the fountain all the time of their discipleship, but only then did they become fountains themselves; only from that time did the rivers of living water begin to flow from them. And just think what rivers they were! Think of John—his life saturated with the Spirit of his Master, sending forth constant streams of blessing for nearly seventy years; his gospel, no mere record, as of a scribe, every sentence of it flowing, not from his pen, not from his fingers, not from his mind merely, but from the inmost recesses of his soul; his letters so instinct with the life of his Master, so full of His Spirit of love and tenderness; his Apocalypse, what an opening of Heaven that has been, not to John himself merely, to make up for the shutting of earth, but to what multitudes since then! We get bewildered with the magnitude of that one man's influence for good; but take a little portion only as a sample. Suppose we could trace the history of the last two chapters of the Book of Revelation down the ages, and get some idea of the comfort and refreshment and revival they have brought to human lives, would it not be a most wonderful story, a new Apocalypse? Was not his own symbol a prophecy of it, "a river of water of Life proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb"? God and the Lamb were enthroned in his heart, therefore from its recesses these rivers have flowed. And so will it be in measure with all hearts where God and the Lamb are enthroned. We cannot all be Johns, indeed; but according to our capacity and opportunity we may be fountains of living waters, and all of us to a much larger extent than we are apt to imagine. It might be presumption, indeed, for me to expect that out of my poor little life should flow such streams of living power. But it is not from me, it is from the Christ-life in me that they are to flow: "He that believeth on Me, out of him shall flow." "This spake He of the Spirit." The man is only the channel. The Spirit is the
living water, and though it might be vain for a man to think he could be a source of blessing, may he not be a channel of it? Look at John again, what could he have done as John? Probably no more than any John among us. May there not then be for any believer, not of course the special usefulness of the Apostle, but something; at all events, far removed from the commonplace or the poor; something really worthy of Christ from whom the Spirit comes, and of the Spirit Himself; something far beyond what apart from the power that worketh in us “we could even ask or think”? And if it is still difficult to entertain such large expectations, we may be helped to it by remembering that our lives do not stand alone. Each life influences many other lives. There is no follower of Christ, however obscure, who might not be the means of bringing some other soul to life, from whom rivers of living water might flow. And why only one? Why not two, three, four, more, many more? And if so, at once we are launched on streams flowing out into the plain of the future, with ever larger possibilities as time passes on. Thus in grace, as well as in nature, the tiniest stream may in process of time become a very Amazon. “He that believeth on Me, out of his hidden life shall flow rivers of living water.”

And if individual life have such promise and potency, what shall be said of Church life? Recall the striking vision of Ezekiel in his forty-seventh chapter, of the waters issuing from the House of the Lord close beside the altar, rising first to the ankles, then to the knees, then to the loins, then to the depth of a great river to swim in, and so flowing on and on, carrying life and verdure and blessing all along its course, through the wastes of the wilderness of Judah, and at last sweetening the waters of the Dead Sea itself. What a grand ideal of the Church, and Church life and power—partially realized at Pentecost, where we can see the waters issuing from beside the great world-altar at Jerusalem, from beside the cross on which Christ “lifted up” began to “draw all men unto Him;” we can see them flowing on through Judea, and Samaria, and Galilee, and Cyprus, and Asia Minor, and Macedonia, and Greece, and Rome, and westward, westward; we can see them even sweeten the waters of the Dead Sea of Roman corruption and barbarian brutality—we can trace it all in history; not that the vision is fully realized, but enough to give an earnest of its final accomplishment, as sketched in the Apocalypse of Patmos: “And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal” (not muddy, as the river which started at Pentecost too soon, alas! became, but clear as crystal), “proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the Tree of Life,
which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no more curse."

That is the final fulfilment, the realization of the true ideal of Church life and power. Meantime why should we not approximate it, seeing the Pentecostal blessing is still at our disposal as much as ever? It is hardly possible to overestimate the power for good even of a small community of Christians, if only they would make the promises of Christ their own, and yield themselves, emptied of self and sin, to be filled with the Spirit, so that it might be said of them as it was prophesied of the first little church in Judah: "It shall come to pass in that day that all the brooks of Judah shall flow with waters." And if such is the power of a single little community filled and flowing with the Spirit of Life, what might we not expect if the Church of to-day were so filled with the Spirit. And why not? Why should there not be a general waiting on the Lord: "Until the Spirit be poured out from on high, and the wilderness become a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest"?

III. But the highest symbol of the Spirit's power still remains, that of FIRE. The symbol of air belongs to all dispensations alike, but it was specially characteristic of the Old Testament. "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? If I ascend up to Heaven Thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea Thou art there"—such utterances as this show how fully the Old Testament saints realized the omnipresence of the Divine Spirit, so well set forth in the air symbol, which is embodied in the very name by which He was known. Water is also frequently used in the Old Testament as a symbol of the Spirit, but almost always in the way of prophecy, pointing on to the time of the Incarnation, when it becomes prominent. The meaning of the symbol was not fully unfolded until Christ, first at "Jacob's Well" and then at Jerusalem, in connection with the pouring out of the water from the pool of Siloam, set forth Himself as the fountain and His people as the rivers to convey the grace of the Spirit of God, the Water of Life, to a thirsty and sinful world. These waters were to flow on through the next dispensation; but inasmuch as they took origin from Christ Himself, they may be reckoned as pertaining to the time of the Incarnation. But there still remains a symbol which is the special property of the dispensation under which we live, which began at Pentecost, and is therefore known as "the dispensation of the Spirit." In the Old Testament the Spirit was known under the symbol of the air, and promised under the symbol of water. In the
time of Christ the Spirit began to be known under the symbol of water, and was promised under a new symbol, as in these striking words of John the Baptist: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." And in accordance with this the outward accompaniment of the Pentecostal baptism was the appearance of "tongues of fire"—tongues, the old idea of the Word, which, as we found, was symbolized in the water; but now it is not merely a word like flowing waters, but like spreading fire.

Fire had been from the beginning a symbol of the Divine presence, as every reader of the Bible knows; but now it is set apart as the distinctive symbol of the Spirit since the exaltation of Christ. We found in the beginning that while air and water belong to earth, fire is a thing of Heaven—they are of this little planet, it is of the great and distant sun. It seems especially appropriate, then, that after the Ascension the blessing of the Spirit coming down from the heavenly throne should be set forth under the symbol of fire. And we have now reached a point of view in which we can see also the naturalness of the order in which the symbols are developed in the Scriptures. If it had been a simple ascending scale, it would have been first water, then air, and lastly fire. But it is not an ascending scale. There is a deep descent into the valley of humiliation, followed by an ascent to the throne. Even in the Old Testament God humbled Himself to dwell among men in the spiritual sense—a presence which is fitly symbolized by the air which is all about the earth, but not at all of it. It was a much deeper humiliation when He "became flesh and dwelt among us," a presence which is, as we have seen, appropriately represented as living waters issuing from an earth fountain and flowing along earthly channels. But now He that first descended has ascended above all Heavens, and so His presence among us now is most fitly represented under the heavenly emblems of light and heat that come down to us from the sun, or, to put all in a single word—the emblem of fire.

At first sight, indeed, it does seem strange that the same thing could possibly be represented under symbols so utterly diverse as those of water and fire, which seem to be sworn foes, mutually destructive. But this is only to a superficial view. Modern chemistry and physics have taught us not only that the life-giving element in air and water is the same, but that this same oxygen, so potent in its life-giving power in the air and in the water, is equally potent in the fire. What is fire? It is the combination of this invisible, impalpable, ethereal element with some grosser substance. Take, for example, the familiar case of coal, which is dull, heavy, hard, dead, emphatically "of the earth, earthy," until this wonderful ethereal
element combines with it; and then it lives, it leaps, it glows, it
sparkles, it soars, develops latent power in the most marvellous
manner—drives engines, sets whole factories to work, runs trains,
does the work of a thousand men or horses—and then ascends into
the unseen, claiming no credit to itself, "only remembered by what it
has done." So is every one that is touched by the heavenly flame of
the Spirit, every one who truly and fully receives the baptism of fire.

This baptism of fire implies both a new element of life and a new
energy of life—a new element, so that Christians are spoken of as
living in the Spirit and walking in the Spirit; and a new energy, for
we read equally of the Spirit being in them and working in them.
In truth, all the different symbols of which we have been speaking
lend themselves to this twofold conception. Air is the element in
which we live; but it must enter into us, by the nostrils and lungs
into our very blood it must enter, that we may live by it. Then,
water, for purposes of cleansing, must be applied from without; but
we must also drink it, take it within us, that we may live by it. So
in the same way when we would heat a cold iron, we must first put
it into fire, so that the heat may be all around it; but presently we
find that the heat has entered into it, deep into the inmost recesses
of its compact structure. Not only is the iron in the fire, but the
fire is in the iron, too. The new element around has developed a
new energy within. So is every one that is baptized of the Spirit.

By faith in Christ we are introduced into a new element of life. We
see everything through a different medium—we see in the light of
eternity, we judge by the measures of eternity. The temperature is
changed; we have passed out of the winter of selfishness into the
summer of love—from the region of the cold North and East winds,
in which all living things wilt and die, into that of the warm South
and West winds, whose breath brings life and spreads dewy fra-
grance all around. Thus genuine faith in Christ changes the very
temperature in which we live—it gives us a new environment. But
we need not only a new environment, but a new life. When the
warm South wind comes, it wakes new life in every bud—some
warm germinating power is set to work within—and it is this unseen
energy working in millions of life germs and buds which brings about
the blessed change that ushers in the summer life and beauty. So
is it in the heart of every one that truly believes in Christ. The fire
without is answered by the fire within.

This fire within has a two-fold energy. It is first a cleansing
fire. This cleansing agency is of course very prominent under
the symbol of water. But there is far more energy in this sym-
bol, which suggests the idea of searching, penetrating, resistless
agency. There are some stains that water cannot take out. It may be that they are so ingrained in the substance that water only passes over them; or that they are so far within the intricacies of its mechanism or constitution, so out of reach, that no mere washing can touch them. The only way to get rid of such stains is to have them burned out. For while water only affects the outside of a hard substance, fire penetrates the pores; it searches into the inmost recesses of the heavy, hard, compact iron, for example. Its work is thorough. When it changes a substance it changes it through and through, as when the hard rock becomes quick-lime. Such is the cleansing power of the baptism of fire. John's was the baptism of repentance, and when the soldiers asked him, "What shall we do?" he said, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages;" when the publicans asked the question, he said, "Exact no more than is appointed you;" when the people asked him, he said, "He that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none; he that hath meat let him do likewise." All very good, most valuable, and necessary, but all belonging to the surface of the life, such as the baptism of water might reach. How different from Him that came after him, who searched down to the angry thought, the lustful look, the covetous heart, penetrating to the deepest thoughts and intents of the hidden life of the Spirit! Now, when the Spirit comes in the name of Christ, He carries His cleansing fires right in, in, in, to the deepest recesses of the heart, and burns out the impurity which had been there ingrained, even that which seemed to have become part of our very nature. Oh, are there not many that need this burning out? Do not all need it more or less? Then let us not shrink from it, let us welcome it, let us petition for it: "Come, Holy Spirit, come; come as the fire, the cleansing fire, and make us pure within!" And why should any one shrink from it? It is no wasting, desolating fire with which He comes; it is the blessed fire of love—a love, however, which has for its counterpart a holy jealousy, keenly sensitive to anything that mars the union of the soul in marriage covenant with the Heavenly Bridegroom—a holy fire of love, which, even as the sun allowed with full ray to stream upon the fire in the grate is supposed first to pale it and then put it out, so, if allowed full play in the heart, will really cause the old wasting fires of lust and passion first to pale and then to perish, quenched in the blessed light and heat of Heaven.

But the energy is not of cleansing merely, but of quickening. Here again we are on the old ground. We had it in the symbol of the air. We had it also in the symbol of the water. But here again
there is an energy in the new symbol of fire which is lacking in the others. Water and air are restoratives. But fire does not merely restore an energy which belongs to the life already. It comes as a new energy altogether, where there was none before—a new energy working all through, making that which was dull before to burn and glow, causing that which before lay useless, only taking up room, like dead coals in a fireplace, to kindle up and live and send out rays of light and heat in all directions, scattering a benign warmth and radiance on all surrounding objects; for the quickening power of fire, while it acts first on the substance itself, making it alive and glowing, never stops there. From the very nature of fire it cannot remain where it is generated—it must give itself out. It is the very law of its being to scatter itself in all directions. We can confine earth in a vessel without any difficulty. With some difficulty we can confine water, making the vessel water-tight. With greater difficulty we can confine air, making the vessel air-tight. But we cannot confine fire. That same penetrating power by which it searches its way deep into the hidden structure of that which is subject to its power, enables it to search its way out, so that, however walled in, with iron, for instance, your fire may be, as in a close stove, it must out in all directions, and so it forces itself through the pores of the iron and radiates heat through all the room. But are there not fire-proof materials? No doubt there are; and these materials may be so adjusted, as in a safe, as to keep fire out; but there is no safe ever made or that could be made that would keep fire in. Shut it in, give it no outlet, and presently there is none of it—as soon as you confine it it dies. So is it with the fire of Heaven; and it is greatly to be feared that many a soul which has had its early fires of love and devotion repressed by conventional usages warranted fire-proof has had the fire first burn low, and then lower and lower till it went quite out. It comes to this, then, that this quickening fire will find an outlet to warm and quicken others, or it will die. In dealing with the symbol of water, we found it quite possible for the Christian to drink himself, without being a fountain to quench the thirst of others. But this is not possible in the baptism of fire. The blessing comes first, like the other, as a personal blessing; but it cannot stop there; from the very nature of it, it is expansive, scattering light and heat, carrying life and blessing to all with whom the fire life is brought into contact. And here, again, there is not only the irrepressibility of which we have been speaking, but there is far greater energy. Water flows down for the most part gently and quietly, but see how the light flashes and the fire spreads! Water flows wherever there is a channel for it, but light and fire ask no
prepared channels, no beaten track to travel on; they make a track for themselves anywhere, everywhere, leap over obstacles, or clear them away, and make their power felt in all directions, up and across and athwart, as well as down. Such was the power of the little church of one hundred and twenty members on the occasion of the first baptism of fire. Such has been the power of Christians and of churches whenever the promise has been welcomed and its fulfilment realized—a promise, be it remembered, which is as good now as it ever was: "The promise is to you and to your children, and to them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

And yet it is greatly to be feared that only a very, very few look for the fulfilment of it, only a very few expect or receive the baptism of fire. It is to be thankfully acknowledged that the promise of the flowing waters is largely realized and fulfilled. It was not always so. A century ago, while there were not a few who quenched their own thirst at the fountain-head, there was very little accomplished in the way of sending streams out from the Church to fertilize the wastes around. But now it is generally understood that churches and congregations of Christians exist not only for their own salvation and edification, but for spreading the Gospel around them. There are channels of work carefully made, and in these channels the living streams do flow. We have our Sunday-school work, and our mission work, and our open-air preaching, and our tract-distributing, and so on, and along these and similar channels flow many life-giving streams. But it is greatly to be feared that we know almost nothing of the baptism of fire. Many Christians seem scarcely ever to think of such a thing, and some would shrink from it as almost a calamity. To have anything so startling would seem quite out of keeping with that quiet and even tenor of our way which seems so proper and becoming. We do not for a moment mean to say that there is no light and no warmth. God forbid! That would mean utter death. There is light and there is heat diffused all through the Church, as light and heat are diffused in the atmosphere on a bright summer day, and in fact even on a cloudy winter day; but what we do mean to say is that there is very little of that powerful and concentrated light and heat which makes fire, which not only warms but kindles. Even the heat of August will not kindle the best set fire. It needs the touch of flame to set it going. Only fire can kindle fire in common coal or common clay.

Think for a moment how many fireplaces there are around us, and in the midst of us, too—in the midst of our Christian communities and congregations—how many fireplaces, with fires well laid, fuel all ready, plenty of Christian ideas and knowledge lying there in the
minds of our young people and many who are no longer young, but lying cold and dead, wanting the touch of fire—not the mere general warmth of a Christian atmosphere, but the hot touch of flame, which can come only from a heart baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire! Now, even if we did not want the baptism of fire for ourselves, if we were content to flow along in the accustomed channels of our life, without any sparkle or glow or flame of Christian joy to gladden our course, should we not earnestly desire that we had just a little fire to apply to these cold fireplaces? Do not we parents who are mourning that our children are so cold in things spiritual long for just a little of this baptism of fire on ourselves, that we might be able to touch their lives with the heavenly spark? Do not Sunday-school teachers long for it, or for more of it? Do we not all desire to have some share in this blessed work of kindling the flame of heavenly love in human hearts? If only we would all take to ourselves this promise and make it our own, waiting for its fulfilment as the one hundred and twenty did during those ten days, what a change there would be! What a blessed summer-time! What a glow of true devotion and warm brotherly love, and here and there and many-where what flashes of light and gleamings of flame and kindlings of fuel! And presently our neighbors would feel it, our churches would feel it, other churches would feel it; and who can tell how far the warmth would spread and the light would shine? We were impressed as we thought of the grand possibilities there are for Christians and the Church, in view of the promise of the Spirit under the symbol of water; but they are grander still, especially as regards the prospect of speedy results, as we think of the promise of the Spirit under the symbol of fire. It takes time, long time, for the tiny stream to grow into an Amazon; but “see how great a matter a little fire kindleth!” It takes very little time to produce great results with fire. We all know it as regards the destructive energy of earthly fire; it is equally true of the blessed energy of the fire that comes from Heaven. How important, then, that the Church should welcome the promise of the Spirit in all the fulness of life-giving power, which is within her reach in this “dispensation of the Spirit!”

Welcome, Blessed Spirit, in all the fulness of Thy grace, and love, and power—come as the wind to revive us—as water to cleanse and refresh us and flow through us as channels of grace to others—as fire, to purify us in the inmost recesses of our souls, to quicken us to a warmer and brighter life, and to give us the blessed power of kindling life all round about us. “Come, Holy Spirit, come!”

J. M. GIBSON.

V.

SIDNEY LANIER.

"Genius takes its rise out of the mountains of rectitude."—Emerson.
Longfellow "saw... that in the morality of human life lies its true beauty."—George W. Curtis.
"Time, whose judgments are inexorably moral."—Lanier.

THE ETHICAL ELEMENT GIVES LIFE TO LITERATURE.

The hope "to write something which the world will not willingly let die," is a noble ambition. But they are fatally in error who hope to write for all time, yet who do not know and use the language of all time. In the noblest literature of the world, as in society, it is the great moral ideas which preserve from decay. Righteousness, goodness in life, is the one great antisepelic in society. And in letters, it is before all the ethical element which preserves and perpetuates. What should one generation of men care to receive from another, and to hand on to posterity, if not that vital element in "habits" which is coined in the Greek word "ethics"—the essentially best in "customs" and "manners" which men have called "morals"?

More writers fail to make an abiding name in literature from blindness to this law than from ignorance of the maxims of the rhetoricians. The gravest defect which stands in the way of success for ambitious young writers is the lack of the true artist's sense of illuminated moral vision. It is the lack of this gift rather than of any other which shuts out all save the truly great souls from pure and abiding literary fame. It was no less a master in the literary world than Goethe who said that "without the ethical sentiment the actual is the low, the vulgar, the gross." All the great masters of the "literature of enduring power" speak again and again in this same strain.

Yet many who profess the literary vocation are led by a strange infatuation utterly to ignore this great truth. There is a persistent bias in many authors and critics to distrust the value of the ethical element in art, and particularly in the arts of poetry and fiction. Such writers dare not reckon upon the moral nature of man. All
appeals to the ethical impulse they decry—if direct, as "preaching," if indirect, as marring art by a "tendency," a "didactic purpose." The thoughts which in their best moments are true and all-important to them, they dare not trust themselves to utter to their fellow-men. They do not venture to express boldly and earnestly what they see of moral beauty and abiding moral truth. They seek other dominating ideas in their conceptions of a work of art. They rely upon lower interests and less noble motives when they appeal to the reading world for an audience. Even among those who are the professed advocates and conservators of the good, the true and the beautiful in the art of letters, there is commonly an infatuation of indirection—an incapacity for giving the best place in thoughts and words to the best things, to the highest ideals. The cry "art for art's sake" is repeated as a shibboleth by critics and by so-called artists who have never seen the first principle of all art, that there can be no true art which is not in harmony with the "holiness of beauty," and suggestive of the "beauty of holiness."

Thus it happens that while the souls of men hunger for moral truth expressed in forms of beauty, while men will reward with an immortality of loving regard the author who supplies this deep hunger of the soul, the lives of too many who make literature a profession are spent in exhorting one another not to "preach," and in adjuring young authors who would succeed not to say that for which men are athirst.

Among too many such writers, one here and there appears of a different voice and filled with a higher faith regarding moral truth and that beauty which has never been and can never be divorced from moral and religious truth. He sees life and nature in "that light which is the master-light of all our seeing." He is "impasioned for beauty and truth." What he sees and believes and loves he dares to utter. Rather, he utters it as a necessity of his nature and because he loves to utter it, with no thought of daring. He has seen that "a breath of will blows eternally through the universe of souls in the direction of the Right." On that unchanging trade-wind his soul is borne, in his commerce between the world of beauty and the hearts of his fellow-men. Not attempting to cultivate style by long practice in indirection, not dallying with pretty phrases, he fixes his eyes on the central truth and speaks it out. All men are delighted. The master-chords, strongly struck, reveal the artist-master. And graces and art in expression come once more to have a value, because men see again what is too often lost sight of in the mass of literary criticism—that there is truth to be
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uttered, and that only in uttering truth that is vital to men's souls, and that binds men to God, can man's noblest gift, the power of true and helpful utterance, whether in prose or poetry, find its freest scope and its greatest beauty.

LANIER SAW THIS TRUTH.

Sidney Lanier was an artist of our own land and of our own younger generation, in whom this gift of clear-sighted, passionate loyalty to the loftiest moral truth was joined with the richest gifts of poetic imagination and utterance. We may well be content to recognize a difference between American literature and the later literature of England, if we can see such sane principles as are cited at the head of this article giving tone and color to the literature of our land. Let the sickly school of "Mors and Eros" flourish where the most of Whitman's admirers are to be found, among men fed on Swinburne's falsely beautiful because immoral rhapsodies; let the still younger school of poets who carve "pretty faces on cherry stones," if they must live, thrive in England, rather than in America. But let us hopefully expect a continuance among us of that line of the seers and singers of sound morals and beauty whose helpful mission is suggested by the thoughts and the names which are linked with Lanier's in the caption of this article.

That we may know something of the soul of the man from the first, let us have before us these extracts from the prose writings of Lanier:

"The greatest work has always gone hand in hand with the most fervent moral purpose" (The English Novel, p. 281).

"The requirement has been, from time immemorial, that wherever there is contest as between artistic and moral beauty, unless the moral side prevail, all is lost. Let any sculptor hew us out the most ravishing combination of tender curves and spheric softness that ever stood for woman; yet if the lip have a certain fulness that hints of the flesh, if the brow be insincere, if in the minutest particular the physical beauty suggest a moral ugliness, that sculptor—unless he be portraying a moral ugliness for a moral purpose—may as well give over his marble for paving-stones." "He who has not yet perceived how artistic beauty and moral beauty are convergent lines which run back into a common ideal origin, and who therefore is not a fire with moral beauty just as with artistic beauty; . . . he is not yet the great artist" (Eng. Novel, pp. 272-3).

"It may be, indeed, that there are more persons, nowadays, who retain the 'elegant' ideal of poetry which was prevalent a century ago than would willingly face an explicit statement of that ideal. But it must be said that the world as world has abandoned it." "The painful undertone which we hear in dearest Keats's introduction to Endymion, as if he were not free from a sense of intrusion in
challenging the world's attention to forms of pure beauty which did not directly concern either trade or politics; the amateurish trifling which crops out in such expressions as 'polite literature,' used even by Poe, . . . and still to be traced here and there in current talk, are things of the past. That all worthy poets belong substantially to the school of David, that it is the poet's business to keep the line of men touching shoulders with each other, that the poet is in charge of all learning to convert it into wisdom, . . . these will not be regarded as merely visionary propositions" (Intr. to Science of Eng. Verse).

In such sentences from an artist and a poet, there is something of the dignity of the seer announcing his own high mission; and the young man who wrote them had that "character which gives splendor to youth." Many of us recall the delight with which we used to welcome his poems as they appeared in the Independent, or Scribner's, or Lippincott's. As we saw his passionate love of beauty and purity, as we learned more and more of the rich endowments of his artist nature, we felt a sense of joy in the possession of such a compatriot. It is no slight matter when a poet, on whose soul God's creative touch has set the starry splendor of genius, is born, in any land, and finds his heaven-appointed means of expression; and there was a grateful sense of hopeful joy and of promise for the future of our literature attendant on the recognition of the fact that in our time and in our land a soul as richly gifted as was that of Sidney Lanier had been heard to speak, and by its utterance had been known and hailed as royal-born in the kingly line of great-souled singers. Here was a dignified young manhood, rich in that perception of the beauty of morality which renders immortal the artist who has it and who does his work in its light. Here was a fresh stream on American soil flowing full and strong from those "mountains of rectitude" where genius has its rise. And when that heroic battle against poverty and hopelessly confirmed consumption which he fought with unwavering valor for fifteen years, ended in his victorious defeat; when, to use the words of his devoted wife, "that unaltering will rendered its supreme devotion to the adored will of God," and the tiding of his death passed through the land, many of us who had never seen him felt bereaved of a helper and a dear friend, while all who watch the progress of letters in our land knew that American literature had lost in him one whose accomplished work gave the most abundant promise for great fame in the future.

It is now three years since his collected poems were published, preceded by a "memorial" from the pen of Dr. William Hayes Ward, of the Independent. To this memorial, a model of brief biog-
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raphy and graceful and deeply sympathetic criticism, all who wished to learn of the life of Lanier, and all who write of him, must acknowledge a debt of gratitude. The opening sentence of that memorial declares the writer's belief that Lanier "will take rank with the first princes of American song." And the constantly increasing number of thoughtful men and women who have learned to love and honor Lanier within these last few years goes far to confirm the prophecy.

HIS LIFE IS A LESSON.

Personality is the most potent teacher. "Happy is the nation that knows its own great men." And the life of Lanier, from the intensity of his personality, has a value for us hardly inferior to that of his writings. Indeed, it is difficult in this case to separate the poet from the poetry. There is nothing in the life of this teller of noble truths to make one question the sincerity of his utterances, or wonder, as we are forced to do when we read the lives of certain poets, that such beauty in the thought should fail to beautify the life. We may apply to Lanier his own words (although he expressly affirms that no poet yet has "wholly lived his minstrelsy"); he fulfilled his ideal in many ways, and so

"Lived and sang that Life and Song
Might each express the other's all,
Careless if life or art were long,
Since both were one, to stand or fall.

"So that the wonder struck the crowd,
Who shouted it about the land;
His song was only living aloud,
His work, a singing with the band."

In that well-known passage in The Republic in which Plato, depicting the ideal "good man," so marvellously portrays in many of its minutest details the life and death of Jesus Christ, we are told that the truly virtuous man must be poor and despised, that it may be evident to all that he is not good merely because virtue pays him well. If the true artist, the man of letters by a call from above, were to be made manifest by a similar testing process, while all circumstances seemed against him, Lanier's life and struggles might be taken as the type of such testing.

HE WAS NOT LEFT TO BE A LAWYER.

Like many another name of honor in English literature, Sidney Lanier's was inscribed in his younger manhood upon the roll of students and practitioners of the law. But he was not left to be a
lawyer. God said to him, There are wrongs to be righted, there are sacred birth-rights of the race to be defended, there is an inheritance of beauty and truth which as poet you can secure to your brother-men, of infinitely higher value and more abiding worth than any which as attorney you could win or hold for your clients!

Here is a sentence from a letter to his father replying to the request that he reconsider his decision to give up the practice of the law. It was written from Baltimore, where he had determined to settle, in 1873, to give himself to the study of poetry and music:

"My dear father, think how, for twenty years, through poverty, through pain, through weariness, through sickness, through the uncongenial atmosphere of a farcical college and of a bare army, and then of an exacting business life, through all the discouragement of being wholly unacquainted with literary people and literary ways— I say, think how, in spite of all these depressing circumstances, and of a thousand more which I could enumerate, these two figures of music and poetry have steadily kept in my heart so that I could not banish them. Does it not seem to you, as to me, that I begin to have the right to enroll myself among the devotees of these two sublime arts, after having followed them so long and so humbly and through so much bitterness?"

Noble lessons from such an experience are written in his poems. He learned to press to his desired work and to its desired end with indomitable purpose and energy. "The great heart," says Emerson, "will no more complain of the obstructions that make success hard than of the iron walls of the gun which hinder the shot from scattering." And in the brief poem, "Opposition," Lanier enforces the same truth:

``
Of fret, of dark, of thorn, of chill,
Complain no more; for these, O heart,
Direct the random of the will
As rhymes direct the rage of art.
``
``The lute's fixed fret, that runs athwart
The strain and purpose of the string,
For governance and nice consort
Doth bar his wilful wavering.
``
``Of fret, of dark, of thorn, of chill,
Complain thou not, O heart; for these
Bank-in the current of the will
To uses, arts and charities."
``

As we look at the circumstances of his life, let us carry with us the strains of this poem, which interprets the use of crosses, interferences, and attempted thwartings of one's purpose; for the ethical value of Lanier's life and writings can be fully understood
only by remembering how much he overcame and how heroically he persisted in manly work in his chosen art through years of such broken health as would have driven most men to the inert, self-indulgent life of an invalid. The superb power of will which he displayed is a lesson as valuable as the noble poems which it illustrates and enforces.

HIS EARLY LIFE.

Sidney Lanier was descended from a Huguenot family whose earlier members were famous at the court of the Stuarts for their gifts of music and their love of art. Transplanted to Virginia in 1716, the Laniers were honored citizens of the colony and the State. Again and again the strain of artist's blood has shown itself among them; and in the family of the poet's mother, Mary Anderson, of Scotch descent, like gifts had marked more than one of her kinsmen.

Born at Macon, Ga., in 1842, Sidney early showed a passionate fondness for music and wonderful powers as a musician. While still a boy he could play upon any musical instrument which came within his reach; but his favorite instrument was the violin, although he so far yielded to his father's fear of the fascinations of the violin as to lay it aside for the flute. His friends were opposed to his devoting to music the time and attention which he wished to give it. But he could not be wholly restrained from his dearest delight. It is an evidence of the sensitive susceptibility of his fine-nerved organism that, under the influence of violin music in his boyhood, he several times passed into a state of trance while he was playing. Apparently unconscious, he would seem to hear the richest music; and the nervous strain would leave him sadly shaken.

AT COLLEGE AND IN THE WAR.

At the age of fourteen he entered Oglethorpe College as a sophomore. He was graduated in 1860, and he held the position of tutor at the college until the outbreak of the Rebellion. The first call to arms, in April, 1861, found him marching toward Virginia with the first regiment that left his State. He and his dearly-loved younger brother, Clifford, enlisted as privates. They were tent companions, and three times Sidney declined promotion because it would have rendered necessary their separation.

After three campaigns together they were at last separated, and each was placed in command of a privateer. Captured in an attempt to run the blockade, Sidney was for five months a prisoner at Point Lookout. His flute, his inseparable companion in his army
life, he had slipped up his sleeve as he entered the prison; and with it the boy-prisoner made many friends.

His prison experience is recorded in his only novel, Tiger Lilies, written and sent to the press within three weeks, in 1867—a story now out of print, but described as "luxuriant, unpruned, yet giving rich promise of the poet," abounding in evidences of a fertile imagination and of high ideals of art.

Released from prison a few days before Lee surrendered, he reached home, emaciated and feeble, only in time to witness his mother's death from consumption. Congestion of the lungs seized on him then, and he never afterward knew vigorous health. Indeed, from this time his life was a prolonged struggle with consumption.

HIS MARRIAGE. THE POET'S WIFE.

For two years he faithfully discharged the humble duties of clerk in a shop, at Montgomery, Ala. In 1867 he became Principal of an Academy at Prattville, and a few weeks later he married Miss Mary Day. The marriage was a most congenial one. Her faith in her husband's future was most stimulating, and it never faltered in the dark years that followed. He dedicated to her many of his poems. From one of them, My Springs, here are some stanzas:

"In the heart of the hills of life, I know
Two springs that with unbroken flow
Forever pour their lucent streams
Into my soul's fair Lake of Dreams.

"Not larger than two eyes, they lie
Beneath the many-changing sky,
And mirror all of life and time,
Serene and dainty pantomime.

"Always when faith with stifling stress
Of grief hath died in bitterness,
I gaze in my two springs and see
A faith that smiles immortally.

"Always, when art, on perverse wing,
Flies where I cannot hear him sing,
I gaze in my two springs, and see
A charm that brings him back to me.

"O Love, O Wife, thine eyes are they,
My springs, from out whose shining gray
Issue the sweet celestial streams
That feed my Life's bright Lake of Dreams."
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"Oval and large and passion-pure
And gray and wise and honor-sure,
Soft as a dying violet-breath,
Yet calmly unafraid of death;

"Thronged like two dove-cotes of gray doves,
With wife’s and mother’s and poor-folks’ loves
And home-loves and high glory-loves
And science-loves and story-loves—

* * * * *

"Dear eyes, dear eyes! And rare complete—
Being heavenly-sweet and earthly-sweet—
I marvel that God made you mine—
For when He frowns, ’tis then ye shine!"

Never has true conjugal love in its sustaining, ennobling, everyday helpfulness to an artist-soul been more truly sung than by Lanier. He makes generous "Acknowledgment" of his debt to his wife for suggestions and inspiration, in the poem that bears that name;

"Twice-eyed, with thy gray vision set in mine
I ken far lands, to wifeless men unknown,
I compass stars for one-sexed eyes too fine."

And when the "Laus Mariae" of his verse has expressed more than most men who have not noble-hearted wives will accept as true (yet how much less than some of us know as truth!) of the preciousness of married life where hearts and souls are joined, he thus repels the charge that love so intense may interfere with supreme love to God:

"Wife-love flies level, his dear mate to seek,
God-love darts straight into the skies above;
Crossing, the windage of each other’s wings
But speeds them both upon their journeyings."

THE LAW. STILL FAILING HEALTH.

Before the first year of his married life had passed a violent hemorrhage from the lungs forced him to give up his position as Principal of the school at Prattville. Yielding to the wishes of his father, a lawyer who still practises at Macon, Ga., he settled at that place, and for five years studied and practised law. The spring and summer of 1870 brought an alarming decline and a distressing cough. Most pronounced symptoms of consumption in 1872 drove him to New York for medical assistance, and later to Texas for a change of air. The conviction was now forced home upon him that he had but a short time in which to do his life-work. From his earliest years he had known a consciousness of great powers, seldom spoken of, and never boastfully. It is easy to ridicule the confidence with
which such richly-endowed young natures sometimes speak of their own powers; but sooner or later the possession of real genius becomes known to its possessor, and usually he is conscious of it himself before he puts it to the proof that convinces others. Lanier's college note-books reveal to us noble ideals, and the high hopes of a boy "who had found in himself a standard above anything in his fellows." In these memorials of a "generous-seeking" youth there is a consciousness of power and a consecration to lofty aims which remind us of Milton's student-days. And now, at thirty, a consumptive exiled to Texas for his health, that his wife may take courage and share his high hopes for his future, he writes to her of "fresh revelations of the very inner essence and spirit of all songs." "All day my soul has been cutting swiftly into the great space of the subtle, unspeakable deep, driven by wind after wind of heavenly melody."

HE GOES TO BALTIMORE TO STUDY POETRY.

Convinced that his life was likely to be a short one, and feeling that he held sacred gifts in trust, he determined to devote what remained of life and strength to music and literature.

In December, 1873, he found in Baltimore the opportunities for broader study which he desired; and, after the fullest deliberation in that correspondence with his father of which we have seen a part, he began a life of systematic study, supporting himself meantime by filling the place of first flute for the Peabody Symphony Concerts. It was a courageous struggle, this long-continued effort to support his wife and children with pen and flute, by such work as he had strength to do between frequent hemorrhages. He had need of faith in his art and in himself, in his vocation as a singer of sweet, strong thoughts to cheer men's hearts.

Who that has read his *June Dreams in January*, written in 1869, but first printed after his death, can forget the passionate, artistic aspiration, the bitter disappointment, and the triumphant strain of success immediately dedicated to the wife and child who had inspired it, which mark this powerful though unfinished poem? The picture of poverty and of acknowledgment long delayed is a literal transcription of his own experience—too literal to bear publication until he had won enough of success to take away the pangs of the long delay.

At Baltimore he entered at once upon an eager and a thorough course of study in Anglo-Saxon and in English literature. These might be styled his professional studies, since they were intimately connected with his own improvement in his chosen art, Poetry.
But he also read eagerly along lines of Natural Science, Philology, Metaphysics, and Art. He sought to make himself the full man, whose mind should be stored with well-ordered knowledge of all that concerned his time. He saw clearly what so many poetasters seem never to suspect, that a great poet must know, first of all. In his marsh-songs there is evidence of a breadth of scientific thought that is cosmic in its far-reaching sweep and in its suggestions of orderly power and unchanging relations, alike in the natural and in the spiritual world. No poet of our time, unless it be Tennyson, has written verse which is at once so instinct with poetic beauty and fire, and so crowded with suggestions of the scientific theories of our time. These poems demand and repay careful study. They breathe the keenest delight in nature, and yet inanimate nature and human life are at one in them, not because the poet's moods are mirrored in nature, not because he has formally resolved to see human life in symbols, but because soul-life is to him so emphatically the Source and the Support of all life, that the growths and phases of nature are not only interpreters of spiritual and aesthetic truth, but naturally and spontaneously speak that language and share in and express that life.

The years from 1873 to 1876 he spent in Baltimore, alone, his family remaining in the South. His flute and his pen supported them; but his sense of the sacred trust imposed upon the artist was so deep, that he would never write for pay alone; and he published only when he was sure that he had a message of truth and beauty for the hearts of men, and that he had expressed it in the most perfect form at his command. No artist has had a heart more steadily than did he through long years of poverty and of physical weakness the principle which Ruskin emphasizes: "If your work is first with you and your fee second, work is your master and the Lord of work, who is God. But if your fee is first and your work second, fee is your master and the Lord of fee, who is the Devil. Work first, you are God's servant; fee first, you are the Fiend's." And no temptations from the Master of Fees could buy this poet, who listened to "the voice of the God of the artist," and took heed to fashion his poems "after the pattern that was shown him on the mount."

Until his marriage his love of art had found expression in music rather than in poetry. His earlier poems were comparatively unimportant; but after his marriage, poetry became his chosen form of expression. He soon began to acquire confidence in the use of rhythm and to express himself more freely.

His poem "Corn," published in Lippincott's Magazine in 1875, won him many friends, and among them Bayard Taylor, who felt
the new poet's power, and interested himself warmly in introducing Lanier to literary friends. Lanier's first letter to Taylor, grateful for recognition, yet dignified in tone, contains a pathetic sentence, which helps to explain that hunger of the soul which had driven Lanier to Baltimore: "Perhaps you know that with us of the younger generation at the South since the war, pretty much the whole of life has been merely not dying."

EFFECTS OF THE WAR UPON LITERATURE IN THE "NEW SOUTH."

This sentence of Lanier's contains a suggestion of the shaping of his life by the war, which deserves more than a passing notice. Great ideas, free and full powers of literary expression, strong tides of impulse toward artistic creation, attend upon and follow great social crises. Before the civil war the people of our Southern States had been notably deficient in evidences of such power. The appeal to arms, in 1861, called out the noblest young men, there as here. To young men reared in a society fevered and blinded by the poisonous exhalations of slavery, its ideas perverted by the vicious political doctrine that supreme allegiance was due to a so-called "sovereign State" and not to the United States, the Southern cause seemed the cause of liberty. At least, it was the cause of their families and their homes. That was a terrible awakening which came to them later, and taught them not only that they were defeated in war, but that they had been entirely wrong in their allegiance to the principles and the ideas which had led to the war.

Under the readjusting influences of such an awakening to truth, the younger men of the South have been moulded as they have approached middle life. Shattered hopes, ruined fortunes, desolated homes, and the grim demand that richly-endowed but passionate natures accept new social conditions and readjust their lives along lines which were untried and seemed unpromising, but which were still seen to be fixed by justice and maintained by irresistible power—this has been the experience of the young men of the South since the war.

