

righteousness, that his ministry became so powerful in producing right conduct.

We are informed that, while the Apostles and immediate followers of Christ largely imbibed his spirit, they soon allowed imagination and fancy to add to the simple teaching of the Master a whole train of extra-belief, including "a phantasmagorical advent of Christ, a resurrection and judgment, Christ's adherents glorified and his rejectors punished everlastingly." (Page 107.)

Our author, as the result of his examination of the Old and New Testaments, discovers that the *residuum* which can be verified, is, that to right conduct belongs happiness, and that the *not ourselves* makes for righteousness. This is the grand *Catholicon* of literary culture to overcome sin, make men religious and renovate the world !!!

It is not necessary that we should answer this volume in detail. The statement of its views is to all ordinary minds a sufficient refutation. But even for those who are inclined to look at the principles which it involves more carefully, a minute examination of all its positions is needless. The whole theory of it is built on a few leading *assumptions*: when these fall, the entire theory necessarily falls with them.

1. The first of these is, that Christians generally, especially in constructing their systems of theology, regard and treat the language of Scripture, as *scientific*, whereas, he assures us, it is "fluid, passing and literary." Hence he asserts, that "orthodox theology is an immense misunderstanding of the Bible."

If this position can be sustained, all existing theologies are worthless, and we must begin our induction of what the Bible teaches *de novo*.

It might be supposed that an author making such assertions, would have felt it incumbent upon him to single out some of the leading doctrines of theology, and show, by a careful examination of the text of Scripture, that they are not taught by the Bible. This is not done.

Now, leaving out of sight, for the present, the epithets *fluid* and *passing*, whose force, in this connection, we do not profess to understand very clearly, we may say that Arnold's unproved as-