

of our real tenets, too much misrepresentation understanding Majesty's subjects, and charity may ten bishops. No ore official. Sec. Catholic has that all articles of the Ca- y Almighty God." out the Infallibility ine be true, must or believing what ven about the In- stead, it is stated: f the Apostles and nely commissioned aw of Christ to all nd universal testi- Christian Churches of the Catholic is which he believes, aith, and all the he observes as the ally revealed and are the same as ist to His Apostles, nations. The Ca- method, which he are the revealed ight rule, and that h."

ter he joined the y the same manner: ds as possible, and Catholic holds that the Church from they were ever the ey are now; that las were publicly t on they were de- Theol. and Eccles.

cepted handbooks English speaking "The Faith of Our used for distribu- thought to be in- the writer declares to bring home the to our separated s issued Nov., 1876, 00 had been issued. Apostolicity of the

Apostolical. . . . church implies that teach the identical Apostles. . . . To dis- Christ among the ve have to enquire, le and entire those the Apostles; 2nd, k in an unbroken the Apostles. e teaches doctrines in original] identi- ers of the Gospel." hat "every Catholic more explicit state- h we should judge ce delivered to the

contained in the stolic, the Nicene, creed of Athanasius.

Though there may be words and phrases in those Creeds not actually found in Holy Scripture, every statement contained in them can be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture. Those who drew them up, or added definitions to them, did not add one single article to what had been believed from the very beginning. They only defined what had so been believed, with increasing definiteness and clearness, as the rise of errors showed that such explanations were necessary for the defence of what had always been believed.

But it is absolutely not true of what the Roman Church has added to these Creeds, and now teaches to be necessary to be believed for salvation, and which, therefore, her own authorities being the witness, are departures from the Catholic Faith.

REVIEWS.

AN OPEN LETTER to the Right Rev. William C. Doane (Bishop of Albany) in reference to the Consecration of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Brooks (Bishop of Massachusetts). By the Bishop of Springfield; pp. 148. Price 50 cents. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Co. Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison.

It is very important to have this record in reservation, because Dr. Brooks' consecration has caused no little uneasiness in the Church. The Bishop of Springfield details his own action with regard to the confirmation of the Bishop-elect, and discusses at length the reasons why such a person as Dr. Brooks, though eloquent and popular, should not be made a bishop. Subordinate matter and letters are given in fourteen articles forming an appendix. A little more time might have been judiciously used in compressing and dressing up the matter in both the work itself and the appendix.

THE CHURCH UNITY QUARTERLY. Vol. I., No. 1. Contents of this number: The Historic Episcopate. A contribution towards Church Unity by the Rt. Rev. G. F. Seymour, S.T.D., LL.D., Bishop of Springfield. New York: Church Publishing Society, Ltd. Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison.

If this number is a sample of what we may expect in future numbers, we give the venture the heartiest commendation. Bishop Seymour's essay fills the thirty-four pages, and it is earnest, compact and convincing. It is a patient working out of first principles, and there is not a superfluous word. It rests on the same basis as the Church Unity Society that really publishes it; it regards the historic episcopate as the only possible centre of unity, and the only fact that binds present and past, to the Scripture and to the only source of all authority and revelation. Unlike most of other treatises on the same subject, it makes little appeal to textual or patristic authority, but dwells rather on its necessity. It makes short work of the papacy, and deals at greater length with the notions of Protestantism. All through it is very satisfactory, and we have no doubt but the Quarterly will keep up to the mark.

GLORIA PATRI, OR OUR TALKS ABOUT THE TRINITY. By J. M. Whiton, Ph. D. 12 mo., pp. 162. Price \$1. New York: Thomas Whittaker. Toronto: Williamson & Co.

