

to be wary about—in reading these lectures. For instance, before they acquiesce in all that he says of St. Augustine, they might do well to read Archbishop Trench's essay on the subject in his volume on the Sarum on the Mount. He speaks of Fichte having been greatly indebted to Spinoza. Certainly, Schelling was still more so. Moreover, some of the phrases which he employs respecting the views of Fichte are not the best that could be found; certainly not those which Fichte himself employs. In his classifications he is somewhat hasty, certainly erroneous, we can hardly think ignorant. Thus he speaks of "Gesenius, Hitzig, Delitzsch, Huther, and DeWette," as being of the meditation school of theology. We are sure that if the rationalistic DeWette and Gesenius could rise from the dead, they would be as much surprised at this classification as the orthodox Supernaturalist Delitzsch, of Leipzig, will be, if he should read this volume. Again, he speaks of Strauss as having changed his theory of the History of Christ in later editions of the *Leben Jesu*; and he refers in a note to the editions of 1864. It is quite true that Strauss published several editions of his original work; but the edition of 1864, in which the change produced by the influence of Renan and others appeared, was an entirely new work.

These are slips of no great importance, and we mention them as some which have come under our eye in reading, without taking any special pains to discover them. It would, doubtless, be easy, in a volume of such extent and comprehensiveness, to find many slight errors. But it is not in this way that a volume of this kind should be judged; and there are certainly few men who could have covered the same extent of country and had so little to answer for at the end of the process.

To many the most pleasing and even fascinating parts of the volume will be the numerous, brilliant sketches of the leading writers who are selected as representatives of the exegesis of their age. Many of these are quite admirable in their union of spiritual insight with exceptional power of description. We have marked many more than it is possible for us to use; So we must content ourselves with a few specimens.

Passing by many excellent remarks on the Rabbinical School and the early Alexandrians, he came to Origen, "of Origen," he says, "the greatest master of this school, it would be impossible to speak in any terms but those of the highest admiration and respect. There is no man to whom the Church of Christ owes a more awful debt of reparation than to this incomparable saint, who, though his memory has been branded and his Salvation denied, rendered to her greater services than all her other teachers, but whom her hierarchical representatives cruelly persecuted while he was living, and violently anathematized after he was dead."

"In Chrysostom," he says again, "we see the 'bright consummate flower' of the school of Antioch, to which he belongs as a faithful and admiring pupil of Diodorus of Tarsus. . . . He was not so learned as Jerome, nor had he

Origen's deep sympathy with the nine mysterious aspects of the Gospel, nor was he so profound a theologian as Augustine, nor was he in any sense a textual critic like Julius Africanus, but as a bishop inspired with genuine love for the souls of his flock; as a preacher of surpassing eloquence, whose popular exposition is based on fine scholarship and controlled by masterly good sense; as one who had a thorough familiarity with the whole of Scripture, and who felt its warm tingling human life throbbing in all his veins, as one who took the Bible as he found it, and used it in its literal sense as a guide of conduct rather than as an armoury of controversial weapons or a field for metaphysical speculations, Chrysostom stands unsurpassed among the ancient exegetes."

Almost as good is what he says of Jerome a little further on. Again of Augustine he says: "In the writings of St. Augustine we see the constant flashes of genius, and the rich results of insight and experience, which have given them their power on the minds of many generations. But these merits cannot save his exegetic writings from the charge of being radically unsound." While we admit the truth of this judgment, we should, in various respects differ with his remarks on this father, as being both defective and, in a measure, misleading. To St. Thomas Aquinas, on the whole, he does justice. We are unable to quote any of the fine passages in which the author commemorates his greatness; but we must draw attention to some just and generous testimonies to the leading schoolmen at the end of the fifth lecture, where he speaks "of Albert the Great preferring his position of a humble monk to the Bishopric of Ratisbon which he resigned; and Thomas of Aquina in his profound humility, his rapturous visions, his glorious daily prayer, *Da mihi, Domine, cor nobile quod nulla ad terram detrahat terrena affectio*, his holy answer to the vision. 'Bene Scripsistide Me Thoma; quam mercedem a me accipies, non aliam nisi Te, Domine' and so forth. We find we have further noted his remarks on Erasmus (p. 317), on Osiander (p. 364), some admirable ones on Bengel (p. 393), on the great Schleiermacher (p. 409), on Neander (p. 415), to which we should draw the attention of our readers. We will only conclude by saying that we entirely agree with his judgment as to the wide and deep and lasting influence of Coleridge (p. 422).

GENESIS AND SCIENCE.

THE cosmical hypothesis of Laplace is accepted and endorsed by the scientists of to-day as the most reasonable guess at the method of the evolution of the solar system in its earlier stages. Let us then take it as representing the latest word of Science on this subject, and as the present boundary of its pretensions to explain the insoluble problem of creation, and let us see how far it agrees with or contradicts the Scripture revelation.

(1.) Laplace's theory presupposes the existence of a diffused nebula, consisting of the cosmical elements or primordial materials of

worlds in the most attenuated gaseous condition. Does this contradict the Scripture statement that 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth:' i. e., as even the non-scientific St. Augustine understood it, the raw materials, as it were, of the heaven and the earth, the world-seed, or seminal fluid from which all its successive forms of existence were developed?

(2.) Laplace's theory then supposes that at some point of time a rotating motion was communicated to this cloud of primordial world-atoms, causing it to revolve round and gravitate towards a central nucleus more or less dense, and subsequently other smaller nuclei, which the revolving contracting mass left behind it at varying distances. Does this contradict Scripture statement that the earth was without form and void?

Let us first take this description as referring to the earth before it came a separate body. As we have seen from Professor Ball's explanation of Laplace's theory, the earth and the other planets were originally not solid bodies deeply buried in the vast bulk of the sun (originally constituting the whole nebula), but gaseous masses undistinguishable from the rest of the nebula. It would be quite correct then to speak of the earth (that is, the portion of elemental matter designed ultimately to form the earth) as being 'formless,' 'desolate,' 'lifeless,' 'empty'; by which terms, 'without form and void' may be interpreted, for it would have no definite shape, limits, or structure, and it would contain no other things than its own constituent atoms. Let us next take the Scripture statement as if it referred to the earliest stage of the earth's existence as a separate body, detached from the main mass of the gradually contracting nebula. Even then the accuracy of the Scriptural description equally agrees with Laplace's theory, according to which each planet, as it was broken, or thrown off and separated from the main mass of the nebula, was itself simply a ring, or miniature nebula, of the same elemental world-matter. In this condition, too, the same terms, 'desolate,' 'lifeless,' 'formless,' 'void,' would be an equally correct description of this detached portion of elemental matter in process of becoming our planet.

(3.) We next learn from the Scripture that the first condition of the earth was one of darkness, and this was succeeded by a condition of light. In verse 2 we read, 'And darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' Here it must first be noticed that the expressions, 'the deep' and 'the waters,' cannot refer to the sea and its waters, for we do not come to their formation until verse 7. The 'deep' and the 'waters' of verse 2 refer to a period and a stage of the world's history long antecedent to the earth's entering on a marine condition of existence. The 'deep' of verse 2 represents the mighty sea or cloud of cosmic matter, and the 'waters' are its gaseous, vaporous constituents. Now, does Laplace's theory contradict the statement of Scripture that darkness preceded light? On the contrary, it starts with supposing a nebulous mass of elemental world-matter to which, at some point of time, a rotating and gravitating motion was given. Now, one of