We know that for too many in the South the result of the war was discouragement, "shiftlessness," and desperation; while others devoted themselves solely and intensely to money-winning. But for certain nobler souls, the result was a deep, intense intellectual and spiritual life. The man who has had the error burned out and the truth burned into him in the very agony of defeat and disappointment knows the truth and its power, for it has conquered him. And certain men who have passed through this experience have become as reverently and passionately devoted to the truth they
have accepted and now advocate as was the subdued giant, Christopher, to the divine little child he bore, beneath the weight of whose pure white hand his giant strength had yielded.

And this stern test has brought from the South such evidences of rich endowment in literature and art as her children have never before given to the world.

Nothing in the entire field of American literature is fuller of promise for our future than this awakening of the South to the consciousness of literary power. To mention but three among many, what a trio of names in literature the New South has given us in "Craddock" and Cable and Lanier!

The fact that Lanier had been in the Confederate army lent an especial propriety to Bayard Taylor's suggestion that he be chosen to write the words for the cantata at the opening of the Centennial Celebration at Philadelphia, when a reunited North and South first learned to know each other in peace. That Lanier had become a true patriot, sincerely ready to accept the issues of the war, and loyally confident in the future of our country, no one can doubt who reads The Tournament (written in 1862 and 1865) and the Psalm of the West.

The larger reputation which Lanier was now acquiring gave him hope and added confidence; but he did not "waste manhood on success." He was stimulated to deeper study and greater effort by the encouragement which began to come to him. And he needed encouragement, for it was nothing less than heroism for an invalid, who should have been nursing his own health so to toil as to support his family by fugitive publications and by his flute. "To coquett with starvation" was E. P. Whipple's synonym for depending upon occasional literary articles to support one's self. But Lanier by such articles supported not only himself, but the wife and children who were dearer to him than his own life. If he had a growing confidence in his powers, there was need of such confidence. We have seen his early consciousness of power. He writes now to his wife:

"So many great ideas for Art are born to me each day, I am swept away into the land of All-Delight, by their strenuous, sweet whirlwind; and I find within myself such entire yet humble confidence of possessing every single element of power to carry them all out, save the little paltry sum of money that would suffice to keep us clothed and fed in the mean time. I do not understand this."

"Why can we poets dream us beauty so,
But cannot dream us bread?"

Says Ruskin: "I believe that the first test of a truly great man
is his humility. I do not mean by humility doubt of his own
power or hesitation in speaking of his opinions; but a right un-
derstanding of the relation between what he can say and do and the
rest of the world's sayings and doings. All great men not only
know their business, but they usually know that they know it; ... only they usually do not think much of themselves on that account."

Tried by this standard, the humility of Lanier is fully vindicated.

In the summer of 1876 his family joined him in West Chester,
Pa.; but symptoms so alarming followed a severe cold that his
physicians warned him that he could not live until spring unless he
sought a warmer climate. The winter of 1877 was passed in Florida.
To this Southern Italy of ours his wife accompanied him, and in the
autumn of 1877 he first ventured to bring his family to Baltimore,
with the hope of making for them there a permanent home. He
resumed his place in the orchestra, where he was known as the finest
flute-player in the country. Indeed, many who heard him in those
concerts at Baltimore feel that the world has never had a truer artist
in marvellous flute-effects.

HIS LECTURES ON ENGLISH LITERATURE.

His devoted study of English literature, continued through all
these years, now bore fruit in a course of lectures upon Elizabethan
verse, delivered to a parlor class of thirty ladies. The warm praise
which these lectures received led to a more ambitious course, upon
Shakespeare. The lovers of art and letters in Baltimore rallied to
the support of these lectures with something of that generous desire
to aid struggling genius, mingled with a willingness to be known as
the discerning early patrons of a nascent reputation, which marked
Carlyle's first lecture courses in London. The undertaking was
much talked of, and the lecturer received unlimited encomiums; but
the course was so managed that it yielded little or no money to the
needy poet.

It had one result that was most welcome to him, however. President Gilman was led by it to offer to Lanier a lectureship on English
literature in Johns Hopkins University. The official notification of
his appointment reached him on his birthday, in 1879, and brought
with it the assurance of a fixed income, however small, for the first
time since his marriage, twelve years before!

This welcome recognition of his literary powers found the poet
exhausted by another hemorrhage, his body so enfeebled that it
could not hold prisoner for a much longer time the rare soul that
had so valiantly struggled against adversity. Still in his feebleness
he did the full work of a strong man. Occasional poems were
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printed, beautiful and carefully finished. Within six weeks, in the summer of 1879, he wrote The Science of English Verse, a volume which in itself merits an essay. Beyond question the English language contains no other such suggestive, artistic, yet scientific analysis of the "formal element in poetry," of the effects of vowel and consonant sequences, and of the acoustic basis and the capabilities of the differing rhythms and measures in poetic composition.

And now, while the last clear flames of his life are burning out in song and in poetic prose so perfect that we can scarcely credit the record of the bodily weakness in which such work was done, let us turn from the history of the poet’s life to note some characteristics of his poetry.

LANIER’S POWER OF IMAGINATION.

We have spoken of the ethical element in poetry as contributing more than any other element to give a poet a place in "the literature of enduring power;" but let no one suppose us to hold that the mere perception of moral maxims can make a poet, or that moral essays are poetry. Lanier has that wealth of imagination which marks the great poet. He "saw nothing alone." Great truths were reflected in nature, flashed back at a thousand varying angles from the visible word. It is for this beautiful imaging of truth that we are most indebted to him. Not only does he have power to make us see in his poetry

"The dearest boon imparted from above,
The greener meadow and the bluer heavens
And the deep heart of wonder and of love;"

but he looks through the phenomena of nature to a spiritual meaning that underlies them. He sees with a double vision. Something there is in Lanier of the spirit that prompted these impassioned words of that poet-artist, frenzied with beauty, William Blake: "What, it will be asked, when the sun rises do you not see a round disk of fire, somewhat like a guinea? Oh, no, no! I see an innumerable company of the heavenly host, crying, 'Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God Almighty!' I question not my corporeal eye any more than I would question a window concerning a sight!" Lanier saw with wonderful accuracy, and reported truly what the "corporeal eye" can see; but deeper than that he saw the ideal, the eternal. He could see well; and "the actual well seen is the ideal!" And those who do not yet know Lanier, if they listen to him in his prose or in his verse, will share the feeling of him who

"Heard one sweet voice ere he sailed away,
And in his joy passed on, with ampler mind."
HOW ESCAPE THE TYRANNY OF THE COMMONPLACE?

No one who hopes to live the intellectual life can with safety undervalue the imagination. A fact is precious. But we can do nothing with the fact; the fact can be nothing to us, save, perhaps, an inexorable limiting condition, until it is imaged forth to us in its ideal relations to other facts, to our own life. A definite thought clearly expressed, an idea instinct with power, an impulse given to our own thought, emotions, and will, comes to have an ever-higher value for all thoughtful men as their experience of life increases. More and more we learn to dread the subtle tyranny of the commonplace and the trivial. "Plain living" does not in itself and by its own inherent tendencies stimulate "high thinking." Those who live in a routine of fixed duties and in quiet surroundings, even if those duties have some bearing upon the intellectual and the spiritual life, still find it needful to guard themselves zealously if they would not be marked by the meannesses and leanesses that are the slavish livery of routine. By ideas we live. Through ideas God the Father of our spirits speaks to us. "Life is energy of mind," said Aristotle. The truly living soul carries ever in itself a sense of possible changes toward an unchanging ideal more and more clearly seen. The soul grows by conscious approaches to its ideal, by successive changes of its course of life. Each day's experience if we are making progress places us in a new point of view. A new light falls upon our course from the inspiring conversation of a friend, or from the grave periods of some deep-thoughted essayist, or some poet whose soul speaks to ours like the voice of a brother, wiser than we, but so akin to us that even if centuries have passed since he wrote, the intervening years are nothing. From such sources and from countless others, but oftenest from poetry, come the impulses which remind us that we are living souls, and should be aspiring and achieving.

THE LOVE OF NATURE.

Among such renovating influences come the sweet, silent ministrations of nature to the soul of man. In her sweet silences from human utterance she speaks to the reverent listener great primal, strengthening truths. We do well to take for ourselves hours of silent communion with nature. Mother earth, "the green things growing," the infinite wealth of up-springing life and insect-busy-ness in the June clover field; the musical allurement of the tinkling brook when no ear but yours hears it, and your willing feet follow its pebble-strewn, grass-carpeted, shadow-canopied course
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alone; the emerald-tinted half glooms of the deep wood, where all
the whispering trees seem pausing to listen, and you cannot resist
the feeling of which we have all been dumbly conscious—the feeling
which some one once expressed to Emerson, that as soon as we shall
have passed on, the genii of the place will resume the converse we
have interrupted; who is not better and stronger for hours thus
spent in the sweet, quiet tutelage of mother-earth? Such lessons
are not of the earth, earthy; they shine with the transfiguring light
which shows us that all nature is but the fringes of the garment of
Him who is Wisdom and Purity and Power and Love.

But however close to nature's heart we may fancy ourselves to be,
she has other children who have loved her even better than we.
They can tell us wonderful things of her which we shall miss without
their guidance. To see her as she is we must have the artist's
vision.

"He murmurs near the running brooks,
A music sweeter than their own."

Man's soul needs the ministrations of poetry, that he may receive
the highest teachings, whether of nature, of human society, or of
spiritual truth. We must have this manna of the soul, or our spirits
faint and die in the sand-wastes of routine.

LANIER PERSONIFIES ALL NATURAL OBJECTS.

If you love nature and enjoy the suggestive wealth of imagery
and association which abounds in the best poetry of nature, you will
delight in Lanier. Through all his verse there breathes a feeling of
brotherly sympathy with everything that has life.

"And I am one with all the kinsmen things
That e'er my Father fathered."

Since St. Francis of Assisi hastened along the up-sloping eastward
pathway at sunrise with arms outstretched as if he would embrace
the morning sun, hailing it as "dear brother mine," because it ran
so willingly on God's errands, and preaching of God's love to the
birds and the fishes as his little brethren, who were so full of life,
God's gift, that he must needs speak with them of God's great good-
ness—since St. Francis, no soul has seemed so heavily overcharged
with this feeling of brotherhood for all created things. But with
Lanier this love does not take the form of a vague, pantheistic
blending of men and things, destructive of all moral agency in men
and all moral distinctions in deeds. It is manifested rather in a
sense of personality so keen that animals, trees, and stars must share
it; and as servants of the Supreme God, they, too, must consciously
wear His livery of holiness and beauty, and be consciously bent upon doing His will. Lowell says that in Wordsworth's "noblest utterances man is absent, except as the antithesis that gives a sharper emphasis to nature." With Lanier, on the other hand, man and personality and will are so intensely real and so constantly underlie his thought, that his most beautiful descriptions of nature take the form of successive personifications, and nature, beautiful as she is and deeply as he loves her, becomes only the antithesis that gives a sharper emphasis to man's power of self-direction, of self-determination. Beauty is always seen as conformity to law, and is a term exchangeable in his thought with purity, truth, holiness. The obligation which rests on every man to make his own life, in the use of all its powers, conform to law, is the supreme fact in personality; and personality is so supremely the all-important fact in the universe that all animate and inanimate objects come into the scope of his vision personified and related to himself.

His sense of beauty and his heart of love fill him with a passionate tenderness toward all that is beautiful in nature. He shows again and again an overmastering love of broad, free spaces—the marshes, the sea, the night sky.

"Oh, is it not to widen man, stretches the sea?"

And he has the gift of setting all his work at times in such wide, cosmic views of nature as flash upon the reader broad generalizations and far-reaching relations whose radiant luminousness has been compressed into a phrase or a verse. But however wide the quick excursion of his thought may be, however terrific the import of the thought-annihilating distances in time and space through which his imagination hurries you, and of the elemental forces whose fury rages about you, always the thinking soul is the calm centre on which all turns and to which the poet constantly refers, "in the consciousness that the whitest of these lightnings cannot singe an eyelash of his immortal personality."

There is room for a most valuable essay upon the doctrine of personality, the key-note to Lanier's conscious and unconscious philosophy, elaborated as it is in *The English Novel*, and flashing out again and again in his poetry. We shall speak of it more fully when we notice his teaching as to the artist's responsibility.

**HIS APPRECIATIVE LOVE OF TREES AND PLANT-LIFE.**

Beyond any other poet, Lanier shows a love for plant-life and trees. Does he love them because they live and grow, yet never make capricious or wilful choice of evil, but grow steadily to their appointed form, breathing out a quiet beauty?
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"To company with large, amiable trees"

was a delight and a necessity with him. Early and late he sought them.

"In my sleep, I was fain of their fellowship, fain
Of the live-oaks, the marsh and the main;
The little green leaves would not let me alone in my sleep.

I have come ere the dawn, O beloved, my live-oaks, to hide
In your gospelling glooms."

Again and again the praise of trees and of forests recurs in his verse, like the delicious veins of rich, penetrating forest-odors that cross your pathway in mountain travel, lending an added charm to the beauty of the scenery.

"The wood-smells, that swiftly but now brought breath
From the heaven-side bank of the river of death."

Here is the secret of the charm of a sunset forest-scene, caught in a couplet:

"And the slant yellow beam down the wood-aisle doth seem
Like a lane into heaven that leads from a dream."

He speaks of

"Beautiful glooms, soft dusks in the noonday fire,
Wildwood privacies—closets of lone desire."

"Pure with the sense of the passing of saints thro' the wood
Cool, for the dutiful weighing of ill with good—"

The presence of trees was a ministration to his soul. He sought the forest for refreshment as a lover seeks the sight of his lady's face. It is as if his soul in some pre-existent state had plighted troth with a hamadryad! Hear him as he lifts the curtain of moss and slips in among the live-oaks, away from carking cares:

"So,
Affable live-oak, leaning low—
Thus, with your favor—soft, with a reverent hand,
Not lightly touching your person, Lord of the Land,
Bending your beauty aside, with a step I stand
On the firm-packed sand,
Free."

And the passionate purity of his forest thoughts is seen in such lines as these:

"To loiter down lone alleys of delight,
And hear the beating of the hearts of trees,
And think the thoughts that lilies speak in white
By green wood-pools and pleasant passages."
Here is a picture of the oak colonnades of a grove:

"Between
Old companies of oaks that inward lean
To join their radiant amplitudes of green."

But it is the soothing yet inspiring companionship of trees that is his favorite note:

"For love, the dear wood's sympathies,
For grief, the wise wood's peace."

This ministration of trees to a mind and heart "forspent with shame and grief" finds its culmination in the pathetic lines upon that olive-garden near Jerusalem, which to those of us who have sat within its shade must always seem the most sacred spot on earth. The almost mystic exaltation of the power of poetic sympathy which inspired these intense lines, Into the Wood my Master went, may impair their religious effect for many devout souls. But to many others this short poem will express most wonderfully that essential human-heartedness in the Son of Man, our Divine Saviour, which made Him one with us in His need of the quiet, sympathetic ministrations of nature—perhaps the heart of the reason why this olive-grove was "the place where He was wont to go" for prayer.

You have noticed the difference between the confused masses of indistinct shadow which the gaslight throws upon the city pavements from the leafy branches of intervening trees, and the crisp, photographic distinctness of the shadow-pictures of leaf and twig and moving branch cast at your feet by the incandescent electric light—shadows in which each individual leaf, its shape, its transparency or opacity, and the angle which its plane makes with the rays of light and with the pavement, is exactly written? As wide as this difference is that between the vague, general terms in which most other poets write of trees (where they write of them at all) and the loving delineation of the minutest peculiarities of tree-life and leaf-life which this ardent lover of trees gives us again and again. The long list of living growths for which "the flute" speaks in the Symphony might almost serve as the classed catalogue of the botanist, so full is it; yet see how it breathes with the poet's love for that of which he writes:

"I speak for each no-tongued tree
That Spring by Spring doth nobler be,
And dumbly and most wistfully
His mighty prayerful arms outspread
Above men's oft-unheeding heads,
And his big blessing downward sheds.
I speak for all shaped blooms and leaves,
Lichens on stones, and moss on eaves,
Grasses and grains in ranks and sheaves,
Broad-fronded ferns and keen-leaved canes,
And briery mazes bounding lanes,
And marsh-plants, thirsty cupped for rains,
And milky stems and sugary veins.
For every long-armed, woman-vine
That round a piteous tree doth twine;
For passionate odors, and divine
Pistils, and petals crystalline;
All purities of shady springs,
All shynesses of film-winged things
That fly from tree-trunks and bark-rings;
All gracious curves of slender wings,
Bark-mottlings, fibre-spiralings,
Fern-wavings and leaf flickerings,
Each dial-marked leaf and flower-bell
Wherewith in every lonesome dell
Time to himself his hours doth tell.''

This selection illustrates that lavish wealth of phrase and fancy which at times needs restraint in Lanier's poetry. Such a poem as The Harlequin of Dreams is evidence that his over-active imagination often crowded upon his mind throngs of suggestions which remained unuttered. His later poems show a growing mastery of that "power to leave out," which makes the highest works of genius as noteworthy for what they have refrained from including as for what they contain. The lush luxuriance of vegetable forms which these lines from the Symphony bring before the eye reminds one of Keats. In the "fervent hymns" which the "Spirits of June-Heat" upraise, in the Psalm of the West (p. 120), there is another passage where the verse is overweighted with beautiful imagery. Have the "innumerable stars," in their celestial beauty of grouping, ever been described with such a dazzling profusion of metaphor and simile as in the lines beginning:

"O stars wreathed vine-wise round yon heavenly dells,
Or thrust from out the sky in curving sprays,
Or whorl'd or looped with pendent flower-bells,
Or bramble-tangled in a brilliant maze," etc.?

Surely he had been "holding the heavens in his heart for contemplation." And not only does he feel their splendid profusion and the rich forms of beauty in their grouping, but he sees them in his thought separated by those vast interstellar spaces which none but astronomers and poets can apprehend, while

"Each grave star,
As in his own still chamber, sits afar
To meditate."

These last quoted lines are from A Florida Sunday, a poem which is an ideally perfect reproduction of a landscape mirroring a
mood which it suggests. In one of his charming letters Charles Lamb expands with delight, I remember, over a wonderful line of Coleridge,

"And tranquil muse upon tranquillity."

Lanier’s *Florida Sunday* might have been suggested by that line. Turn to it for a picture of Southern seas:

"Pale in-shore greens and distant blue delights,
White visionary sails, long reaches fair
By moon-horned strands that film the far-off air,
Bright sparkle-revelations, secret majesties,
Shells, wrecks and wealths are mine."

"Long, lissome coast, that in and outward swerves,
The grace of God made manifest in curves—
All riches, goods and braveries never told
Of earth, sun, air and heaven—now I hold
Your being in my being; I am ye,
And ye myself; yea, lastly, Thee,
*God, whom my roads all reach, how’er they run,*
My Father, Friend, Belovéd, dear All-One,
Thee in my soul, my soul in Thee I feel,
Self of myself."

"Thou, Father, without logic tellest me
How this divine denial true may be,
How all’s in each, yet every one of all
Maintains his self, complete and several."

**HIS DOCTRINE OF PERSONALITY.**

See how carefully, even if unconsciously, Lanier guards his choicest treasure, the inviolable self of a self-conscious personality, in these last lines. None of the pantheistic poets feel more deeply than does he the solvent, blending power of the Father-Love which makes all nature one.

"But in the multichord of ecstasy
Our souls shall mingle yet be featured clear."

He has learned the essential emptiness of a Nirvana that blots out God’s handiwork, the individual soul. To Buddha he says:

"All the All thou hadst for needy man
Was Nothing, and thy Best of being was
But not to be."

And to the half-pantheistic tendencies of the modern disciples of this doctrine, with their reiterated assertions and implications that "Good and Evil are but different and partial names for one and the
same thing," Lanier steadily opposes the clear intuition of a self-determining personality. He will not be misled by

"Emerson
Most wise, that yet, in finding Wisdom, lost
Thyself, sometimes."

He never halts at that old confusion (in our day renewed) of the "good" in deeds with the "good" in things or "the pleasurable" in experience, which led Plato to speak of "suffering injustice" and "doing injustice" as alike moral "evils," though one was a greater and the other a less evil. He sees that morals have to do only with self-activity of deed and feeling.

Yet this constant perception of responsibility and of law, far from making him sternly repellent, is joined with the deepest reverence for Love as supreme. "The great artist can never work in haste, never in malice, never in even the sub-acid, satiric mood of Thackeray; in love, and love only, can great work, work that not only pulls down, but builds up, be done; it is love, and love only, that is truly constructive in art" (The English Novel, p. 204).

It is the blending of the "conception of Love as the organic idea of moral order," with an austerity of purity, an intense white-heat of admiring devotion to holiness and truth, which makes Lanier the Apostle of Beauty and Holiness in the history of American art and letters.

While he is not distinctively a religious poet, there are not wanting passages in his poems as well as in his prose which express those convictions that early in life led him to membership in a Christian church of the fellowship which lends a name to this REVIEW. The experience of later years broadened his faith, and his poetic perceptions of a scope in certain feelings too wide for formulated words led him to speak less sympathetically of creeds as tests for laymen's thinking. But always he held that the hope of society is in those

"Godly hearts, that, grails of gold,
Still the blood of faith do hold."

It would be difficult to find a sharper contrast between the spirit of enlightened Christian faith and the spirit of agnosticism than you will feel if you compare with Lanier's Marshes of Glynn and Florida Sunday the utterly pathetic lament of the brilliant young scientist, Clifford, over the loss of cradle-faiths: "We have seen the sun shine out of an empty heaven to light up a soulless earth; we have felt with utter loneliness that the Great Companion is dead." To Lanier, the universe beats warm with the presence of a Personal God whose will upholds its laws, whose Love is Life, and whose high behests the artist, the poet is quick to hear and swift to obey.
"WHAT WORTH, THE WHOLE OF ALL THINE ART?"

His conception of the function, the "mission" of the artist we need not infer from mere allusions. He distinctly formulates it in more than one of his poems, as well as in his prose writings. In Individuality, the cloud (which, "still-eyed and shadow-browed, steals off from yon far-drifting crowd," "And comes and broods upon the marsh") is arraigned by the poet for "contempts on Mercy, Right, and Prayer," because but yesterday

"Thy lightnings slew a child at play,
And then a priest with prayers upon his lips
For his enemies, and then a bright
Lady that did but ope the door
Upon the storming night
To let a beggar in," etc.

"What myriad righteous errands high
Thy flames might run on!"

To which the cloud makes answer:

"What the cloud doeth
The Lord knoweth,
The cloud knoweth not.
What the artist doeth
The Lord knoweth;
Knoweth the artist not?"

"Awful is art, because 'tis free.
The artist trembles o'er his plan
Where men his self must see;
Who made a song or picture, he
Did it, and not another, God or man."

"Each artist, gift of terror, owns his will."

Not Arthur's Difference between Physical and Moral Law, not Hazard's Man a Creative First Cause, is more explicit in its doctrine of responsibility. This Puritan-like sense of man's accountability, "as ever in the Great Task-Master's eye," pervades his poems. And in particular upon the artist, Lanier lays the heaviest responsibility for the right use of the great gifts entrusted to him. The thought of artists as

"harps that stand
In the wind, and sound the wind's command,"

breathing out, irresponsibly, a strain in praise of good or ill, is repellant to his soul. The true key-note and master-tone is the holiness of beauty. With this all a man's words and deeds should be in
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harmony. And neither in artists nor in common men can he tolerate that clanging, discordant looseness of tone which inevitably follows the surrender or the forgetting of responsibility, of personal allegiance to ethical law.

HIS CRITICISMS OF POETRY.

But while he loyally insists upon allegiance to moral law as underlying all true beauty, Lanier is not blind either to the fleeting beauties or the defects of poets who renounce that allegiance. Hear some of his epigrammatic judgments of the fleshly school of poets:

"There was something in Whitman," he says, which when he first read Whitman at his best, "refreshed me like harsh salt spray." But this is his verdict: "Whitman is poetry's butcher. Huge, raw collops, slashed from the rump of Poetry—and never mind gristle—is what Whitman feeds our soul with. Whitman's argument seems to be, that because a prairie is wide, therefore debauchery is admirable; and because the Mississippi is long, therefore every American is a God." And as an artist and a teacher Lanier warns his fellow-countrymen against the assumption that there is to come from democracy a "revolutionized democratic literature, which will wear a slouch hat and leave its shirt open at the bosom, and generally riot in a complete independence of form" (The English Novel, p. 27).

Of Swinburne he says: "He invited me to eat; the service was silver and gold, but no food therein save pepper and salt." And of William Morris: "He caught a crystal cupful of the yellow light of sunset, and persuading himself to dream it wine, drank it with a sort of smile."

While Lanier held to the loftiest ideals in art, he believed that poetry would vindicate its value even if tried by utilitarian standards. He wrote that he might fortify men's souls, and so minister to their deepest needs. He held no art true art which failed of this. The beauty and the teaching service go hand in hand. The truth that a poet should minister to others is set forth in The Song of the Chattahoochee, with a delicate grace of descriptive beauty and imitative melody that makes this one of the most bewitching "stream-songs" in all literature. It is more beautiful than Tennyson's brook, in its pure, stream-cool imagery. It is as full of the motion of hurrying water as are Southey's celebrated lines, How the Water comes down at Lodore. But Southey's verse is a mere agglomeration of syllables, over which you must hurry and stumble in the effort to pronounce them. After study of both, when you com-
pare Southey's lines with the on-sweeping, impetuous, swaying rush that lends unity to thought, metre, and choice of words in the beautiful interpretative poem of Lanier, the comparison well illustrates the difference between a versifier's tour de force, and the fine, spontaneous outburst of a poet responding to and interpreting the phases and voices of nature which he loves and feels.

"THE NOBLE AND PROFOUND APPLICATION OF IDEAS TO LIFE."

The poet or preacher who feeds the souls of men with truth which is the life of the soul does them greater and higher service than the distributer of coal and bread; for

"He that feeds men serveth few,
He feeds all that dares be true."

"We live by admiration wisely fixed." In turning men's thoughts continually to the worthiest objects of admiration, and in holding that the poet's mission was "to keep the line of men touching shoulders with each other," and to discharge "the function of elevating all commonplace life into the plane of the heroic; by keeping every man well in mind of the ego within him, which includes the possibility of all heroic action," Lanier gave ample evidence of what Matthew Arnold has called "the most essential part of poetic greatness"—"the noble and profound application of ideas to life." In Clover, the beautiful poem which he inscribes to the memory of Keats, in answer to the question, "A poet, thou; what worth, what worth, the whole of all thine art?" he declares that

"The artist's market is the heart of man,
The artist's price, some little good of man."

And in The Bee he tells us how this service is to be rendered to men by the poet:

"Wilt ask, 'What profit e'er a poet brings?'
He beareth starry stuff about his wings,
To pollen thee, and sting thee fertile.'
* * * * * *
"For oft these pollens be
Fine dust from wars that poets wage for thee."

While the higher lessons of soul-life are especially the province of the poet, in his Southern "dialect poems" he set himself the immediately useful task of opposing two dangerous tendencies of the planters at the South after the war—excessive borrowing and "speculation."

But in the main it was by strengthening "those sacred bases of
personality upon which the fabric of our modern society rests" that Lanier sought and hoped to serve his fellow-men. "The possibility of making one's life a good life invests it with a romantic interest whose depth is infinitely beyond that of all the 'society pleasures'" (Eng. Novel, p. 254). "The possibility of such moral greatness on the part of every most commonplace man and woman completely reduces to a level the apparent inequality in the matter of genius, and so illustrates the 'russet-coated epic' of every-day life and common people" (Eng. Novel, pp. 192, 194).

The Symphony.

Through an ethical impulse, always associated in Lanier's consciousness with an aesthetic feeling, men are to be brought to a steadier voluntary conformity with law; the "free, preferential power" of the man is to be used for good. And while the poet always knows that reforms must begin with the individual, and can go forward only as men, one by one, become possessed of nobler ideas and take on the new life at the touch of Truth, yet Lanier was keenly alive to those social problems of our age which in their outcome have to do with men in the mass. In many respects the Symphony seems his most characteristic poem. It reproduces marvellously many of the effects of the orchestral symphony, taking up the motif, varying the mode of presentation to represent the different instruments, recurring to the theme, now bold and clear, now delicately suggestive and remote, now throbbingly pathetic. But see what an intensely practical and warmly human theme the artist in music and verse has chosen for this typically artistic production! This beautiful poem is full of large-hearted sympathy with the laboring men and the "prisoners of poverty," and under its poetic imagery gives a summary of the political economy of "the labor question."

Lanier was pre-eminently a musician in his art. In his literary criticism there is abundant use of the "imagery" of music—"notes" and "tones" and "melodies" and "harmonies" and "tone-colors" are his natural language. He believed, too, that

"Music, on earth, much light upon heaven had thrown;"

and his most helpful views of the future of men on earth, as well as his most inspiring outlooks into the heavenly distances and the vast futurities of the soul, are most frequently given in terms of music. In a noble passage on the development of music as at once the effect and the evidence of the development of the modern idea of that personality which Wordsworth says may "make each soul a
separate heaven, a court for deity," the sentence which we quote blends love of music, individuality, and hope of the moral amelioration of men—three marked characteristics of Lanier's thought. In orchestral harmony he sees: "The highest type of social development, where the melody is at once united with the harmony in the most intimate way, yet never loses its individuality; where the melody would seem to maintain toward the harmony almost the ideal relation of our finite personality to the infinite personality, at once autonomous, as finite, and yet contained in and rapturously united with the infinite" (Eng. Novel, p. 144).

LANIER AND "SCIENCE" IN ART.

He was possessed by the deepest conviction that the beauty of the art of poetry, like all other beauty, had its foundation in law. So dominant was this conviction that, publishing but little, he held all his powers of expression in reserve until by intense study he could formulate a scientific theory of the art of verse, under which he could be free (for freedom is possible only by voluntary conformity to law)—free to work freely "for time, not for the day." The Science of English Verse gives us the result of these studies. It deserves a fuller criticism than is possible in this article. Its central inspiring idea is to be inferred from that sentence of Dante's which Lanier inscribed upon its title-page: "But the best conceptions cannot be, save where science and genius are." While it was written and prepared for the press within six weeks, in one of those white glows of rapid, intense, and free creation, which are the mark of genius, it embodies the methodical study and the thought of years. Lanier had no sympathy with the poet-friend who objected to any theory of verse, and said, "As for me, I would rather continue to write verse from poetic instinct." To him Lanier quotes Ben Jonson's lines eulogizing the knowledge and trained skill with which Shakespeare "shakes a lance at ignorance" in every "well-turned, true-filed line,"

"Who casts to write a living line must sweat
(Such as thine are) and strike a second heat
Upon the muses' anvil."

"For a good poet's made as well as born."

Lanier's was a trained mind, remarkable for its combination of artist-impulse with scientific knowledge of music, methodical persistence of acquisition, careful and wide reading, especially in English literature, and capacity for broad generalizations based on facts carefully observed, but not allowed to tyrannize the soul. For natural science he had a marked fondness, and in The English
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Novel he has written most inspiring truths as to that vexed question in aesthetics, the effect of science upon the art of poetry in the future. He does not fear that the secrets of God are so shallow that science will explore all the unknown, and poetry will die in an atmosphere exhausted of all mystery. "Science, instead of being the enemy of poetry, is its quartermaster and commissary," he declares; and if you wish for a beautiful commentary on this sentence, read such passages in his own poetry as that from Sunrise in the Marsh Hymns, beginning, "O artisan born in the purple —Workman Heat." Into his chosen art he must carry a truly scientific (yet not the less an artist's) method; for Dr. Ward has justly said of him, "His mind was as truly philosophically and scientifically accurate as it was poetically sensuous and imaginative." He knew that no artist consciously works by rule at the moments when he is most truly inspired. But he insisted with equal clearness upon the counter-truth (too often forgotten by weaklings who talk of "hours of inspiration" and do not study), that the normal rules of art are to be deduced only from careful study of the masterpieces of art wrought at their best moments by those master-minds who knew by heart the laws which they unconsciously obeyed.

"Nay, as the poet, mad with heavenly fires,
Flings men his song, white-hot, then back retires,
Cools heart, broods o'er the song again, inquires,
Why did I this, why that? and slowly draws
From Art's unconscious act Art's conscious laws."

—Psalms of the West.

His volumes of prose are invaluable for students, because they incessantly demand of the reader and the would-be poet that he study, learn, acquire. "The trouble with Poe was, he did not know enough," says Lanier. "He needed to know a good many more things in order to be a great poet." And to young poets: "You need not dream of winning the attention of sober people with your poetry unless that poetry and your soul behind it are informed and saturated with at least the largest final conceptions of current science." "Once for all, in art, to be free is not to be independent of any form; it is to be master of many forms."

Such sentences as these make it a matter for congratulation, as we look to the future of American letters, which suffered so deep a loss in Lanier's death, that the reports of librarians at all our literary centres show that rapidly increasing numbers of our young people are consulting the works of Lanier for inspiration and guidance. As the generous-hearted youth of Cambridge once undertook a mission to Oxford, sending a delegation of their finest scholars to
awaken at Oxford a love for Shelley and an appreciation of his poetry, so may the love of this noble American poet spread from college to college.

CHARACTERISTICS AND "HAPPY PHRASES."

His wealth of imagination; his fine powers of poetic conception; his skill and art in the coining of happy phrases; his "deft marshalling" of vowels and consonants; his constantly-increasing mastery of the forms of verse; his union of close study and broad reading with deep poetic insight, the finest flushes of poetic feeling, and the most daring freedom in the use of passionate, thought-laden outbursts of expression; his quick, full, and unvarying reliance upon intuition and the intuitive perception of great truth as the poet's supremest gift, at the moment when

"Belief overmasters doubt, and I know
That I know:

—all these mark him as a great poet.

One is tempted to group certain happily phrased verses, many of which reveal his wonderful power of hearing the sounds and voices of nature, and his gift of coining expressions, which illustrate the Arabian proverb, "That is the best description which makes the ear an eye:"

"The cricket tells straight on his simple thought,
Nay, 'tis the cricket's way of being still."

"A one-desiring dove
Times me the beating of the heart of love."

"And down the hollow, from a ferny nook,
'Lull' sings a little brook."

"As some dim blur of distant music nears
The long-desiring sense, and slowly clears
To forms of time and apprehensive tune."

"Yet precious qualities of silence haunt
Round these vast margins, ministerant."

Of the sudden outburst of a bird's song:

"Dumb woods, have ye uttered a bird?"

Of the sun:

"Unto thee, whence the glittering stream of all morrows doth roll."

"Up the sky
The hesitating moon slow trembles on,
Faint as a new-washed soul but lately up
From out a buried body."

"The dew-drop, morn, may fall from off the petal of the sky."
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One might multiply without number beautiful lines, particularly those which touch on the sweet antithesis and familiar rhythmic interplay of night and day, full of mystery and beauty to him as to all true poet-hearts. The gracious charms of the hours of dawn and even, when Night and Day are blending and interchanging, he sings again and again with a dewy, dawn-like freshness and a full-throated, evening-robin song of peace.

HIS LAST WORK.

But we left the poet just made happy in his illness by his appointment, on his thirty-eighth birthday, in 1879, to a Lectureship on English Literature at the Johns Hopkins University. Let us follow him hurriedly through the two years of life left to him.

Before the heaviest strain of ill-health fell upon him, he had recorded in verse this prayer, fully answered as the life of his body waned and the beauty of his soul grew clearer:

"Would that my songs might be
What roses make, by day and night:
Distilments of my clod of misery
Into delight."

It was in May, 1880, that the final fever fell upon him. After that date he lived only because soul and will triumphed over a body that, but for their transcendent power, must have yielded at once to disease. A summer in the open air at West Chester prolonged his life; and the autumn-time saw him again in Baltimore, his wife and children about him. In December all hope was abandoned; but he rallied, and in February he delivered his second course of Lectures at the University, since published as the Development of the English Novel, a most delightful and thoughtful volume, already recognized as a classic. He had the strength to write with his own hand only the earlier lectures of the course. The later he dictated in whispers to his wife. A tragic interest will always attend the memory of these lectures as they are recalled by affectionate hearers. They listened, one has said, "with a sort of fascinated terror, as the beautiful thoughts fell from his lips, in doubt whether the hoarded breath would suffice to the end of the hour." It was in December of this winter, when too feeble to raise food to his mouth, with a fever temperature of 104°, that he pencilled that glorious outburst of poetic life and fire, Sunrise on the Marshes, his greatest poem. He seemed to fear that his soul might lose its feeble servant, the body, before this message from the world of beauty, where that soul already floated far above pain and suffering, could be left on record that other men might by it be uplifted.
These lectures finished, he devoted some time to the prosecution of a task which well illustrates his love of the pure-hearted, honorable boys of our land. *The Boy's Froissart, The Boy's King Arthur, The Boy's Mabinogeon, and The Boy's Percy,* "edited by Sidney Lanier," have already reached an aggregate sale of nearly 25,000 copies; and the boys who from these titles become familiar with the name of the man who gave his latest strength to preparing for American and English boys these noble volumes, will surely seek later in life some acquaintance with the sweet-souled poet and critic in his own works. Lanier will be remembered where even fiery-souled old Pindar felt that heroes had their noblest laurels, "in the gentle fellowship of young boys' themes of song."

As soon as the return of spring would allow a change, they bore the dying poet to the Carolinas, as a last hope, to try the effect of tent-life in a milder climate. His brother Clifford became once more his tent-companion, as in the days of their army life. Laid thus close to the bosom of mother-earth, breathed upon day and night by her soft mother-breath, he lingered yet a little while—he even seemed to rally back toward strength.

His brother, summoned suddenly by important business, left him, in hope of seeing him again, so marked had been the improvement. But in September, 1881, alone with his wife, as they would have chosen to meet the inevitable, his eyes closed on this world, looking last of all into those dear eyes of hers, that were his "Springs of Peace."

"Just when he seemed to have conquered success enough to assure him a little leisure to write his poems," says his biographer, "then his feeble but resolute hold upon earth was exhausted. What he had left behind him was written with his life-blood." "High above all the evils of the world, he had lived in a realm of ideal serenity, as if it were the business of life to conquer difficulties."

In an age which is so strongly marked by blind devotion to money-getting he lived in the spirit of his own fine lines,

"The artist's market is the heart of man;
The artist's prize, some little good of man."

Alone, with a flute that breathed out music which was almost poetry, with a soul that saw only the law of love and beauty and truth, consumption grudging him every breath he drew, poverty pinching those dependent ones whom he loved best, serene he faced the hardest blows that Providence can deal to such a man, his soul and his verse mirroring only beauty, purity, and faith in God.
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To an age assailed by the dangerous doctrines of the fleshly school in poetry, and by that unhealthy "æstheticism" and that debauching "realism" which see in vice and uncleanness only new fields for the artist's powers of description, and no call for the artist's divine powers of denunciation—to save young men into whose ears is dinned the maxim, "art for art's sake only," "a moral purpose ruins art," Lanier came, noble-souled as Milton in youthful consciousness of power, yet humble before the august conception of a moral purity higher than he could hope to utter or attain, discerning with the true poet's insight the "beauty of holiness" and "the holiness of beauty."

Had he lived and died in England, how he would have been embalmed in loving odes, his sepulchre how perpetually draped with insignia of national appreciation! He is ours! He was an American to the centre of his great, loving heart. Shall we cherish his memory any the less lovingly because his works are the first-fruits of a reunited people—the richest contribution to our national fame in letters yet made by our brothers of the South?

MERRILL EDWARDS GATES.

*Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.*
VI.

CRITICAL NOTE.

SOME EXEGETICAL NOTES ON 1 TIMOTHY.*

VII. THE MEANING OF 1 TIMOTHY iv. 14.

The word χαρίσμα suggests a miraculous gift that had been conferred on Timothy. If we may assume this, the passage becomes somewhat easier. This divine gift, it is asserted, was given through the medium of prophecy. The phrase μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου cannot be pressed beyond the assertion that the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, by which seems to be meant Timothy's ordination, was concomitant with the giving of the χαρίσμα—i.e., this took place at the same time as that.

If now we turn to 2 Timothy i. 6, and read that Timothy received this χαρίσμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (6), this gift of the Spirit (7), through the medium of the laying on of Paul's hands, there can result no inconsistency with what is here taught. The medium is in the one case declared to be "prophecy," in the other, "the laying on of the Apostle's hands;" and it is only necessary to suppose that the Apostle did not silently lay on his hands to bring the two statements into exact harmony.