The style of this is novel and rather pleasing, being conversational without the distraction of names like Tom, Dick, and Harry. The language is pure and nervous, on a groundwork of good honest thinking. It is an attempt to reconcile Unitarianism and Trinitarianism, and we often feel as we read that the second speaker or pupil is just a little too easily pleased. The historical Christ is but one and the highest of a series [of Christ-like personations, and we are all sons of God, as He is, because the divine nature and the human are the same; if they are not the same, it is argued, then we have no assurance of the unity of moral and spiritual law. Jesus is the Christ, not because His nature is unique, but because He is the fullest embodiment of the Christ-like essen-

tial character, and gives the completest revelation of God. By his own form of interpretation the Unitarian becomes enamored with the Nicene creed, and the Homousion is his favorite word. The book will convince those who are willing, and in any case it is worthy of study as containing a carefully formulated phase of modern thought. Like all Whittaker's volumes, it is very handy and compact.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY PROFESSOR W. H. GREEN, D.D., LL.D., MODERATOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

From *The Independent* (Undenomin.), New York, Jan. 28, 1892.

Dr. Green is recognized as the leading conservative Bible critic of the United States, and his position as Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly entitles him to a wide hearing.

"For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"—John v. 44, 47.

No graver crisis has ever confronted the evangelical Churches of Christendom, than that which they are called to face at present; none which affects matters so fundamental, or the issues of which are so serious and so far reaching. Heretofore, the contests within the Church have concerned questions of doctrine or of policy, more or less momentous; but all parties recognized one supreme authority. The Word of God was the admitted standard by which all controversies were to be ultimately decided. But now the Word of God is itself brought into question, and the issue which is forced upon us is, Is the Bible what the Church has always believed it to be, and what we have always been taught to regard it? Or must the old view of the Bible be given up, and a new view be substituted for it, by which its authority and trustworthiness will be seriously impaired?

Attacks upon the genuineness and the truth of the books of the Bible, made by the enemies of the Bible, are no new thing. Nor is there anything novel in such attacks made in the name of Biblical Criticism by scholars, who have no faith in the supernatural. They cannot consistently do otherwise than discredit the books of Moses with the marvelous miracles which they record, and the accurately fulfilled prophecies which they contain. The only thing that is novel in the present situation is the acceptance of these critical conclusions by Christian scholars, who claim to be evangelical in their creed, and to be reverent students of the Word of God.

They admit the allegation that it has been demonstrated that several of the books of the Bible were not written by the persons to whom they have heretofore been attributed. But this, they affirm, need occasion no concern. It is really no damage to the Christian faith. Human authorship matters little in the books of Scripture. The only thing of consequence is divine authorship. Let the critics establish what they may, the heart of the matter is beyond their reach. The divine origin and authority of Scripture are not dependent upon their human authors, but upon God, whose Word it is.

Now we wish it distinctly understood at the outset that we do not object to the application of the most searching tests to the books of Scripture, and the most thorough scrutiny as to their real origin. Turn on the light from every possible quarter and ascertain the exact truth. If all antiquity has been in error and the Jewish people and the Christian Church through all the ages have been in error in believing that the Pentateuch was the production of Moses, let the truth be told though the heavens fall.

We think it capable of demonstration that Moses did write the Pentateuch, and that the objections by which the attempt has been made to set aside the faith of all past ages and to contravene the explicit testimony of our Lord in this matter, can be shown to be invalid. This, however, is not the point to which I ask your attention at this time. My object at present is to set before you the gravity of the question at issue. It is not so indifferent a matter as it has been represented to be, whether or no Moses wrote the Pentateuch. It is said that the contents of the first five books of the Bible remain the same, whoever wrote them and whenever they were written. It may still be the Word of God and equally command our faith, whether it was all written in the Mosaic age and by Moses himself, or was written by other inspired men in later ages.

But this reasoning leaves out of view the intimate connection between the genuineness of a production and its truth and authority. It is not accounted a matter of indifference in the affairs of ordinary life, whether a legal instrument, claiming to be authoritative, or commercial paper, purporting to present a given value, has proceeded from the proper authority, and whether the signature that it bears is genuine. If it is not from the source that it claims to be, and the signature attached to it is false, it is not worth the paper that it is written on.

