

tions, there had already been an Anna and the women that followed Christ: even a company of Greeks had come to see Jesus. Our Lord states a fact, whose bearing is not limited to Samaritan or Jew. When looked at in this way the passage is simple, and all the surroundings are in due perspective. The fact is that in the plains around Sychar the harvest was rapidly approaching, and the hearts of both Jew and Gentile were longing for the revelation of Christ: the visible was a parable to the all-seeing eye of Him to whom all nature was an open page, and it required no forced imagery for Him to express His thought.

It is perhaps unfortunate that we cannot fix the chronological position of the passage. Some harmonists put the incident in the month of December, the seed-time, and four months before the time of harvest; others in the month of April or May. It is probably about the time of transition from summer to autumn: the summer season is not quite closed, and yet the harvest is pressing on. It is the correlative to His own feeling: "and how am I straitened until it be accomplished?" The Vulgate has "adhuc quatuor menses sunt, et messis venit," and the Douay translation corresponds, "there are yet four months and then the harvest cometh." It would be pleasant pastime for those who have libraries to trace out the origin of the mistranslation, account for the motive that suggested it, and give any probable reason for its long continuance.

#### REVIEWS.

##### CHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.\*

The subject of this book is the greatest of all subjects in this and in every other age; and it is an excellent idea to bring out the unity of representation which pervades the whole of the New Testament. Jesus Christ is indeed "the same" not only in all ages, but in every one of the sacred books, in each of which His image is enshrined, and in each of which it is the same image.

Dr. McConnell of Philadelphia, in writing a brief introduction to this volume, informs us of its origin. The lectures, nine in number, which it contains, were prepared for a society of "a hundred and fifty educated and thoughtful women, together with their instructors," who formed the "Church Woman's Institute," organized in Philadelphia in 1887. Dr. Tidball delivered the first course of lectures to this Association, covering and illuminating "a region where obscurity is very common." Dr. McConnell justly remarks that the Church has claims upon the service of men "who can unlock the hoard of learning with one hand, and distribute it to the people with the other;" and we think he is right when he says that Dr. Tidball is such a man.

The author accomplishes his work admirably in two respects. In the first place, he gives us in this volume all that ordinary Christian people will want to know about the origin and the contents of the books of the New Testament, and he gives the reader ample guidance to the sources from which he has himself drawn and from which further supplies may be obtained. The effect is assuring. We feel that we are in the hands of a man who knows his business, and who has no need to assume to know more than he does know.

The first chapter deals with the subject generally of the origin and nature of the New Testament. The second opens the real subject of the book, the humanity and divinity of Christ, and here as set forth in the Synoptic Gospels. We believe that the account which the author here gives of the origin of the first three Gospels is that which is now generally accepted by scholars and which will probably be sustained by further inquiry. We would refer the reader to some excellent remarks of Godet, quoted towards the end of this chapter.

\*Christ in the New Testament. By Thomas A. Tidball, D.D. Price \$1.25. T. Whittaker, New York, 1891; Rowsell & Hutchison, Toronto.

Passing on to the third lecture, on Christ in the Gospel of S. John, we find the writer declaring that of no other book in the whole Bible is it so important to establish the authorship as of the "Fourth Gospel." If by this is meant that S. John's Gospel is one of the most precious portions of the New Testament, or even perhaps the most precious, we should not be inclined to disagree with him. We do not, however, for one moment allow that the whole circle of Catholic doctrine could not be constructed from the other books of the New Testament, or even from those whose genuineness is conceded. This chapter on S. John is excellent both in its defence of the authorship of the fourth Gospel, and in its account of the contents as testifying to the person and work of Christ.

The Acts of the Apostles comes next, and is recognized as bringing before us not only the history of that Body which was born on the day of Pentecost, but also as recording the ruling and teaching of our ascended Lord. "The Day of Pentecost," he says, "is rightly regarded as the birthday of the Christian Church . . . but it might just as fitly be styled 'The Acts of the Risen and Glorified Christ.'" Of course, this view of the matter is not new. It was brought out long ago by Baumgarten in his elaborated commentary, and probably before his time; but, now that the corporate character of the Church is getting to be so fully recognized, there is some danger of this view of the book being overlooked. It comes quite within the author's plan thus to regard it, and he makes valuable use of it.

Christ in the Pauline Epistles is a subject not unfamiliar to most of us; but it here receives fresh and vigorous handling. The author very properly gives a separate lecture to the Epistle to the Hebrews; and this is one of the best in the volume, whether we consider his judicious remarks on the authorship of the Epistle or the excellent account which he gives of its contents. Similar remarks may be made on his treatment of the Epistle of S. James. We are in entire accord with him as to the personality of the author, and we can speak highly of his analysis of the book.

The writer very properly leaves out the second Epistle of S. Peter, without conceding its spuriousness. It is better to take his stand upon the glorious first Epistle; and his lecture on this leads little to desire. Very much the same may be said of his remarks on S. John's Epistles. He abstains from commenting on the Apocalypse on the ground that he does not understand it. Dr. Tidball might, however, very easily have shown that this book has the same Christology as the fourth Gospel. The whole volume may be safely recommended as of great value and interest.

#### THE ORDERS OF THE WESLEYAN METHODISTS, IN ENGLAND AND THE COLONIES.

BY THE REV. ANDREW GRAY.