It is not necessary for us to distinguish (for the Apostle distinguishes for us) between the laying on of his hands, which conferred the gift, and the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, which conferred ordination, and was only concomitant with the conferring of the gift. Ordination could doubtless be conferred by an apostle, although this was ordinarily the function of a presbytery; but the conferring of miraculous gifts by the laying on of hands seems to have been ordinarily confined to the apostles, as Simon Magus early discovered (Acts viii. 18). Possibly there is only one case of a miracle being wrought by the laying on of hands of others than an apostle recorded for us (Acts ix. 12-17), and no case of miraculous gifts being so conferred. The case of the Samaritans is a very instructive one (Acts viii.). Hitherto, apparently, converts had received the power of working signs, or speaking with tongues or other Spirit-given manifestations, by the laying on of the apostles' hands at baptism. But the Samaritans were converted by one not an apostle, and it was not until Peter and John were sent to them that they "received the Holy Ghost" (Acts viii. 14-17). The same results followed the imposition of Paul's hands (Acts xix. 6, cf. xxviii. 8). On the other hand, ordination was

* Continued from July number.
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something distinctly different from this; in Acts vi. 6 the apostles ordain, and in Acts xiii. 3 an apostle is ordained by those who were not apostles; in Acts xiv. 23 again ordinations take place by Paul and Barnabas, and in 1 Timothy v. 22, and apparently Titus i. 5, ordinations take place in the absence of apostles. It seems clear, then, that we must distinguish between ordination in which the presence of an apostle was not necessary and the conference of miraculous gifts which came only by the imposition of the hands of an apostle.

1 Timothy iv. 14 and 2 Timothy i. 6, when taken together, tell us thus that the ordination of Timothy was the occasion on which by prophecy and by the laying on of the hands of Paul the miraculous gift was conferred. But this no more confuses the ordination with the laying on of Paul's hands than with the prophecy, or than in earlier times baptism was confused with the impartation of spiritual gifts. It may have been in one composite act that Timothy received both ordination and the gift; but still the ordination came by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery and the gift by the prophecy and the laying on of the hands of Paul. Though not distinguished in time, the two were distinguishable in source.

VIII. THE SEVERAL CLASSES OF WIDOWS IN 1 TIMOTHY V. 3-16.

A careful scrutiny of this passage will show us that Paul here speaks of no less than four classes of widows. He first divides all widows into two general divisions: those who have descendants to whom they may look for support, and those whom he calls real and desolate widows. The former class he expects to receive their support from their descendants, who will please God by learning to show (filial) piety first at home, and to requite the former goodness of their progenitors (verse 4), and who are declared to be worse than unbelievers if they do not provide for their own (verse 8). The real and desolate widows include within their number three separate classes. First, there are the desolate widows, so far as husband and children go, who unbecomingly live a life of luxury and pleasure; they are dead though living, and the Church has nothing in them (verse 6). Next, there are the real and desolate widows, who have neither descendants nor wealth to depend upon, but can only set their hope on God, and abide in petitions and prayers night and day* (verse 5). These are to receive from Christian charity the help that they need. Finally, there is a still narrower class of these latter needy ones, which the Apostle speaks of at some length in verses 9-16, and which we may call, for lack of a more definite name, "listed widows." Exactly what these "listed widows" are has been a standing subject of dispute among commentators and writers on ecclesiastical organization, although it does not seem impossible to learn from the Apostle's description their true status.

Putting behind us, then, what has been written about them, and attending to the text itself, it may be remarked, first, that the "listed widows" do not seem

* That these words are not intended as praise to the widows, but as a sign of their desolation is clear from the context. Cf. Weiss in loc.
to be an ecclesiastical order, whether of deaconesses or presbyteresses. This
may be urged on three grounds: (a) The requirement as to age—"not
under threescore years old," with no limit in the upward direction (verse 9)
—seems inconsistent with the "enlistment" being to an office with duties
and, in some sense, active functions. (b) That the enlistment was not to
official activity, but was rather a relief from the necessity of labor, follows from
verse 13, where the Apostle expresses his fear that the younger widows, if en-
listed, would only learn to be idle, * and so become busybodies and gossip-
ers. An office does not beget idleness. (c) The placing of a widow on the
list made her a burden to the Church (verse 16); and this is scarcely a usual
way of speaking of the officers of an active body. If, then, the enlistment in
question can scarcely be enrolment into an ecclesiastical order, we may note,
secondly, that it is an enrolment into a body of pensioners of the Church's
bounty. For this assertion much the same reasons may be urged as were
pleaded against the former notion. More explicitly: (a) On enrolment, a
widow became a burden to the Church (verse 16), and that in such a sense
that she would no longer need the aid of private charity. (b) On enrolment
the widow was relieved from the necessity of labor (verse 13) to such an extent
that were she young enough, to continue active, she was in danger of reaping
the fruits of idleness in deterioration of character and growing carelessness of
speech. (c) The whole context may be pleaded, which, at verse 3, begins
with the subject of the support of the widows, and does not leave it until verse
16; whereas if the "listed" widows be an ecclesiastical order, the paragraph
treating of it is inserted in the midst of a discussion with which it has nothing to
do, and without any warning as to the double change of subject, first from (verse
9) and then back to (verse 16) the general subject of the section. In order
that we may not be misunderstood, we ought to add, thirdly, that the "listed
widows" are not, however, to be regarded as the only widows entitled to the
charity of Christians. It is clear that the τιμακ of verse 3 (note the " but if"
of verse 4) includes monetary help, and the whole drift of verses 3-8 shows
that all needy widows were to be aided by charity. So, too, verse 16 demonstrat-
est that the Church felt the duty pressing upon her of relieving all widows
that were "widows indeed" (cf. verses 3-5), while even beyond these there
were some who had claims on private charity. The "listed widows," therefore,
were but one class of those whom the Church helped, and the objection
so often urged against understanding them to be a body of pensioners—"Would
the Church thus limit her alms?" †—is meaningless. St. Paul certainly dis-
tinguishes between a larger body of alms-receivers ("widows indeed," verses
3-5) and a less inclusive body of alms-receivers ("widows-enlisted," verse 9); and our task is simply to discover what distinction he made between them.

* That "learn to be idle" is the proper sense of this clause seems certain both be-
cause no suitable meaning can be got from any other connection of μανθάνωναι, and
because otherwise ἄραῖ becomes very subordinate, whereas both its position and its
repetition in verse 13b show it to be the most important idea of the clause. For the
linguistic point involved, see Field, "Otium Norvicense," Part III., p. 126.
† e. g. Ellicott in loc.
The distinction seems to lie ready at our hand. All desolate widows, young or old, were to receive the alms of the Church in accordance with their need and its ability. But these alms were to be given from time to time, to relieve present need, and without entailment of the future. Thus these widows stood in the same relation to the almsgiving body that other needy persons did, and received their aid from time to time as they needed it. But there was another narrower circle of widows, called "listed widows," who were enrolled as permanent pensioners of the Church; to them the Church assumed the position of children; it recognized them as its "mothers," so to speak, and it engaged for their entire support for all their future life. These were, indeed, "burdens" on the Church—"burdens" which it cheerfully undertook, but, none the less, permanent "burdens." Naturally enough, enrolment on this list was to be carefully guarded. All widows, whether young or old, whether their past life would bear scrutiny or not, might receive alms in their times of need; and they might count upon these alms in the charity of the Church so long as they had need. But the Apostle wisely decrees that none should be placed on the list of permanent pensioners, for whose whole future the Church undertook to provide, who had not already reached an age which would render it probable that they would need help for the rest of their natural lives, and who had not only been pure in their marital relations, but had been of approved Christian character in all their relations. Only mothers in Israel should be honored by being adopted as the mothers of Israel. The exclusion of the younger widows from this list is justified by him on the two grounds that their enlistment placed them in an equivocal position, and that the freedom from care for their livelihood that resulted would beget idle and gossiping habits. He does not forbid these younger women to be helped; they were to be helped according to their daily needs. But he bids them to look for their permanent support where they naturally would seek it—in that second marriage and family activity which their youth and energy fitted them for; rather than that, in their first feeling of desolation, they should by an open and public step proclaim that they had no hope but in God (verse 5), and could henceforth have no spouse but Christ (verse 11), lest in the course of nature they should at some time wax wanton against Christ and wish to marry again, and so be forced to condemn themselves as breakers of their first faith (verse 12). Far better for the Church to remember their youth for them at a time when they naturally forget it, and refuse them opportunity for ostentatious proclamation that they are dead to the world at a period when their life in it is scarcely begun, and for thus making that second marriage, which would naturally succeed the first, an open disgrace rather than what it really is, a second blessing.

We may venture to say that the completeness with which this interpretation of the "listed widows" unties all the knots of this rather difficult paragraph is a convincing proof of its correctness. It accounts for the insertion of the paragraph here, where the support of widows had been the theme (verses 3–8). It accounts for the arrangement of the matter through the paragraph itself, which seems to be the following: 1. Prerequisites for enrolment—viz. (a),
age over sixty years; (b) purity in marital relations; (c) reputation for good works (9, 10). 2. Justification of the requirement as to age—viz., it is an equivocal position for young women (11, 12), and it is a dangerously idle life for young women (13). 3. Intention for the younger widows—viz., they should marry, lest they fall into temptation and sin (14, 15). 4. The source of support for the unlisted women—viz., their relatives, if they have such, and Christian charity if they are desolate (16). It accounts still further for the details of the discussion. For instance, it accounts fully for the requirement of age; and as the position of permanent pensioner was one of necessary honor, for the requirement of virtue and good works. The Church would honor and reward such women.

It accounts again for the very difficult statements of verses 11-13, adduced in justification of the exclusion of younger women. Verses 11, 12 are read by those who understand the "listed widows" to be an ecclesiastical order, as implying that a vow of "celibacy" was a prerequisite to entrance into it; and some even say this would be "self-evident." But is not this reading a later age into Paul's words? No doubt this verse has become the support of celibate orders, and perhaps it helped to found them; but certainly by a misunderstanding. It is not marrying, but "wishing to marry," that is the fault here; it is not falling away from faith, but "breaking the first faith," that is condemned in the woman's conscience. Paul does not object to the younger widows marrying; it is possible that he does not even object to the "listed" women marrying again; what he objects to is permitting a woman to enroll herself as one who will never have hope in any but God for her support, and thus proclaiming to the world her permanently desolate position, who, there is every reason to believe, is taking a temporarily despondent view of her true case. His object is to protect both the church and the woman; but his language is framed, as it is also in verse 13, from the point of view of the woman's need. No doubt it is implied that all the listed women are without husbands and are not to marry again; but this grows out of the very nature of the case that the enlistment is of those who have and will never have any one to look to for their support but the Church of their God, in whom their only hope is set (verse 5). They do not, then, pledge themselves not to marry, but they represent themselves as without any possible hope of marrying; and under such circumstances the Church assumes their support. Therefore the Church cannot accept these representations in the case of one who is so young that they need not be true; and for one who gives such assurances and then "is wishing to marry," an inconsistency results which is little short of a scandal, and which must produce a self-condemnation which need not be less sincere because her broken faith is based on obligations arising from monetary aid rather than from a recorded vow. The reason given in verse 13 rests also on a reminiscence of verse 5; freedom from care and the necessity of self-support in the older women means, in accordance with the contemplative character of increasing years, sitting at home to pray; but in the activity of youth it means idleness and its consequent vices. Herefrom arises another
sound reason for excluding young widows from the list—a reason that would be inoperative if enrolment brought service instead of leisure.

Lastly, this understanding of what a "listed widow" is accounts for the return to a question of support in verse 16, which must ever remain inexplicable on any other hypothesis.

Perhaps it ought to be said in closing that verse 15 does not refer to the "listed widows," but rives means simply some younger widows who had not married. We cannot appeal to this verse, therefore, as showing that for a listed woman to marry was to "turn off behind Satan;" what it teaches is just the opposite—viz., that for a younger widow not to marry placed her in danger of being led "off behind Satan." The "waxing wanton against Christ" in verse 11 is doubtless used figuratively, according to the current designation of the Old and New Testaments, of Christ as the bridegroom of the soul; but the "turning off behind Satan" of our present verse seems to refer to literal impurity. The widow of the first century was in every way in a dubious position, and her chief safety was in an early remarriage. On the understanding of our present passage which we have commended, the Church's care for her widows is brought out in a remarkable light. Not only did she busy herself with the relief of their necessities, but she appears to have honored them by adopting them, under proper safeguards, as her own "mothers," and thus to have placed them in a position of respect which, though it appears to have had no official meaning when Paul penned these words, could not fail to develop into an ecclesiastical order. How it did so, and what growth resulted, the records of later ages tell us. Only we must not read those later records back unto Paul; rather, the Pastoral Epistles here, as elsewhere, approve themselves as standing behind the developments of the second century as their root and source.

IX. THE TRAIN OF THOUGHT IN 1 TIMOTHY v. 17-25.

In his instructions to Timothy as to his dealing with the various classes in the Church, Paul reaches at verse 17 the Presbyters. And here he gives instruction as to three separate circumstances—viz., what should be Timothy's attitude (1) toward deserving Presbyters (17, 18), (2) toward the undeserving (19-21), and (3) toward candidates for the office (22-25). In each of these sub-sections there are points of difficulty and interest.

1. The phrase, "the Presbyters that rule well," does not imply a distinction between two orders of Presbyters, but only between individuals within the one body of Presbyters; and no less the words, "especially those that labor in word and doctrine," seem not to distinguish between two separate orders of Presbyters, one of which preached and the other only ruled, but should apparently be taken as distinguishing between two sets of individuals within the one order. There can be little question but that the whole body of Presbyters is here represented as combining the functions of ruling and teaching (cf. iii. 5, 2; Titus i. 9). Every Presbyter might rule well; and
every Presbyter might labor in word and doctrine; and the amount of honor accorded to each was to be measured by the excellence of his work in the two functions that belonged to him. Just as in the case of the widows, so in the case of the Presbyters, the Pastoral Epistles belong at the beginning; in our present matter they were written before the teaching function was differentiated to the exclusive possession of one "order" of Presbyters. The "double honor" is doubtless not to be taken numerically, but rather in an indefinite "higher" sense. But "honor" here, just as the cognate verb in verse 3, includes pecuniary reward, as the γάρο of verse 18 informs us. And it is to be noted that thus we learn, apparently, that the whole board of elders received "pay" at Ephesus, with the Apostle's approval, although this "pay" was graduated among them according as they ruled well, and especially according as they labored in the word and doctrine. This matter, too, of salary was as yet in an undifferentiated state.

The conjunction here of a passage from Deuteronomy and a passage from Luke as equally written Scripture (ἦ γραφή) cannot be escaped by any of the shifts of the commentators; and besides fully authenticating Paul's rule for the payment of the laborers in the harvest, also demonstrates to us that Paul recognized Luke's Gospel as given by inspiration and as authoritative to the Church. This can create objection only if we have adopted theories of the rise of the New Testament canon which covertly assume it to be a natural development rather than a divine gift. As a matter of mere fact, Paul does accept Luke and call it Scripture.

2. Paul, first under this sub-head, cautions Timothy as to the reception of accusations against Presbyters, and formulates the safe rule that no accusation be listened to except in the presence of two or three witnesses (verse 19), and then proceeds to prescribe that the rebuke of those convicted of sin shall be administered only in the presence of all their brother Presbyters, that "the rest too may have fear" (verse 20). This verse opens up a curious view of early Church life, and one for which we should be ill prepared were it not for the details of 1 Corinthians. Converts from heathenism could not but bring their characters into the Church with them, and the transforming sanctification of the Holy Spirit was a slow process. Even the Church officers thus needed from the first the most careful watching and discipline. Finally, the apostle most earnestly warns his delegate against prejudice in the investigation of charges or in any other dealing with the Presbyters (verse 21).

3. "Neither doing anything by partiality" prepares the way for the third and last sub-section, that which concerns ordination. For that "lay hands suddenly on no one" refers to ordination is certain, not only from the fixed sense of the phrase, but also from the context itself (24, 25). The reason not so much for delay as against over-haste in ordination is given by the second clause of verse 22; by over-haste the ordainer becomes sharer in others' sins, by which is apparently meant all the sins that arise out of the evil deeds of an unfit Presbyter. "Keep thyself pure," adds the apostle, with solemn warning, and then parenthetically adjoins (verse 23) a sentence which is seemingly in-
tended to guard Timothy against supposing that this exhortation included an approximation of his life to the asceticism that was already prevalent, and against which Paul had already warned him (1 Tim. iv. 1-10). With verse 24 he returns to the matter more immediately in hand, and adduces a justification for seemly delay of ordination. Time develops the real character of a man; both the good and evil in him shows itself only after awhile. If, then, Timothy should not wish to be partaker in others' sins, let him "lay hands suddenly on no man," but bide his fit time, that even those whose sins follow slowly behind may be made apparent in their true character, and those whose virtues are hidden may be brought to light. The gist of verses 24, 25, thus is that the proper men for ordination cannot be hastily selected; the bad often on first acquaintance seem good; the good often appear of no worth; let time, the true revealer, pass, lest in hasty ordination you become partakers of others' sins. So read these verses not only take their place in the context, but become the analogue of the requirements in iii. 6-10. "No neophyte is to be ordained bishop; no one is to be ordained deacon until he, too, has been tried and found blameless; therefore lay hands suddenly on no man, lest you become partaker in others' sins. For how can you know the true character until you have observed the course of life? Some men's sins, no doubt, are afore-evident and drag on into judgment; but others, they only follow after. And likewise the good works too are either afore-evident or else cannot permanently be hid." If verse 23 be taken as parenthetic, it is thought that this connection of verses 24, 25, which have always been a puzzle to commentators, approves itself as sufficiently natural to be acceptable.

X. DISPOSITION OF THE MATTER IN 1 TIMOTHY.

This expistle is the most abrupt in its beginning and closing of all St. Paul's letters, with the single exception of the Epistle to the Galatians. After a brief address of two verses it at once passes to the serious matters of Timothy's work, without a trace of that introductory thanksgiving which is a characteristic of this Apostle's letters; and it closes, without salutation or personal mention of any sort, with a sudden and unexpected benediction. Why Paul has departed from his customary form of composition here it is useless to speculate. In the case of the letter to the Galatians we perceive the abruptness to grow out of the circumstances of the case and the ardor of the Apostle's argument. But here there is nothing analogous to this to be discovered; on the contrary, the letter is specially tender, and filled with the signs of the Apostle's unbroken regard for "his own son in faith." The disposition of the matter is as follows:

After a brief address and greeting (i. 1, 2), in which the Apostle so expresses himself as to show that he is writing an official letter in the prosecution of his duty as an apostle appointed by God and with the concerns of salvation weighing on his heart, the letter proceeds (I.) to remind Timothy of the exhortation which had been before given to him to silence the false teachers at Ephesus, and to justify the charge thus placed in his hands (i. 3-20). In this connec-
tion the Apostle explains the evil nature of this false teaching (i. 6–11), his own justification in assuming authority over it (i. 12–17), and his choice of Timothy for the work (i. 18–20). Opening now the new matter for which the letter was composed, Timothy is exhorted (II.) properly to order the Church life in Ephesus (ii. 1–iv. 11), and this particularly in two particulars—viz., (1) with reference to the public services of the Church (ii. 1–15) and (2) with reference to the choice of proper men for the Church offices (iii. 1–13). Under the former of these captions the duty of universal intercession is explained (ii. 1–7), directions are given as to the proper manner in which public prayer shall be exercised (ii. 8–10), and a general command that women keep silence in the public services is given and justified (ii. 11–15). Under the latter, the requirements for the ordination of bishops (iii. 1–7) and of deacons (iii. 8–13) are given at some length. Then the Apostle proceeds (3) to point out the importance of these directions as to church services and officers (iii. 14–iv. 11), asserting it from the nature of the Church as God's house and Church (iii. 14, 15a) and enhancing it by the function of the Church as the pillar and ground of the truth (iii. 15b, 16), and still further by the danger which impends over the truth from the false teachers (iv. 1–11). The paragraph is closed (iv. 6–11) with an exposition of Timothy's personal duty in these circumstances, and this forms a natural transition to the next subject (III.), in which earnest exhortations are addressed to him to make full proof of his ministry at Ephesus (iv. 12–vi. 2). In this section, beginning with his duty to himself and his calling (iv. 12–16), his proper attitude toward, or his proper dealing with, or his proper exhortations to the various classes in the Church come under review: the old and young of both sexes (v. 1, 2), the various kinds of widows (v. 3–16), the presbyters (v. 17–25), and the slaves (vi. 1, 2). After this the Apostle pauses only to add (IV.) some concluding warning to Timothy against the dangerous element in the Church (vi. 3–19), in which he describes the false teachers in their essentially corrupt and greedily avaricious character (iv. 3–5), expounds the true relations of godliness and wealth (vi. 6–10), and exhorts Timothy (vi. 11–16), and through him the rich members of the Church (vi. 17–19), to set their minds on high things, to trust only in God, who alone can give richly, and to treasure up good works. Finally, he most touchingly exhorts Timothy to keep faith and avoid error (vi. 20, 21a), and closes abruptly with the benediction (vi. 21b).

Benjamin B. Warfield.
VII.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The rapid march of empire Westward, and the place that Presbyterianism occupies in the Western part of this Continent are well indicated in the fact that the General Assembly of the Northern Presbyterian Church met this year in Omaha, and that of the Canadian Church in Winnipeg. The former body met on May 19th, and was opened with a sermon by the retiring Moderator, Rev. Professor D. C. Marquis, D.D., from Rev. iii. 8: "I have set before thee an open door and no man can shut it."

A number of ministers were nominated for the moderatorship, any one of whom would have filled the position admirably, and all of whom were so well known in the Church as to make entirely unnecessary the nominating speeches by means of which they were introduced to the notice of the Assembly.

The choice of the body fell upon the Rev. Joseph T. Smith, D.D., LL.D., of Baltimore, who proved his rare qualifications for the position by the admirably efficient manner in which he performed the duties pertaining to it. The Assembly itself is spoken of as a thoroughly business-like body. The reports show that important matters were brought to the notice of the judicatory, and that its proceedings were happily characterized by wise action and few words. The Assembly gave its emphatic approval to the proposal to raise a Five-Million Fund as a memorial of the Centennial of American Presbyterianism; and it is to be hoped that the movement in this direction will be successful. The endeavor to raise one million dollars in behalf of the Fund for Disabled and Infirm Ministers is a part of this scheme that should enlist the generous support of our entire Church; and it is with no ordinary regret that we learn that more than twenty-eight hundred churches failed last year to contribute to this fund. Such negligence is altogether inexcusable.

The Assembly at Omaha signalized itself by making sweeping, in fact, almost revolutionary, changes in the management of the Board of Publication. The nature of these changes has been fully explained in the columns of the religious papers, and it is not necessary to refer to them here. The Assembly places at the head of this reconstructed Board the Rev. E. R. Craven, D.D., under the title of General Secretary. Dr. Craven will carry with him to his new work a wide experience, great wisdom, accurate scholarship, the habit of
patient attention to details, executive ability, thorough knowledge of the practical life of the Church, and exceptional acquaintance with ecclesiastical affairs. Few men have rendered the Church greater service than Dr. Craven, and we trust that his greatest service will yet be done in the responsible position where he is now placed.

It is not too much to say, perhaps, that some progress has been made this year toward the reunion of the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches. The resolutions of the Missouri Synod respecting the spiritual character of the Church were adopted by our Assembly. Very able committees of conference have been appointed by both Churches, and good results may be expected to follow from their deliberations. There seems to be a growing desire for Reunion among the ministers and elders of the Southern Church, but it is also quite evident that there is still a very effective opposition to it. We shall be glad to see a reunion effected when the time comes, and we should be happy to think that the time will come soon. But it is not well to magnify too much the importance of organic union. The two Churches are territorially separate. They are both doing a very important work; they can co-operate without coalescing. A generation of separation has developed differences that may prove more serious obstacles to organic union than the eager advocates of union now suppose. There are questions of administration about which the two Churches seriously differ, and while it may be natural for us to suppose that our way is in all cases the right way, it would be neither modest nor in good taste for us to press this idea upon our Southern brethren, at a time when we are urging upon them the problem of reunion. It is likely that Reunion when it comes will be the fruit of mutual concessions; and it does not seem as if the spirit of concession was abroad in either church. We hope that the negotiating parties will look at all the questions that are likely to be involved in the proposed partnership, and that neither Church will allow itself to be precipitately drawn into a union under the influence of the enthusiasm of centennialism.

We were glad to see that our Assembly responded in appropriate terms to the Commission of Conference on Church Unity appointed by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is impossible, of course, to forecast the future, but one must have read history to little effect if he does not feel that tendencies are at work that are the harbingers of some very important change of relationship between the different Protestant churches. To our eyes anything beyond co-operation in Christian work and a more generous appreciation of each other on the part of Christian denominations seems chimerical. Episcopalians have no idea, apparently, of giving up their doctrine of apostolic succession; and Presbyterians betray no tendency to adopt the prelatic mode of church government. The agitation of the Reunion question will, however, open in all probability a new chapter in controversy; and that, to be profitable, must go behind the discussion of the New Testament Episcopos, and deal with other questions than the place of prelacy in the patristic writings. Episcopalians cannot defend prelacy by showing that it is old; and Presbyterians must not suppose that they have said the last word for Presbyterianism when they
have accounted for the evolution of diocesan episcopacy. The knot of the controversy is to be found in the place that must be given to development in the organization of the Church.

Several matters besides the one just referred to came before the Assembly, and the Assembly, as the published Minutes will show, expressed its solemn opinions regarding them.

It is becoming the custom for the General Assembly to "confirm" the election of Professors in the Theological Seminaries. Thus, on page 93 of the Minutes, we read, "Your committee recommend that the Assembly confirm the election of the following professors." The General Assembly has no such power as that which is implied in this recommendation. The Constitution of Princeton Seminary, for example, distinctly says, "The Board of Directors shall have power to elect the Professors and to remove them from office, such election and removal being subject to the veto of the General Assembly." As one of the results of the union of the Old and New School Churches, it was resolved "that the several Boards of Directors of these seminaries, which are now under the control of the General Assembly, shall be authorized to elect, suspend, and displace the professors of the seminaries under their care, subject in all cases to the veto of the General Assembly" (New Digest, p. 386). The difference between the right to confirm and the right to veto is very appreciable. It is one thing to say that the electing act is complete unless vetoed by the Assembly, and a very different thing to say that it is incomplete until confirmed by the Assembly. This, however, is the difference between the action of the Assembly just referred to and the plain statements of the law that should have governed it. It is better in all such matters to adhere strictly to the law.

It was found that the Overture respecting the eligibility of ruling elders for the moderatorship of the General Assembly had failed to meet with the approval of even a majority of the Presbyteries, and that the Overture relating to marriages of affinity had been approved by more than two-thirds of the Presbyteries. The General Assembly, thereupon, in the exercise of the power vested in it by the Constitution, enacted that the clause of the Confession of Faith contemplated by the Overture be stricken out. The Report upon this question was brought in by the Rev. Dr. Cameron, and as it is likely to be possessed of historic value we print it here.

It is as follows:

"Whereas, One hundred and fifty-six (156) Presbyteries, being more than two-thirds of the Presbyteries under the care of the General Assembly, have, in writing, approved of an amendment of Chapter XXIV., Section 4, of the Confession of Faith, by striking out the last period thereof; therefore, be it enacted by the General Assembly that the following words, 'The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than her own,' be, and are hereby stricken from Chapter XXIV., Section 4, of the Confession of Faith."

Nothing that was done at Omaha impresses us as having greater importance than the passage of this resolution. For nothing is the Omaha Assembly more
likely to be referred to in the future than for the fact that in establishing the first precedent for a revision of the Confession of Faith it has conformed to the requirements of the Adopting Act of 1788.

Princeton.

F. L. Patton.

GENERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH.

This body met at Catskill, N. Y., June 1st, and continued in session eight days, the Rev. C. L. Shepard, of Newtown, L. I., President. There was an unusually large attendance of both ministers and elders. A novelty of the session was the accommodation of all the members under one roof, that of the Prospect Park Hotel. This was found to be very advantageous as well as agreeable, for it afforded much more opportunity for the meeting of committees and the interchange of views than was possible when the members were scattered round in different places. This was felt so keenly that when the invitation was given to meet next year in the same place, it was accepted with enthusiasm.

The first question that came before the body was that of organic union with the Presbyterian Church. The committee to whom the subject was referred reported that six Classes had memorialized the Synod against such action and only two in its favor, and hence it was considered "that the indications of Providence are not of such a nature as to make the present effort of some in this direction wise or hopeful of good to the Church; from all present appearances, it would be only detrimental to peace, unity, and prosperity." Resolutions to this effect, after being debated as fully as any one desired, were carried nem. con., a very gratifying result, since it was quite clear that whether such union in itself was wise or unwise, the Church was not prepared for it. Many of the Synod were opposed to the measure, because in the nature of the case it would be a simple merging or absorbing of the smaller body into the larger; because it would lessen the number of independent witnesses to the truth; because it would greatly diminish the work and gifts now proceeding from the smaller body; and because it would make the larger body too large for the proper working of its system.* The committee appointed in 1886 to confer with a similar committee from the Reformed (German) Church reported that they were unable to do anything because the General Synod of the sister church, which meets only triennially, did not have a session until the present month. Our committee, according to their instructions, collected and reported considerable information on the general subject, which was well digested and carefully arranged by the Chairman, Dr. William J. R. Taylor. The committee was continued, and it is supposed will be able to report definitely next year. Union between these "Reformed" bodies would be desirable on many ac-

* The writer was present last May when several prominent delegates to the General Assembly at Omaha were speaking of its doings. One said, "The fact is, the Assembly is too large a body to do business properly," and all the rest assented.
counts, if it could be effected kindly, cordially, without sacrifice on either side, and with a fair approach to unanimity. The Board of Foreign Missions reported a prosperous year. Ninety-three thousand dollars had been expended. An endowment for the Isaac Ferris Seminary, at Yokohama, has been secured. An attempt was authorized to secure $50,000 to establish a theological school in connection with the Arcot Mission, and at this writing the larger part of the sum has been obtained. The aspect of all the fields is encouraging, especially in Japan, where events move with astonishing rapidity, and where all Christian bodies need to act promptly and seize the advantages of the moment. The Board of Domestic Missions reported favorably. A legacy of $30,000 (three fourths paid in) was received, the interest of which is to be used by the Board. The policy to be pursued was patiently discussed, and measures were adopted to secure a better working of the system, and a larger support from the churches. The Board of Education reported a slight increase of receipts, but still an amount far below the abilities of the Church and the needs of the cause. The sum of endowed scholarships now is $150,000. The Board of Publication was directed to issue a monthly magazine under the editorial control of the Boards. This, it is presumed, is an effort to imitate the example of the Presbyterian Church, who have made such a splendid success in their new periodical, *The Church at Home and Abroad*. The statistical tables show an increase of eleven churches and of over five thousand communicants during the year. The subject of co-operation in mission work with other bodies of like faith was taken up, and provision made for the appointment of delegates to confer with the delegates of the Boards of other churches as to the measures to be adopted. The Dutch Church, having pursued this policy for more than twenty years at Amoy, is, of course, ready to extend the same to the whole field. The usual number of delegates to the Council of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, to be held at London next year was appointed.

The sessions of the Synod were spirited and harmonious, almost the only drawback being the sacrifice of a full working day to a pleasant excursion, which it appears could be enjoyed on no other day. The feeling was very general that now that the Church had decided anew to maintain its distinct ecclesiastical existence, there should be a generous and hearty development in every branch of its activity to justify this decision. Love ought to express itself by constant liberality and self-sacrifice.

T. W. CHAMBERS.
had been the appointment of Lord High Commissioner in the person of the
Earl of Hopetoun. Himself a Presbyterian, it was pointed out that the name
of one of his ancestors—Edward Hope—stands next but one to that of John
Knox in the Sederunt of the first General Assembly of the Reformed Church
of Scotland, in 1560; and that in the interval between others of his line had
stoutly upheld the Presbyterian cause, and represented the Sovereign in the
Supreme Court of the Church.

On the motion of the leader of the House, Dr. Phin, the Assembly unan-
imously resolved, as its first duty, to hold a special service of Thanksgiving on
the following Tuesday, and thereafter to adopt an address of congratulation to
the Queen. The service itself, which was conducted by the Moderator and
clers in a crowded Assembly, was singularly impressive.

Notwithstanding the long-continued depression in trade, commerce, and
agriculture, the Christian liberality of the Church had in the past year been
fully sustained, the contributions amounting to £343,595 as compared with
£311,378 for 1885, and with £304,077 for 1884. In these sums, however,
 neither the pew-rents nor the revenues derived from the investment of capital
or from grants from the Ferguson Bequest and Baird Trust are included. They
are exclusively contributions for the year on behalf of religious and charitable
purposes connected with the Church. Read in the light of these figures, the
complaints of diminished revenue on the part of the conveners of most of the
spending committees received a partially satisfactory explanation. It would
seem to be that while there had been a falling off in contributions to the
schemes of the Church, local enterprise in individual parishes and congregations
had under adverse circumstances considerably increased. It appeared from the
Reports on Presbyterial Superintendence that the number of communicants
is 571,029, being an increase of 6594 over the previous year. This was said
to be a low ratio of increase, owing partly to emigration, and partly to the lack
of suitable clothing interfering with the attendance of the poorest class of com-
municants. It is rather ahead of the rate at which, according to the Registrar
General’s returns, the population of all Scotland has increased—being as 1.18
to 1.06—but it affords no ground of belief that the Church has made any great
cpalpable impression during the year on those who have lapsed from all Christian
influences. At the same time, the Reports of Committees clearly indicated
that the usefulness of the Church is on the increase both at home and abroad.

The Home Mission Committee announced only a small income—£8540—
which, contrasted with that of 1885, showed a decrease of £1533. They had
under their charge 64 mission stations or districts without churches and 72
mission churches, with a certified average attendance of 20,796, of whom 11,302
partook of the Communion when last administered. They had also voted £3017
toward the erection, enlargement, or acquisition of 15 places of worship, with
accommodation for 6462, and to meet a total cost for these purposes of
£25,915. Their great auxiliary, the Endowment Scheme, reported the erection
of 5 new parishes, each endowed with the minimum annual stipend of £120,
making, in all, 356, since 1846. As the resolution come to in 1876, to endow
an additional 100 churches, had been successfully carried out in 1885, last year had purposely been a year of comparative inactivity. No special appeal had been made, and in consequence the year's ordinary revenue had dropped from £13,141 in 1885 to £9,213. But in view of the reports and recommendations received from Presbyteries, the committee proposed that a further effort should be made to endow and erect into parishes at least other 50 unendowed chapels and districts, a proposal which was adopted and warmly commended by the Assembly. The administration of the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund and of the Small Livings Fund had a slightly diminished income. The latter had dealt with 313 parishes, but drew attention to the fact, that the stipend of each of 233 parishes in receipt of a grant was still under £200—the total amount distributed being £8,441. A considerable increase in communicants and a marked increase in the contributions to the schemes of the Church within the last ten years were adduced as indications that a change was in progress in the Highlands in favor of the interests represented by the National Church. One of the earlier sessions incidentally brought to view the difficulties with which some of our Highland ministers have still to contend. A member said that he ministered at three outlying stations in turn, one of them being 5 miles, another 12 miles, and a third 17 miles distant from the parish church. To attend a meeting of presbytery often necessitated a week's absence from home, while the visiting of one's own parish meant the frequent crossing of treacherous fords and stormy ferries. The number of Sunday-schools connected with the Church was given as 2,067, with 210,197 scholars on the roll, and an average attendance of 165,481, taught by 19,681 teachers. Compared with last year, there is an increase of 50 schools, 3927 scholars on the roll, 4086 in average attendance, and 420 teachers. There were besides, in advanced classes, 33,784 taught by ministers, and 7282 taught by elders and others not ministers. In these schools £2838, a slight increase on the previous year, had been collected. The number of parishes returned as without schools was 29, and of non-reporting schools, 30. The cause of temperance was stated to have made marked progress during the year, although few parishes had temperance associations directly connected with the Church. The Committee on Christian Life and Work preside over evangelistic effort among our fishing population, the development of personal and congregational life by means of young men and young women's guilds, and the management and circulation of the Year Book and Parish Magazine. These did not escape criticism, but the drift of the discussion was mainly of a friendly nature. The problems with which the Committee were now more immediately engaged were the organization of deaconesses on Scriptural and Presbyterian lines, and the best way of reaching the lapsed masses, a subject which was pointedly brought before the Assembly by an important overture from Glasgow.

Regarding the Church's work abroad, the statements made for the Colonial Mission, with its subdivisions on army and navy chaplains and continental chaplaincies, the Jewish and the Foreign Mission and the Foreign Correspondence Committee, were couched, on the whole, in hopeful and encouraging
terms. In speaking to his Report, the convener of the Jewish committee pronounced it to be the most encouraging which they had submitted. The tokens of divine favor were twofold: in their own mission and in the Jewish community. There had been fifteen baptisms in less than two years; and the utterances of the leading rabbis breathed a more conciliatory spirit. The schools of the mission were prosperous. Evidence of recovery in the affairs of the Foreign Mission was cordially welcomed. The year's income at home and abroad—£35,163, inclusive of £6357 contributed by the Ladies' Association—was given as the largest hitherto obtained. A remarkable movement, resulting in the baptism of 443 converts, was reported from the Punjab. There had also been 154 baptisms at Darjeeling and Kalimpong. The institution at Calcutta continued to prosper, while that at Madras had been raised to a college of the second class. The Universities' Mission had been founded in Independent Sikhim. The mission staff at 15 stations consisted of 28 European missionaries, of whom 17 were ordained, and 77 native agents, of whom 3 were ordained and 3 licentiates. The Committee had to deplore the untimely death of Mr. Macfarlane, founder of the Darjeeling and Universities' Mission. There was a debt of some years' standing; and as there was no reserve to meet current expenditure, there was a heavy charge for interest on overdrafts. To meet these burdens, the Assembly resolved to raise a further sum of £10,000; the conviction at the same time finding free expression that the Church still came far short of its duty in this wide field. The Committee on Correspondence with Foreign Churches had supplemented the efforts of two societies in France, the Société Centrale, or Home Mission of the French National Church, and the Evangelistic Society, which works in harmony with it. The Evangelical Society of Geneva, the Waldensian Church in Italy, and the Amos Comenius Society of Bohemia had also been remembered. Deputations from the Irish Presbyterian Church and the Synod in England connected with the Church of Scotland were present, and addressed the Assembly. A proposal to authorize two or three members of the Synod to sit as members without a vote in all future convocations of the General Assembly met with very general approval, and was referred for consideration to a committee.

The far-reaching import of an Overture on the subscription of the Confession of Faith by elders, to lessen the difficulties which conscientious men have in accepting office, cannot be overrated. The subject has frequently been considered by the General Assembly, but never before with the same promising results. The motion in support of the Overture was entirely confined to the case of elders. But after an animated and weighty discussion the motion was withdrawn, and an amendment adopted, which refers the whole subject of the subscription presently required of the officebearers of the Church, whether ministers or elders, to a committee whose duty it will be to report to next General Assembly whether any modification is desirable. Not less significant was the treatment accorded to another Overture which craved the Assembly to devise some better means of presbyteral supervision. The practice at present is to issue schedules in which queries are addressed to members of Presbyteries in
the various departments of pastoral work. But complaints have long been rife regarding its effects. It was stated on this occasion that 15 parishes have no eldership, while 6 have only one elder each. In other words, there are 21 parishes without a Kirk Session. The injunctions of the Assembly also in regard to collections for missions and the schemes of the Church are persistently neglected. In this case also a motion was unanimously adopted, which remitted the Overture to a committee to consider and report to next General Assembly. The matter of the relations between the Scottish Presbyterian churches was brought in this Assembly to a definite issue. In the belief that a desire had been unmistakably manifested by the people of Scotland for reunion, on the basis of a national recognition of religion, the Church of Scotland had made proposals for union, and in particular to the Free Church, on the basis of its own standards. In its reply the Free Church expressed its willingness to enter into conference, but with the stipulation that the question of Disestablishment and Disendowment should be left open for discussion. The Committee on Church Interests, having been empowered to draw up an answer, now recorded their profound regret that no ground appeared to be left open upon which a correspondence could be continued. On the one side, the Free Church had by many recent public acts pledged itself to a policy of Disestablishment and Disendowment, which it considered to be not inconsistent with its recognized standards. On the other side, the Church of Scotland held that it would be disingenuous to enter into conference under the stipulation which had been laid down. It could not pretend to leave the very constitution of the Church an open question. All that it could now do was to instruct the Committee to watch for opportunities of kindly co-operation. The Churches will therefore go, each of them its own way. The Assembly, which had opened on the 19th, terminated its sittings on the 30th of May, with an address from the Moderator and the Lord High Commissioner.

