

than fatally, even in cases, I mean, in which the faith with all its hopes and all its requirements is not finally flung away, either a most timid and uncertain grasp of all revelation, or else the selection of a few scattered portions of it and the rejection (secret or avowed) of all the rest. These, when the general wreck is complete, have contrived to save out of it a few fragments and relics of the ruined vessel, like those *boards and broken pieces of the ship* of which we read in the description of an apostle's shipwreck, on which, amidst waves and storms and under the very darkness of a midnight sky, they seek, as it were, to *escape safe to land*. But, alas! it is a poor hope, in many cases, if the Scriptures say truly that in Christ and in Christ alone is there hope of salvation for fallen man. That which is saved out of the wreck, that on which the chance of escape and safety all depends, is too often little more than a Gospel without its Gospel, a creed which reason could have taught without revelation, and which is accepted just because it is reason and not revelation which warrants it and vouches for it."

NOTE (B), PAGE 10.

An objection may be urged against the assertion in the text, on the ground that Philip was still living, and that St. John rebuked Herod for simple adultery. It has been asserted that Josephus testifies that Philip died in the 20th year of Tiberius, about five years later than St. John's imprisonment. The Philip, however, of whom Josephus speaks, is Philip, tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis (St. Luke, iii. 1,) not Philip, the husband of Herodias. Thus there is no proof that Philip was still living, but there is also no proof that he was dead. What, then, is to determine the nature of the offence with which St. John charged Herod? We must appeal to the language of the Baptist himself. He accused Herod, not of adultery, but of incest. He did not say "It is written, Thou shalt not commit adultery," nor did he say, "It is not lawful for thee to have the wife of another," but, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy *brother's* wife." (St. Mark, vi. 18.) If Philip were dead at the time, (which, for aught we know, he was,) John forbid Herod to maintain his union with the widow of Philip. If Philip were still living, John urged against Herod the sin of incest rather than of adultery, probably because incest was a bar to the lawfulness of the union, which could never be removed; while the bar presented by adultery might be removed by the murder, or by the natural death, of Philip.

At all events, the words of the Baptist, addressed to Herod, unquestionably involve, if Philip were living, the charge of *incestuous* adultery; and though on the death of Philip the connexion would cease to be adulterous, it could not cease to be incestuous. Josephus (Ant., xvii. 15, 1,) tells us that Archelaus, "transgressing the institutions of his ancestors, married Glaphyra, who had been the wife of his brother Alexander, and had borne him children; it being a thing detestable to the Jews to marry their brothers' wives." In this instance there is no uncertainty whatever as to the circumstances under which the union was contracted, as Alexander was put to death by his father Herod the Great; and Archelaus married Glaphyra, after his father's decease, on his return from Rome as Ethnarch of Judæa. That which Josephus, then, so strongly denounced in the instance of Archelaus, St. John would, assuredly, have denounced no less strongly in the instance of his brother Herod.