Even if the Apostolical Succession through presbyters were valid, the modern Wesleyans can claim no benefit from it whatever, for they have not got a shadow even of that. Presbyterians (e.g.) claim that they have a regular succession transmitted by the laying on of hands of successive presbyters from the beginning. But the Wesleyan preachers simply met together, the year after Wesley died, and put it to the lot whether or not they should administer the Sacraments; the lot said "no." The next year the question was put to the vote, and the majority said "yes," and thus voted themselves into the priesthood.\* There was no pretence of ordination, nay, they absolutely repudiated the necessity for it. "We resolved," they said, "that all distinctions between ordained and unordained preachers should cease, and that the being received into full connection by the Conference, and appointed by them to administer the ordinances (i.e., the Sacraments) should be considered a sufficient ordination without the imposition of hands." (Smith's Hist. II., p. 22.)

Nor was it till forty-three years afterwards, when a whole generation had passed away, viz., in 1836, that the Wesleyans first began to use an Ordination Service with the laying on of hands. But, even then, the ordainers were not themselves presbyters, for the rite was to be performed by "the president, ex-president, and secretary of the Conference, for the

time being, with two other senior preachers." (Smith's Hist. III. p. 417.) The president and ex-president, for the year 1836, were Jabez Bunting and Richard Secoe; the secretary, Robt. Newton; all were preachers who had never themselves received an ordination with the laying on of hands from any body whatever, and consequently had no orders whatever, whether Presbyterian or Episcopal. Up to that time they had abided by the principles laid down by the Conference of 1793. "We have never sanctioned ordination in England, either in this Conference or in any other, in any degree, or ever attempted to do it." (Minutes of Conference, I. p. 281.) Is it not plain that if the president and his four associates were presbyters without ordination, the preachers on whom they laid their hands did not need it? But if they did need it, then the president and his associates were not presbyters without it.

Nor can any intelligible explanation be given why the itinerant preachers should assume to themselves the priestly power and deny it to the local preachers. It is quite clear that whatever scriptural commission the itinerants may be supposed to possess, the local preachers must possess the same. Whatever commission can be supposed to be derived from a connection with John Wesley is possessed by both parties equally. But in fact both the one and the other are now in the exact position described by Charles Wesley. Speaking of King Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, "who made Israel to sin" by making priests of "whosoever would," he writes:

But kings may spare their labor, vain;  
For in such happy times as these,  
The vulgar can themselves ordain,  
And priest commence whoever please.

And how strongly he felt on the subject will be seen from the following lines:

Raised from the people's lowest lees,  
Guard, Lord, Thy preaching witnesses;  
Nor let their pride the honour claim  
Of sealing covenants in Thy Name,  
Rather than suffer them to dare  
Usurp the priestly character,  
Save from the arrogant offence,  
And snatch them uncorrupted thence.

To sum up this matter:

1. Wesley, throughout his entire life, asserted the Apostolical Succession as running in the Episcopate, and during a short portion of his life, he held that the episcopal and priestly offices are one and the same.

2. Wesley never dreamed of the possibility of any man becoming a priest, or consequently having any authority to administer the Eucharist, otherwise than by the laying on of the hands of bishops (for a short time, he said, or of priests). Such a thing he termed "stupid," "sinful," and "unscriptural."

3. Wesley sternly forbade any of his preachers to administer the Sacraments unless they had been so ordained.

4. Two years after Wesley's death, the Conference solemnly protested that they had never at any time sanctioned any sort of ordination in England.

5. Whence it follows that the Wesleyan Society in England was without any kind of ordination or ordained ministers till the year 1836, when the preachers, without ordination themselves, began to ordain by the imposition of hands.

EXTRACTS FROM JOHN WESLEY'S WRITINGS, ETC.

In 1744, among the Minutes, etc., are "Wesley's Instruction to his Preachers":

"Let all our preachers go to church. Let all the people go constantly, and receive the Sacrament at every opportunity. Warn against calling our society 'a Church'; against calling our preachers 'ministers'; our houses 'meeting houses'; call them, plainly, 'preaching houses.' License yourself as a Methodist preacher." (Works, VII., p. 358.)

† The apology which the historian of Wesleyanism makes for this transaction is worthy of being transcribed. "The Methodist preachers," he says, "of 1836 held that the true Apostolical Succession was that the ministry appointed the ministry, and must continue to do so to the end of the world. The reason why the first Methodist preachers were not ordained was that they were not accounted ministers, but helpers to others who held that character; while it was now (i.e., in 1836) an undoubted fact that, by the Providence of God, they had long ceased to occupy a subordinate position. They were no longer helpers to any class of men, but the constituted ministry of a large and growing Christian denomination. (Smith's History of Methodism, III. p. 326.) To assert that it was 'by God's Providence' that the preachers ceased to occupy a subordinate position, is not only begging the question, but is also a placing of God's Providence and John Wesley in direct antagonism. How the ordainers were 'constituted' a ministry, our author does not tell us. It is plain, however, from what he does say, that they were not ordained by ministers, as he confesses they ought to have been.

‡ It is worthy of remark that the Conference in 1793 enacted that "the distinction between ordained and unordained preachers shall be dropped." (Smith's History, II. p. 24.)

\* It is to be noticed that this decision was the cause of a deep and wide rent in the Wesleyan Society, which continues to this day.