Edinburgh.

MALCOLM CAMPBELL TAYLOR.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

There seems little need, in an account of this Assembly for The Presbyterian Review, to record the little ups and downs in the current operations of the Church, which are always found in annual reports, but are of little interest to those outside. It seems more suitable that we should confine our record to any features of unusual interest that may serve to indicate the spirit of the whole, the attitude which the Church occupies to the forces of the age, and the measure of success that attends her endeavors.

I. We may therefore dismiss in a few lines the statistical view of her affairs. (1) Finance. The sum total of all her funds for last year is £564,442, being for Sustentation Fund, £171,467; Local Building, £54,060; Congregational Fund, £204,626; Missions and Education, £118,758, and Miscellaneous, £15,531. There is a decrease of nearly £30,000 on the whole, mostly on
Local Building, Missions, and Miscellaneous; the decrease on Missions arising from the fact that last year some very large legacies were received. That the ordinary funds should be so well sustained in a year of great depression is justly regarded as matter for great thankfulness. (2) Membership. The number of members is 331,243, a small increase on last year. (3) Students of Divinity. Last year there were at Edinburgh, 164; at Glasgow, 112; at Aberdeen, 36; total, 318, being an increase of 5 upon the unusually large number of 1886. (4) Sunday-schoo]ls. Number of schools, 1910; of senior classes, 1266. Teachers (including ministers when they teach senior classes), 18,979. Scholars, 169,563; senior classes, 48,377; total, 217,940. Contributions for missionary purposes during the year, £6840. Decrease in number of schools, 29; of senior classes, 4; of teachers of senior classes, 6. Increase in number of teachers, 881; of Sabbath scholars, 6081, and of senior scholars, 2533. (5) Welfare of Youth. This scheme invites the youthful members of congregations to competitions in biblical subjects, the shorter catechism, and the composition of an essay. Number of competitors, 3788, being an increase of 711, of whom 19 were in Calcutta, 9 in Bombay, and 15 at Constantinople. (6) Training of Teachers. The Church still maintains three normal colleges for the training of teachers—at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. The Privy Council Education Department examines yearly for certificates of merit. Last Christmas 142 male and 249 female teachers obtained these certificates; this year there are 400 students in attendance. In the practising schools are 1349 pupils and 26 pupil teachers. (7) Publications. Circulation of Free Church Monthly and Missionary Record, 78,000, being an increase of 1500; of Children’s Record, 80,000, being a decrease of 500.

II. With regard to the character of the proceedings of the Assembly generally, there has been for a few years back a very obvious change from former days. It has been the lot of the Free Church during her forty-four years of separate existence to have a large share of controversy on public questions. Now it was on union with other churches; now on Robertson Smith, and now on the connection of Church and State. It was always the best days that were set apart for these questions, and the most crowded audiences that assembled for their discussion. Now that we have no such burning questions, it came to be asked, Will the meetings of Assembly be as popular and as crowded without them? Happily we may now answer that question in the affirmative. We have found, for example, that Foreign Missions attract as full a house, both of members and public, as the battles did in former years. Other subjects that proved very attractive this year were, the proceedings connected with the opening and the closing of the Assembly, addresses on the state of religion, and the religious state of the Highlands. This seems to indicate a wholesome advance. The heart of the Church is becoming more and more set on practical work. All through the history of the Church of Scotland she has had to strive so much for the integrity of her machinery, and the right to work it free from secular control, that the actual work has sometimes fallen out of sight. But the feeling has become strong and decided, that inasmuch as the machinery is now
wholly under her control, and no serious external hindrance exists to its active working, the main and most earnest effort of the Church should be directed toward the production of the results for which the Church exists in the world.

III. That the spirit of the Free Church continues to be evangelical and evangelistic is apparent in many ways. One of the most interesting parts of the proceedings of the Assembly is to hear accounts from this quarter and the other of the breaking out of a fresh religious interest, and of the deepening of the Christian life. Of such narratives there were not a few at the recent meeting. And again and again it turns out that some minister who was not thought to be in very warm sympathy with such manifestations has himself been warmed and brightened by what has been going on around him. Expectation of similar blessing is aroused in other hearts, and both ministers and elders return to their congregations with the assurance that the Spirit of God is not straitened, and that the promise still stands—"prove Me now, saith the Lord, if I will not open you the windows of heaven and pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room to receive it."

IV. Yet the Church would not shut her eyes to the difficulties of the day, whether as regards the foundations of the Gospel itself or the application of Christian principles to the social and political problems of the age. Nothing could have shown a more open, candid, and yet hopeful spirit, in reference to the present conflict of Christianity and unbelief, than the opening address of the new Moderator, Principal Rainy. He most frankly conceded the great importance of the recent attitude and achievements of natural science and historical criticism, and did not wonder that they had caused perplexity and unsettlement to some minds, and something more to others. He was as far as possible from counselling the Church, in reference to such things, to take the ostrich policy of plunging her head in the bush and ignoring them. Equally far was he from thinking that our policy ought to be one of mere concession, of slowly receding before the advance of natural and historical science. The Christian Church had its own special grounds for confidence in the truth, and likewise for summoning all men to yield allegiance to Christ. What he chiefly desired on the part of the Church was an attitude of candor on the one hand, and patient trust on the other; patience emphatically; for as Christianity had withstood many a siege, it would survive the present conflict, too, and as at other times, it would come out of the battle purified and strengthened.

V. The Free Church is somewhat cautious of uttering its voice with reference to the political and social questions of the day. With reference to the question of the crofters in the Highlands, the prevalent feeling is that of warm sympathy with them as a body of men who have been harshly treated, and who are now beginning to be lawless not from inherent lawlessness, but from sheer exhaustion of patience. There is much of the same feeling, too, with regard to the Irish peasantry. It is distressing to see the strong arm of the law applied to repress with violence what in many instances is the cry of distress and the claim of justice. Yet the Church cannot but hold that there is not in present circumstances the excuse for resistance to the law which our forefathers had
when they were required not only to forego their rights, but violate their consciences. It cannot but discourage the attitude of opposition to the law. And with reference to the deeper and larger questions that are now raised as to the tenure of land and the distribution of property, the Church maintains a similar attitude. It is obvious that Christianity embraces certain of the principles of socialism. The brotherhood of humanity; the obligation of the strong to bear the infirmities of the weak; the recognition of all property and other gifts as talents lent by the great Owner, to be employed not for the selfish purposes of the holder, but for general benefit, in accordance with the will of the Master: the fact that the earth has been given to the children of men not for the benefit of the few, but of the race—such are undeniable principles of God's Word, of which it cannot be said that they are exemplified in our present social condition. Yet the Church feels that it is not her part to rectify all social disorders, but rather to instil the spirit and urge the principles which bear in that direction. And this was manifestly the feeling of the late Assembly.

VI. The Free Church has always cultivated friendly relations with other Churches when congeniality of views and spirit enabled her to do so. With many of the Churches in the Continent of Europe she has long been on terms of cordial friendship. For some time past it has been her great regret that she has not been able to render them more substantial assistance for their evangelistic work. What is called her continental fund is chiefly employed in maintaining charges in Italy (Rome, Florence, Naples, Leghorn, Genoa, etc.), while, at the same time, a good deal of assistance is given in other forms, apart from the Continental Committee, to various continental countries. When the Italian stations were formed, Italy of all countries was most difficult of access for the Gospel; now it is the most free. This year an important step was taken, with a view to the welfare of the Reformed Churches of Hungary and Bohemia. The ex-Moderator, Dr. Somerville, was requested, in addition to the many similar services of the like kind which he has rendered to other countries, to visit the stations of the Jewish mission, and to make an evangelistic tour in Hungary and Bohemia. As many of the pastors of both countries have been educated at the Free Church College of Edinburgh, there can be no doubt of his meeting with a very cordial welcome.

VII. That the Free Church should not accept the offer of the Established to discuss the subject of union on the basis of connection with the State will not surprise those who remember that again and again the Assembly has declared disestablishment to be the only feasible solution of the Church problem in Scotland. To some members it appeared that the Established Church introduced a new element into the proposed basis of discussion by a somewhat vague reference to "the Claim of Right"—the document which set forth the claims of the Church as against the civil courts, in 1842. It appeared to these brethren as if the Established Church were now looking more favorably to that claim than it ever did before. But the great majority of the Free Church conceive that it is out of the question to discuss the subject on that footing. The Claim of Right affirmed that the Church had a legal claim to the emoluments that came
to be sacrificed in 1843, consequently, if the claim were conceded, compensation would be due for forty-four years' injustice, and the lost benefices should all be restored. The Free Church would never dream of making such a claim to-day. She is content to bear the great wrong then inflicted on her, and desires to turn no man out of his benefice. But neither, on the other hand, is she prepared to form a new concordat with the State, nor is she ready to risk her organization, erected at such cost and labor, in order to become a pendicle of a Church which has never expressed regret for her expulsion, nor admitted that she did right in her deed of separation.

VIII. And yet, in spite of all this, I believe that there is a deep current in Scotland flowing toward Church union. We are all feeling more the force of the adverse currents that affect us—rationalism, worldliness, laxity of church attendance, socialism, and atheism. There is a growing conviction that in order to resist these, to maintain the tone of religion in the country, and to do aggressively the real work of the Church, we need the union of all our forces. There can be no doubt that the heart of all our churches is more bent on work at the present time than it has been in former years. We must all justify our existence by substantial fruits. The more that this spirit spreads, the more will the spirit of union grow.

IX. At the meetings of Assembly this year there was no lack of evidence of fresh speaking power among younger brethren. One who is certainly not young, but who has seldom spoken in the Assembly, Dr. Walter Smith, author of the "Bishop's Walk" and other well-known poems, made an excellent speech on the state of religion, and another on the Sustentation Fund, which elicited unbounded applause. A brilliant address on Temperance was given by Rev. Dr. M. Ross, Dundee. Mr. Lee, a young minister at Nairn, is rapidly rising to a high place both as a speaker and an organizer. We have several young laymen of high speaking and debating gifts, and thoroughly imbued with the Christian spirit. It might be invidious to select names, yet one cannot help laying stress on that of Mr. Charles J. Guthrie, advocate, youngest son of the late Dr. Guthrie, who holds the honorable post of law adviser of the Church.

The next meeting of the Assembly is to be held at Inverness. We are so conservative a people, and Edinburgh is by so long tradition the ecclesiastical capital of the country, that to many it seems as if a right Assembly could not take place anywhere else. The capital of the Highlands, however, has great claims to an exceptional honor, and no doubt every effort will be made to secure a successful and interesting meeting. The Celtic population of Scotland has not too many friends, and this token of interest on the part of the Free Church will not be without its use.

W. G. Blaikie.

_Edinburgh._
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE IRISH CHURCH.

Since the subject of Instrumental Music was by common consent, at the Assembly of 1886, allowed to drop for three years, no ecclesiastical question has arisen to excite keen feeling or debate in Ireland. The result is that the Assembly of 1887 was a quiet meeting, in which the practical business of the Church was transacted and discussed without any collision or discord whatever.

The Assembly met in Cooke's Church, Belfast, on Monday evening, June 6th. The outgoing Moderator, Rev. Robert Ross, of Londonderry, was succeeded by Dr. John H. Orr, of Antrim, who has for many years filled the office of Clerk, and whose efficiency and character entitled him to the highest honors.

Much of the time of the Assembly was occupied with routine and administrative business, important to individuals, but of no general interest. Dr. Todd Martin was elected by a large majority to the Professorship of Christian Ethics in the Assembly's College, Belfast, left vacant by the retirement of Professor Henry Wallace, who has been in the public service of the Church for more than sixty years. During the year the loss of ministers by death has been heavy, and to the places left vacant various brethren were appointed.

The Statistical Report showed that the General Assembly has on its roll 614 ministers and 557 congregations; the total income of the Church for religious, charitable, and ecclesiastical objects being £159,550, which is £2721 over the preceding year. The Commutation Fund—that is, the aggregate sum paid over by the Government to the Church in 1871, at the time of Disestablishment—has produced this year only £24,395, which is less by £4500 than it yielded ten years ago, while the Sustentation Fund this year has produced only £23,123, being nearly £2000 less than the preceding year. The general result is that the supplemental annual dividend is only £15 over and above the income to each Minister before Disestablishment. The highest point the supplemental dividend ever reached was £22. There has thus been for some years a general falling off in ministerial income; but these are times of great hardship in Ireland, and an unceasing drain of emigration is yearly diminishing the population. The Sabbath-schools in active operation are 1107; the teachers, 8939; and the scholars, 101,230. During the year the schools have collected £2951 for missions and for other religious objects.

In regard to Ireland, Church extension is in a great measure stayed, owing to social causes, the poverty of the country, and a declining population. The whole effort now is not so much to enlarge the borders of the Church as to hold the ground already gained. Ten congregations in Ulster, two in Connaught, twenty-two in Leinster, fourteen in Munster, and upward of eighty mission stations received grants during the year. The means adopted for reaching the surrounding masses are preaching, colportage, and mission schools. The results are not so visible as could be desired; but it requires great strength of
conviction in young or old to avow a change of religious opinion in Ireland, and any who wish to change their ecclesiastical relations prefer to do it with the sea between them and the "Emerald Isle." Congregations in Leinster and Munster are much weakened of late. Many of their members consisted of Scottish and of Ulster people, who were brought South in the employment of the gentry; now, owing to the non-payment of rents and the general depression, the local gentry have been compelled in many cases to contract their expenditure, dismiss their servants, and leave the country. The result is that the congregations sparsely scattered over the South and West have lost some of their most useful members. The Assembly held a conference to consider what could be done to help struggling and dying congregations; but nothing more practical was suggested than to send them frequent deputations of ministers and elders residing in the North.

Of late years the interest in Foreign Missions is very much increased. Operations are carried on in India and China, and the income of the scheme for the year is £12,728—a small sum compared with the necessities of the case, but large as compared with the means and the numbers of the home church, and the calls made upon her. About three thousand persons have been gathered out of paganism. Four native congregations have been organized. Four native students are nearly ready for license. It was agreed that as soon as possible they should be ordained as pastors appointed to act as evangelists in their districts, and formed into a separate Presbytery. The natives should be taught from the first the duty of supporting their own pastors. There cannot be a doubt that this is a step in advance. The Jewish, Continental, and Colonial mission schemes were also reported as in a fair condition of prosperity.

Deputations from the Church of Scotland, the United Presbyterian Church, and the Presbyterian Church of England attended and addressed the Assembly at Belfast. The Free Church was not represented this year, as, owing to a special arrangement, their deputation to Ireland is only biennial. The addresses, as usual, were very able, and the speakers were heard with great attention, as they gave details of the work on which their respective Churches are engaged in the home country and in other lands. The relation of the Irish Church to the Scottish Churches is somewhat peculiar. For more than forty years she has been in closest terms of fellowship with the Free Church; but the bond of attachment has of late been relaxed a little, owing, as some think, to the unexpected amount of sympathy which the opinions of Professor Robertson Smith received among the younger ministers of the Free Church, and owing to the belief, entertained by others, that the extreme voluntaryism developed in that Church of recent years is in some degree a departure from the position taken up in the Claim of Right, and is a new and needless barrier in the way of that general union of the three Churches in Scotland which nearly all Presbyterians desire. Further, it is believed that the Church of Scotland now enjoys privileges which, if the State had only extended them to her in 1842, would have prevented the Disruption, and that in many parts of Scotland
at this moment she is doing a good and noble work. Lastly, the Irish Assembly is not very ardent in its voluntaryism; but it can never do anything but love a Church which (like the United Presbyterian) has among its leaders such men as Principal Cairns, Professor Calderwood, and Dr. James Brown. Irish Presbyterians are now in correspondence with all three Churches, some of which are not in correspondence with each other. The Established Church is believed to be more in sympathy with her Irish daughter on the Home Rule Question than are the other two Scottish Churches. But when the day comes—and it does not seem to be very distant—when the question of Scottish Disestablishment shall be before Parliament, if Irish Presbyterians do not then stand to the Church which now stands to them, that Church will be much disappointed, and count them somewhat ungrateful. On the other hand, to unite with her in resisting Disestablishment and holding her position, would be an offence that the Free Church and the United Presbyterians would not easily forgive. This is a somewhat precarious position for a Church to occupy, and it is not impossible that the attempt to keep friends with three Churches which are not all in friendly union with each other, may lead to a disruption of feeling some day which it will not be easy to avoid. To attempt to sit on three stools at once may result in an undignified posture in the end.

An interesting debate occurred during the sittings of the Court on an overture to assign to each minister for evangelistic operations a certain well-defined territory in connection with his church, for the working of which he and his elders would be responsible. The advantages supposed to flow from such an arrangement were perhaps a little exaggerated in the course of the discussion. The want of such limits at present does not impose the slightest restraint upon any man who is willing to work; neither could the most careful delimitation of territory put in motion any man and church who are not willing. Perhaps all that can fairly be said is that a settlement of boundaries in towns and parts of the country where churches are thickly planted would economize pastoral labors and keep ministers from overlapping each other in their work. But the Assembly thought that a parochial system would not work in their circumstances. Their churches are unequally distributed over Ireland. Many villages have none; some have two or three. In the latter case, if each church is to stand on its own territory, it must stand not in the centre, but on the very edge of the territory assigned to it. At present should any man neglect his duty, some zealous neighbor supplies his lack of service, and possibly visits his people; but by the proposed arrangement the man who came into the territory of another, whether it was cultivated or neglected, would be counted a trespasser, and would some day find himself indicted at the bar of the Church courts. Every removal of an old church or erection of a new might require an alteration of territory, and this territory would in its extent vary to a great degree. In Belfast it would extend to a few streets; in the country to a parish or barony; in the South to a whole county. It would lead to misunderstandings and complaints. The Assembly thought it wise, for the present, to refuse its sanction to the Parochial System, and dismissed the
overture. It is not new machinery that is needed so much as power to make the existing machinery move effectively.

The Assembly did not again take up the question of Home Rule for Ireland, further than by reaffirming the resolutions passed against it in the spring of 1886. This is the mind of, perhaps, 610 out of the 614 ministers, and of a similar proportion of the elders, and of the Presbyterian people. They are, indeed, anything but satisfied with the treatment, which, in regard to public employment, they receive from Government, for Government seldom, except under pressure, confers any office of honor or emolument upon a Presbyterian; they suffer, as well as Roman Catholics, from back rents, which the land is not able to pay; but one and all of them would regard an Irish Parliament, leading up, as they believe it would, to separation, or an attempt at separation from Great Britain, as the greatest calamity of all. The Irish Parliament when it did sit in Dublin was the most unprogressive of all Parliaments; it governed in the interests of one Church and one class; it imposed the Penal Laws; its leaders had to be bribed in order to do anything that the British Government wished, and finally it had to be bribed in order to put itself out of existence. Any political freedom worth possessing has been obtained not from the Irish, but from the British Parliament. If such have been the fruits from Protestant ascendency, it would be very sanguine to expect better from Catholic ascendency. In Ireland Home Rule is already not so much a social as a religious question. Roman Catholics, with few exceptions in Ireland, are all for Home Rule; Protestants, with still fewer exceptions, are all against it. The Protestants in its favor are, as a rule, those who live outside Ireland. Roman Catholics in Ireland are, to all Protestants united, in a majority of four to one; as a rule, intelligence, culture, property, trade, and obedience to the law are found with the minority; and people here do not think much of an arrangement that would set ignorance to rule over culture, poverty over wealth, and inexperience over knowledge. If the State of New York were a Roman Catholic State in the proportion of four to one; and if a proposition were made to withdraw New York from the jurisdiction of Congress, and give it a Congress of its own, practically independent; and if this State Legislature were clothed with legislative and administrative power, so as to have under its control the lives, property, religion, and liberty of the Protestant minority; and if the Protestant minority had before them the certainty of being governed in perpetuity by such men as the popular vote now casts to the surface in Ireland—we here wonder how all this would be regarded by the Protestant minority in the State of New York? All who understand this will understand perfectly why it is that the idea of an Irish Parliament is repulsive to the General Assembly and to the Protestants of Ireland.

THOMAS WITHEROW.

Londonderry.
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA.

The General Assembly met at Winnipeg, Man., on Thursday, June 10th, at 7.30 P.M. The retiring Moderator, the Rev. Dr. Smith, preached an earnest sermon on Zeal in the Lord's Service, from Zeph. iii. 16. The Rev. Dr. Burris, of Halifax, N. S., was unanimously called to the chair, which he occupied with the utmost tact, urbanity, and judgment.

Winnipeg is a long way from the parts of Canada where population is densest and Presbyterianism strongest, but no member of the late Assembly regrets the distance he had to travel in reaching this rising city. The place of meeting was doubtless chosen in order that the Assembly might come closely in contact with the mission work of the Church in the wide fields of the North-West, and thus learn more adequately to realize the magnitude of that work; while, on the other hand, its presence might somewhat encourage those who are laboring with much self-denial in territory as yet for the most part sparsely populated.

The meeting of Assembly, it is hoped, has not entirely failed in accomplishing these important ends. Mission work in the North-West is to many a more vivid reality than before, and the liberality of the Church can hardly fail to be stimulated in support of our great Home Mission, as well as of the Indian Mission, by what shall be heard from members of the Winnipeg Assembly.

Nothing could exceed the hospitality with which the Assembly was entertained—the Governor of Manitoba, the Corporation of Winnipeg, and several public bodies of the city showing special courtesies to the members.

Fortunately, the Assembly was able to give almost its entire time to the consideration of the work and schemes of the Church. It had not a single Appeal Case, and hardly any Questions. The absence of appeals, whether due to a good condition of the Church or to the success of the lower judicatories in dealing with cases, was a great relief to the General Assembly.

The Home Mission field of the Canadian Church extends from ocean to ocean, and in proportion to its resources is probably larger than that of any other Church. Valuable financial help has for many years been rendered by the Scotch and Irish Churches, but even with this assistance the work is imperfectly overtaken. The great Home Mission, as already signified, is in the North-West. Within the last sixteen years the congregations and missions in this region have increased from 9 to 389, and the ministers and missionaries at present number 115. In British Columbia there is, in addition, a Presbytery with eleven ministers. In the Home Mission four classes of laborers are employed, ordained missionaries, licentiates, students for the ministry (whether in Theology or Arts), and catechists who are not proceeding to the ministry. Much difficulty is experienced in keeping the fields supplied when the students, who constitute so large a part of the force, return to their classes in autumn.
During the college session the presbyteries and the energetic Superintendent of Missions do the best they can to keep the work going, but many places remain unoccupied, and not a little of the fruit of preceding labor is lost.

The Home Mission has exceeded its revenue during the year, and the reserve fund, which has stood it in good stead for several years, is exhausted; nothing, therefore, but increased liberality can obviate the necessity of retrenchment in a province of labor where retrenchment simply means that some—perhaps many—congregations and stations shall be left without the ordinary means of grace.

The Scheme for Augmentation of small salaries shows a slight increase of $1000 in the contributions of the year; but as—here again—a considerable reserve has been exhausted, the Church must either do better or fail in reaching the very modest minimum of $750 and a manse. Presbyterianism, not to say Christianity, enforces the duty of the strong helping the weak, and no church should decline to recognize the obligation of large and wealthy congregations to supplement the inadequate salaries which many weaker charges must offer. The Canadian Church has not found it possible to copy the Sustentation Scheme of the Free Church of Scotland, but the principle of mutual helpfulness which underlies that scheme is a clear deduction from the oneness of the body of Christ and the law of Christian love.

The Foreign Missions of the Church are in China, India, the New Hebrides, the West Indies, and among the Indians of the North-west. The staff consists of 27 ordained missionaries (2 native Chinese), 2 medical ladies, 3 zenana teachers in India, 4 lady teachers in Trinidad, and 2 among our own Indians, “and the usual additional teachers and helpers in the several missions.” The statistics of these missions cannot here be given in detail. The record of the year testifies to earnest labor of missionaries and an encouraging measure of success. In Formosa there are already 38 native preachers, and as many preaching stations, while 20 students are preparing for the ministry in the College at Tamsui. Church-members in Formosa have increased by 315 during the year.

On all hands there is evidence of growing interest on the part of the Canadian Church in the evangelization of the heathen world. Two matters may be specially noted in this connection: 1. The Woman’s Foreign Missionary Society is extending its influence over the whole Church, while its funds are yearly increasing. Though organized but a few years, it has this year added over $20,000 to the contributions of the general Society. And, what is of still greater value, the intelligence circulated, the prayers offered, the sympathy with missions awakened throughout the whole Church, are giving a higher place to this holy enterprise than it had hitherto secured. 2. The other token of progress is the inception of Foreign Mission work by Students’ Missionary Societies. These societies have existed in our colleges almost from their beginning, but hitherto their attention has been confined to the home field. The societies of Queen’s College and Knox College have now, with the sanction of the Assembly, resolved to take part in the foreign work, and Messrs. Goforth
and Smith, graduates of this year, will in a few months proceed as college missionaries, probably to Northern China. The salaries of these missionaries will be paid by the alumni of the colleges, without drawing upon other sources.

Nothing can be matter of greater thankfulness to the churches over this whole Continent than the zeal of their students in Foreign Missions. That 1500, or more, young men in the colleges of America should have signified their readiness to “go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature” is a thing to which, probably, no parallel has been witnessed since the early ages of the Church. The fire burns in Canadian colleges as in those of the United States, and no limit is imposed to the development of Foreign Missions except by the Church's ability or willingness to send forth the men who are ready to go.

On the evening devoted to Foreign Missions most interesting addresses were made by Rev. Messrs. Flett, John McKay, and Hugh McKay, missionaries to the Indians. Very suitable it was that in an Assembly held so near the scene of their labors these brethren should lift up their voice on behalf of the forlorn race to which this Continent once belonged, and should assert, as they energetically did, the duty of the Church and country to those whose lands we have possession of.

The evangelization of the French Canadian Roman Catholics is a work requiring, in addition to zeal, great wisdom and patience. The difficulties are exceedingly formidable. The Church of Rome is a political as well as a religious power, and in Quebec her social influence is nearly irresistible. Yet the duty of giving the pure Gospel to those who are in great ignorance of it seems unquestionable. This conclusion will be reached independently of any views on the validity of Romish baptism or ordination. The Presbyterian Church is specially bound to engage in this work, and has special historical advantages in conducting it. During the past year over $33,000 has been expended in French evangelization, and while a good many people have been reached in various ways, the educational work has been specially successful.

The Reports from the colleges occasioned little discussions, but they were quite encouraging. The aggregate number of graduates in Theology is probably greater than in any preceding year of the Church's history; two or three of the schools send forth the largest classes they have ever reported. Yet considering that the Church has 775 pastoral charges, and 309 groups of mission stations (to say nothing of foreign work), the 52 or 53 graduates are surely not too many. Without additions to our ministry from other sources we could not hitherto have carried on our work; and while some of these additions have been of excellent quality, it is on the whole better that a Church should not depend largely on foreign sources for its ministry.

Two of the colleges, Queen's and Manitoba, give instruction in Arts as well as in Theology; Queen's has University powers. The other colleges are theological seminaries, whose students take their Arts course wherever they please, provided they complete the Arts curriculum required by the Church.

In view of the importance of medical knowledge to foreign missionaries the
Assembly was overtured on the subject of accepting certain medical studies in lieu of some part of the Arts or Theological curriculum. A scheme of equivalence was prepared by a Committee of Assembly, and was sent down to the theological schools to be considered and reported on to next General Assembly. It seems only reasonable that two or three years spent in the study of medical science should have some recognition in the curriculum of the Church; and if these years must be simply added to the seven devoted to Arts and Theology, many candidates for the foreign field will be deterred from seeking attainments which on all hands are regarded as exceedingly valuable to the missionary in India and China and other countries. On the other hand, neither the ordinary Arts course nor the ordinary Theological course must be lightly impaired. No work could be accepted in substitution for any part of these which did not imply equal mental discipline, or which would leave a candidate seriously deficient in his preparation for the work of the ministry in the home church. The Assembly has taken the proper step in consulting the colleges, and they will certainly give their best attention to a subject which becomes increasingly practical. With its traditions and its present convictions on the subject of an educated ministry, there is little danger that the Presbyterian Church will approve of any proposal by which ministerial training would be injured. No one desires that the standard should be lowered; what the promoters of the overture seek is that ministerial education should, under special circumstances, receive the best adaptation to the field to be occupied.

Some progress is being made in College Endowment, but the amount accruing from funded capital still requires large supplement from annual collections in congregations. Queen's University has just announced a scheme which is intended to add $250,000 to its endowments, and of this sum nearly half has been already secured. Canada is not as yet a wealthy country, but in proportion to their means the people of all denominations are disposed generously to support education, both theological and general.

The Assembly appointed a large Committee on Systematic Beneficence. Its main duty will be to influence the Church in the matter of adequate and systematic giving for the support and extension of the Redeemer's kingdom in every department of work. Almost every scheme—especially Home Missions and Foreign Missions—imperatively requires larger revenue. If this is not forthcoming the sad necessity of even curtailing operations will be forced upon the Church. But no such necessity should arise. The $1,600,000 contributed for all Church purposes (this is near the amount) cannot adequately represent the giving power of the Church. The sum named does not, probably, exceed the $1 or $1 part of the revenue of members and adherents; and whatever opinion is held as to the permanent obligation of giving a tenth to the Lord, it will surely be agreed that we Christians should not content ourselves with giving less. Some, indeed, cannot give the tenth, but others can easily give more, and this average at least should be reached. Were it so, the Church's exchequer would be overflowing, and wonderful expansion of work would be seen in all directions. The contributions of the Canadian Church
are probably not behind those of other churches of equal means, but this is no reason why the duty of Christian giving should not be earnestly and affectionately pressed upon our people. Moved by such views and convictions the Assembly has taken this step toward raising the standard of liberality in the whole Church. To all the churches the subject is one of the deepest interest. In almost every department of her activity the entire Church of Christ is hindered by want of funds. Many individuals, and some congregations, are doing well—perhaps approaching the measure of their ability—but the slightest inspection of the finances of any Church will show that the cause of Christ is receiving far less than might be expected. It is simply appalling to compare the amounts expended for drink, tobacco, etc., with what is devoted to the extension of the kingdom of Christ.

As in the United States, so in Canada, the Episcopal Church recently passed Resolutions on Union, and appointed a committee to meet with any committees which might be appointed for a similar purpose by other Christian bodies. The General Assembly was not slow to respond to this invitation; it named its committee, and gave them power to confer with the Episcopal and other churches on the great question of Church Unity; but this action was not accompanied with any declaration of Church principles or any detailed instruction to the committee. It was judged better at the present stage of proceedings not to make any general enunciation of views regarding the principles and requisites of Union.

This movement toward Union on the part of the Episcopal Church will be watched with interest. At present its meaning is not quite apparent, and different explanations are offered. Some see in it a truly Christian attempt to promote the unity and efficiency of the Church, and a revival of the better traditions of the Church of England; others, marking the fact that many leading advocates of the measure are High-Churchmen, infer that Union, as it is spoken of, means the submission and absorption of non-Episcopal bodies. We are willing to hope the best. The Episcopal Church contains a large number of people and many ministers who are wearied of hierarchical pretensions and who have learned to love the brethren of other churches. For their sakes at least we should be forward to meet any overtures of Union which do not on the face of them bear evidence of a wrong spirit or of conditions to which we cannot assent. The Presbyterian Church is in no danger of being entrapped into a false position, and she will know how, at the proper time, to maintain and defend the heritage of truth which she has received. Should it be that the Spirit of God is moving upon men's hearts to seek an end which is dear to the Lord, who would wish to stand in the way?

The proposition that "The discipline of the Church shall not be exercised in regard to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, deceased wife's aunt, or deceased wife's niece," was sent down by the Assembly of last year under the Barrier Act. This Remit was found to be approved by 30 presbyteries, disapproved by 5, while 7 made no return. The action taken by the Assembly was the following: (a) The above recited proposition was passed into an ad interim
Act. (6) The question was sent down to presbyteries under the Barrier Act,
"Shall the words of the Confession of Faith, 'The man may not marry any of
his wife's kindred, nearer, etc.,' be struck out of the standards of this Church?"
The marriage question is by the recent action virtually settled, and it is to be
hoped that after next year it will not again come before the Assembly.

William Caven.

SYNOD OF THE ENGLISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England met in Manchester on
the 25th of April last. The sad history of the decadence of the Presbyterian-
ism of England, so powerful an element in her religious life in Puritan times,
is well known. Half a century ago it was represented by a small number of
struggling congregations in the northern counties, with some in the larger cities
—mainly composed of Scottish immigrants—and directly connected with the
Scottish Established and Secession Churches. Although the history of a fair
proportion of the northern congregations could be traced back to the Puritans,
the powerful strain of Scottish blood in the Church as a whole, and the close
ecclesiastical connection with Scotland, made "Presbyterian" and "Scottish"
synonymous terms to the popular English mind. In 1843, when the Presby-
terian Churches of the British Empire connected with the Established Church
of Scotland were agitated by the controversy that divided the Mother Church,
an overwhelming majority of the English Presbyterian Church resolved to sever
their ecclesiastical connection with Scotland and to form a separate and inde-
pendent Church on English soil. A small section, now numbering about
twenty congregations, led by the once well-known Dr. John Cumming, re-
mained in the old connection with the Church of Scotland, regarding it as their
special mission to represent her and to look after her members who migrated
to the southern part of the kingdom. The new body that, without disowning
its Scottish kindred, aspired to represent and revive the ancient Presbyterianism
of England, displayed singular spirit and energy, and made rapid progress.
Led by men among the ministers like the late Dr. James Hamilton and the
venerable Principal of the London Theological college, Dr. William Chalmers,
supported by a band of noble-minded and generous elders, and cheered by
the approval and sympathy of the Free Church leaders, this little Church girt
herself for her great task with enthusiasm and hope. Although the sanguine
anticipations of youthful days have scarcely been fulfilled, and it is now recog-
nized that a sustained and up-hill struggle must be made ere the little one be-
come a thousand, the rate of progress may well inspire thankfulness for the
past and hope and energy as regards the future. One of the most cheering
events in the history of this earnest effort to restore to England an Evangelical
Presbyterian Church, worthy to take its place and able to hold its own with the
other institutions that form and direct her religious thought and life, was the
union, ten years ago, of the English congregations of the United Presbyterian
Church of Scotland with the Presbyterian Church in England. Although the united Church is still but small among the powerful religious communities of England—having not quite three hundred congregations—she has a position of influence greatly beyond what her numbers alone warrant, due, in some measure, no doubt, to the fact that she represents one of the largest and most powerful families of the Reformed Church, and yet more to the eminence of some of her ministers and the high average of education and ability among the rest, but most of all to the unswerving evangelical testimony of her pulpits and to the evangelistic earnestness and energy of her work at home and abroad.

As the Synod sits only from Monday to Friday of one week, there is not much scope for oratory, and perhaps too little for discussion. The Convener of the Business Committee, Dr. Donald Fraser, keeps a keen eye on the House, and makes the sharp crack of his whip heard, and, if need be, its sharp point felt, if the pace gets too slow. The opening sermon by the Moderator of 1886, the popular and highly-esteemed Dr. David MacEwan, of Clapham, was short, clear, and impressive. But the impression gains ground that the ancient practice of beginning a Synod with a sermon, especially on a Monday evening, and with only a few days for a long and varied business programme, might in the case of this Church be departed from without any disrespect to sermons or retiring moderators, and with real advantage to the main purpose of the meeting. The Synod, on the recommendation of a committee of selection appointed the preceding year, called to the Chair, by acclamation, their senior Chinese missionary, the Rev. William S. Swanson, of Amoy. Mr. Swanson's election was intended to honor both the missionary and the man. No Church has a staff of foreign missionaries who more fully deserve and enjoy the confidence and affection of their brethren at home. Mr. Swanson having been obliged, on the score of health, to remain at home for some years, has done the mission immense service by his wise and eloquent expositions and appeals, and has thus become personally known to a wide circle. His opening address was a powerful plea for missions as the chief work of Christ's Church on earth.

The second day of the Synod was opened, according to custom, by the observance of the Lord's Supper. The prayers and addresses which preceded and followed the silent showing forth of the Lord's Death were in beautiful harmony with the sweet and holy solemnity, and must have helped to make that best hour of the Synod one of true fellowship with the Lord Jesus and with one another in Him. The communion was followed by a Conference on the State of Religion. For some years past the Synod has set apart several of its ministers and elders to visit the congregations of a Presbytery or District, inquiring into their spiritual life and working, and giving such advice as may seem needful for encouraging and stimulating them in the good work of the Lord. The Conference, starting from the Reports of these deputies, which were in type and in the hands of the members, yielded some valuable practical suggestions from such esteemed brethren as the Rev. Dr. Monro Gibson, of London, Mr. Lundie, of Liverpool, and others. The Conference was followed by the Report of the Jewish Mission. The veteran missionary, the Rev.
T. I. Meyer, himself an Israelite, who while a student in Berlin became a believer in Jesus, after many years' service on the European Continent accepted an invitation from this Church, nearly twenty years ago, to found a mission to the Jews in the east of London. He has labored faithfully, and has been honored to gather in year by year a remnant, mostly of the humbler classes of Jews, into the Christian fold. Encouraged by an offer of generous pecuniary help from the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, a new branch of the Jewish Mission has been recently established, under a devoted medical missionary, in a city in the north of Africa.

Tuesday evening was, according to custom, devoted to a missionary meeting. The Foreign Missions Report was presented by the Convener or Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Hugh M. Matheson, one of those princely merchants who write "Holiness to the Lord" upon the methods and the fruits of commerce, and who by the loftiest integrity and by the largest liberality command the respect and confidence of all and do yeoman service to the cause of Christ. Though one of the smallest of the Churches of England, the China Mission of this Church, tested by the number of its agents and converts, is the largest in that great empire, with the single exception of the American Presbyterian Mission, with which it is in close alliance. The agents of the mission, European and native, number nearly one hundred and twenty; the membership is close on six thousand; and those more or less loosely connected with and influenced by the mission must be three or four times as many. The Church has a small mission in India, which, though somewhat overshadowed by the work in China, is most faithfully conducted by Dr. Morrison and his gifted wife, and is writing its own record in souls won to the Saviour. A Women's Missionary Association, formed and conducted on the American model, is rendering inestimable help, not only in the way of funds, but by fostering a missionary spirit among those to whom God has given the greatest influence in moulding the religious life of the rising generation. The missionary meeting was large and aglow with zeal. The addresses of the missionaries from the several parts of the Chinese field were full of vivid and suggestive incidents and marked by a modest self-forgetfulness and a quiet yet exultant confidence in the grace and power of the Master that won and warmed all hearts and moistened many eyes. A speech of extraordinary power on the subject of the Home Heathen—reminding some of the older hearers of the moral enthusiasm and explosive energy that flashed and rolled like a thunderstorm in the oratory of the great Chalmers—was made by Mr. John Smith, once a minister of this Church, as the successor of Dr. John Cairns at Berwick, and now the colleague of Dr. Andrew Thomson in Broughton Place Church, Edinburgh, so well known in connection with its first minister, the late Dr. John Brown.

Our space prevents us doing more than barely noticing other matters of importance which came before the Synod. The Sustentation Fund, represented by the joint Convener, Dr. Donald Fraser and Dr. MacEwan, had a good account to give of itself, having succeeded, though not without special exer-
tions and serious apprehensions of falling short, in maintaining the equal dividend to all the ministers, sharing it at the former figure of two hundred pounds. Dr. Oswald Dykes, who commands in an eminent, we might write pre-eminent, degree the confidence of the Church, and whose rising is always the signal for hearty applause and earnest attention, had a somewhat disheartening report to give of the funds of the Theological College, and felt himself compelled to recommend a reduction of expenditure. The work of the College was, however, faithfully and successfully accomplished, and a fair number of earnest and capable men were devoting themselves to the holy ministry. The other report, which it fell to Dr. Dykes also to present, on the Higher Biblical Instruction of the Young People of the Church, was altogether of a brighter complexion. By recommending various biblical subjects for study, with the help of text-books and of ministerial classes, and by arranging for examinations to test the proficiency of the candidates, who receive certificates or diplomas graduated to the scales of merit, this Committee has given an immense stimulus to biblical study and a wise direction to the spirit of inquiry abroad among the more intelligent young people of our day.

