

statement of the ground covered by our author (pp. 709-843.) The external evidence, critically examined in accordance with the plan usually adopted, must, of necessity, be passed over with the remark that, in the reference to Clement of Rome, the parallel passage is not the one already quoted; and it further seems strange that Acts xx. 35 was not cited as proof that the writer, whether Luke or another, did not quote from Clement the phrase—'and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus,' which do occur as we have seen in the latter's Epistle, c. xiii. The passage here placed in juxtaposition to the text of the Acts is in entire concord with it, the only difference being that Clement uses the phrase in an exhortation, and the compiler of the Acts puts them as a maxim uttered by our Lord Himself. So far *Supernatural Religion* traverses the old ground; but henceforth we are bound to admit that he makes out a strong case regarding the Acts of the Apostles. It is admitted that the third Gospel and the Acts bear strong marks of a common origin; as our author says the 'linguistic and other peculiarities which distinguish the Gospel are equally prominent in the Acts.' The theory here advanced is that the book was written as a sort of Eirenicon with a view to reconciling the Jewish and Gentile sections of the Church. There is certainly much to enforce a theory of that sort. The balance is held evenly between Peter and Paul; where one Apostle is represented as performing a miracle, the other is stated elsewhere to have worked one of a similar description. All runs smoothly at the Council of Jerusalem. Peter, in the episode of Cornelius, acknowledges the reception of the Gentiles; Paul, in the way of compromise, goes so far as to circumcise Timothy, and so on. The most serious objection against the Acts is its distinct contradiction of St. Paul's narrative of the events which succeeded his conversion during a long series of years. Here the plain statements of Paul in an Epistle to the Galatians, the authenticity of which is beyond dispute, must outweigh those of the unknown author of the Acts, and they are directly contradictory in all essential particulars. The hostility between the 'pillar' Apostles, as St. Paul somewhat disdainfully calls them in his epistle, and himself, never ceased, so far as we can gather, during the lifetime of the first dis-

putants. Those who, as St. Paul says, 'seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me,' (Gal. ii. 6), 'who seemed to be pillars,' (v. 9), he distinctly mentions by name as James, Cephas (Peter) and John. Now if St. John wrote the Apocalypse, there is abundance of evidence that St. Paul's disregard of the Apostolic school at Jerusalem was returned with interest. To Ephesus it is written, 'I have tried those which say they are Apostles, and are not, and have found them liars;' and to the Church at Smyrna: 'But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, and to eat things sacrificed to idols' (iii. 14). It is contended that these attacks were aimed particularly at St. Paul by the Judaizing section of the Church. In the Clementine Homilies there is a similar assault against the Apostle of the Gentiles 'scarcely disguised.' He is there represented under the name of Simon Magus, and St. Peter follows him from city to city, 'for the purpose of denouncing and refuting his teaching.' Moreover he is not numbered with the Apostles in the Book of Revelations; they are still only twelve. We may add that our author enters into an elaborate comparison of the speeches placed in the mouths of Stephen, Peter and Paul in the Acts of the Apostles, and claims that they are of the same nature as those we find in Greek and Roman historians, i. e., efforts to reproduce what the writer supposed the speaker likely to say. Stress is particularly laid upon the dissimilarity in views and opinions between the St. Paul of the Acts, and the St. Paul of the Epistles.

The fifth part on the direct evidence for miracles deals with the Epistles and the Book of Revelations. Considerable space is devoted to Paul's treatment of the Charismata, or gifts of tongues, &c., but upon that branch of the subject, the reader must consult the work for himself. The rest of the volume (pp. 971-1079) examines fully all the evidence for the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus. There is nothing new in the exhibition of disagreements between the Gospel narratives; yet in *Supernatural Religion* it is made with conspicuous lucidity and acuteness. Yet, after all, the supreme fact that the reality of