Moses was a commissioned messenger of the Most High. His inspiration is attested by indubitable proofs. Our Lord and the inspired writers of the New Testament abundantly confirm the claim of the Pentateuch to be regarded as the Word of God, but in so doing, they uniformly attach to it the name of Moses; Moses says, Moses wrote, Moses taught, the law of Moses, etc. It is as God's Word through Moses, that they commend it to our faith. If you detach these books from Moses as their author, you thereby detach them likewise from the indorsement of our Lord and His Apostles. They bid us accept what Moses taught and what Moses commanded. If these are not the teachings of Moses, and these commands are not his, their sanction is withdrawn.

Much has been said of late about the absolute inerrancy of the original autographs of Scripture, as though the question at issue at present was one of minute accuracy in trivial and unessential matters, and this related only to hypothetical originals no longer in existence, and was a mere inference from a particular theory of the mode of inspiration. This is an utter misunderstanding of the real gravity of the case. The actual issue which is now before the evangelical Churches of Christendom is far more serious and far-reaching than this. It is vital and fundamental. It is a question of the historical truth and the divine authority of the Old Testament from beginning to end. Are its statements trustworthy? Can they be depended upon, not in minor and unessential matters, but in the great body of its contents? and has it any just claim to be regarded as really the Word of God? Its historical truth and its divine authority are closely linked, and must stand or fall together, not only because that which is untrue is thereby evidenced not to be from God, but because the Old Testament is professedly a record of God's revelation to His chosen people through a long series of ages. If the facts as therein set forth are true and real, it is beyond question an immediate divine revelation. If the alleged facts are fictitious the revelation itself is unreal.

The particular point to which I wish to direct your attention this evening is the bearing of the critical hypotheses respecting the Pentateuch upon its historical truth, and consequently upon its divine origin and authority.

If, according to the common and well-attested belief upon this subject, Moses is the author of these books which bear his name, their historic truth is placed beyond controversy. If Moses is the author of the narrative of those fearful plagues which broke the obstinacy of Pharaoh, and of the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, and of the majestic scenes attending the delivery of the Law at Sinai, and of the journeyings of Israel through the wilderness attended by so many manifestations of divine grace and power; and if he placed on record the legislation attributed to him and which he is said to have received directly from God Himself, then we have in this fact the highest possible voucher of the truth and certainty of the whole. It is the testimony of an eyewitness and a principal actor in the scenes recorded, of unimpeachable veracity; his record was made at a time when the events were fresh in the minds of the whole people; and his word is moreover confirmed by the mighty signs and wonders wrought by him, which are God's own attestation to its truth.

But we are told that we lose nothing by accepting the critical hypothesis, which denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and affirms it to be of composite origin; that this hypothesis is not discredited because unbelieving critics, such as Kuenen and Wellhausen, have used it to destroy the authority of the Pentateuch. In the hands of evangelical critics it is harmless. What evil can result from admitting that the Pentateuch is a compilation from four different inspired documents? Then instead of only one witness we have four separate witnesses to the history of the Mosaic period. These have been compared to the four Gospels, which supplement and corroborate each other and give a more complete and better attested life of Christ than could have been afforded by one alone. And it has even been alleged that we have in the Pentateuch a singular advantage beyond that which we possess in the Gospels. Uninspired men have undertaken to harmonize the Gospels, and to combine them into one continuous narrative. But there is much in even the best of these efforts which is open to question. Of different possible arrangements of the materials we cannot be certain in every case that the right one has been reached; whereas the Pentateuchal history is already compacted for us into one continuous narrative by one inspired redactor.

Such is the representation that has been made. Now let us look at the actual operation of this critical hypothesis, and that not in the hands of Kuenen and Wellhausen, but of those who call themselves evangelical critics. We shall leave out of view the more destructive speculations and inferences of the former, and confine ourselves to those consequences which are inseparable from the hypothesis, however