It is a notable feature of the English Presbyterian Church that her courts have very seldom been engaged with cases of discipline, either for heresy or immorality. By the grace of God and the wholesome influence of conditions that make hard practical work and a high pulpit ideal incumbent on all her ministers, she has been preserved in large measure from the distracting speculations that lead away from the simplicity of the faith and from the self-indulgence and ease so often fatal to purity of life. May the same grace, under like Providential conditions, keep her for the future faithful to the truth as it is in Jesus, and fruitful in every good work!

R. TAYLOR.

HOW ARE INFANTS SAVED?

The grounds for believing in the salvation of all who die in infancy are examined in the last number of the Review. From the conclusion reached in Dr. Blaikie's article I do not dissent. We cannot make our opinion—our highly probable opinion—in favor of the salvation of all who die in infancy to be de fide. But the discussion of the present question stands quite apart from our view on the former one. If any dying in infancy are saved (which none deny), we still have the question presented, How are they saved?

Some, indeed, place the salvation of those who die in infancy on ground which affects our present topic. They argue that infants not having sinned their salvation is matter of necessity—of justice. Pelagianism certainly affects both questions—the universal salvation of infants, and the manner of it. But in this case salvation cannot properly be spoken of; for salvation is deliverance from sin, and cannot be predicated of those who have not sinned and are not involved in the penal consequences of sin. If you say that infants have no
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Taint of nature—have nothing in them to expose them to condemnation—you cannot speak of their salvation, though you may of their future felicity.

It is thus important that we should begin our statement with the distinct affirmation of the sinfulness and condemnation in Adam of the entire human race. The question of Mediate or Immediate Imputation need not be raised, for in either case the condition of infants brings them under condemnation. If infants are left without some work of grace upon them, if left merely to develop the tendencies which are in them, they cannot inherit the kingdom of God. The Lord's declaration, therefore, touching the necessity of the new birth applies to infants as to adults, and no answer to the question before us which ignores this fact can be entertained. That which is born of the flesh remains flesh, and only by a second and spiritual birth can the kingdom be entered.

The Confession of Faith teaches that "elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth." Such infants are saved (a) by Christ. He atones for them; for they have need of expiation as have others. No one, old or young, can enter heaven except by Christ, and all who appear before the throne have washed their robes in His blood. But also, (b) through the Spirit. The Spirit must regenerate. This necessarily follows from the fact that infants are sinful. The Spirit must renew the nature, take away its evil tendencies, and give adaptation to a holy destiny. Nothing but the utmost misconception of the moral and spiritual elements of the problems can determine any one to think otherwise. The human race is fallen—sinful—in all its members, and none can be saved unless "by Christ through the Spirit."

This is all certain, and is not denied by any who hold the evangelical doctrine; but the question remains, How are infants saved by the work of Christ and through the Spirit? In a most important respect their case differs from that of persons who can understand the method of grace. The work of the Saviour and of the Spirit is by such intelligently regarded as the way of salvation. Faith embraces Christ and unites them to Him, and the Spirit in regenerating and sanctifying them works by means of the truth concerning Christ. Knowledge and faith are both indispensable. "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe on Him of whom they have not heard?" But in the case of infants there can be no knowledge, and no faith springing from knowledge. This at least is the conclusion which we should reach from the appearances of the case; for there is nothing to suggest that infants are capable of such intellectual and moral activity as we know to be connected with salvation in the case of others. The difficulty, therefore, seems to remain. If we hold that mental activity is indispensable in the appropriation of salvation, we shut out infants from the kingdom of God.

The difficulty does not lie in the Scripture statements which make faith and knowledge necessary in salvation; for though infants may not be expressly excepted from the application of these statements, no violence is done to Scrip-
ture, if, on sufficient grounds, such statements are limited to adults or to those who have a measure of developed intelligence. And when we take into account cases like those of Jeremiah (Jer. i. 5) and John the Baptist (Luke i. 15), of which there may be very many, we must not insist upon an unlimited application of the texts referred to.

The question then is merely respecting the way in which infants are made partakers of the redemption purchased by Christ.

Here let it be carefully noted that the case of infants dying in infancy is the same as that of regenerated infants who do not die in infancy. And this, we may believe, is not a rare case. A considerable proportion, perhaps, of those who become faithful servants of Christ were the subjects of grace from an early period; many before intelligence was awakened. Not only so, but we look for a time when such instances of early renewal shall be far more frequent—when, indeed, renewal in infancy or childhood shall be the rule and not the exception. This will unquestionably be a higher condition of the Church than that in which years of indifference to religion so often precede the religious life. The Church longs for the day in which her children shall grow up in the kingdom, and shall not know a time in which they were not subjects of it and in sympathy with it. Hence the interest of our question widens and passes greatly beyond the case more immediately before us.

All except Pelagians, as already said, hold that infants in order to salvation must be regenerated. The question then comes to be, How is their regeneration effected? Now here again there is common ground in a most important matter, for all ascribe regeneration to the Holy Spirit as its efficient cause. But at this point a wide difference of opinion emerges; for some hold that regeneration takes place in baptism and is effected by it or in connection with it, while others earnestly reject this doctrine.

Romanists, Lutherans, and many of the Anglican communion agree in holding baptismal regeneration. The Canons of the Council of Trent are explicit: Baptism is defined as "sacramentum regenerationis per aquam in verbo." Baptism, as Rome teaches, cleanses from inherent corruption, secures remission of the penalty of sin, infuses sanctifying grace, unites to Christ, impresses upon the soul an indelible character, and opens the portals of heaven (Newman's Lectures on Justification). There can be no salvation therefore without baptism: to die unbaptized is to be lost, and to die with the efficacy of baptism unimpaired is to be saved. Bellarmin says: "The Church has always believed that infants perish if they depart this life without baptism. For although little children fail of baptism without any fault of their own, yet they do not perish without their own fault, since they have original sin." We thus see in what way the Church of Rome answers the question, How are infants dying in infancy saved? They are saved by baptism. If unbaptized neither infant nor adult can enter heaven.

The Church of Rome further teaches that faith is required in the case of the baptized, and while infants do not believe by their own proper act, "parentum fide, si parentes fideles fuerint, sin minus, fide universae societatis muniantur."
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Not less clearly does the Lutheran Church teach that regeneration is through baptism. "De baptismo docent quod sit necessarium ad salutem, quodque per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei, et quod pueri baptizandi, qui per baptismum oblato Deo recipiantur in gratiam Dei. Damnant Anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum puerorum et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri" (Confessio Augustana). While the doctrine is toned down and even evacuated by many Lutheran divines, such is the confessional ground of the Church.

It is unnecessary to set forth the modifications of this doctrine introduced by Anglicans, apparently with the view of evading the objections made to the opus operatum of Rome.

We are not here expected, of course, to refute the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. It might easily be shown that it is inconsistent with the whole nature of true religion, that as regards adults it places baptism in the position assigned to faith, that it is not sustained by fair exposition of any passages of Scripture, while it is contrary to the plain meaning of other passages, and that it is contradicted by experience—which unquestionably shows that many baptized persons are not regenerated, and that many persons are regenerated previous to their baptism. There is no escaping the force of this latter consideration except by giving a new and unscriptural meaning to regeneration.

But the Lutheran Church seeks to avoid the substitution of baptism for faith, and makes faith necessary even in the case of infants. The fides infantium was propounded by some of the schoolmen, and it is definitely embraced by the Lutherans. This faith is described as præsumpta, implicita, per baptismum sine verbo (or, sine cognitione) infusa, talis affectio in infante qualis Deo placet, dispositio ad justitiam, etc. Luther’s Larger Cathechism says: "Citra fidem nihil prodest baptismus, tametsi per se celestis et insestimabilis thesaurus esse negari non possit." And again: "Absente fide, nudum et inefficax signum tantummodo permanet." The Smaller Cathechism: "It is not water indeed that does it, but the Word of God which is with and in the water, and faith which trusts in the Word of God in the water.” Quenstedt: "By baptism and in baptism the Holy Ghost excites in infants a true, saving, life-giving, and actual faith, whence also baptized infants truly believe.” Gerhard: "Nos non de modo fidei sumus solici sed in illa simplicitate acquiescimus, quod infantes vere credant." Chemnitz: "Nequaquam concedendum est, infantes, qui baptizantur, vel sine fide esse, vel in aliena fide baptizari.” Though the production of faith may not be separated from the Word, baptism, which is the visible Word, produces faith in the infant.

But to impute faith to an infant is to deceive ourselves with words; it is to surround ourselves with a dense fog in which nothing can be seen. The only reason for inventing this kind of faith is to fulfil the condition which makes faith essential to salvation. But if the faith of infants is something quite different from faith in the ordinary use of the term, the condition is not fulfilled, and we have imposed upon ourselves with a mere figment. That an entirely new meaning is given to faith is evident from the fact that not one of the elements of faith as ordinarily defined is found in this faith of infants. Faith is
said to embrace Notitia, Assensus, Fiducia. Faith presupposes knowledge; it is not a blind thing, but has eyes. Something must be known regarding the object of faith—enough to warrant its exercise. In regard to Christ faith apprehends the truth that He is able and willing to save, and that salvation is freely offered to us in the Gospel. Faith implies the exercise of the understanding. The truth referred to becomes the material on which the mind operates, and there is conscious apprehension and reception of this truth; while the affections and the will unite with the understanding in embracing Christ and resting upon Him. Of this mental activity, in all its parts, infants are incapable.

Nothing is gained by calling the faith implicit, or germinal, or the like. In any proper sense of the term faith is a conscious act, and to designate something in which there is no mental activity at all by the same name is only to abuse terms.

We are not helped to accept this doctrine of infant faith by learning that the faith is implied in regeneration, and that regeneration is effected in baptism. This is only to add difficulty to difficulty, and to supply us with further reasons for rejecting the doctrine. All the arguments by which we refute baptismal regeneration are now proper to be used against the faith of infants, which is alleged to be the fruit of their regeneration or part of it.

The only specific Scripture proof which seems to be offered in support of such faith is Matt. xviii. 6: "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me," etc. But here the "little ones" will very naturally mean those who have the disposition of little children. The parallels in Mark and Luke support this view; but in any case we must remember that παιδία are not necessarily infants.

The second view as to the method of infant salvation is content to hold that infants are saved through the merits of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit, but attempts no explanation of the way in which the Redeemer's merits are applied and in which the Spirit accomplishes regeneration and sanctification. No attempt is made to advance beyond the statement of the Westminster Confession, which is not only the substance of all that can legitimately be said, but is felt at once to be sufficient.

It is, of course, involved that the work of Christ may be applied, and the work of the Spirit accomplished apart from the communication of that knowledge of Christ and apart from those mental exercises which, in the case of adults, ordinarily accompany salvation. Should any one decline to take this ground he must fall back upon that of the Church of Rome or of the Lutheran Church.

(a) As to the work of Christ, less difficulty will perhaps be found in accepting what has just been stated. There is no obvious reason why the merits of the Saviour should not be counted to an infant, so that He should be accepted on the ground of them. We cannot demonstrate, and it is not axiomatic, that the exercise of intelligence must precede such divine imputation; more especially when we reflect that our connection with "the first man" precedes con-
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sciousness, and that infants come into the world with the burden of this connection upon them. The divine justice may be entirely satisfied with the work of Christ for infants, though they cannot comprehend that work, and to argue the opposite from the case of adults, when the knowledge of Christ is requisite to the production of certain saving graces, as repentance and faith, is clearly not allowable. But certain it is that infants need atonement, and the view we are sustaining does not for a moment forget that fact.

(6) But the work of the Spirit in infants is equally necessary with the work of the Lord for them; and here it is that special difficulty has been found in apprehending the method of their salvation. In adults—in persons of developed intelligence—the Spirit works through the truth. In both regeneration and sanctification the truth is the instrument which He employs. The Church is "sanctified and cleansed with the washing of water by the Word" (Eph. v. 26). "Sanctify them through the truth; thy Word is truth" (Jno. xvii. 17). "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit . . . being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever" (1 Pet. i. 22, 23). In like manner we read that the heart is purified by faith (Acts xv. 9). The understanding, will, conscience, affections, are all called into exercise in the Spirit's working, and it is hardly supposable that we should be renewed and sanctified by the Spirit, and yet the entire process lie outside the sphere of consciousness and mental activity. How, then, shall those who are incapable of such mental activity become subjects of the Spirit's work so as to be qualified for heaven?

Now let it be remarked that the question is only an appeal to our ignorance; for no one can prove the impossibility of the Spirit's accomplishing His work apart from the exercise of intelligence in the subject of that work. We know too little on the one hand of the Spirit's power, and on the other of man's nature—of the human soul—to hazard any such assertion. We do know, indeed, that the Spirit in acting upon persons and things must act in accordance with their nature and characteristics. His action, therefore, upon an infant will not be after the manner of His action upon purely material substances, as when He "renews the face of the earth;" but we cannot maintain that the Spirit's work in the infant must come into the region of knowledge and faith. Still less can we assert the impossibility of the Spirit's operating upon the infant mind at all.

Even in adults regeneration precedes the conscious turning of the soul to God. There is a creative work of the Spirit in which our mental activity bears no part. Whatever action of the truth upon mind and heart has gone before, the creative power of God is exerted immediately upon the nature, giving it new qualities and tendencies, and the whole cannot be described as a purely rational process. But if so, we can the more readily believe in the possibility of the Almighty power so operating upon an infant as to result in spiritual renovation; nor can it be shown that the important distinction between a person and a thing is thus disregarded. The Spirit's work is inscrutable, and we
have no right to say that the possibility of it is conditioned upon the exercise of intelligence. In due time the regenerated infant, if spared, will manifest the fruits of the Spirit; but if early death prevent the appearance of fruit or blossom upon earth, the work of renewal is accomplished all the same, and the fruit will mature under brighter skies. By immediate omnipotent action upon the qualities of the infant’s soul the Spirit has made them holy, and this has been done in harmony with the nature of the soul. Cases like those of Jeremiah and John the Baptist show that the Spirit can and does so work. The same is clearly deduced from the Lord’s declaration regarding little children, that of such is the kingdom of heaven. The fact is established, however little our curiosity may be satisfied regarding the method of the Spirit’s working. But those who remember the Lord’s conversation with Nicodemus concerning the new birth will not be surprised that a work which we cannot comprehend in any instance should be specially hidden from our inspection when it precedes the exercise of reason and intelligence.

The Reformed do not receive the Lutheran doctrine touching the faith of infants. Certainly they do not ascribe to infants actual faith. Calvin says: "At quomodo, inquiant, regenerantur infantes, nec boni nec mali cognitione prediti? Nos autem respondemus, opus Dei, etiamsi captui nostro non sub-jacet, non tamen esse nullum. Porro infantes qui servandi sunt, ut certe ex ea ætate omnino aliqui servantur, ante a Domino regenerari minime obscurum est. Nam si ingeniam sibi corruptionem et matris utero secum afferunt, ea purgatos esse oportet, antequam in regnum Dei admittantur, quo nihil ingredi-tur inquinatum et impollutum" (Inst., Lib. IV., Cap. 16, Sect. 17).

It seems of little use to admit, with Turrettine, that while infants have not actual faith they have the root of faith or the seed of faith in them: "Non potest ipsis negari semen vel radix fidei, quae a Spiritu Sancto ipsis teneris ingeneretur, et suo tempore exeat in actum," etc. (Inst., Vol. II., Loc. XV., Quaest. XIV.). The seeds or germs of all graces are undoubtedly contained in regeneration, but there is no greater reason on this account for ascribing faith to infants than for ascribing to them the other Christian virtues. Turret-tine would oppose the Anabaptists, "qui omnem fidem non modo quoad actum, sed etiam quoad habitum et formam denegant infantibus." But whatever the error of the Anabaptists may be, it does not need to be met in this way. The language is misleading, giving, as it does, a meaning to faith which it bears neither in Scripture nor in theological literature. We may indeed say with Calvin, "The seed of repentance and faith lies hid in them by the secret operation of the Spirit," or, with Dr. A. A. Hodge, "Infants may receive from the Holy Ghost the habit or state of soul of which faith is the expression." But the habitus of the soul is one thing and the habitus of faith, in distinction from its actus, is another thing.

Nor is it necessary in vindicating the right of infants to baptism to adduce any such consideration as the following: "De fide infantium federatorum idem dicendum, quod de ipsorum ratione. Utraque ipsis actu primo, non secundo; in semente non in messe; in radice non in fructu; interna
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Spiritus virtute, non externa operis demonstratione” (Turret., de Baptismo). We can certainly speak of the principle of faith as distinct from the acts of faith, but it is of very doubtful propriety to attribute faith to those who have not begun to think or reason. Infants possess every principle or component part of our nature, and regenerated infants possess that nature in such moral condition that faith will appear as soon as the requisite development of faculty takes place; but inasmuch as faith is not a faculty or part of the nature, but the reception of divine truth upon proper evidence, it is an improper use of language to speak of a faith which cannot possibly be actualis.

Moral qualities or conditions belong to the soul before there are any conscious actings of it. If so, infants are moral beings, and the Almighty Gracious Spirit can mould them as He will—touch them to what spiritual issues He will. He can before the first gleam of intelligence appears infuse new moral habitues and qualities—regenerate—sanctify—prepare for a heavenly home. It is enough to know and be sure of this general fact which the Word of God so clearly establishes; and we should exclude from our reasoning on this interesting subject all such doubtful psychology as the faith of infants.

The glory of divine grace will shine forth forever, not less wondrously in the salvation of infants than in the salvation of those who through long conflict, perhaps, have reached the kingdom.

WILLIAM CAVEN.

Toronto.

RUPERTUS MELDENIUS AND HIS WORD OF PEACE.

In the last number of this REVIEW I gave an account of the efforts of Lücke and other German scholars to trace the origin of the phrase: “In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque charitas.” I also reported additional evidence that I had discovered in several of the rare works of Richard Baxter and other scholars of the seventeenth century. This additional evidence strengthened the opinion of Lücke that Rupertus Meldenius was the author of the phrase. Baxter refers to Conradus Bergius as his authority for referring the phrase to Rupertus Meldenius. I was unable to secure any of Bergius’s works before I left America, but I have taken advantage of a few weeks in Germany to pursue the investigation. The works of Bergius and his associates in the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder are extremely scarce. By combining those found in the libraries of Leipzig and Berlin I have been able to examine the most of them; but there are some volumes not to be found in these great libraries. The volume from which Baxter derived the sentence is entitled, Praxis Catholica divini canonis contra quasvis hereses et schismata seu de fide catholica jusque imprimis fundamento et Christianorum quorumvis circa illud consensu vel dissensu dissertationes IX., etc., a Conrado Sergio. Bremæ, 1639. It is singular that the passages should have escaped Lücke, for he mentions the book, It has a full index, and the name of Meldenius is there, referring to the page where the extract is found. The extract is in the second dissertation, entitled, “De modo revelationis catholicae, tanquam principio fidel communi, quomodo Deus loquatur hominibus; et quæ vel qualis sit illa revelatio, quæ habeat authoritatem divinam et catholicam; adeo ut omnes eos quibus ostensa fuerit, ad credendum obliget.” This dissertation cites a very large number of authorities from all the churches of Christendom. In Section CVII. the author comes
to the *Paraenesis Votiva*, and begins thus: "Non prætererumpa est hoc in loco, Paraenesis Votiva pro pace Ecclesiae ad Theologos Aug. Confessionis, auctore Ruperto Meldenio Theologo: qui licet tempus et locum editionis et suam authoris conditionem (quod velim) non distincte exprimat, tamen guarum partium sit satis indicat." Conrad Bergius follows the method of quoting in the ordinary type of the book and inserting his comments in italics. It is clear from his statement that he regards Meldenius as the author, but does not know anything about him. His appreciation of the tract is evident from the number and length of his quotations from it, extending from page 159 to page 188. He concludes with the golden word of Meldenius and a brief comment upon it.

"Fol. F 2. Verbo dicam: Si nos servaremus in necessariis Unitatem; in non necessariis, Libertatem; in utrisque Charitatem; optimo certe loco essent res nostra. *Ita fiat Amen.*"

Baxter gives it in a slightly different form:

"Were there no more said of all this subject but that of Rupertus Meldenius, cited by Conradus Bergius, it might end all schism if well understood and used—viz., *Si in NECESSARIIS sit UNITAS, IN NON-NECESSARIIS LIBERTAS, IN UTRISQUE CHARITAS, optimo certe loco essent res nostra.*"

It is clear that Baxter derived the word of peace from the passage of Conradus Bergius given above. We now have to build on Conradus Bergius for a further investigation.

As we have already seen in the last number of this REVIEW, the phrase is also found in a tract of Gregorius Francus, entitled: *Consideratio theologica de gradibus necessitatis dogmatum Christianorum, quibus fidei, spei et charitatis officia reguntur.* Frankfurth-an-der-Oder. 1628. It is found in the following form: "Summa est: servemus in necessariis unitatem, in non necessariis libertatem, in utrisque charitatem." The phrase is here in a terser and more independent form, and some have thought that possibly Meldenius derived it from Francus. This question may be regarded as settled by Conradus Bergius, for he not only ascribes the phrase to Rupertus Meldenius, but he makes extracts from the tract of Gregorius Francus, in Section LXIX. (p. 108), showing familiarity with it. He would not have omitted the sentence from Francus and used it from Meldenius unless he wished to indicate that the sentence belonged to Meldenius and not to Francus. The relations between Francus and Bergius make this absolutely certain. Gregorius Francus was a colleague of Conradus Bergius in the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1627-28. Gregorius Francus was born in 1585, and was for many years professor at Frankfort. He was rector in 1616, 1624, 1633, 1640, 1645. He died in 1651. Conrad Bergius was rector of the University in 1628, the date of the publication of this tract of Gregorius Francus, and he certainly would have ascribed this golden sentence to his colleague and friend if it belonged to him, rather than to the unknown Rupertus Meldenius.

Just at this time there was a strong movement in this University in the direction of Christian union. In the autumn of 1627 Conradus Bergius preached two discourses in Frankfort on this subject, which were published with the consent of the theological Faculty of the University, so that his book appeared at the same time with the tract of his colleague Francus. They are in entire accord; they breathe the same spirit and have the same purpose. These discourses are, indeed, the original edition of a work which in its third stage reached the form of the *Praxis Catholica*. We shall give the original title entire: Grund und Hauptsumma des waren Christenthums und recht alten Catholischen oder allgemeinen Glaubens nebenst wolmeinender Erinnerung wie sich ein Einfälliger für gefährlichen Irthümern am sichersten hüten; auch ein jeder Friedliebender alles weitleuften streitens mit gutem Gewissen entschlaken.
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These discourses were attacked by Nicolaus Hunnius, of Lübeck, and, accordingly, Bergius prepared a second edition in reply under the title: Grund und Hauptsumma des wahren Christenthums erleutert, und mit Nic. Hunnii Bedenken und Widerlegungen zusammengehalten. Franckfurt-an-der-Oder. 1633. This was finally enlarged and published in Latin under the title, Praxis Catholica, etc. Bremen, 1639. Bergius had removed to Bremen in the mean while. There can be no doubt, therefore, that Conradus Bergius knew what he was doing when he ascribed the phrase to Rupertus Meldenius. He was familiar with the whole subject of Protestant Polemics and Irenics. His citations from the literature of the subject are richer and more extensive than I have found in any other writer.

The phrase was known to Francus in 1628. The tract of Meldenius cannot have been later than 1627.

There is a temptation to regard the name Rupertus Meldenius as a pseudonym, and to look for the author in one of the group of Frankfort theologians. We find that a similar pseudonym was used by Gregorius Francus in connection with some of his writings. We might think of Christopher Pelargus, the veteran professor of Frankfort, who was called the Irenæus of his times on account of his irenic disposition and teachings. He was born August 3d, 1565, at Schweidnitz, in Silesia. He was professor in Frankfort from 1585 until June loth, 1633, when he died in the rectorate. He was originally a Lutheran, but subsequently became a Calvinist without partisanship. His pupils were inspired with his irenic spirit. With the brothers Bergius and Gregorius Francus he gave the Calvinism of Prussia a milder type than that which prevailed at the time in Switzerland and Holland. It is also noteworthy that John Durie began his work of peace-making from Elbing, in Prussia, in this region, soon after this time. Christopher Pelargus would be just the man to have written such a tract as the Parænæsis Votivæ. And yet we cannot think of him, for the reason that he was the teacher and friend of Conradus Bergius. Bergius quotes from him in his Praxis Catholica, Dissertation II., Section LXXIV., and calls him præceptor promotor meus. He could hardly have been ignorant of the fact, if he had been the author of the Parænæsis Votivæ. Rupertus Meldenius seems to have belonged rather to the school of John Arndt.

I had the privilege of examining a copy of the Parænæsis Votivæ in the Royal Library of Berlin. The golden sentence is the climax of a paragraph, and it seems to have sprung out of the author's mind in the advance of his thought toward the climax. We give it exactly as it appears in its context, preserving the lines and italics of the original.


The golden sentence seems to belong here, as the author sums up in it all that
has gone before. Bergius quotes it exactly, only he emphasizes UNITATEM
LIBERTATEM, and CHARITATEM, and adds his own wish, "ita fiat AMEN." Baxter quotes from Bergius, but inexactiy. He substitutes sit for servaremus,
and then nominatives for accusatives of the three leading nouns. He follows
Bergius in emphasizing these, but he goes further and also emphasizes NECESS-
ARIIS, NON-NECESSARIIS, and UTRISQUE.

It still remains undetermined who Rupertus Meldenius was. The words of
Bergius are strongly against the view that the name is a pseudonym, and favors
the view that we have the real name of the author. The first we know of the
tract is in the extract of Gregorius Francus. The one who gave it the widest
currency was Conradus Bergius. The theological school of Frankfort-on-the-
Oder seems to have had the first knowledge of it. This urges us to look for the
author in Eastern Europe. If the author's name was Rupert of Melden, where
is Melden? There is a little village of that name on the borders of Bohemia and
Silesia. It is possible that the author came from thence. This I have been
unable to determine. But it matters little whether an obscure village gave birth
to this golden sentence or not. The author does not belong among the men of
fame. Like many other men of peace, he has been consigned to obscurity by
the polemic and scholastic theologians, who gained the ear of the world and
drowned the words of peace and reform in their partisan cries and loud and
bitter wrangling. I have been greatly impressed, in the study of the work of
John Durie and his associates, and of the whole Frankfort school, which in his
day played so important a part in the history of theology in Germany, how
greatly they have been neglected by Reformed as well as by Lutheran writers.
Here is a new chapter in theological history for any one who will venture upon
it. Like a mountain stream that disappears at times under the rocks of its bed
and reappears deeper down in the valley, so these long-buried principles of
peace have reappeared after two centuries of oblivion, and these irenical theo-
logians will be honored by those who live in a better age of the world, when
Protestant Irenics have well-nigh displaced the old Protestant Polemics and
Scholastics.

C. A. BRIGGS.

New York.
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I.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

WORD STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D.

This is a work by a scholar, for men who are not scholars, but only diligent students of the New Testament desirous to know as much of the original sense as is possible for persons having little or no acquaintance with Greek. The nature and aim of the work are indicated very distinctly in this sentence from the preface: "Taking a position midway between the exegetical commentary and the lexicon and grammar, it aims to put the reader of the English Bible nearer to the standpoint of the Greek scholar, by opening to him the native force of the separate words of the New Testament in their lexical sense, their etymology, their history, their inflection, and the peculiarities of their usage by different evangelists and apostles." The author pleads for the legitimacy and utility of such a study, as not rendered superfluous by the most successful translation, and as really fitted to convey a large amount of benefit to the merely English reader. Such a reader, he contends, may be made acquainted with the history of Greek words used in the New Testament, with Greek idioms, with the pictures hidden in Greek words, and lost in translation, with Greek synonyms; he may be made to understand the reasons for many changes of rendering from an older version, which, on their face, seem to him arbitrary and useless, and may attain some knowledge of the styles characteristic of different writers, and some insight into the distinctions between Greek tenses and the force of the Greek article. These and other advantages specified in the preface show what ends the author has in view, and the value of the work must be judged by the extent to which he has succeeded in securing them. If they have been secured in any considerable measure the existence of the work is fully justified.

In venturing to express an opinion on this point, we may say at once that it is evident at a glance that this book has not been hastily got up. The author states that he received the impulse to this line of study from Bengel, while translating his "Gnomon" more than twenty-five years ago. We can well believe it. The idea has evidently been in his mind for a long time, and has been gathering around itself materials of very varied character from many different sources. The book before us embodies the carefully-collected results of a very extensive
course of reading, as well as the original thoughts of a highly-cultivated mind. On every page it bears traces of good Greek scholarship, and of general literary culture. The writer is well acquainted with poetry and art. Dante is obviously a special favorite. Quotations from the best classic authors, as well as from modern writers abound, the result being that these "Word Studies" are anything but dry reading. Take as a sample the paragraph on the words, "On his shoulders" (Luke xv. 5). First comes a note on the exact force of the Greek "Lit. his own shoulders." Then follows a quotation from Bengel, "He might have employed a servant's aid, but love and joy make the labor sweet to himself." Then at more length the artistic side of the subject is taken up. "The 'Good Shepherd' is a favorite subject in early Christian art;" then follows an illustrative quotation from Northcote and Brownlow's "Roma Sotteranea," and a description of a specimen found in the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia, at Ravenna. Similar acquaintance with the history of Christian art is displayed in connection with the topic of "the Prodigal Son." While obviously partial to subjects affording scope for classical, literary, and artistic allusions, the author has not neglected those the treatment of which forms the proper \textit{raison d'être} of his work. He has made it his business where opportunity occurred to bring out the full force of a Greek word, to direct attention to Greek idiom, to indicate the exact effect of the Greek article (as in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican: "God be merciful to me the sinner"), to take notice of the most important various readings, to indicate and vindicate many of the changes made in the Revised Version. So that the English reader, habitually using this work as a companion to the New Testament, cannot fail to learn much which will increase his understanding and enjoyment of the sacred text.

While aiming chiefly at the benefit of the merely English reader, Dr. Vincent has furnished his work with features which will tend to make it acceptable to such as are more or less acquainted with Greek. The Greek words corresponding to the English ones commented on are in many instances given within brackets, at the end of each book of Scripture a list of the Greek words peculiar to the sacred author is supplied, and at the end of the volume full lists both of the English words commented on, and of their Greek equivalents, are furnished, which will much facilitate consultation.

The preacher comes legitimately out in lengthy articles on topics which give scope for ethical or religious observations. The extended remarks on "Blessed" (μακάριος), "The Meek" (οὐ πτωτικός), "The Kingdom of God," "Devils," "Hades," "Conscience," "Repent," may be referred to as samples.

On the whole, our verdict is that the task undertaken has been honestly, carefully, gracefully, and usefully done. But of course not perfectly. Every human work has its defects, and this one is no exception; and we may mention one or two blemishes, if it were only to show that we are endeavoring to perform our part as critics with sincerity. One fault—not a very grave one in a popular book—is too frequent use of one or two authors, not always of the highest merit or authority. Thus Edersheim is frequently cited to illustrate Jewish or Rabbinical custom. Too little, again, has been said on some words; for instance, on "When he thought thereon, he wept"—Mark xiv. 72 (ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκλαυε). All that is said on this passage is: "From ἵππι, upon, and βάλλω to throw. When he threw his thought upon it." Of course the author knows that there has been much dispute about the meaning of ἐπιβαλλω, and that the passage has been variously rendered: When he thought thereon he wept, or he wept abundantly, or he began to weep, or he covered his head and wept. Why not give the reader a short history of these various renderings? The last, especially, should not have been deemed unworthy of notice when it has the powerful support of Dr. Field, of Norwich (vid. \textit{Otium Norvicense}, Pars Tertia). It might be plead that no
benefit accrues to the general reader from details as to diverse renderings. But
the author has not acted on this principle, for he goes into considerable detail
on the meaning of the word ἔσωθον in the Lord's Prayer. No remarks are
made on the nature of the "tongues" spoken of in Acts ii., but this omission
may be supplied in the second volume in dealing with the spiritual gifts spoken
of in 1 Cor. xiv. In some instances more might have been said to bring out the
ethical significance of words. Thus the frequent use in the New Testament, as
in the Septuagint, of the verb πτωπητομαι, and its derivatives, in the sense of
gracious visitation. The remarks on ἀγαθός (good)—Acts xi. 24—are in the right
direction, but too meagre. We once read in a commentary on Acts this remark
on this passage: "He was a good man—would be able to discern between the
genuine and the counterfeit"—as if good meant shrewd, smart. This is entirely
beside the mark. Dr. Gloag, quoted by the author, is on the right track when
he says: "His benevolence effectually prevented him censuring anything that
might be new or strange in these preachers to the Gentiles, and caused him to
rejoice in their success." ἀγαθός means benignant, large-hearted, and the
history of Barnabas supplies interesting material for determining the Bible idea
of a good man. He sold his property for the benefit of the Church. He gave
Saul at a critical moment the right hand. He threw himself sympathetically
into the movement toward Christianity at Antioch. The word ἀλλός (Luke iii.
14), as it occurs again in Romans vi. 23, affords an opportunity of moralizing
not to be lost. It means literally "whatever is bought to be eaten with bread."
Scottice, kitchen. Hence, the kitchen of sin, the best thing sin has to give, is
death. Φιλανθρωπία (Acts xxviii. 2, Titus iii. 4), offers another golden oppor-
tunity. In the one text it is used of the kindness of the barbarians of Malta to
Paul, and his shipwrecked companions; in the other text of God's kindness to sin-
ful men in Christ Jesus. How significant this juxtaposition! More attention
might have been paid to characteristic diversities of style in the evangelists;
especially in contrasting Luke and Matthew, in their respective accounts of our
Lord's words. Let one instance suffice. In Matt. xviii. 6 Christ speaks of a
millstone (μύδος ὄνωπε) to be suspended about the neck of one who makes the
little ones stumble, that he may be drowned in the deepest part of the sea. Our
author properly points out that it is the larger sort of millstone that is spoken
of, one turned by an ass, not merely by the hand. In the corresponding passage
in Luke he contents himself with a bare reference to the text in Matthew. But
Luke does not use the same expression. He says not μύδος ὄνωπε, but ὁδὸς μυλικός,
which means simply a millstone, not a great millstone. And in accordance with
this he says simply "be cast into the sea, not, as in Matthew, "drowned in the
depth of the sea." In both cases Christ's strong language is toned down; and
this instance raises the question whether thoroughout Luke there be not dis-
cernible a tendency to soften down harsh expressions, as if in the interest of the
amiable or gracious side of Christ's character. Another example is: I came
not to send peace, but a sword. Luke for sword has division. While com-
mandingly attentive to the shades of meaning peculiar to Greek tenses, such as
the imperfect and the aorist, some chance of making good points have been lost.
Thus in Matthew xi. 19: "And wisdom was justified of her children." An in-
stance of the gnomic aorist, stating what belongs to the moral order of the world,
as in James i. 11 we have again the use of aorists to state what belongs to the
usual order of nature. And wisdom is justified of her children, of course. The
praise of the wise is as much a matter of course as the blame of fools.

But enough of fault-finding. We cordially commend this book to the class of
readers for whom it is intended. It is excellent in substance, style, and spirit,
and the publishers have done their part worthily; the printing is beautiful and
the get-up handsome.

A. B. BRUCE.
ABRAHAM, JOSEPH, AND MOSES IN EGYPT: Being a course of lectures delivered before the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J., by Rev. ALFRED H. KELLOGG, D.D., of Philadelphia, Member of Victoria Institute, etc. 8vo, pp. 160. New York and London, 1887.

These very interesting lectures are an important contribution to the question discussed—viz.: the synchronism of three salient points of contact in the early history of Israel and Egypt, which it is proposed to settle definitively on the basis of recent monumental discoveries. The most striking and valuable portion of the discussion concerns the period of the Exodus. After long wavering between the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties there seems to have been of late a general disposition to acquiesce in Lepsius's conclusion that the Mineptah of the nineteenth dynasty was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. So far as the dynasty is concerned, this seems to be settled beyond peradventure by the recent identification of Pithom and the evidence gathered on the spot which connects it undeniably with Rameses II., who is thus shown to have been one of the oppressing Pharaohs. But was his son Mineptah the Pharaoh who hardened his heart and refused to let the people go at Jehovah's bidding? There are various circumstances which combine to cast doubt upon the present current hypothesis. And to these Dr. Kellogg now adds a very remarkable passage from the famous Harris papyrus, which appears to point strongly in another direction. This contains a confession that the nineteenth dynasty ended in disaster and anarchy connected with a great emigration from Egypt, and that the disturbed state of affairs was terminated only by the strong hand of a successful usurper. If the ingenious application made of this passage to the exodus of the Israelites, which seems exceedingly plausible in itself and is corroborated in various ways, shall be confirmed by a thorough examination of the whole subject, it deserves to be classed as a discovery of the first order. The curious perplexity as to who the last Pharaoh of this dynasty really was, arising from a singular conflict of monumental evidence on the subject, is very skilfully disentangled and put upon as secure a basis as existing data will permit.

The lucidity of the style of these lectures makes it a pleasure to follow them even through the perplexities of the Manetho lists and the vexed question of the shepherd domination, whose point of beginning is here precisely fixed by the Tanis tablet of the reign of Rameses II., and dating from the four hundredth year of the Set era. Upon the basis of this and of the four hundred and thirty years of Ex. xii. 40 all other identifications are made. The preponderating weight given in the discussion of this latter period to genealogical deductions above an explicit statement of the Hebrew text seems to us to be the one weak point in the general argument.

The volume is provided with charts and tables for ready comparison; and the admirable style of its execution is worthy of the character of its contents.

W. HENRY GREEN.


The author of this valuable book is pastor of a Congregational Church in London. He published the first edition of his work anonymously, but has now yielded to the advice of his friends, and added his name to the title-page of the new edition. It was my privilege to know the author and to read his first edition in the light of personal acquaintance. It was then my opinion that he had made the first thorough study of New Testament Prophecy, with the use of correct principles of exegesis. I have used the book constantly since that time, and
have just completed the reading of the new edition, and my first impressions have been confirmed. No student of New Testament Prophecy can afford to do without the wealth of knowledge that this book will give him. It is easily worth all others that have been written on the subject. I give this opinion notwithstanding the fact that I cannot accept the theory of the Parousia that dominates the book. I shall not take any further space in setting forth its merits, but devote my attention to a criticism of the theory.

This new theory of the Parousia is that the second advent of our Lord and all the events connected with it in New Testament Prophecy took place at the destruction of Jerusalem. This theory puts many of the passages of the New Testament in a new light: it brings into consideration the historical circumstances of the prophecies, and their relation to the closing scenes of the great catastrophe of the Jewish nation, and it makes it evident that a much larger portion of prophecy refers to these events than interpreters have usually supposed. But after all this has been conceded, the author maintains his theory by doing violence to not a few passages and by wresting the structure of New Testament Prophecy from its Old Testament foundations.

(1) This, then, is the first criticism that we make upon the theory, that it is at war with the Messianic Prophecy of the Old Testament. It is significant here that the author limits himself to the prophecy of Malachi, and seeks a basis here because that passage suits his purpose in representing John the Baptist as the herald of the advent to judgment; he refers this judgment to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. If he had studied this judgment scene of Malachi in connection with the entire sweep of Old Testament Prophecy he might have come to a different conclusion. We cannot accept this isolated prophecy as the summation of Old Testament Prophecy, or a suitable introduction to New Testament Prophecy, all the more that it does not contain any references to the events of the first advent of Christ; Malachi connects the herald with the advent to judgment; he does not see the historical Christ intervening. If this most important history escaped his attention, surely the destruction of Jerusalem would hardly arrest it. Malachi agrees with all the prophets in disregarding intervals of time and in looking at the great end of all prophecy in its connection with the herald that he predicts.

(2) The second fault of the theory is its neglect of the Jewish apocalypses and the Jewish Messianic ideas of New Testament times. These cast an immense amount of side light upon New Testament Prophecy. These would have shown him that it was not in accordance with even Jewish ideas to limit prophecy so strictly to Jewish affairs. Mr. Russell's interpretation of New Testament Prophecy is narrower than the elaboration of Prophecy that we find in these apocalypses.

(3) There is an extreme literalness in Mr. Russell's interpretation of the word "near" as used by Jesus, which fails to recognize that the term had acquired a technical sense in the Old Testament Prophets, implying that the events predicted were impending, certain to come, and yet uncertain as to time. Mr. Russell's interpretation of ἐγερθεί applied to the equivalent Old Testament וַיֶּרֶד would make a large number of the Old Testament Prophets false prophets. It would also force us, in a correct interpretation of the New Testament, to the opinion that Jesus and his apostles were mistaken. Mr. Russell offers a very perilous dilemma when he asks us either to accept his theory, and believe that the second advent took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, or else that Jesus and his apostles were mistaken.

(4) Mr. Russell in his interpretation of New Testament Prophecy fails to make such distinctions as are required by a careful exegesis. He praises Dr. Edward Robinson for founding so much on the eschatological discourse of Jesus refer-
ring to the destruction of Jerusalem, and blames him for not referring everything to that event. He also praises Moses Stuart for his literalism, and blames him for not carrying it out to the end. In other words, Mr. Russell refuses to recognize the distinction between the judgment of Jerusalem and the judgment of the nations that these scholars, who were distinguished for their adherence to strict grammatical and historical exegesis, were obliged to make. In shutting his eyes to the prediction of the judgment of the nations, Mr. Russell is guilty of great error. We agree with him that "this generation" refers to the generation contemporary with Jesus, and that \( \sigma ντ ις το ι ρι νος \) means the completion of the age, but these admissions do not help his theory, for he cannot prove that Jesus predicts the judgment of the nations in his own generation, and it still remains to be decided whether the age was completed at the judgment of the Jews or at the judgment of the nations. We must protest, moreover, against the limited application of the term "\( \gamma \eta \)" to the land of Israel, and of the "nations" to the inhabitants of the land. We admit that \( \gamma \eta \) is often used in the restricted sense, but claim that the context of the passages under consideration is against the restricted sense. We admit that "nations" is used in poetical passages of the Old Testament for the tribes of Israel, and that it is also loosely used elsewhere for the mixed population of the land, but the context decides in every such instance, and the term is to be taken in its wider and more usual meaning, unless the context forces us to a narrower meaning. We claim that in all these passages of New Testament Prophecy the contexts force us to a wider meaning. The apostles were commissioned to all the nations of the world, and not merely to the tribes of Israel and the mixed population of Palestine. They preached the Gospel to the nations to prepare them for the judgment of the nations.

Mr. Russell also fails to notice the difference between the advent to judgment and the setting up of the kingdom. The latter is predicted in the lifetime of hearers of Jesus, but not the former. These are two different events. The parables of the kingdom teach us that the kingdom will be established, and that it will grow to maturity before the advent to judgment. These are specimens of the neglect of the author to make these distinctions, which were sufficiently evident upon the face of the passages to those who interpret them without the prejudice of a theory, and who do not expect to open all the doors of the mysteries of prophecy with a single key.

(5) Another fault in the book is the neglect to estimate the different points of view of the authors of the New Testament. The principles of Biblical Theology have been ignored. The differences of the New Testament authors often greatly help to an understanding of their predictions. The author has observed the peculiarity of the Gospel of John in this respect. He notes that not one allusion to the Parousia in the synoptical gospels is found in the Gospel of John. He might also have noticed that the view of the Parousia in this gospel differs in many important respects. He fails to make the discrimination, and seeks to constrain the predictions of judgment in this gospel to correspond with the advent scenes of the synoptists. He does not apprehend the profound spiritual conception of the advent, that is such a notable feature of this gospel.

(6) We have no space to enumerate all our objections to the new theory. We shall simply mention one more. The reader will be impressed with the singularity that the author represents so much of the fulfilment as taking place in the other world, invisible to the inhabitants of earth. He also presumes that many of the most startling events were fulfilled to the eyes of men without leaving any historical traces of the facts.

If anything is clearly predicted as to Christ's second advent, it is its visibility, not to a few, but to all, and that it is to be on the clouds of heaven in the same manner in which he ascended. Mr. Russell's dealing with Acts i. 11 in a single page
and with Rev. i. 7 on half a page is hardly creditable to him. It is asking a great deal for us to believe that all that is said about the resurrection of the dead took place at the destruction of Jerusalem in the invisible world, that Christ was actually visible on the clouds at that time, and that Peter and James were the two witnesses of Rev. xi., and that they arose from the dead and ascended into heaven in the sight of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. This latter transcends the fable of the ascension of the Virgin Mary, as the former requests us to believe that the most stupendous events of all prophecy have actually been fulfilled without leaving the slightest trace in human history, and this merely on the ground that they were predicted by Jesus and his apostles; and our author claims that they must have been fulfilled together with the other events, or Jesus was mistaken. It can hardly be that the Christian Church has believed for so many centuries in the "coming of Christ to judge the world and in the resurrection of the dead" at that time, when these two greatest of all events have been fulfilled already.

Notwithstanding these grave defects in the book, that are caused by the persistent adherence to the new theory and the disposition to ride it as a hobby through the entire New Testament, the exegesis, as a whole, especially in the gospels and the Apocalypse, is exceedingly creditable. The new theory is, after all, no worse than many others that have been proposed. And it is to my mind no more objectionable than the Premillenarian theory, which infatuates so many excellent men, and which works mischief in the whole system of Christian doctrine, to which the new theory is the antipodes. We apprehend that the Christian Church will reject both alike, and adhere to its faith in the second advent as it is set forth in the Sacred Scriptures and in the symbols of the Church.

C. A. BRIGGS.

We notice briefly the following:

Genesis and Geology. The Harmony of the Scriptural and Geological Records. By Rev. N. Collin Hughes, D.D. Pp. viii., 142. Chocowinity, N. C. Published by the Author, 1887. The author attempts, with painstaking earnestness, to interpret Genesis i. in the light of geological discovery and theory. He has a strong belief in the necessity of such an interpretation, and he reaches conclusions which he is confident will tend to confirm faith in the Scriptures. The book has several illustrations, and abounds in italics.

Bible Class Primers, ed. by Professor Salmond, D.D., Aberdeen. The Period of the Judges, by James A. Patterson, M.A. Pp. 88. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford. This is a carefully prepared little book, and gives the history of the period under discussion, following the familiar lines, and not discussing or raising many critical questions. It shows good judgment and a recognition of the qualities demanded in a "Primer."

FRANCIS BROWN.

II.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.


The author of this treatise does not use the word Reformed in the classical sense as opposed to Lutheran, but in the popular sense as opposed to Roman Catholic. He divides the Protestants of Ireland into two sections, which he designates respectively, "Protestant with Episcopacy, and Protestant without Episcopacy." His work deals with the former of these sections only. It is, in
fact, a history of the Irish Episcopal Church, in the legislative aspects of the subject, from the reign of Henry VIII. down till the present time. The points which Dr. Ball dwells upon are not the spiritual or even the ecclesiastical details, but rather the modifications and alterations of administration to which the Church has been subjected during its connection with the State, and during the brief period which has elapsed since that connection was broken up. However much one might desire to know the opinions of so competent a writer as to the claims of the Church of which he is a member to derive its authority from St. Patrick, or the action of the Bishops on their treatment of Protestant dissenters for two centuries, or their complicity in the penal legislation of the eighteenth century, or as to the general policy of Disestablishment, there is nothing to gratify public curiosity in these matters. The writer scrupulously limits himself to the matters which from taste and habit he thoroughly understands, and which he is best able to expound. He sets before his readers the nature of those Acts of Parliament which for more than three hundred years have moulded the action of the late Established Church in Ireland; he describes the changes which during that time have been made in its creed and its formularies; he dwells with pleasure upon the most distinguished of its bishops from Ussher to Whately; and he gives an account, full and reliable, of the working of the Representative Church Body since the Church's right of self-government was restored. The treatise before us is distinguished by accuracy and impartiality. The writer is an eminent and highly respected lawyer, who once filled the position of Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and who has himself taken a not undistinguished part in the reorganization of the Church. He writes, therefore, about matters in regard to which he is perfectly informed. He is calm, intelligent, studiously moderate, and fair. His work is neither a criticism, nor a eulogium, nor even an apology. He looks at everything with a judicial mind—the rarest of all possessions in Ireland—and he describes what happened without dropping one offensive word. We do not, indeed, feel at liberty to estimate as highly as the respected writer does such bishops as Bramhall and King and Mant, who did not, as we believe, serve the true interests of the Irish Establishment; though we can cordially join in with all he says in commendation of Ussher and Berkeley and Whately. The toleration that Jeremy Taylor so eloquently advocated in Commonwealth times was toleration for himself and his brethren; we are not aware that he said and wrote much for it after the Restoration, or that, when he and his party regained power, he practised in regard to others that toleration which he claimed for himself. Apart from this, we have read with great satisfaction this book of calm and sober narrative, so clearly and tersely expressed.

THOMAS WITHEROW.

A LIGHT TO THE BLIND. Historical Manuscripts Commission. Tenth Report. Appendix. Part V.

This manuscript, which gives a contemporary account of the Revolutionary War in Ireland (1690–91), is repeatedly quoted by Lord Macaulay in dealing with that portion of the history of England. Hitherto it has reposed on the shelves of the Earl of Fingall's library at Kileen Castle, and has been accessible only to favored writers, such as Sir James Mackintosh, Sir William Wilde, or Lord Macaulay. Now, by the kindness of its noble owner, it has been printed by the British Historical Manuscripts Commission, and has been published, strange to say, as a Parliamentary paper, "presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of her Majesty"!

The work entitled *Light to the Blind* is a manuscript of some size, bearing on its title the date 1711, but continued by the writer for some years after that time. The author's name is not given, but tradition says he was one Nicholas Plunket,
an eminent lawyer in the reign of Queen Anne, and, judging from the name, perhaps a distant connection of the Fingall family. Two things are certain—the writer was a devoted Roman Catholic, and a warm partisan of the exiled Stuarts. His work is divided into three books; the first treats of the oppression inflicted on Roman Catholics in England from Henry VIII. till the death of Charles II.; and the third treats mainly of continental affairs down till the death of Queen Anne, or nearly so. It is the second book which is now considered of the greatest value. Its value is derived from the fact that it was written by a man who lived at the time, was well acquainted with the matters of which he speaks, and who looks at the transactions from the Roman Catholic side. It is only the most interesting portion of what by all accounts is a rather bulky work that is printed by the Historical Commission.

The writer, after an elaborate defence of the government of James II. and the loyalty of the Irish, passes on to speak of the Irish campaign. He alludes but slightly to the siege of Londonderry and the defence of Enniskillen, or, indeed, to anything that occurred in the country prior to the landing of King William. But he describes in full detail the Battle of the Boyne, the Siege of Limerick, the Battle of Aghrim, and the subsequent Treaty of Peace. He says that the failure to capture Derry “proceeded from the want of battering-pieces; of which if the [Irish] army had a dozen, they might have well made themselves masters of that town in twelve days after the trenches opened.” He says that at the Boyne William was able to bring into action 36,000 men against 26,000 on the side of James. He confirms the statement, which has been questioned by some, that Baldcarg O’Donnel was not true to the cause. His statement is that he “made conditions for himself, and took the Prince of Orange his side at the end of the warr.” The general effect of Light to the Blind is, that its author confirms all the main facts of the story as given by Lord Macaulay, while differing on some minute particulars, and supplies some important facts not noticed by contemporary writers. We feel sure that this interesting document will not long remain a mere parliamentary paper, but that some enterprising publisher will give it to the public in whole or in part, with notes and illustrations attached, and in a more handsome and convenient form.

Thomas Witherow.


Two important works, which must be ranked among the first sources for the history of the Lutheran Church in America, which is fast growing in numbers and influence.

They are closely connected, and refer to the period of the founding of that Church in Pennsylvania. German emigration to America began at the close of the seventeenth century. But the Germans were like a flock without a shepherd until Muhlenberg gathered the Lutherans and Schlatter the German Reformed into regular congregations under Synodical government.

Muhlenberg is the patriarch of the American Lutheran Church and the founder of a distinguished family. He was born in 1711 at Hanover, and was sent by
Augustus Hermann Francke, the leader of the Pietistic movement and founder of the famous Orphan House at Halle, as a missionary to the German Lutherans in Pennsylvania. There he labored with great zeal and eminent success till his death, in 1787, leaving an imperishable memory. He sent from time to time Reports, which were published in one volume at Halle, in 1787, and are known as the *Hallesche Nachrichten*. Dr. Mann, Professor in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, aided by Dr. Schmucker, of Pottstown, Pa. (son of the late Dr. Schmucker, of Gettysburg), has re-edited these Reports, with very numerous historical explanations and additions, which make it an authentic history of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in this country, especially of Pennsylvania, during its first formative period. The labor bestowed upon this work is immense.

In addition to this Dr. Mann has written the first full biography of that great and good man, with ample learning and in-excellent spirit. The work has an interest far beyond the limits of the Lutheran denomination. The late Dr. William Augustus Muhlenberg, so well known as the founder of St. Luke's Hospital in New York and of St. Johnland on Long Island, and the author of the popular hymn "I would not live alway," was a great grandson of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg.

**PHILIP SCHAFF.**

**DIE SELBSTBIOGRAPHIE DES CARDINALS BELLARMIN**


Bellarmin is the greatest anti-Protestant controversialist of the Roman Catholic Church. His work is still an armory for all learned opponents of the doctrines of the Reformation. He left an autobiography which goes to the year 1613, and was first published in 1653, and again 1762. But it has never become extensively known. It was used as an argument against his canonization, inasmuch as an autobiography always implies a certain degree of vanity, although this is written with great simplicity and humility. The aged Dr. Dollinger and Professor Reusch, both Old Catholics, have done a good service in making it more generally known. Dr. Döllinger has enriched it by numerous explanations of several topics treated in the biography, such as Bellarmin's mission to France, his controversies, his connection with the famous editions of the Vulgate by Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., James I. and the Gunpowder Plot, the number of ecumenical Councils, the execution of heretics in Rome, canonization, the connection of Pius V. with the attempt to assassinate Queen Elizabeth, and the canonization of Ignatius Loyola.

**PHILIP SCHAFF.**

**III.—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.**

**POPULAR LECTURES ON THEOLOGICAL THEMES.** By the Rev. ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER HODGE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1887.

This work of Dr. Hodge is difficult to examine and estimate in a brief critical notice. It is very comprehensive, very full of particulars, and, notwithstanding its popular style, very concise and dense in statement. The treatise is remarkable among systems of divinity in these respects; and the reason is that the positions, distinctions, and definitions lie perfectly clear in the author's mind, and have been phrased so frequently and carefully before classes of students,
that he is able to express them with both precision and vivacity; so that he is at once scientific and oratorical.

That the volume as a whole is positive in the statement and defence of the Calvinistic type of doctrine it is needless to say. At the same time the attitude of the author toward those who hold the Arminian form of the evangelical truth is respectful and fraternal.

Dr. Hodge makes the Trinity the foundation of theological science, following the generally received method in the ancient, mediæval, and modern Church. He assumes the Divine existence as a self-evident truth, "the most certain of all truths" (p. 11), and omits the discussion of the several arguments for it. God is defined as a causative personal Spirit. A brief, comprehensive, and eloquent analysis under these heads is given, in which it is shown that the half-truths of deism, pantheism, and heretical Christianity are all included in the complete view of orthodoxy—the inscrutability asserted by agnosticism, the transcendence by deism, and the immanence by pantheism, are all comprehended in the Biblical representation of the Infinite Being, not in isolation from each other, and in an exaggerated form, but balanced and complementary. The relation of God to the universe, under this head, is one of the best-reasoned parts of the volume.

The doctrines of Providence and Miracles are enunciated in the common way in which the Church has held them; and the author's familiarity with natural science enables him to elucidate them by illustrations that are felicitous and striking. The subject of the Canon and Inspiration follows; the infallibility of Scripture being maintained, and the historical criticism defended in opposition to the rationalistic. The infidel objections to Prayer are then answered, and the error in the recent novelty of the Prayer-Cure exposed.

The Nicene doctrine of the Trinity is adopted, and the author shows more inclination than do some modern Trinitarians to assert its rationality and to find illustrations of it. Predestination is taught in the Calvinistic form, and the Scripture proof carefully cited with reference to the Arminian synergism and conditional election. The Creation of MAN ex nihilo is maintained, and the difference between true and pseudo-evolution is carefully shown. The original holiness of man is presented, in the main, in the Augustinian form, though founding upon creationism, which is asserted to be "the doctrine of the Church" (p. 169). In his discussion of the subject of Free Will Dr. Hodge adopts the narrow definition of the later Calvinism rather than the wide definition of the elder, in making the will the power of alternative choice, and placing the "character" and moral affections outside of it. This explains his assertion: "My will is not free; it is myself that is free" (p. 185). By this he means that the volitions of the will are necessarily determined by the character and disposition, and cannot be morally different—which is certainly true. The character and disposition is the "myself." But how this "myself" can be "free," unless, as immanent inclination and moral desire and affection, it is brought into the will as a part of its content, is a question which the later psychology cannot answer.

The doctrine of the Covenants of works and grace is handled with good judgment, and also that of the visible and invisible Church. The Person of Christ is described in the Chalcedon manner. On page 222 it is said that "the Divine Word, which from eternity was the second Person of the Trinity, did eighteen hundred years ago take, not a human person, but a human nature, into His eternal personality, which ever continues, not a human person nor a Divine-human person, but the eternal second Person of the Trinity, with a human nature embraced in it as its personal organ." The words which we have italicized are incorrect. When the second Trinitarian Person has united with a human nature He is certainly then a complex Divine-human Person, and no longer a simple Trinitarian Person as before. Incarnation is something more than the
adoption by a Trinitarian Person of a "finite personal organ." It is such a union of the Divine with the human as to result in a new and unique person that is not Divine simply (as the Logos was before incarnation), nor human simply, but Divine-human.

The discussion of the Offices of Christ is full and discriminating—the Kingly office receiving in particular a very careful examination. The Kingdom of Christ and the Law of the Kingdom are described with special reference to the past progress of Christianity and its future extension. Hopeful and inspiring views of missions are presented.

The subject of Sanctification and Good Works is scripturally treated as a whole, but some statements are made respecting Regeneration and its relation to Justification which seem to us not to be marked by the usual discrimination of the writer. Dr. Hodge asserts that "justification must precede regeneration" (p. 340); that "regeneration follows immediately upon being received into the favor of God on the condition (ground?) of Christ's righteousness" (p. 341); and that "faith is the necessary source of regeneration" (p. 343). This is not the teaching of the Westminster standards, to say nothing of Scripture, respecting the order of regeneration and justification. According to these, justification is preceded by effectual calling. "Those whom God effectually calleth, He also freely justifieth" (Confess., XII. 1). But effectual calling includes regeneration, which constitutes a part of it. "They who are effectually called and regenerated have a new heart and a new spirit created in them" (Confess., XIII. 1). Regeneration is that part of effectual calling which is described as "savinly enlightening the mind and renewing and powerfully determining the will, so that the elect are thereby made willing and able freely to answer God's call and embrace the grace offered therein" (L. C. 67). Prior to this imparting of Divine life to the soul dead in sin, neither faith nor repentance (the two converting acts) is possible. By it the elect have "the grace of faith whereby they are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls" (Confess., XIV. 1). Regeneration is thus plainly taught to be prior to the act of faith in the order of salvation, and faith is unquestionably prior to justification. An unbeliever cannot be justified. Justifying faith is a product of regeneration, and cannot therefore be the "source" of it, as Dr. Hodge asserts. There is nothing either in Scripture or the Westminster symbols to support the view that God first justifies the sinner and then regenerates him; or, as Dr. Hodge puts it, that God first "changes the relation of the justified person to the law, and receives him into His favor on the condition of an imputed righteousness, and then regeneration follows immediately upon this" (p. 341). If this be so, it would follow either that God justifies a person prior to faith in Christ and without faith, or else that an unregenerate person can exercise saving faith—which latter position is denied over and over again in the Westminster standards.

Regeneration, of course, supposes the plan and covenant of Redemption. It is founded on the fact that a Divine sacrifice for sin has satisfied the claims of justice and propitiated the Divine wrath against sin. But to call this objective satisfaction by the name of "justification"—which, perhaps, is all that Dr. Hodge intends—is contrary to theological usage, and is incorrect. Justification

* The following remark on page 340 suggests this explanation of the author's meaning: "The doctrine of the evangelical Church is that a man must first become reconciled to God, and be brought back into the sphere of Divine favor before he can receive the Holy Spirit and be brought into union with God and made spiritually good. That is, the favor of God is the essential precondition of grace and holiness. Now, this is expressed by saying that justification must precede regeneration."

If in this passage "satisfaction" were substituted for "justification," and "God must first become reconciled to man" for "a man must first become reconciled to
is the application of the objective work of Christ to an individual, in remitting his sins and accepting him as righteous, because he has exercised faith in this work; but this faith itself is "the gift of God" (Eph. ii. 8) in regeneration; a consequence of the new birth, without which the individual is neither able nor willing to believe. "The grace of faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts" (Confess., XIV. 1). To refer the sinner's regeneration to his own act of faith as "preceding" it and the "source" of it, instead of referring it, as both Scripture and Calvinism do, to the sovereign creative act of God in election, reverses the true relations of these important doctrines, and leads to conclusions which the revered author of this work would have been the last to adopt.

The subject of the Sacraments is admirably treated. The topics in Eschatology conclude the series of Lectures. The author adopts the common view of the Reformed Church upon these—with the exception of that of the so-called Intermediate State. Dr. Hodge holds to the descent of Christ to Hades, and the deliverance of the Old Testament saints from it. He remarks that there are a "few matters of detail, not settled in our Confession of Faith, upon which he is forced to differ from brethren whom he holds in great respect and affection" (p. 419). One of these is "that the condition of the Old Testament saints before Christ's death was in some essential respects different from that which all the redeemed dead share together since His death and resurrection" (p. 423), and that "on the evening of Friday the soul of the then dead Christ, personally united forever to His divinity, entered Paradise, irradiated it with a sudden light never seen there before, and consummated heaven, and revolutionized the condition of the redeemed forever" (p. 426). We do not see how this can be harmonized with the explicit statement of the Confession (XXXII. 1) that "after death the souls of the righteous, being made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none." There can be no doubt that the authors of the Confession meant that this statement should apply to the Old Testament saints and sinners.

The argument for Endless Punishment is strong and conclusive, drawn from Scripture, and corroborated by ethics and reason. The author, however, underestimates the truth of the dictum that "sin against God is an infinite evil" in saying that "we are not required to assent to it" (p. 454).

We have thus, within the brief limits allowed, given a sketch and general estimate of this learned, logical, and vigorous treatise in theology. The Calvinistic creed has had no abler advocates and defenders in this age than the two Hodges, father and son. Its prevalence in this country, and also in Great Britain, has been due in no small degree to the firm and steady advocacy which for more than a half century it has obtained from them, in their consistent, unswerving service of the Presbyterian Church, in the theological chair of one of its oldest and most influential institutions.

WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD.

We notice briefly:

WIDER DIE UNFEHLBARE WISSENSCHAFT, EINE SCHUTZSCHRIFT FÜR CONSERVATIVES

God," the meaning would be unambiguous and accurate. The regeneration of the sinner presupposes the satisfaction of Divine justice, but not the justification of the sinner.

On page 238 Dr. Hodge adopts the usual order of the doctrines. "The essential parts of our salvation are regeneration, justification, sanctification, resurrection, glorification."
As a protest against the attitude of infallibility as regards their own results, and of intolerance toward investigations the results of which do not jump with their assumptions, which the negative wing of Biblical critics have taken up, it is perfectly timely and perfectly just. Professor Zöckler's own position is somewhat over liberal; but he draws a very clear line of demarcation between it and that of the more negative school. The difference lies in the exact point where the line between criticism and hypercriticism is drawn. Dr. Zöckler gives to external evidence its rights, and counts all criticism that ignores it hypercriticism. Negative criticism clears the path of external evidence that the "literary organ" may have full play. The so-called "historical" criticism begins by doing violence to "history," the so-called "scientific" investigation, by shaking itself free from "knowledge," that conjecture may the more freely act. In a word, while earnest men seek the true, the energies of the self-designated scientific school too often expend themselves in seeking the new. And then they complain that sober writers are beginning to neglect their "results"! Why, however, should earnest men play all their lives with the infinite combinations of even a beautiful Chinese puzzle?

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

---

IV.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

KATHOLICISMUS UND PROTESTANTISMUS GEGENÜBER DER SOCIALEN FRAGE.

Von GERHARD UHLHORN, Doctor der Theologie. (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.)

We have received from Westermann & Co. this new brochure from the incisive pen of the Abbot of Loccum. It is rigidly confined to the theme stated on the title-page, how Romanism and Protestantism stand related to the social question of the age. Dr. Uhlhorn admits, or rather insists, that religion does not directly solve any economical problems, but contains the moral forces which condition such a solution. But which form of it has these forces? Romanism insists that Socialism is the child of the Reformation, and that the only remedy is a return to the principles and usages of the Middle Ages. The author allows that modern development, the subjection of nature, the growth of production, etc., are due to the impulse given by the religious revolution wrought through Luther. Rome opposes these, as he shows from Thomas Aquinas and Bishop Ketteler, on account of its ethics, which makes poverty a virtue, which denounces the enterprise that seeks for more than the supply of necessary wants, and which holds the taking of interest (not usury) in any form a deadly sin. Here he cites a card in common circulation, styled, "A Ticket for the Journey to Paradise," which contains a list of the classes for a railway trip to heaven: "I. Class (express train)—Innocence, or Martyrdom, or the Counsels of Perfection (poverty, chastity, obedience). II. Class (direct train)—Penance, Faith, and the Doing of Good Works (Prayer, Fasting, Almsgiving). III. Class (ordinary train)—Keeping the Commandments of God and of the Church, and fulfilling the duties of one's station. IV. Class (very rare)—Conversion on a dying bed." Here it is seen that the laborer does indeed reach heaven, but only in the third class. However conscientiously he may work, the monk or nun is far before him, and so is the rich man who gives alms and has time to pray. This is the Romanist view of labor. One must have more or less of property to fulfil life's purposes, but still poverty is
"the better good." It is the certain way to perfection, while riches always has a suspicion of sin attached to it. The inconsistency of these notions with modern life is plain, so plain that, as the author shows, recent Romanist writers "Lutheranize" on the point, and flatly contradict the positions of Thomas, whom the present Pope has recommended as the peculiar teacher of the Church. That such things are allowed is due to the spirit by which Rome accommodates itself to contradictory situations, and to the prevalence of Jesuitism and its manipulations of the doctrine of sin. But while Rome is powerless to solve the social problem, it must be confessed that it has done and is doing much to relieve pressing evils. Its charities are abundant, its activity is great, and its organization is effective. And there is a correspondence between it and Socialism. The summa angelica maintains that it is "covetousness that has called into being thine and mine, against the law of nature which made all things common." So Ketteler denies that man can justly consider what he has gained from earthly things as private property; he must regard it as a common good. This, he says, is "the true Communism." Indeed, the attempt was made to win the Socialists over on this ground, but the difference was that Rome wished the Church to control matters, but Lasalle and his friends wished the State, and this proved irreconcilable. Besides, the ideal of Rome stands in the way. This is to fly from the world and lead a contemplative life. It thinks only of eternity, and considers absolute indifference to the present scene a mark of perfection. Hence the dualism, or twofold type, of disciples, consisting of the perfect Christian and the ordinary. Luther utterly rejected this dualism. True Christianity does not lie in forsaking the ordinary pursuits of life, but in prosecuting those pursuits with a Christian spirit. Men are not to be angels, but genuine men, not renouncing the world, but subduing the world, showing in every field of activity, by their faith and love, that they are the children of God.

Modern enterprise has made a huge advance of the race by its labor-saving inventions; and the merchant, the manufacturer, and the banker acting as Christians are as truly on the way to heaven as any monk in a convent. This does not mean that the whole system is good, and only good. There are those who so declare, holding the evils that exist to be unavoidable. But this is not the view of Protestants, for they hold that all earthly things are indeed imperfect because of sin, but in the Gospel is the power to conquer sin and remedy imperfections. The unequal distribution of property is partly divinely ordered, and is in so far a blessing; but it is also, in part, a result of human institutions, and in so far is a curse. And there is a grain of truth in the extravagances of such men as Henry George, while it is heathenish to say, as Professor Treitschke does, that millions must toil with their hands that thousands may be scholars and artists; that the tragedies of Sophocles and the Jupiter of Pheidias were cheaply bought at the price of the miseries of slavery. If we thought and acted thus, new Goths and Vandals would lay waste our civilization, as their predecessors did that of the ancient world. Directly opposite to the Professor's words stand those of Stöcker, who says he sees in the social question an abyss gaping before the German people, and he springs in without measuring its depth, because he cannot do otherwise. This is the feeling which all Christians, and especially all clergymen, should cherish. There is sorrow and suffering; what can I do, what have I done to relieve it? Yet one cannot adopt Stöcker's conclusion. He says that the Church cannot rely upon preaching, pastoral care, missions, etc.; for new circumstances demand new methods. This Dr. Uhlhorn denies, insisting that, unlike Rome, which is a theocratic State, and rules in all relations, the Church has only the Word and sacraments, and seeks by these to make men Christians. The two peculiarities of the present state of things are labor-saving machinery and freedom of contract. The workman, instead of
completing an article himself, merely serves a machine, and becomes almost as mechanical as that is. He can work where he chooses, but when work fails there is no guild or society to take care of him. Employers, too, depend upon the changes of the market, and labor to secure themselves. Hence an ever-increasing strife after wealth. The evils of the time lead to a sort of Chiliasm as fantastic as that of the Anabaptists. Dr. Uhlhorn does not undertake to solve the economic questions that arise. The Church has no commission for such a purpose; its message is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Still it is not indifferent to men's temporal condition, but exerts moral forces in their behalf. One of these is the honor put upon labor—all labor of whatever nature, faithfully performed; for the Apostle (1 Cor. vii. 20-23) deemed even slavery a divine calling. Another is the reminder to employers that though labor is bought, still the laborer is one made in the image of God, and a soul that is worth more than the whole world. True religion hinders a man from feeling himself a part of the machine he feeds, by lifting his thoughts outward and upward. See the effect of Sunday. The Church, indeed, has neglected its duty, so many thousands being left without pastoral care. But besides churches and pastors, operatives want fellowship. They find it in socialist circles; they should find it in us. This Rome cannot furnish. It has sodalities and unions, but no common life. The distinction of perfect and imperfect Christians makes this impossible. Yet there are Protestants that envy Rome! What is needed is not cathedrals nor evangelists, but pastors with a church the centre of a common life. Alms are useful, but still only a part of love to our neighbor. Not so the Romanists. To them they are a work surpassing all others. See the "Ticket" before referred to. Almsgiving is in the first class, and performance of one's ordinary duties in the second. The Lutheran view is the reverse. This is to bring the whole society into such a condition that alms would not be required. Infant schools, asylums, etc., are needed at present, but do not meet the case fully. Even the "Inner Mission" needs to be watched, lest it lead from rather than to the Church. It needs to be guided, not harshly and by mere authority—that is Rome's way—but tenderly and so as to respect the free movement of Love. The author gives wise counsels as to the pastoral office in connection with the inner mission, which latter he thinks should pass into a revived diaconate. There is, then, no need of new methods. The Gospel is enough. Rome boasts of its power, but Protestantism, despite its divisions, has the moral forces required. Luther's Reformation aimed at the religious life, since he knew that moral renovation would follow, and he succeeded; whereas previous efforts aiming first at moral reform failed. The Lutheran Church has not developed its moral forces. If now after surviving Rationalism it puts forth these powers, taking the impulse from Pietism, but, instead of fleeing like it from the world, exemplifying the genuine Lutheran idea of the freedom of a Christian and his dominion over the world, then neither will Rome convert the world into a cloister nor will Socialism turn it into a house of correction, where every one has enough to eat and drink, but there is no individual freedom, and therefore no true culture; but there will be a new economical condition, not without its imperfections, indeed, yet free from the oppressive evils of to-day. The foregoing is a meagre outline of an admirable essay, which although written from a German point of view, still is so clear and candid and forcible that it would well repay the labor of translation. Few writers think so logically and write so perspicuously as the Abbot of Loccum.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

Books for Practical Edification:

Hints on Early Education and Nursery Discipline. (Funk & Wagnalls.)

This book has a curious history. It was first published in England sixty years
ago, went through eighteen editions, was reprinted in this country, and then disappeared from circulation, so that it was only after a long search in London bookstores that a copy could be obtained for this reissue. The modern advances of Pedagogy have in no respect rendered the book antiquated. It is as well suited now as ever to give useful suggestions to young parents and to all entrusted with the care of children, and well deserves the hearty commendation given to it by Dr. John Hall. Its subject gives it unspeakable value. Of all earthly influences, the parental is the strongest, and nothing is of more moment to the Church or the State than that this influence should be wisely exerted.—

People and Pastor. By the Rev. Thomas Murphy, D.D. (Presbyterian Board of Publication.) This little volume, evidently the fruit of long experience and extensive observation, abounds with useful suggestions. It sets forth in a simple, sensible way the various methods by which a people can work most effectually with their pastor and get the largest benefit from his ministrations. Its wide circulation would be of very great service.—

The Duty of the Church in the Conflict between Capital and Labor. By the Rev. R. E. Thompson, D.D. (Ibid.) This discourse is appropriately founded on the text in Luke (xii. 14), where our Lord says, "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" After stating the changed circumstances which have brought about the existing conflict, Professor Thompson returns to Christ's example, who refused to interfere in specific cases, because his aim was to deal not with the branches of the world's evil but with its roots. He sought to remove the evil tempers of heart and mind, which make such cases possible. And this is the divine pattern for the Church. She is not to seek machine methods, nor to labor at co-operation, arbitration, profit-sharing, or any other similar device, as the solution of all difficulties. No one of these, nor all together, nor any other that can be imagined, will avail, unless there be right tempers and dispositions on both sides; and these it is the province of the Church to seek and to labor for. Professor Thompson concludes his brief and earnest tractate with urging the stewardship of earthly possessions. "All wealth is a trust for God," and can be so regarded even when spent on the support of the family, the enlargement of business, the defence of the State. When men in general feel and act upon this view, the antagonisms of modern life will be done away, because human brotherhood will be confessed, and its claims cheerfully recognized. T. W. CHAMBERS.

V.—PHILOSOPHY.


To compare Professor Ladd's book with Professor Wundt's great work bearing the same title is the greatest compliment we could pay it. But we must notice a distinction between them which Professor Ladd himself indicates in proposing the end of his book. He has no experimental investigation to offer us, but is dealing altogether with the results heretofore arrived at in the various departments of the science. Professor Wundt, on the other hand, is one of the foremost of living inquirers, and in nearly every chapter has results of his own which in many cases decide the question at issue in favor of the hypothesis he advocates. There may be originality, certainly, in interpretation and arrangement, and we are not disposed to deny this to the excellent treatment of the superabundant materials at the hands of Professor Ladd.
His introduction is to our mind peculiarly judicious and well-weighed. He holds the balance evenly between the ravings of the advanced "new-psychologists"—of whom Ribot is a shining example—and the extreme conservatism of the theological school. A successful theological writer himself, and a man of authority in religious philosophy, his attitude toward neuro-psychology shows him to be fully alive to the limitations of that science, and to the extravagances of some of its claims. And his position is abundantly justified by the discussions and conclusions of the chapters which follow. "Physiological Psychology," he says, "can scarcely claim to be an independent science, or even a definite branch of the science of psychology in general. It is rather to be regarded simply as psychology, approached and studied from a certain—the so-called physiological—side or point of view." His definition of the science turns upon his attitude toward the doctrine of a substantial soul. The demand that so-called scientific psychology is making, namely, that the entire question of the nature of the soul be relegated to metaphysics, and that psychology deal simply with phenomena which are psychic, he concedes at the outset, but with the distinct understanding that the science is not complete until all those deductions which may be legitimately made from the discoveries and laws of physiological psychology be duly accredited to the account of rational psychology. "In all the earlier part of the treatise," he says, "the word 'mind' will be employed simply as the equivalent of the subject of the phenomena of consciousness. . . . We wish to begin, as far as possible, upon purely scientific grounds. And when, subsequently, these grounds are in part abandoned for certain fields of rational speculation, we wish to have the connection between the two kept open and unimpeded." The wisdom of this concession we have already maintained,* and the legitimacy of the final development of physiological into rational psychology is readily vindicated. The highest end of such a science is its final report upon the mutual relation of mind and body, and the nature of each. But we have some doubts as to whether the particular conclusions of Professor Ladd, which are negative to the main body of data, belong within its sphere; and when we are called upon to "abandon purely scientific grounds for certain fields of rational speculation," our hesitation, as we find below, is greater still.

The main division of the book is simple and exhaustive, viz., "The Nervous Mechanism," "Correlations of the Nervous Mechanism and Mind," and "Nature of the Mind;" the only question being how much and what shall be included under the third head. This is substantially Wundt's division, except that he makes separate sections of the various so-called correlations of nervous mechanisms and mind instead of grouping them under a general term. The trichotomous division, however, seems to give a basis of unity to the consideration of the points of interaction of body and mind, which is wanting in the earlier work.

The successive chapters of the first section are devoted to a consecutive account of the development, nature, and functions of the entire nervous system. This is necessary to the understanding of all "correlations," since it is along this system that the contact of body and mind occurs. A separate chapter devoted to the end organs is necessary also, since the question of the transformation of excitation to sensation-energy rests in each case upon these organs, and since the differentiation of the functions respectively of the central and terminal organs is often difficult. The questions most open to debate arise in the discussion of the "functions of the central organs." Professor Ladd is very cautious here, and does not venture beyond his facts. He says very truly: "On passing from the spinal cord to the brain, the difficulties of defining the specific functions of the different central organs become greatly increased. The phenomena are vastly more

* See article on "Postulates of Phys. Psychology" in this Review, July, 1887.
complicated, and the methods of analyzing them experimentally much less readily applied." This determination to cite only well-ascertained and admitted truths makes the treatment of some of the centres somewhat meagre, especially the corpora quadrigemina and optic thalami. He has not noticed, for example, that Dr. Ferrier, in his last edition, positively reaffirms, as the result of new experiments, the direct excitability and consequent motor function of the caudate nucleus of the corpus striatum.

In the second great division we have chapters on "The Localization of Cerebral Function," "Quantity and Quality of Sensation," "Presentations of Sense," "Time Relations of Mental Phenomena," "Physical Basis of the Higher Faculties," etc. This is the open and debatable ground of physiological psychology proper. Two chapters are devoted to cerebral localization. The history of the controversy is brought down to the work of Exner and Luciani. The second chapter gives a detailed résumé of the present status of the question for the localization of each of the motor and sensory functions, and will be found instructive to those who wish such a general account. But it is by no means exhaustive, and one is often driven to consult his authorities for fuller statement. Thus, in the section devoted to the "Relation of Motion to Sensibility," a question whose settlement will affirm motor localization or transfer the controversy to the basis of the sensor centres in the cerebral cortex, the very important position is overlooked, namely, that, admitting the fact of motor paralysis arising from the destruction of a given centre, the accompanying impairment of sensibility is due to the incapacity to give the necessary motor reaction and not to real anaesthesia.*

The general conclusions of the subject of localization differ from those of Wundt, in the main, only in wording. There are five principles which seem to be established by legitimate inference from experiments upon the functional activities of the nervous system. One of these is the principle of functional indifference of the sensor and motor nerve courses, as opposed to the old doctrine of "specific energies" held by J. Müller and others. This principle is recognized by Professor Ladd (pp. 54 and 55, also p. 307), and his use of the phrase "law of specific energies" to indicate the principle of specific connectionism is misleading. The latter principle, as stated by himself, is this, "the different elementary parts of the nervous system are all (together) capable of performing its (the system's) specific functions when and only when they have been brought into the proper connections." This is another of Wundt's laws. It has nothing whatever to do with the question of the specific energy of the courses, except as illustrating, under artificial experiment, the established principle of functional indifference; and, even though we admit Professor Ladd's demand for a specific energy of the special senses (p. 307) with a view to the explanation of the quality of sensation, this could not be called a general principle of nervous activity with respect to the localization of function. The author attributes the differentiation of sensations, in respect to quality, to the end organs conjointly with the centres, while experiment goes to show that this differentiation is complete, for some of the senses, after the ablation of the end organs. It may be possible that the law of habit, the third of our principles (p. 300), accounts for this phenomenon, on the supposition that the end organs have performed their functions in an earlier state, and that the central terminations are, as Ribot surmises,† functionally indifferent; but this can never be proved, and experiment goes to show, as Wundt maintains, that the centres—perhaps a single one—exercise the differentiating function. The two remaining principles, viz., localized function and substitution, are duly recognized by Professor Ladd.

* See Schäfer, Nature, March 17th, 1887. † German Psychology of To-day, p. 197.
The chapters on Psychophysics ("Quantity of Sensations") and Psychometry ("Time Relations of Mental Phenomena") give full and exact accounts of the latest work in these two promising branches of inquiry. The problems of quantity, however, while involved in difficulties enough, do not seem to us as incapable of approximate solution as Professor Ladd is inclined to represent. The question of the perceptible minimum is not worth its cost, except as an indispensable datum to the application of Fechner's law. This minimum affords the zero point from which the ascending scale of sensation values is calculated, and as long as the physical modifications intervening between the external stimulus and the subjective sensation are constant, their magnitude is unimportant, and they may be entirely disregarded. The questions "How do the end organs modify the quantities of the stimuli before they transmit their effects to the conducting nerve fibres?" etc. (p. 360), are irrelevant to the point at issue, provided, as is the case, that these modifications are constant throughout the entire series of excitations. This consideration justifies, in so far, the advance of Fechner upon the law of Weber, a distinction which is hardly noticed by Professor Ladd, namely, that equal observed differences—a matter of perception—correspond to equal real differences—a matter of sensation. Granted this transition and the mathematical deductions of Fechner follow. We notice, also, an absence of reference to Delboeuf and Beaunis, the former being barely alluded to. M. Beaunis was the first to make careful experiments upon the reaction time for olfactory and gustatory sensations, and his results are as reliable as any yet obtained. The theory upon which Delboeuf's work in psychophysics rests, namely, that sensation must be measured by an internal and not by an external standard, is not noticed by Professor Ladd, perhaps from economy of space, though as a criticism from the side of general philosophy (in the hands of Kant, Zeller, and Delboeuf) it is the severest assault which the advocates of Fechner's law have had to withstand.

The chapter on the "Physical Basis of the Higher Faculties" is a model of wise concession on the one hand and of determined protest on the other. We know of no American writer who is as fair toward the question of a physical basis of the higher faculties, except Dr. McCosh. And his conclusions are all that any reasonable advocate of the energizing activity of the mind could wish. We commend this chapter to all those who fear that physiological psychology is materialistic in its tendency or conclusions.

As to the doctrine of a uniform psychophysical connection—a physical basis for all mental activity—Professor Ladd seems somewhat in doubt, and his statements are not consistent. On page 388, speaking of the constructive or synthetic activity of mind whereby presentations of sense arise from elementary sensations, he says: "It may, indeed, have a physical basis in some central organic combination. . . . On general grounds of our theory of the nervous mechanism, we conjecture that it is so." Then (p. 594): "In investigating the correlations which undoubtedly exist between the nervous mechanism and the phenomena of consciousness, it is found that some of these phenomena imply activities of the mind which do not admit, in any sense of the word, of being thus correlated. For an example we may refer to what was said as to a mental synthesis being implied in the formation of all presentations of sense." In the latter connection, also, speaking of consciousness: "The same thing may be said of consciousness in itself considered," while he has already admitted (p. 545) that consciousness is a state, and not a process, depending upon the general healthfulness and blood-supply of the cerebrum, and, consequently, incapable of having its own peculiar physical process or basis. The uniformity of the psychophysical connection is now very generally admitted from strong presumptive evidence, such as the discovery of such a connection in all the processes which admit of investigation, the perceptible duration of will, discernment, choice, as mental acts due probably
(so Ladd) to the time occupied by the corresponding physical processes, and the
derangement of the purest forms of ideation in certain kinds of cerebral disease.
The distinction, however, between the physical basis and the mental process to
which it belongs, as in the case of will, association of ideas, memory, etc., is
strenuously and consistently maintained.

Finally, we reach the third great division of the work, "The Nature of the
Mind," and we revert to the question already raised, namely, how far is physi-
ological psychology competent to give a deliverance on this subject? Evidently
only as far as this deliverance rests upon the ascertained laws of the science itself
and upon the imperative demand of the philosophic reason for a unifying basis
to phenomena. We are compelled to ask with Professor Ladd (p. 588) "Which
one of the two theories ('materialistic' or 'spiritualistic') best accords with all
the facts?" "These facts," he continues, "which are to test the theory, are facts
of the nervous mechanism, and of the correlations between this mechanism and the
phenomena of consciousness." And as for method, it is evident that we must
go carefully through the facts of our earlier chapters and question them in turn as
to their report, if they have such, upon the question. So we decidedly object when
Professor Ladd goes on to say: "The approach to this question must be through
the introspective study of mind, for only such study can tell us what the phe-
nomena of consciousness actually are." It is not the phenomena of conscious-
ness which are to be interpreted. That is the last department of rational
psychology, and its results have been assumed in the section on "correlations." As
has been quoted, we now deal with facts of the nervous system and its cor-
relations, and it is not by introspective study that we have discovered these facts.
On the contrary, neither the facts of the nervous system nor their correlations are
facts of consciousness at all; otherwise, there would be no justification for such a
science as physiological psychology.

And we also object to the "metaphysical assumptions" which the author then
makes. Not that they are not true; we believe that they are true and funda-
mental to a true philosophy of perception. But they are not derived from our
facts. The "synthetic activity" of mind in the construction of presentations of
sense is both unknown to consciousness and untouched by investigation. It may
have a physical correlate; but as yet it belongs to the large class of residual
phenomena which physiological psychology cannot reach. The difference be-
tween this activity and memory, with reference to a known physical basis, in-
dicates the distinction between the usable and the unusable in interpretation.
Following this distinction throughout the series of correlations, the first of Pro-
fessor Ladd's conclusions, in which he follows Lotze, is indisputably established,
viz., "The subject of all the states of consciousness is a real unit being called
Mind, which is of non-material nature, and acts and develops according to
laws of its own, but is especially correlated with certain material molecules
and masses forming the substance of the brain."

But the remaining chapters on "The Development of Mind," "Real Connec-
tion of Brain and Mind," "The Mind as Real Being," with their avowedly (p.
668) metaphysical treatment, fall outside the domain of the science, and should
have been printed separately. In themselves, however, they are well-sustained
and sublime, and are an excellent and original adaptation of Lotze's defence of
spiritualism. The work as a whole is a great contribution to the literature of
philosophy in English, and should be mastered by every student of psychology.

J. Mark Baldwin.
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Dr. Führer (Encycl. Brit., xviii., 326) estimates the present number of the adherents of Zoroastrianism as not more than 82,000. The character, wealth, and influence of the Parsis of India would, however, make the study of their faith a matter both of theoretical and of practical importance. If we take into account the 3000 years or more of their past history, as well as the internal characteristics of their religious system, we cannot hesitate to assign this faith a place among the world’s great religions. Mr. Mills concludes his thoughtful and learned Introduction to the volume before us with this expression of his own judgment: “If the mental illumination and spiritual elevation of many millions of mankind, throughout long periods of time, are of any importance, it would require strong proof to deny that Zarathushrianism has had an influence of very positive power in determining the gravest results.” We must, moreover, bear in mind its influence upon the Jews during and after the Exile, and upon early Gnosticism.

Vols. I. and II. of the Zend-Avesta (including the Vendidad, with a portion of the hymns and prayers), edited by James Darmesteter, of Paris, appeared in this valuable series of translations in 1880 and 1883. The completion of the work, forced out of his hands by other duties, has fallen into the hands of a scholar whom many years of devotion to this special line of study qualified in an unusual degree to carry it through with independent judgment and manifest ability. While many parts of the work can be appreciated only by specialists, he has by the style of his translation, by his careful summaries, explaining each section analytically, and by his copious notes, done all that could be done within the space allowed him to make the work valuable to the comparative student of religions, and to all who may be drawn by any special attraction to the study of this system. The portion of the Avesta which is dealt with by Mr. Mills has this peculiar interest, that the five Gáthas (hymns), which make up about half of the volume, are regarded as specially valuable on account of their relative antiquity, their substantial genuineness, and their historical tone. They throw peculiar light upon the views and aims of the Zoroaster, and the circumstances which in measure moulded his work. While Darmesteter treats Zoroaster as belonging mainly to the mythology of the Avesta, and speaks doubtfully on historical questions, Mr. Mills is much more disposed to emphasize the historical reality of the man and the great and fruitful movement which he led in its most important juncture.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.


This book is an almost perfect text-book. If properly supplemented, it would subserve completely the present needs of American students. Since the Manual is intended for beginners, we shall merely criticise it in so far as it fails to meet their requirements. Its faults are those of omission rather than those of commission. They arise chiefly from the failure of the author, who has been fed on
Arabic from his mother's knee, to appreciate sufficiently the difficulties of those who must begin it late in life. In part, also, they arise from a certain lack of system, or of consistency in the carrying out of a system, which in certain directions runs through the whole book.

For example, the author starts out to give us "exercises" from English into Arabic illustrative of the principles of grammar which he has just stated. After giving five exercises he stops suddenly at the end of the pronoun, and omits to give any exercises illustrative of the usage of the verb, or of the noun. The burden of supplementing this part of the work he has thrown upon the teacher; and if the student be self-taught, he will be left without that drillon the formsof the irregular verbs and of the broken plurals which is so essential to thoroughness and readiness in the apprehension of the principles of Arabic grammar. A series of exercises like those in Harper's "Hebrew Manual" or like those to which we have been accustomed in the Latin and Greek Prose Compositions would, in our opinion, be a most useful addition to the work.

Again, the author has been too sparing in his illustrative examples. What is perfectly plain to him will often be misunderstood by the student, unless it be explained by example. We do not know but that the plan of giving but one illustration of any form or rule is a good one. Better for the student to learn one by heart than to be so confused by many as to learn none. But there should be one example, at least, under each form or rule. This is not the case in many instances in this grammar—e.g., in the illustration of the meaning of the forms of the verb, § 37, and of the changes of the Tay of the eighth form in verbs whose first radical is Dal, Zal, or Zain, § 49 : 16. We think that the author should, if possible, have taken his examples from the Chrestomathy in his book. In all instances, moreover, he should give the translation of the examples, especially when he omits the word from his vocabulary. If not, he might better have given a list of ideal forms based on katala or fa 'ala.

In his vocabulary, also, the author presumes too much on the knowledge of the student, or on his perseverance. In every case but one he gives the first form only of the verb, leaving us to acquire the meaning of the other forms from his explanations of them on page 45 sq. Out of the many possible variations of sense for some of these forms, it might well confuse others than beginners to select the right meaning approximately, let alone accurately. For example, he leaves us to find out for ourselves the meaning of the participle active of the tenth form of the verb kāma, "to stand" (Sura I., verse 5), and the perfects of the fifth form of wālā, and of the tenth form of ghaniya (Sura Taghabun, verse 6). Again, he frequently omits to give the meaning of nouns either under their roots or elsewhere. For example, see in the second chapter of Genesis, verses 5-8, where we have five nouns not given anywhere in the vocabulary. We think this omission to be a mistake. The beginner ought not to be expected to learn everything at once. In no other dictionary with which we are acquainted is any such plan of forcing the student to learn the meaning of the forms resorted to. In most instances the students will merely fall back on the teacher, and entailing on him the labor of supplying the knowledge which the text-book has failed to give.

Again, in his analysis of Gen. i. 1-5, and of the Sura Taghabun, there are but twelve references in all to the sections of the grammar; and for the rest of the Chrestomathy, there are neither notes nor references. Harper's Manual, a book in the same series, has "notes" and "observations," and frequent references to the "Elements of Hebrew." Here, where we have so few notes (none saving those in the six pages of "analysis"), we might have the references at least. All these helps are thought necessary to enable beginners to read Cesar or Xenophon. Why should they be dispensed with in an Arabic Chrestomathy?

There is no syntax in the book. The author probably deemed this unnece-
sary in view of the easy construction of the passages which he has selected for
his Chrestomathy.

In spite of the above deficiencies, the book is much in advance of anything
accessible to students a few years ago. It is clear and accurate in its statements
and definitions. With a competent teacher it could easily be made both prac-
tical and efficient.

R. D. WILSON.

BOSWELL'S LIFE OF JOHNSON. Edited by GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL, D.C.L.

Boswell's Life of Johnson is one of the books which have claims on any age of
readers, and a thorough knowledge of which is indispensable to any student of
English literature. It may admit of question whether, after all the reading it
has had, the criticism evoked, and the praise bestowed, the book is yet fully ap-
preciated. That which makes the charm and power of the book in great part,
its desultoriness, is one bar to its full recognition. For many who dip into it
here and there come to feel that this piecemeal acquaintance gives the key to
its fruitful meaning. That it is not so goes without saying. It is a book to be
studied as well as browsed over, to use one of Dr. Johnson's expressive epithets.

Mr. Matthew Arnold has in recent years called attention to Dr. Johnson's ad-
mirable critical genius in the selections from the Lives of the Poets, which he
edited. The centenary of the great author's death (1884), calling forth as it did
in the Quarterlies fresh reviews of his work and character as a man of letters, may
also have revived popular interest in the man and author. But Mr. Birkbeck
Hill by this sumptuous edition of his Life by Boswell has done more than any-
thing else to bring him before the minds of men. In doing this, he has ren-
dered an invaluable service to our time and to times succeeding. It is safe to
say that no other edition of Dr. Johnson's Life is likely to be called for soon, if
ever.

There are two reasons, at least, why Dr. Johnson's Life should be kept prom-
ominently before all students of English literature. First because Boswell has pre-
served in the Life the literary life of the time as nothing else has done. Dr.
Johnson was the centre of London literary life, and London was then, as now, the
literary centre of England. In the course of Boswell's narrative, nearly every
man of mark in any department of thought, nearly every book, passes under
notice. We hear the talk of the noted club of which Goldsmith, and Burke, and
Reynolds, and Johnson were members. Side lights flash on nearly every subject
then discussed by learned scholars. What authorship was in the days when
Johnson wrote the pregnant line

"Toil, envy, want, the patron and the jail,"—

if Pope gives us one picture of Grub Street in his vindictive Dunciad, we get
another and juster one from Boswell's Life of Johnson. Hence it is simply in-
valuable as a picture of the literary history of the time. This very fact makes
careful editing a necessity, and the editing of Mr. Hill seems to leave nothing to
be desired.

There is a second reason why Boswell's Life of Johnson should be given to the
world in the best shape possible. It is well worth the while of every scholarly
man to study Dr. Johnson as the best type of the literary man. Garrick never
said a truer word than when he said of him that "there was nothing of the bear
about him but the skin." Under that rough exterior there was nothing of the
dilettante, that bane of the literary spirit. His interest in literature was born of
a deep central conviction that literature in all its forms is of the highest worth to
men. That is the soul of his literary life. It is not simply as an author that he
claims our homage. His authorship is not, indeed, fully appreciated. There
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are papers in the Rambler which equal anything in the line of the periodical essay. There are some of his Lives of the Poets which as criticism will never be surpassed. But if every line of his writings had perished and we had only Boswell's Life, we should have a record of a literary life full of nobleness and full of import for all generations. We owe Thomas Carlyle a great debt for his review of this book, in reply to Macaulay's shallow estimate. Read Carlyle's paper, and you can see the inner sources of Johnson's literary greatness.

There have not been wanting editions of this book. Croker's has long been before the public. But the work of editing had not been fully done till Mr. Birkbeck Hill took it in hand. His edition, he tells us in his preface, has been in hand for many years. He has not only given the most minute examination to Boswell's narrative; I have sought to follow him [Dr. Johnson] wherein a remark of his required illustration, and have read through many a book that I might trace to its source a reference or an allusion. That remark of the editor will show the endless pains bestowed on his work. A valuable Index on an alphabetical plan has been added and a Concordance of Dr. Johnson's sayings. The text is that of Boswell's third edition. The result is before us in this admirably printed edition of a great English classic. American scholars will not be slow in uttering their appreciation of what Mr. Hill has done so laboriously and so well.

James O. Murray.


In this third memoir of the Egyptian Exploration Fund we have an excellent example of the value of scientific method in excavation. It is not so many years ago that the material which has been uncovered in Naukratis would not have elicited much enthusiasm. It consists of faint traces of streets and buildings, a few rude statuettes, some architectural fragments, quantities of broken pottery, inscriptions, and coins; all of little or no aesthetic value. But the methods of scientific archaeology enable us not only to fix with certainty the site of the long-forgotten city of Naukratis, but to determine the position and character of its principal buildings, and even to trace the general outline of its history.

Here, as we learn from literary evidence, was a temple of Aphrodite as early as 688 B.C., and of Apollo in 608 B.C. In the following century, Herodotus tells us, there were at Naukratis temples of Zeus, Hera, Apollo, and the sacred temenos of the Pan-Hellenion. With the exception of the temple of Zeus, the sites of these structures have all been determined. The Pan-Hellenion, which served as the civil centre, the common sanctuary and the rallying point in time of danger, is specially interesting from its gigantic walls and peculiar structure, as also from the foundation deposits discovered beneath each corner of the building. The determination of the sites of the temples did not present great difficulty, as their presence was evident from the large number of inscribed votive offerings. Far more difficult is the arrangement of the material in chronological sequence. In this direction Mr. Petrie shows great ingenuity and scientific imagination. Thus a rough chronological classification of archaic pottery corresponds in general with the differences of level at which they were found in the rubbish heap of the temenos of Apollo. Again, the sizes of brick furnish a criterion of age, as from the twenty-sixth dynasty down to late Roman times the sizes of bricks in Egypt decreased about an inch in length per century. It appears to be a characteristic of Mr. Petrie's mind to trust to such modes of determination as involve exact measurement, rather than to the more usual method of inference from variation of style. In cases where such evidence as he
prefers is wanting he is not always so happy in his inferences, as, for example, when he assigns the architectural fragments illustrated on Plate III. to the seventh century; whereas a comparison with the Ionic architecture of Asia Minor would lead us to put them almost certainly a century later.

The study of the painted pottery of Naukratis by Cecil H. Smith shows the important bearing of these discoveries upon the early history of Greek vase-painting. Not only must the so-called Rhodian class of vases be modified by the discovery of similar vases at Naukratis, but a new and peculiar type has been found, which henceforth will be known as Naukratian. The inscriptions, which have been studied by Ernest A. Gardner, are even more important, and throw new light upon the early history of the Ionian alphabet. Viewed in the light of these new discoveries, the well-known inscriptions of Abu Simbel may no longer be considered the earliest or most characteristic example of the Ionian alphabet. The philologist will also find in \( \nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \) a vocative form hitherto unknown, and involving an early form of nominative in \( \omega \), accusative in \( \omega \), etc.

The coins, which are separately treated by Mr. Head, are interesting not so much for their novelty as for the light they throw upon the material prosperity of the place. They range in date from 520 B.C. to 340 A.D., the greater number belonging to the period from 30 B.C. to 190 A.D.

One of the most thoroughgoing examples of the application of exact methods in archaeology is given in the treatment of the weights of Naukratis by Mr. Petrie. These he has not only tabulated according to form and material and country, but with scrupulous exactness has calculated their present and original weights, and even adds a diagram with curves to represent the frequency of the occurrence of weights of any particular variety of each standard. How quickly the new science of archaeology seems to be reaching the mathematical stage!

We add brief notices of

*Principles of Hygiene for the School and the Home, etc.* By Ezra M. Hunt, A.M., M.D., Sc. D., etc. 12mo, pp. 382. (New York and Chicago: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 1886). Dr. Hunt's established reputation not only in his profession, but as an authority in sanitary and hygienic matters, settles the presumptive value of a book like this from his pen, designed for popular use. He has also experience as a lecturer and instructor, and puts things well. He has drawn upon the best sources in his department, but does not burden his book with references to them. The illustrations are well chosen and handsomely executed. Dr. Hunt's positions in regard to stimulants and narcotics are very emphatically taken, and pressed with scientific and moral earnestness. Some of them are contested by men equally scientific and equally in earnest in behalf of the moral welfare of society.—*American Commonwealths—Connecticut: A Study of a Commonwealth-Democracy.* By Alexander Johnston, etc. 16mo, pp. 400. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887.) This is the ninth of the valuable historical and political studies which have thus far appeared in the series to which it belongs. The general facts are mainly familiar; it is their presentation and interpretation that give Professor Johnston's work special value and significance. The peculiarities of the town system of Connecticut were in themselves strongly marked, and had great influence on the type of this potential little State, which, in turn, made contributions of a most important character to the national Constitution. The peculiar relation existing between Church and State, especially in the New Haven Colony, makes this well-told story one of unusual interest to the student of our American religious life and history. This volume will extend the author's reputation already so well established.

*Charles A. Aiken.*
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MESSRS. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS beg to announce that they will continue the publication of The Presbyterian Review, under the editorial management of the Presbyterian Review Association. With the present number the Review enters upon its eighth year.

Its editorial staff represents six of the leading Theological Seminaries of the Presbyterian Church of America.

MANAGING EDITORS:
CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.
FRANCIS L. PATTON, D.D., LL.D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:
RANSOM B. WELCH, D.D., LL.D.
W. H. JEFFERS, D.D., LL.D.
*JAMES EELLS, D.D., LL.D.
THOMAS H. SKINNER, D.D.

With these are also associated: Talbot W. Chambers, D.D., LL.D., of the Reformed (Dutch) Church; Robert Flint, D.D., LL.D., of the Church of Scotland; Henry Calderwood, LL.D., of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland; *Thomas Croskery, D.D., of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland; W. G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D., of the Free Church of Scotland; and Principal William Caven, D.D., of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. *During the year the editorial staff has suffered by the death of Drs. Eells and Croskery; their places have not yet been filled.
I. ARTICLES.

The Review has aimed to present to its readers articles of a high grade of scholarship, the fruit of original investigations in the fields of Theology. The editors adhere to this design. But they propose to publish a greater number of shorter and lighter articles. It is their purpose to give more attention to the burning questions of the day, even at the risk of developing differences in their own ranks. Should such differences appear, the readers may be assured that the various views existing in the Presbyterian churches will have free, full and adequate representation. The following papers have been engaged for the forthcoming numbers of the Review:

(1) Principal D. W. Simon, Ph.D., of Edinburgh, on Dorner and his Theology.

(2) Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D., of Allegheny, on Recent Criticism of the Gospels.

(3) Principal D. H. McVicar, D.D., of Montreal, on Social Discontent.

(4) President Merrill E. Gates, LL.D., of New Brunswick, on Sidney Lanier.


(6) Prof. J. S. Candlish, D.D., of Glasgow, on The Reformation Theology in the Light of Modern Knowledge.

(7) Prof. R. B. Welch, D.D., LL.D., of Auburn, on Our Teachers.

(8) Principal Grant, D.D., of Queen's University, Ontario, on Plato's Theory of Education.

(9) President W. C. Roberts, D.D., of Lake Forest, Illinois, on Higher Education in the West.

(10) Prof. Robert Flint, D.D., LL.D., of Edinburgh, on Agnosticism.


(12) Prof. C. A. Briggs, D.D., of New York, on Recent Criticism of the Pentateuch.

II. NOTES.

(1) The Editorial staff will discuss matters of current interest in the Presbyterian world and will give reports of the work of Presbyterian ecclesiastical bodies throughout the world. Especial attention will be given to the Alliance of the Reformed Churches. It is the intention of the editors to furnish a number of brief editorial papers upon the burning questions of the time, such as Christian Union, the New Theology, and the eschatological questions connected therewith, Missionary Co-operation, and the Higher Education.

(2) The Review will continue to publish Critical Notes upon Biblical, Historical, and Bibliographical matters, giving the most recent discoveries in these fields.

(3) The editors have a number of valuable tracts and unpublished manuscripts that will excite great attention. It is proposed to issue them from time to time as there may be space.

III. REVIEWS.

The department of Book Reviews has ever been regarded as one of the most important parts of the work of the Review. It is the design of the editors to make a more careful selection of reviewers and to give a more comprehensive survey of the literature.

The editors and the publishers are prepared to enlarge the Review, and to increase the frequency of its publication, so soon as the number of subscribers shall be so increased as to justify an increase in the expense of publication. Those who desire the Review to make greater progress will encourage the editors by aiding the publishers to increase the circulation. It is the interest
of all the Presbyterian Churches to maintain the Review and make it a financial as well as a literary and theological success.

We send the Review to all subscribers for 1886. It is assumed that the subscription is to be continued for 1887, unless the publishers are notified. We would suggest that those who have learned to value the Review should aid the Association to extend its circulation.

Published Quarterly on the First of January, April, July, and October,

Annual Subscription, $3.00. Single Copies, 80 cents.

A limited number of previous volumes are for sale at $2.50 each.

Remittances should be sent to the Publishers,

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743-745 Broadway, New York.

Subscription Blank.

To Charles Scribner's Sons,

743-745 Broadway, New York:

Enclosed find Three Dollars* for One Year's Subscription to "The Presbyterian Review," beginning with the current issue, to be mailed to

*Remittances may be made by bank draft, money order, or the new postal notes, which may be obtained at your post-office for a fee of three cents.
**BIBLE AIDS, Etc., Etc.**

**THE "OXFORD" PARALLEL BIBLE.**

Being the Authorized Version arranged in Parallel Columns with the Revised Version, in one volume. Minion type. Size, 10 1/4 x 7 1/4 x 2 1/2 inches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Cloth, beveled boards, red edges</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Persian Morocco, beveled, red under gold edges</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Turkey Morocco, boards, gilt edges</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greek New Testament.** With the readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version. Foolscap 8vo, cloth...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Persian Morocco, beveled, red under gold edges</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **HANDBOOK TO THE GRAMMAR OF THE.** With a complete vocabulary and an examination of the Chief New Testament Synonyms. 12mo, cloth...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Turkish Morocco, boards, gilt edges</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HELPS TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE.**

Being the "Oxford" Index and Concordance, with other additional matter as bound in the Teachers' Bibles.

### PEARL TYPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embossed Black Cloth, boards, red edges</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Morocco, limp, round corners</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NONPAREIL TYPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embossed Black Cloth, boards, red edges</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Morocco, limp, round corners</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LONG PRIMER TYPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloth, red edges</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Scriptures (The). In the order in which they were written. A very close Translation from the Greek Text of 1611. With Brief Explanations. The First Portion the Six Primary Epistles to Thessalonica, Corinth, Galatia, and Rome, A. D. 52-58. By the Rev. Charles Herbert, D.D. 12mo, cloth extra</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"It has really more color, however, than appears at the first sight, the text being written in an easy, flowing style."—S. S. Times.

**Infidel Objections to the Scriptures Considered and Refuted.** By the Rev. F. B. Whitmore, B.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Three Christian Centuries. A History of the Church of Christ, with a Special view to the Delineations of Christian Faith and Love. (From A.D. 1 to A.D. 313). By Islay Burns, D.D., late Professor of Church History, Free Church College, Glasgow. 12mo, cloth, red edges</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Christ and the Church.** Thoughts on the Apostolic Commission (Matt. xvi. 18-20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Popular Introduction to the Pentateuch. By the Rev. R. Wheeler Bush, M.A., Rector of St. Alphage, Lenden Wall, etc. 12mo, cloth, 187 pp</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outline of the History of Protestant Missions from the Reformation to the Present Time.** A contribution to Recent Church History. By Dr. Gustave Warneck. Translated by Rev. Thos. Smith, D.D., Professor of Evangelistic Theology, Edinburgh. 12mo, cloth, 220 pp | $1.25 |

**LAW FROM HEAVENS FOR LIFE ON EARTH.** 12mo. Consists of short comments on select portions of the Book of Proverbs. It allures the reader on from page to page with amazing fascination, and is richly fraught with the highest lessons of practical sagacity.

**The Lesser Parables of Our Lord, and Lessons of Grace in the Language of Nature.** With Biographical Notice by Canon Bell. 12mo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. LIFE IN CHRIST.</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parables of Our Lord.** 12mo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourses on the Parables of our Lord. A book vigorous in style and earnest in tone; fitted to come home to the experiences of all who are willing to glance at the necessities and responsibilities of a higher life.</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For sale at all bookstores, or of the publishers,

**THOS. NELSON & SONS,**

42 Bleecker Street, New York.
AIMS to give its readers general literature of lasting value and interest. Each number is illustrated fully and handsomely by the work of the leading artists, reproduced by the best known methods. The pictures will be in the best sense illustrative of the text.

THE FIRST (JANUARY) NUMBER WAS PUBLISHED ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1886. THE EDITION OF 100,000 COPIES WAS EXHAUSTED ON THE DAY OF PUBLICATION. SECOND AND THIRD EDITIONS WERE PUT TO PRESS AT ONCE, AND THE SALE OF THE FIRST ISSUE HAS NOW REACHED 140,000 COPIES.

From the NEW YORK SUN.
If ever a magazine was started with a place ready and waiting for it, the new SCRIBNER'S has that good luck. The name is a letter of recommendation to friendship and respect. The cover is an invitation to closer acquaintance. The table of contents is a revelation of character and intelligence. The first number is welcomed before it is read, and when it is read it takes its place easily and at once among the things that justify their own existence and need no probation before being fully and finally accepted. The individuality of the handsome new magazine is distinct. It is an imitation of none of its contemporaries, and it is on a level with the best of them, both in the merit of its general scheme, and in the details of workmanship. This, we believe, will be the verdict of the intelligent reading public of the new SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE.

From the NEW YORK TIMES.
The periodical will at once take its place far forward in the magazine ranks, and it will command intelligent attention from readers everywhere. While it is illustrated with sixty odd views, portraits, maps and head and tail pieces, the aim has obviously been to subordinate the picture to the text, and this has been studiously done with results that are entirely pleasing. The illustrations always bear direct relation to the text, and besides being ornaments are appropriate, helpful, and in place... SCRIBNER'S seems to have started full grown. It has, no doubt, come to make a stay among us, at once amusing, instructive and protracted.

From the BOSTON POST.
The tone and character of the magazine, as shown in the first number, are admirable, and there is certainly a high place for SCRIBNER'S.

From the JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.
The first number of SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE meets the high expectations that had been formed of it. The publishers have only to maintain the initial level of excellence in order to realize their utmost wishes of circulation and influence. The exterior is prepossessing. The color of the cover is a new shade of buff, restful to the eye. The title and the border are simple and tasteful. The only attempt at ornament is a wreath, which encloses a book and an antique lamp throwing out rays. Inside every reader will be pleased to find a large, bold style, making the perusal of the magazine a positive luxury.

From the NEW YORK TRIBUNE.
The cover of SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE is unpretentious, quiet, and simple. It is business-like rather than artistic, but it is in perfectly good taste. Taking a general view of the first number, the new aspirant for public favor enters the field cool, competent, capable.

From the BOSTON TRAVELLER.
Its price at 25 cents a number is calculated to bring its splendid array of reading matter within the reach of every one, and its initial number is an evidence of the high standard of the character of the magazine and the wide and varied range from which it will draw its interests.

From the BOSTON TRANSCRIPT.
The new magazine begins its career auspiciously, and with an evidence of reserved strength that promises well.

From the PHILADELPHIA RECORD.
The first number of SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE, which has been eagerly looked for, comes not only as a welcome Christmas guest, but as one whose visits will be gladly hailed at all seasons.

25 CENTS A NUMBER. $3.00 A YEAR.
BEGIN YOUR SUBSCRIPTION FROM THE FIRST NUMBER.
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, PUBLISHERS,
743-745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.
INVALUABLE FOR CONSTANT REFERENCE.

Fisher's Outlines of Universal History. $3.00.

By George Park Fisher, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Yale College. 8vo, cloth, morocco back, 690 pages, with 32 maps, $3.00.

2 vols., extra cloth, gilt top, large paper, in box, $5.00.

"Decidedly the best book of its kind extant in English."—N. Y. Tribune.

"I am astonished that any one man should have been able to write such a work as the 'Outlines of Universal History.' No living man is more competent to do it than Dr. Fisher. I keep the book on my table for constant reference."—Pres. J. S. McCosh, LL.D., Princeton College.

"Professor Fisher's 'Outlines of Universal History' is a model of its kind, and cannot fail to take the very highest place as a book of reference for the scholar, and as a text-book for the learner and teacher."—Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College.

"I have spent some hours with it, and as a result have received the impression that it is far superior to anything of the kind that has before been published in our language."—Pres. C. K. Adams, Cornell University.

"I cannot speak in terms of too high praise of the excellence of the work."—Pres. J. B. Angell, University of Michigan.

"Better than anything of its kind we have had heretofore."—W. P. Atkinson, Prof. Hist., Mass. Inst. Technology.

Hunt's Principles of Hygiene. $1.00.

Including the essentials of Anatomy and Physiology. By Ezra M. Hunt, A.M., M.D., Sc.D., Tenth President of the American Public Health Association; Secretary of the State Board of Health, of N. J.; Instructor in Hygiene in the State Normal School of N. J. 12mo, cloth, illustrated, 400 pp.

This is an authoritative work on an original plan which makes the knowledge of Hygiene and the practice of its principles the first aim, using the study of Anatomy and Physiology as a means to this end and not the end itself. The effects of alcoholic stimulants and narcotics are treated in proper connection, and the author has not failed to state the entire truth on these subjects, and has been particular to give no doubtful views.

Webster's Condensed Dictionary. $1.80.

800 Pages. 1500 Illustrations. 60,000 Words.

A PRONOUNCING VOCABULARY OF 24,000 PROPER NAMES.

An entirely new DICTIONARY on a novel and original plan, containing all recent terms, and in its etymologies and definitions, more thorough and accurate than any other abridged dictionary.

Handy Atlas of the World. 50 cents.

Contains 38 new and accurate maps of all parts of the world, including railway maps of the United States, Mexico, the Canadas; general maps of all the continents, with special maps of important localities, as Great Britain, France, German Empire, Egypt and the Soudan, the Congo State, the Arctic Regions, etc., etc. Nothing similar is so valuable for the price.

Our Descriptive List sent free to any address on request.

IVISON, BLAKEMAN, TAYLOR & CO., Publishers,
AMERICAN HISTORY, STATESMANSHP, AND LITERATURE.

"Logically compact in structure and development, scholarly and readable in thought and style, and withal pervaded by a lofty ethical spirit, they mark a most decided advance in modern English prose, and bid fair to settle many a literary question that has hitherto defied the wisdom of the wisest."—The Independent.

AMERICAN COMMONWEALTHS.
A Series of volumes narrating the history of those States of the Union which have a striking Political, Social, or Economical History.

Edited by HORACE E. SCUDDER.

I. Virginia. By John Esten Cooke.
II. Oregon. By William Barrows.
III. Maryland. By Wm. Hand Browne.
IV. Kentucky. By N. S. Shaler.
VI. Kansas. By Leverett W. Spring.
VII. California. By Josiah Royce.
VIII.-IX. New York. By Ellis H. Roberts. (Nearly Ready.)

(Other volumes in preparation.) Each volume, 16mo, gilt top, $1.25.

AMERICAN STATESMEN.
A Series of Biographies of Men conspicuous in the Political History of the United States.

Edited by JOHN T. MORSE, Jr.

I. John Quincy Adams. By John T. Morse, Jr.
II. Alexander Hamilton. By Henry Cabot Lodge.
III. John C. Calhoun. By Dr. H. Von Holst.
IV. Andrew Jackson. By Prof. Wm. G. Sumner.
V. John Randolph. By Henry Adams.
VI. James Monroe. By Prof. D. C. Gilman.
VII. Thomas Jefferson. By John T. Morse, Jr.
VIII. Daniel Webster. By Henry Cabot Lodge.
IX. Albert Gallatin. By John Austin Stevens.
XI. John Adams. By John T. Morse, Jr.
XIV. Thomas H. Benton. By Theodore Roosevelt. (Nearly Ready.)
XV.-XVI. Henry Clay. By Carl Schurz. (Nearly Ready.)

(Other volumes in preparation.) Each volume, 16mo, cloth, gilt top, $1.25.

AMERICAN MEN OF LETTERS.
A Series of Biographies of Distinguished American Authors.

Edited by CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER.

II. Noah Webster. By Horace E. Scudder.
III. Henry D. Thoreau. By Frank B. Sanborn.
IV. George Ripley. By Octavius Brooks Frothingham.
V. James Fenimore Cooper. By Prof. T. R. Lounsbury.
VI. Margaret Fuller Ossoli. By T. W. Higginson.
VII. Ralph Waldo Emerson. By O. W. Holmes.
IX. Nathaniel Parker Willis. By H. A. Beers.

(Other volumes in preparation.) Each volume, with portrait, 16mo, gilt top, $1.25.

For sale by booksellers. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price, by the publishers.

11 EAST 17TH STREET, NEW YORK.
BOUND VOLUMES

--- of ---

The Presbyterian Review
For 1886.

We have had specially made, and have now on hand, a number of bound copies of Volume VII. of The Presbyterian Review, covering the year 1886. The binding is of handsome and durable brown cloth, with gilt lettering on outside, and makes an ornamental as well as a most useful addition to the library of every minister, student or layman. We will send a copy of this bound volume to any address upon receipt of $3.00.

BINDING CASES.

Single cases for binding The Presbyterian Review will be sent to any address for 50 cents each. Any one sending us the four numbers of 1886 in good condition, together with 75 cents, may receive a copy of the bound volume in exchange without any further extra charge.

BACK NUMBERS AND VOLUMES.

Any back number desired of The Presbyterian Review may be had by addressing the publishers, at the price of 80 cents each, affording an opportunity to any of our readers desirous of completing their sets with missing numbers.

Address all letters to

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, Publishers,
743-745 Broadway, New York.
125,000 "Notes on Ingersoll," by Rev. L. A. Lambert, have been sold.

We shall go to press in a few days with the new book of Rev. L. A. Lambert, entitled "TACTICS OF INFIDELS," and shall publish as first edition 10,000 Copies. READY ABOUT APRIL 16TH.

It will be printed from brand new type, on handsome paper, and will be issued in two styles:

Paper Binding, 30c.
Cloth, 60c.

MAILED, POSTPAID, UPON RECEIPT OF ADVERTISED PRICE, ON DAY OF PUBLICATION.

PETER PAUL & BRO., Publishers,
BUFFALO, N. Y.

Orders for the "Notes on Ingersoll" can be filled at once.

A Valuable Historical Work.

FRANKLIN IN FRANCE.

From original documents, most of which are now published for the first time. By Edward E. Hale and Edward E. Hale, Jr. With a steel portrait from a painting by Van Loo, two portraits on wood by Chapman and de Carmonelle, and medallion portrait by J. B. Nini, together with numerous vignette portraits of noted contemporaries. One volume. 8vo. Cloth. Gilt top. Price, $3.00.

When Benjamin Franklin died, in 1790, he left to his grandson, Wm. Temple Franklin, the largest collection of his papers. This collection, which had been supposed to be irrevocably lost, was found a few years since on the top shelf of an old tailor's shop in St. James, became the property of Mr. Henry Stevens, and finally of the United States. From this collection, and from other original documents, this life of "Franklin in France" has been written.

Said by all Booksellers. Mailed, Postpaid, by the Publishers.

ROBERTS BROS., BOSTON.

E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.'S NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Episodes in Clerical and Parish Life,
With Other Sketches on Church Subjects,

"We are glad to give it a hearty approval, and to thank the publishers for a volume that contains a godly and wholesome doctrine supported by argument and proof, and in an attractive form."—Churchman.

BY AUTHOR OF WOOD'S "NATURAL HISTORY."

Man and His Handiwork.
Showing the History of the Human Race from the weapons and utensils used by man at different periods. With about 500 illustrations. 8vo, cloth, $3.15 net; by mail, $3.25.

This book is in no sense a treatise on Technology, but is a brief sketch of human handiwork. It deals with man, to whom was given the Divine command to subdue the earth, and shows some of the means whereby he is steadily carrying out his high mission."—From Preface.

The Church and the Faith.

A REPRODUCTION IN CHEAPER FORM OF
The Likenesses of Christ.
Being an Inquiry into the Verisimilitude of the Received Likenesses of Our Blessed Lord. By the late Thomas Heaphy. Edited by Wylie Bayliss. 4to, cloth, black and gold side, red edges, $1.50 net; by mail, $1.65.

With 12 large colored plates, heightened with gold in the fac-simile of the ancient paintings from which the recognized portraits of Christ are derived, including four on cloth, of remote antiquity, one in metal and enamel, seven after mosaics in the Catacombs and churches of Rome, with numerous wood-engravings.

E. & J. B. YOUNG & COMPANY,
Cooper Union, Fourth Avenue, New York.
WEBSTER'S UNABRIDGED DICTIONARY.
Recommended by the State Superintendents of Schools in 30 States, and by leading College Presidents of the United States and Canada.


Your Attention is invited to the fact that in purchasing the latest issue of this work, you get

A DICTIONARY
containing 3000 more words and nearly 2000 more illustrations than any other American Dictionary,

A GAZETTEER OF THE WORLD
containing over 25,000 Titles,
with their pronunciation and a vast amount of other information (recently added), and

A BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY
giving pronunciation of names
and brief facts concerning nearly 10,000 Noted Persons; also various tables giving valuable information.

ALL IN ONE BOOK.

Webster is Standard Authority in the Gov't Printing Office, and with the U. S. Supreme Court. It has been selected in every case where State Purchases have been made for Schools. Nearly all the school books used are based on Webster. Get the Best.

Published by G. & C. MERRIAM & CO., Springfield, Mass., U. S. A.

"A BRILLIANT WORK."

NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.


"This is in many respects a remarkable book. . . . It is the product of a mind both scientific and religious."
—Masonic Magazine.

"Every intelligent man and woman should read this book."—Buffalo Sunday Express.

"Its originality will make it almost a revelation."—Christian Union.

"A WORK BEYOND CRITICISM."

GEIKIE'S HOURS WITH THE BIBLE.


"In the interest of Bible study, and unsolicited by the publishers, we wish to call the special attention of our readers to a series of volumes with the above title, written by that distinguished Bible scholar, the Rev. Dr. Cunningham Geikie."—Christian Advocate.

THE WILL POWER, ITS RANGE AND ACTION.

By J. Milner Fothergill, M.D. 182 pages, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

"The longer I live the more I am certain the difference between men, the feeble and the powerful, is energy invincible determination, a purpose once fixed, then death or victory. This quality will do anything in this world."

"Dr. Fothergill treats of the Will in relation to the inherited character, and to self-culture, of Will and circumstance, of the Will fight."—The World.

Ask for these at your bookseller's, or any of the above sent, post free, on receipt of price. Mention the Presbyterian Review.

JAMES POTT & CO., 14 and 16 Astor Place, N. Y.
**Fisher's Outlines of Universal History.** $3.00.

By George Park Fisher, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Yale College. Svo, cloth, morocco back, 690 pages, with 32 maps, $3.00.

2 vols., extra cloth, gilt top, large paper, in box, $5.00.

"Decidedly the best book of its kind extant in English."—N. Y. Tribune.

"I am astonished that any one man should have been able to write such a work as the 'Outlines of Universal History.' No living man is more competent to do it than Dr. Fisher. I keep the book on my table for constant reference."—Pres. J. A. McCosh, LL.D., Princeton College.

"Professor Fisher's 'Outlines of Universal History' is a model of its kind, and cannot fail to take the very highest place as a book of reference for the scholar, and as a text-book for the learner and teacher."—Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College.

"I have spent some hours with it, and as a result have received the impression that it is far superior to anything of the kind that has before been published in our language."—Pres. C. K. Adams, Cornell University.

"I cannot speak in terms of too high praise of the excellence of the work."—Pres. J. B. Angell, University of Michigan.

"Better than anything of its kind we have had heretofore."—W. P. Atkinson, Prof. Hist., Mass. Inst. Technology.

**Hunt's Principles of Hygiene.** $1.00.

Including the essentials of Anatomy and Physiology. By Ezra M. Hunt, A.M., M.D., Sc.D., Tenth President of the American Public Health Association; Secretary of the State Board of Health of N. J.; Instructor in Hygiene in the State Normal School of N. J. 12mo, cloth, illustrated, 400 pp.

This is an authoritative work on an original plan which makes the knowledge of Hygiene and the practice of its principles the first aim, using the study of Anatomy and Physiology as a means to this end and not the end itself. The effects of alcoholic stimulants and narcotics are treated in proper connection, and the author has not failed to state the entire truth on these subjects, and has been particular to give no doubtful views.

**Webster's Condensed Dictionary.** $1.80.

800 Pages. 1500 Illustrations. 60,000 Words.

A PRONOUNCING VOCABULARY OF 24,000 PROPER NAMES.

An entirely new DICTIONARY on a novel and original plan, containing all recent terms, and in its etymologies and definitions more thorough and accurate than any other abridged dictionary.

**Handy Atlas of the World.** 50 cents.

Contains 38 new and accurate maps of all parts of the world, including railway maps of the United States, Mexico, the Canadas; general maps of all the continents, with special maps of important localities, as Great Britain, France, German Empire, Egypt and the Soudan, the Congo State, the Arctic Regions, etc., etc. Nothing similar is so valuable for the price.

*Our Descriptive List sent free to any address on request.*

IVISON, BLAKEMAN & CO., Publishers,

THE HERALD AND PRESBYTER.

A PRESBYTERIAN FAMILY PAPER.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT CINCINNATI, O.

$2.50 PER YEAR.
TO MINISTERS, $2.00 PER YEAR.

An able editorial corps and a strong force of contributors.

Rev. J. G. MONFORT, D.D., and
Rev. C. E. BABB, D.D.,

have been associated with the paper for more than thirty years.

Mrs. G. R. Alden (Pansy) is a regular contributor. Most of her stories have appeared as serials in the columns of the HERALD AND PRESBYTER.

Correspondents in the leading cities of our own and other lands.


The back chapters of Mrs. Alden's serial entitled "Eighty-seven," now running, will be sent to all new subscribers. Send for sample copies. Address

HERALD AND PRESBYTER,
178 Elm Street,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

MENTION PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek.

BY EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D., LL.D.

New and Revised Edition, by M. B. RIDDLE, Professor in the Hartford Theological Seminary. 1 vol., 8vo, $2.00.

Dr. Robinson's Greek Harmony has for many years held the first rank among works of its class. But the discovery of new manuscripts, and the critical labors of Greek scholars, have resulted in numerous more or less important corrections and changes which it was highly desirable should be incorporated in this work. Professor Riddle, who is easily one of the foremost American scholars in Greek, especially the Greek of the New Testament, has made a very careful and thorough revision of Dr. Robinson's Greek Harmony, producing a work of inestimable value to clergymen and theological students.

The distinctive advantages of this edition are:

1. A better Greek text, enabling the student to form an adequate idea of the minute resemblances and divergences of the Gospels.

2. A carefully-sifted list of authorities for readings where there is a difference of opinion among recent editors. This advantage is great: (a) in relieving the student of the mass of secondary authorities; (b) in ignoring, as scholars must now do, the poorly-supported readings of the so-called received text; (c) in giving an idea of the correctness of the readings accepted in the Revised Version. Thus the student of the New Testament has a valuable assistant in actual training of his judgment upon questions of textual criticism. No English work can be as useful to the beginner in textual criticism, and the more mature student has a careful collation of readings and authorities before his eye. Only a trained student can appreciate this advantage.

3. The Additional Notes in the Appendix present the result of more recent studies than those of Dr. Robinson. The questions are approached in a spirit, and are handled in a manner, not out of accord with those of the distinguished author.

Harmony of the Four Gospels in English.

BY EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D., LL.D.


This Harmony retains the authorized Version, but gives in footnotes the correct readings and renderings of the Revised Version, so far as questions of harmony are concerned. The full Appendix virtually reproduces the additions and alterations in the Appendix to the new edition of the Greek Harmony, which have been pronounced exceedingly valuable by competent critics. Professor Riddle has aimed to make his Notes as clear and untechnical as possible, so that they may be helpful to persons who are not familiar with the Greek.

Dr. Robinson's Harmony has long been the standard. It is now brought up to date by Professor Riddle, who has added to it the results of recent scholarship.

For sale by all booksellers. Sent by mail, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the publishers.


11 EAST 17th STREET, NEW YORK.
Tolstoi's Great Work.

"Should go to every household where the New Testament is read. They who believe that Christianity will never vanish from the earth, that its power of self-adjustment and self-clarification is exhaustless, and that it is far from being irreparably divorced from the threatened social revolution, will welcome with delight and gratitude the extraordinary book from the famous Russian novelist, Count Lyov Tolsito, entitled 'My Religion.'" — N. Y. Sun.

MY RELIGION.

By Count Lyov N. Tolsito. Translated by Huntington Smith. 12mo, gilt top, $1.25.

This work, which has created something of a sensation in Europe, has already been published in Germany, France and England, but has been forbidden in Russia.

It is an exposition of the Christian life in relation to its social aspects and duties, apart from theological teaching and history of ecclesiastical government; and although we may regard with wonder the magnificence audacity of his exegetical speculations, we cannot refuse to admire a faith so sincere, so intense, and in many respects so elevating and so noble.

"We have been thinking of Christ as a Saviour. Here is a man who does not know that he is a Saviour, but desires to obey him as a Master. We have been thinking of this life as a probation and preparation for another, and have put her soul into her books, and a very beautiful soul is still any further probation and preparation when this life is over. Here is a man who does not know whether there is any other, but who is very sure that if we will only understand what the Master says, and obey Him, we can and will revolutionize life here. Let us hear what he has to say. Perhaps the Master has some message to the world through him."

"We do not advise our readers to accept everything they find in this book, but we advise them to read it."—Christian Union.

Easter Novelties

IRENE E. JEROME'S
The Message of the Blue-Bird
TOLD TO ME TO TELL TO OTHERS
In a new and appropriate Easter dress. Palatine boards, floriated ornaments, raised gold titles, satin ribbon, boxed. Price, $1.00.

"Although less elaborate than Miss Jerome's other two books, there is something about the very simplicity of 'The Message of the Blue-bird' that makes it charming, and many will prefer it to the more profusely decorated pages of 'Nature's Hallelujah.' Little songsters stand out boldly against a wintry sky, singing their 'messages' far and wide. Nor storm nor blither wind can daunt the tiny herald as he proclaims 'Christ, the Lord, for you is risen; doubting hearts. He lives again.' Miss Jerome has put her soul into her books, and a very beautiful soul it must be."

By the author of "Nearer, My God, to Thee"

Arise, My Soul, Arise
By Sarah Flower Adams. Illustrated. Tastily bound in Palatine boards, with floriated designs and gold titles, knotted with satin ribbon and nicely boxed. Price, $1.00.

"Nearer, My God, to Thee" is undoubtedly the popular hymn of all denominations. "Arise, My Soul, Arise!" is impregnated with the same fervid faith, enhanced by peans of victorious praise, that give it a foremost place among Easter favorites.

CHARLES KINGSLEY'S EASTER HYMN
See the Land Her Easter Keeping
ILLUSTRATED.
Uniform in size and style of binding with "Arise, My Soul, Arise!" Mr. Kingsley's verses have the ring of the true poet, and the spirit of the true Christian teacher.

"A BASKET OF EASTER EGGS"

Gladness of Easter
From the Poets. ILLUSTRATED.
Uniform in size and style of binding with "Arise, My Soul, Arise!" and "See the Land Her Easter Keeping." Price, $1.00.

From the many choice poems that celebrate the Easter season, gems of verse have been culled, symbolizing in their treatment of nature the glories of the resurrection and the joyousness of Easter.

OLD FRIENDS IN EASTER DRESS

As souvenirs of Easter, nothing more appropriate could be desired, being profusely illustrated, petite in size and delicate in binding. Also bound in cloth, gilt, 50 cents; alligator style, 75 cents; French morocco, $1.00; call for catalogue.

OTHER NEW BOOKS
MORAL PHILOSOPHY

HINTS ON WRITING AND SPEECH-MAKING

ENGLISH SYNONYMS DISCRIMINATED

Sold by all booksellers, and sent by mail, postpaid, on receipt of price. Catalogues free.

T. Y. CROWELL & CO.
13 Astor Place, New York.
CREATION OR EVOLUTION?

A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY.

By GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

"I some years ago took up the study of the modern doctrine of animal evolution. Until after the death of Mr. Charles Darwin I had not given very close attention to this subject. The honor paid to his memory, and due to his indefatigable research and extensive knowledge, led me to examine his 'Descent of Man' and his 'Origin of Species,' both of which I studied with care, and I trust with candor. I was next induced to examine the writings of Mr. Herbert Spencer. . . .

"The result of my study of the hypothesis of evolution is that it is an ingenious but delusive mode of accounting for the existence of either the body or the mind of man; and that it employs a kind of reasoning which no person of sound judgment would apply to anything that might affect his welfare, his happiness, his estate, or his conduct in the practical affairs of life."—From the Preface.

12mo, 564 x 22 pages, cloth. Price, $2.00.

D. APPLETON & CO., Publishers, 1, 3, & 5 Bond St., New York.

THE GREATEST AND THE BEST.

The Large Double Weekly, Religious and Secular,

NEW YORK OBSERVER.

(Established 1823.)

Undenominational, Evangelical, Unsectarian and National.

THE NEW YORK OBSERVER CAN BE TRUSTED.

It Stands by the Old and Tried Truths in Religion, Morals, Education, and in all Public and Private Matters.

It is a paper that has opinions, and can defend them; which has a faith, and holds to it. The NEW YORK OBSERVER is a living and growing Power in this Land. It contains all the News of the World; the Best Thoughts of the Ablest Authors and Correspondents everywhere; Poetry, Book Reviews, Notes and Queries, Departments for Teachers, Students, Business Men, Farmers, Parents and Children.

NO MINISTER CAN DO WITHOUT IT.

We give new Subscribers a copy of JERRY McAULEY'S LIFE, a book of thrilling interest.

Price, $3.00 a Year, in Advance. Clergymen, $2.00 a Year.

Send for Sample Copy, free. Address

NEW YORK OBSERVER, New York.
BOUND VOLUMES

— of —

The Presbyterian Review

FOR 1886.

WE have had specially made, and have now on hand, a number of bound copies of Volume VII. of THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, covering the year 1886. The binding is of handsome and durable brown cloth, with gilt lettering on outside, and makes an ornamental as well as a most useful addition to the library of every minister, student or layman. We will send a copy of this bound volume to any address upon receipt of $3.00.

BINDING CASES.

Single cases for binding THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW will be sent to any address for 50 cents each. Any one sending us the four numbers of 1886 in good condition, together with 75 cents, may receive a copy of the bound volume in exchange without any further extra charge.

BACK NUMBERS AND VOLUMES.

Any back number (excepting the issue for January, 1883) desired of THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW may be had by addressing the publishers, at the price of 80 cents each, affording an opportunity to any of our readers desirous of completing their sets with missing numbers.

Address all letters to

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, Publishers,
743-745 Broadway, New York
THE BOOK BUYER.

An Illustrated Monthly Summary of American and Foreign Literature

Annual Subscription, One Dollar.

THE BOOK BUYER is the only monthly illustrated journal devoted entirely to books and bibliographical matters. It aims to keep its readers abreast of the current literature of the day and the principal events occurring in the world of letters. Its information is given in a concise and interesting manner. It deals only with that literature which commands attention by its merits.

EACH NUMBER CONTAINS:

PORTRAIT OF A WELL-KNOWN AUTHOR.
(Engraved for THE BOOK BUYER.)
ILLUSTRATIONS FROM NEW BOOKS.
ENGLISH LETTER.
READINGS FROM NEW BOOKS.
NEWS AND NOTES.

In the series of portraits of prominent authors, the following have already been given:

RICHARD HENRY STODDARD,
GEORGE W. CABLE,
FRANK R. STOCKTON,
President NOAH PORTER,
FRANCES HODGSON BURNETT,
President TIMOTHY DWIGHT,
H. H. BOYESN.

ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON,
GEORGE PARK FISHER,
BRANDER MATTHEWS,
President JAMES McCOSH,
Dr. HENRY SCHLIEMANN,
DONALD G. MITCHELL, and
JOEL CHANDLER HARRIS.

AMERICAN COMMENTS.

"A most admirable literary periodical."—Boston Post.

"It is full of news, presented in a very attractive form."—New York Tribune.

"The Book Buyer is an honest, diligent, and capable expositor of current literature at a low price."—Boston Literary World.

"Always bright, chatty and readable."—Brooklyn Times.

"No one can afford to be without this bright and suggestive little magazine. It is one of condensed literary excellence."—Boston Traveller.

"We do not know where one can get so much good literature and so much fresh and reliable literary information, for a small sum, as in The Book Buyer."—Albany Argus.

"As an assistant in making a choice of books, its advices, information and suggestions are invaluable."—San Francisco Examiner.

ENGLISH COMMENTS.

"A very readable and trustworthy monthly literary guide . . . in which the 'English Notes' are particularly pleasantly written."—EDMUND YATES, in London World.

"The Book Buyer is full of interesting information and tastefully illustrated . . . The 'English Notes' are highly entertaining."—GEORGE AUGUSTUS SALA, in Illustrated London News.

"An interesting American magazine that contains a very pleasant variety of literary matter . . . The 'English Notes' are among the most interesting features, . . . and reveal the touch of the cultured journalist."—Tunbridge Wells Advertiser.

"A charming little periodical which bibliophiles should appreciate, and that desirable consumption, from the healthy appearance of the paper, seems to be attained. The literary tone of the paper is distinctly high, and certainly not the least interesting of its contents are the 'English Notes.'"—Liverpool Review.

Address

Charles Scribner's Sons,
743 and 748 Broadway, New York.
AN ADDITION TO
THEODOR MOMMSEN'S HISTORY OF ROME.

The Provinces of the Roman Empire.

FROM CAESAR TO DIOPETIAN. BY THEODOR MOMMSEN. TRANSLATED, WITH
THE AUTHOR'S SANCTION AND ADDITIONS, BY WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D.,
LL.D. WITH TEN MAPS BY PROFESSOR KIEPERT. 2 VOLS., 8vo, $6.00.

CONTENTS: The Northern Frontier of Italy—Spain—The Gallic Provinces—Roman
Germany and the Free Germans—Britain—The Danubian Lands and the Wars on
the Danube—Greek Europe—Asia Minor—The Euphrates Frontier and the Parthians
— Syria and the Land of the Nabataeans—Judea and the Jews—Egypt—The African
Provinces.

FROM ENGLISH REVIEWS OF THE WORK.

"The long interval has enabled a history of the Empire
to be written far more complete in one sense than could
have been produced a generation ago. . . . The details
of public and private life, of administration, of religion, of
society, of associations, have been recovered to an immense
extent, by the systematic study and combination of coins
and inscriptions. Abundant use is made of such materials
in this volume. . . . But the interest will be found
little inferior to the solid value. It is a book which
no other living scholar could have written."—London
Academy.

"The book for which the learned world has been wait-
ing for thirty years has come at last. The time has come
for a serious effort to sift this information, to piece out the
story, and put the facts together in their true relations, and
Mommsen was the man to do it. He knows the Empire,
and he knows the Provinces. The reader will find almost
every point of Rome's foreign policy discussed."—Mac-
millan's Magazine.

"Boundless erudition and faultless scholarship are as
manifest in this volume as in those that went before it.
. . . Students of Mommsen will know that if the his-
torian's hand has lost none of its cunning his book will
need no eulogy; and assuredly that hand has lost no jot
or tittle of its cunning. The book is one that all Germans
may well be proud of, and we are glad to find the same
English translator, who succeeded so well with the earlier
volumes, is engaged in this."—St. James Gazette.

For sale by all booksellers, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 743-745 Broadway, N. Y.
First Number now in Press.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

A REVIEW CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

EDITORS:


Manager: GEORGE SUMMEY, Chester, S. C.

PUBLISHERS:

Atlanta: Constitution Publishing Co.

New York: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO.


It is the aim of the Association, through the Editors and Manager, to furnish a Review worthy of the liberal support of the class for which it is provided; representative of the views, literature and ability of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES; open for free discussion, within limits, of the great questions of the day; the organ of no particular party or section of the Church; and a stimulus to thought and effort on the part of her ministers and people.

Each number will contain one or two elaborate theological or philosophical articles, with others of a more practical character. Special effort will be made to present such short discussions of timely topics as will be useful to the intelligent ruling elders and laymen of the church. A sufficient number of contributions from the pens of the ablest and most practiced writers, has been definitely pledged to assure the literary character, as well as soundness and ability, of the Quarterly.

CONTENTS OF THE JULY NUMBER:

"Berkeley's Idealism," by John L. Girardeau, D.D., LL.D.

"The Andover Renaissance in Theology," by Sam'l. M. Smith, A.M.

"The Restoration of the Jews," by A. W. Miller, D.D.


"Creation as a Doctrine of Science," by Geo. D. Armstrong, D.D., LL.D.

With shorter articles, critical notices and reviews by Drs. C. R. Hemphill, C. R. Vaughan, Thos. A. Hoyt, W. W. Moore, J. L. Girardeau, and others.

Subscription: $3.00 per annum; 80 cts. per number.

Address all communications, MSS., exchanges, books, etc., to

GEORGE SUMMEY, Manager, Chester, S. C.
Some Problems of Philosophy.

By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER,
Professor of Philosophy in Columbia College.

1 vol., 12mo, $1.00.

Professor Alexander has the gift of a simple, direct, and natural style, which he uses to great advantage in this volume. He clears up at the beginning some popular misconceptions with regard to philosophy, and then proceeds to state briefly, but comprehensively and intelligently, those problems which may be regarded as still unsolved, and with which philosophy has concerned itself almost from the beginning. To understand the nature of these problems is to understand the present condition and work of philosophy in its various departments.

"For clearness and profundity of thought, definiteness of presentation, and lucidity of style, Professor Alexander's book is not surpassed by any philosophical work of similar scope in the language. It is so simple, frank, and straightforward, that it will appeal to a large class of thoughtful men."—Science.

"It is a book that should be familiar to all who take an intellectual interest in the great questions with which it deals."—The Churchman.

"The work is so valuable that it should be carefully studied by all who are trying to stand upon firm moral foundations, and especially by all ministers who are forced into a contact with the philosophy of the day, falsely so-called.' To the latter it will be found an armory of most effective weapons."—Chicago Interior.

"Professor Alexander has rendered good service to the cause of philosophy and science and religion by this book. He reasons upon correct principles and by consistent methods; his conclusions are warranted by the strictest process of induction; and the tendency of the whole work is to place philosophy upon the surest basis of reason and law."—Church Press.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743-745 Broadway, New York.

Presbyterian Banner.
PITTSBURGH, PENN'A.
Oldest Religious Newspaper; Established July 5, 1814.

Subscription Price, $2.15 Per Year.

This journal supplies its readers with the very best of all kinds of reading matter. It has over 100 special correspondents as to church news alone, besides a large number of occasional writers. It has contributors in every State in the Union and in nearly every country on the globe, and its circulation is large and wide-spread.

The Ladies' Presbyterian Societies have a department of their own, and short, concise reports as to them are sent from all directions.

In the Departments of Original and Selected Stories, the Banner is unsurpassed. Market Reports, Hints on Health, Household Receipts, etc., etc., receive careful attention. General Topics of the Day and Secular News are written up attractively and correctly.

It is the lowest-priced paper of its class and merit published in the world.

Send for sample copies to
JAMES ALLISON & CO.,
616 Penn Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mention where you saw this advertisement.
BIBLE AIDS, ETC., ETC.

THE "OXFORD" PARALLEL BIBLE.

Being the Authorized Version arranged in Parallel Columns with the Revised Version, in one volume. Minion type. Size, 10½ x 7 x 2½ inches.

Nos.
140. Cloth, bevelled boards, red edges............................................. $ 5.00
147. Persian Morocco, bevelled, red under gold edges .......................... 12.00
150. Turkey Morocco, boards, gilt edges............................................. 16.00

GREEK NEW TESTAMENT. With the readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version. Foolscap 8vo, cloth......................... 1.75
Demy 8vo, large paper edition, cloth............................................. 6.00

HANDBOOK TO THE GRAMMAR OF THE. With a complete vocabulary and an examination of the Chief New Testament Synonyms. 12mo, cloth.................................................. 8.00

PARALLEL NEW TESTAMENT (THE). Greek and English. Giving the Authorized Version, the Revised Version, the Revised Greek Text, and the Readings displaced by the Revisers, in four parallel columns; also space for Manuscript Notes. Minion, 8vo, cloth, bevelled, red edges.............................. 6.00

HELPs TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

Being the "Oxford" Index and Concordance, with other additional matter as bound in the Teachers' Bibles.

PEARL TYPE.
Embossed Black Cloth, boards, red edges............................................ $0.50
French Morocco, limp, round corners............................................... 1.00

NONPAREIL TYPE.
Embossed Black Cloth, boards, red edges............................................ 1.00
French Morocco, limp, round corners............................................... 1.50

LONG PRIMER TYPE.
Cloth, red edges.................................................................. 1.50


New Testament Scriptures (The). In the order in which they were written. A very close Translation from the Greek Text of 1611. With Brief Explanations. The First Portion the Six Primary Epistles to Thessalonica, Corinth, Galatia, and Rome, A. D. 52-58. By the Rev. Charles Herbert, D.D. 12mo, cloth extra.................................................. 1.00

First Three Christian Centuries. A History of the Church of Christ, with a Special view to the Delineations of Christian Faith and Love. (From A. D. 1 to A. D. 315.) By Islay Burns, D.D., late Professor of Church History, Free Church College, Glasgow. 12mo, cloth, red edges............................................. 1.25

"It has really more color, however, than appears at the first sight, the text being written in an easy, flowing style."—St. James Times.

Infidel Objections to the Scriptures Considered and Refuted. By the Rev. F. B. Whitmore, B.A. 12mo, cloth.................................................. $1.25

Christ and the Church. Thoughts on the Apostolic Commission (Matt. xviii. 18-20). By Adolph Saphir, D.D. 12mo, cloth.................................................. 1.75

A Popular Introduction to the Pentateuch. By the Rev. R. Wheeler Bush, M.A., Rector of St. Alphage, Lenden Wall, etc. 12mo, cloth, 187 pp.................................................. 1.75

Outline of the History of Protestant Missions from the Reformation to the Present Time. A contribution to Recent Church History. By Dr. Gustave Warneck. Translated by Rev. Thos. Smith, D.D., Professor of Evangelistic Theology, Edinburgh. 12mo, cloth, 280 pp.................................................. 2.25

BY THE LATE REV. W. ARNOT, D.D.:
Anchor (The) of the Soul, and Other Sermons. 12mo................................ 1.50
Laws from Heaven for Life on Earth. 12mo........................................ 1.75

Consists of short comments on select portions of the Book of Proverbs. It alluresthe reader on from page to page with amazing fascination, and is richly fraught with the highest lessons of practical sagacity.

The Lesser Parables of Our Lord, and Lessons of Grace in the Language of Nature, With Biographical Notice by Canon Bell. 12mo............................................. $1.75

I. LESSON PARABLES.—II. LESSONS OF GRACE IN THE LANGUAGE OF NATURE.—III. READINGS IN FIRST PETER.—IV. LIFE IN CHRIST.

Parables of Our Lord. 12mo................................................... $1.75

Discourses on the Parables of our Lord. A book vigorous in style and earnest in tone; fitted to come home to the experiences of all who are willing to glance at the necessities and responsibilities of a higher life.

"For sale at all bookstores, or of the publishers,

THOS. NELSON & SONS,
42 Bleecker Street, New York.
The Completion of Dr. McCosh's Psychology.

PSYCHOLOGY.

I. The Cognitive Powers.
II. The Motive Powers.

By JAMES McCOSH, D.D., LL.D., Litt. D.,

President of Princeton College; Author of "Intuitions of the Mind," "Laws of Discursive Thought," "Emotions," "Philosophic Series," etc.

Two Vols., 12mo. Each, $1.50.

The second volume, now ready, concludes this work with the discussion of the Motive Powers of the Mind, including the Conscience, Emotions, and Will. The author has treated the difficult, and at times obscure, topics which belong to the department of Psychology with characteristic clearness, conciseness and strong individuality. In the first volume he treats of sense perception, illustrating his theme with appropriate cuts, and discussing it with fulness from the psychological side. A third of the book is devoted to the reproductive, or representative powers, in which such subjects as the recalling power, the association of ideas, the power of composition, etc., are described, while the book concludes with a full discussion of the comparative powers.

EXTRACT FROM THE INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME II.

"Having treated of the Cognitive Powers in Vol. I., I am in this to unfold the characteristics of the Motive Powers, as they are called—the erective, the appetent, the impulsive powers, the feelings, the sentiments, the affections, the heart—as distinguished from the Gnostic, the cognitive, the intellect, the understanding, the reason, the head. These Motive Powers fall under three heads: the Emotions, the Conscience, the Will. It is not to be understood that these are unconnected with each other, or with the Cognitive; emotions contain an idea which is cognitive. The conscience may be regarded as combining characteristics of each of the two grand classes, being cognitive as discerning good and evil, and motive as leading to action; the will has to use the other powers as going on to action. Emotion occupies more room than the other two in this treatise, inasmuch as its operations are more varied, and as the account usually given of it (so it appears to me) is more defective."

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD.

By SAMUEL HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale College. 1 vol., 8vo, uniform with "The Philosophical Basis of Theism." $3.50.

"We do not know a better work among recent publications than this one for building up old hopes and giving new strength to one’s faith. The book is thoroughly evangelical, fresh, and well wrought out. It is a valuable contribution to our American theology."—BISHOP HURST, in Northwestern Christian Advocate.

"It is a book which must be read, and which, when read, in our opinion, will be assigned by most competent and candid scholars to the front rank of modern philosophical and theological literature. Indeed, we doubt whether any book has appeared in this century surpassing this work of Dr. Harris, in real intellectual power and permanent value."—Christian Thought.

"It presents the ripe fruit of a lifetime of study and original thought. The subjects of inquiry are those which excite the deepest interest at the present time, for they have to do with the origin and significance of the material universe, the rational and religious constitution of man, the philosophy of history, the distinctive features of Christianity, and also with these great sources of knowledge in their continuity and unity. The extent of literary, philosophical, and theological learning which the work displays is remarkable. The style is vigorous, luminous, finished, and sometimes brilliant."—Boston Daily Advertiser.

"Such a work is not brought out in a day, but is the growth of years of professional study and reflection. Few books on Apologetics have been recently produced that will be more influential and formative upon the mind of the theological and philosophical student, or more useful. It is calculated to influence opinions and to influence them truthfully, seriously, and strongly."—Prof. WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, in The Presbyterian Review.

These books for sale by all booksellers, or sent, postpaid, upon receipt of price by

No recent contribution to literature has given so much delight to lovers of good reading as the Thackeray letters, published in SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE. With each installment, the half incredulous recognition with which the first letters were received, renews itself. The genius, the humor, and the pathos of Thackeray, all shine in every line of these friendly letters. It is like the despair of, yet hoped and longed for meeting, eye to eye, and face to face, with one who had passed apparently beyond all hope of our sight again in the world. . . . The promise of the Scribners to publish a first-class magazine, ably and liberally edited, has already been fulfilled.

JULY NUMBER, NOW READY, CONTAINS:

BONAPARTE.—Frontispiece. From a miniature by Frédéric Millet, presented by Napoleon to Marshal Soult.


A COLLECTION OF UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF THACKERAY.—IV. With a reproduction of a letter and drawings.

THE RETURN TO NATURE. Poem. By EDITH M. THOMAS.

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS OF NAPOLEON AND HIS TIMES—I. Illustrated. By JOHN C. ROWES.

JEMIMY BASCOM. Story. By PHILIP HENRY.

THE COMMON CHORD. Poem. By ELLEN BURROUGHS.

A GIRL'S LIFE EIGHTY YEARS AGO.—ELIZA SOUTHGATE BOWNE—I. Illustrated.

ON AN OLD ROAD. Poem. By CHARLES EDWIN MARKHAM.

A GREAT PATIENCE. Story. By EDWARD IRWIN STEVENSON.

SETH'S BROTHER'S WIFE.—Chapters XXIV-XXV. By HAROLD FREDERIC.

SILENT SORROW. Poem. By LOUISE CHANDLER MOUTON.

FRENCH TRAITS—THE SOCIAL INSTINCT. By W. C. BROWNELL.

THE OWL. Poem. By CHARLES LOTHIREDHRT.


Vol. I.—Jan.–June, 1887—(Bound), Now Ready.

THE NEW YORK TIMES says:

"Scribner for June completes its first volume. Probably a history of magazine ventures would be unable to record any other success so signal, so deserved, and so gratifying. Everything printed has been well worth printing, many contributions have been of real importance, and some of them are to take their places at once as parts of that literature which does not die. From the start Scribner has steadily grown better and better."
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CROSBY’S VITALIZED PHOSPHITES

For 15 years has been a standard remedy with physicians treating mental or nervous dis-
orders. Not a secret. It aids in the bodily and wonderfully in the mental growth of
children. Students with impaired mental faculties can regain their strength by its use.
IT RESTORES THE ENERGY LOST BY NERVOUSNESS, DEBILITY,
OVER-EXERTION; REFRESHES WEAKENED VITAL POWERS IN OLD
OR YOUNG. A Vital Phosphite, not a Laboratory Phosphate or soda-water absurdity.
It is used by the Emperor Dom Pedro, Bismarck, Gladstone, and other great brain workers.
For sale by druggists, or mail, $1. F. CROSBY CO., 56 West 25th St., N. Y.
The New York Evangelist

It is well known to the readers of this Review. It was established in 1830, and its files now for nearly sixty years cover the chief facts and incidents of our current religious history. The country was yet poor in those early years of the century, and missionary efforts at home and abroad were carried on by a "Plan of Union" among the churches, the Congregational and Presbyterian bodies the chief parties. The Evangelist was loyal to that arrangement even when, later on, it was opposed, and became an element in the division of the Presbyterian Church. Its affiliations were largely, though not wholly, with those of New England extraction. It travelled with them by the then lately opened Erie Canal, and by stage coach, to Western New York and the Western Reserve of Ohio, and by "prairie schooner," and the Lakes to the settlements in Michigan. During the first dozen years of the existence of this paper there was no Central Railroad, nor Pennsylvania, or other track connection with the West.

But a population was being prepared to promote religious institutions in new regions as facilities of communication improved. This paper gained its first impetus in a time of general revival among the churches. So powerful was the work, and so earnest those who promoted it, that "new measures"—as they were termed by some, but which only sought a more consistent devotion on the part of Christians—were favored in many communities. We refer to this only in a passing way, but it is due to the leaders in those revivals, the Rev. Charles G. Finney, and those who stood with him, to say that their early and later labors have stood the test of time. They were genuine awakenings to spiritual life, and produced lasting reformations. From its first number to its current issue THE NEW YORK EVANGELIST has been an advocate of revivals. The temperance movement, from the days of the Washingtonians onward, has also found countenance in its columns. It favors prohibition wherever the sentiment of the community is such as to promise its enforcement.

The controversy over slavery was long and bitter. This paper was pronounced in its anti-slavery attitude. Its first editor was Joshua Leavitt, than whom it would be difficult to name a more strenuous opponent of the "peculiar institution," now happily abolished forever in these United States.

On the division in the Presbyterian Church in 1837, THE EVANGELIST became the principal organ of the New School body, and so remained until the re-union in 1870. As regards this last important step, our files warrant the statement that THE EVANGELIST was second to no other paper in the whole Church in its advocacy of the measure and influence upon the result. A few prominent New School men were lukewarm and distrustful, but all finally and cordially acquiesced in what they have now come to see was a wise measure and calling for no sacrifice of principle. The late Professor Henry B. Smith was at that time, and up to his death, a frequent contributor to these columns.

To-day, as we write, the Centennial of the Constitution is being celebrated in Philadelphia, and we are all looking forward to May next, when the Centennial of the Presbyterian General Assembly will be commemorated in the same city. The "forms of government" thus synchronizing, the one pertaining to the State and the other to the Church, are the complements of each other in their respective spheres. The successful war of the Revolution was in some sort the precurs of both, winning and maintaining as it did the doctrine of representation in both Church and State, against "the divine right" of king and spiritual hierarchy. No other Church had quite our stake or our broader interest in that contest, for our theory of government—as well as the common liberties of the people—was involved. It hence well becomes us, in this time of the commemoration of great events, to renewedly pledge ourselves to endeavors for the purity of the public service and the welfare of the Church. We advocate no theories which would constrain our ministers and others to forego any of their rights as citizens. Our duties are imperative in both spheres; and we may well view with alarm the growing desecration of holy time, and the supineness of many of the "sons of the Pilgrims" in the presence of influences foreign to our habits and inimical to American institutions.

Consonant with its always Christian temper, this paper has pursued a conciliatory course toward the South since the war. This not as a mere policy, but from genuine appreciation of a brave but misguided people. We can hence say, without fear of being misunderstood that, that we cannot approve the course of the Church South in one particular—we refer, of course, to their policy of isolating all churches composed of colored communicants, and constituting Presbyteries and Synods of them strictly "on the color line." The traditions and equally the convictions of this journal forbid its favoring or consenting to such a course; and though THE EVANGELIST should stand alone in this matter of all the papers of the Presbyterian Church, it will not hesitate, constrained as it is by convictions of duty. It cannot consent to see those freed at so great cost of blood and treasure fliched of half their boon.

And the still greater matter that needs to be put beyond question or subterfuge is as to the attitude of the Presbyterian Church at this critical juncture. We hold that however diverse the relations of men elsewhere, all are on a common footing before God. The Christian Church can provide for no race distinctions, much less write such degradation of her poor children in her laws. She is set for the uplifting and equality of all her members. The caste principle which some would fain adopt—hardly knowing, we charitably hope, what they are about—is equally inimical to the Christian spirit and purpose.

THE EVANGELIST favors union with the Southern Church on right principles, but it is constrained to believe that the time is not yet ripe for this.

Had we space it would be in order to speak modestly of the "good degree" which THE NEW YORK EVANGELIST has earned as a religious and literary journal, and of some other features, especially of the letters from Spain and Northern Africa, now in course of publication by its editor, Dr. Henry M. Field; and witbal to gratefully acknowledge the support and countenance now for fifty-eight years of a constituency not second to any other in America for intelligence, worth, and influence.

The Terms are $3.00 a year, in advance.

Address
THE NEW YORK EVANGELIST, New York City.
Aids to Common Worship.

Compiled by the Rev. Richard G. Greene.

This book is offered as an aid to that worship which is common to all who meet together in the Lord's house—to pastor, people, and choir. The conviction is spreading that the congregation is not brought into proper activity in prayer and praise; that worship has not its rightful place; that methods at first accepted almost by accident have become established in an unwritten liturgy. It is certain, however, that the suggestion of any uniform and unvarying service for all would not meet the present demand. The aim of this service is to gather and assign, on a monthly calendar, a reasonably full and balanced presentation of those portions of Holy Scripture that are best fitted for public worship and instruction. The volume contains a service for each Sunday and such other days as Thanksgiving, etc. Its suggestions will be exceedingly helpful to pastors, and the musical portions (prepared by Prof. Waldo S. Pratt) will be found of great value to conductors of church music. 8vo, 413 pp., cloth bound. At retail, $2.00. A single copy to a pastor, $1.50, postage paid.

THE NEW SUNDAY-SCHOOL MUSIC BOOK.

Songs of Worship.

Edited by Prof. Waldo S. Pratt.

Here is an ideal Sunday-school hymn and tune book, containing only the best music, yet much of it as simple and "taking" as that which formerly filled the Sunday-school books. "Songs of Worship" contains a number of new pieces by American composers, Dudley Buck, W. W. Gilchrist, S. P. Warren, J. H. Cornell, and others, besides the work of Sullivan, Barnby, Stainer, Dykes, and other foreign musicians. 250 pages, bound in cloth, with illuminated linings. Price, in quantities, 35 cts. A single sample copy sent, for examination, at quantity price.

THE LEADING CHURCH MUSIC BOOK.

A New Edition of "Laudes Domini."

Edited by the Rev. Chas. S. Robinson, D.D., LL.D.

This is the latest compilation of Rev. Dr. Robinson, whose books are probably more widely used in the Presbyterian and Congregational churches of America than all other hymn and tune books combined. "Laudes Domini" has been before the churches for the past three years, and advantage has been taken of the necessity of making new plates this summer to reset the book from entirely new type, and to make a beautiful specimen of typography. Names of authors and composers have been added. An abbreviated edition for the chapel is in preparation. Send for testimonials and prices.

SOLD BY SUBSCRIPTION ONLY.—AGENTS WANTED IN EVERY CHURCH IN AMERICA.

Parish Problems.

Edited by the Rev. Washington Gladden, D.D.

The labor of many years, the wisdom of many minds, and the fruitage of a rich and manifold experience are harvested in this volume. The purpose has been to make a book that every pastor would wish to see in the hands of every member of his flock, and that no church officer—no elder or deacon or warden, no steward or trustee, no Sunday-school superintendent or teacher, no mission-worker, no chorister or organist, no active helper in any department of church work—could afford to do without. It contains chapters contributed by

Leewellyn Pratt, D.D., Chas. H. Richards, D.D., Prof. Waldo S. Pratt,
Geo. R. Leavitt, D.D., H. T. Satterlee, D.D., Margaret W. Lawrence,

Agents are wanted to sell this book in every church community. Write to us for particulars. THE CENTURY CO., 33 East 17th Street, N. Y. City.