

Rationalists, according to which the Saviour's death was only apparent—a state of trance or swoon. Another view confessed the reality of the death, but denied the resurrection as an outward fact, attributing it to visions experienced by the disciples. Schenkel has also recourse to the belief that the belief in the resurrection was the result of hallucination. The Church at Jerusalem, he thinks, regarded the fact that the grave of Jesus was found empty, as a miracle of Divine omnipotence, and supposed that “it had taken place by the help of angels. Hence the first tradition of an angelic appearance, which was supported by the utterances of deeply-excited women.” Renan espouses the “visionary theory.” He does not think that Christ, though he often spoke of resurrection and a new life, ever distinctly said that he would rise again in the flesh. Yet in another place he is constrained to admit that “several of the Master's words *might* be understood in the sense of his again issuing from the grave.” In reference to the patriarchs, Renan makes the singular remark that “the belief began to gain ground that even the patriarchs and other Old Testament worthies of the first rank had not really died, and that their bodies were alive in their graves at Hebron!” On which Dr. Christlieb remarks: “How does Renan know this? It is simply a piece of his lively oriental imagination which plays such an important part in his *Vie de Jésus*. Nor can Renan adduce a single authority for this wild assertion.” The French writer then proceeds, by the aid of this random invention, to connect the credulity of Mary Magdalene and the other women with the gradual growth of the resurrection myth. Strauss, of course, favours the visionary hypothesis, but his scheme is not quite so wild as Renan's. It has weak points of its own, however, and is demolished by our author without much difficulty. His first step is to marshal the historical testimonies and to submit them to a searching criticism, and then to take the various theories already enumerated, and expose the fallacies which they involve. Concluding his examination of Strauss, the author remarks:—“His explanatory attempts, as well as those of all other anti-miraculous critics, are entangled in an endless chain of enigmas and difficulties. Difficulties exegetical, for there is the clear testimony of St. Paul, and the distinction between visions and the narratives of our Lord's appearances. Difficulties psychological in the way of so many and so differently constituted persons having been simultaneously pre-disposed to see visions. Difficulties dogmatical, arising from the question, Whence should the idea of an isolated individual resurrection, hitherto foreign to their belief, arise in the minds of the disciples? Difficulties chronological: unanimous historical evidence points to “the third day” and this leaves no space for the gradual development of visions, or of the translocation of the first appearances to Galilee. Difficulties topographical: there, in a well-known spot, stands the empty tomb, with its loud question:—“Where is the body?” To which Dr. Christlieb adds finally, difficulties historical, such as the existence of the Christian Sunday, and difficulties moral—the entire regeneration of a world which proceeded from the preaching of the Apostles. “The critic,” he concludes, “is not yet born who could overcome all these obstacles.” It will be seen by the brief account we have given of the evidences of the Resurrection, as Dr. Christlieb has stated them, that he

has omitted no argument which possesses any logical force, and that his positions are enforced by a certain originality in their presentation we do not often meet in modern English treatises on Apologetics.

There are two other chapters of great interest to which we should like to refer briefly, because we think the author, contrary to his usual practice, has been led into a false position in his anxiety to render the evidence cumulative in character. We refer to the lectures on Theism and on Miracles. The first section of the former is devoted, for the most part, to the views of Deity presented in the Old Testament. The solution of anthropomorphic and other difficulties, the distinction between the Elohistic and the Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch borrowed by Bishop Colenso from German Rationalism, and the moral objections to the Old Testament theocracy are criticized at considerable length. Then comes the main purpose of the chapter, the development of the Trinitarian conception of the Divine Nature. The varied lights in which the theory is viewed are so many proofs of the author's extensive learning and polemical skill. It would be impossible to give here even an enumeration of the leading arguments employed by Dr. Christlieb. First, of course, the Scripture testimony of the Divinity of the Three Persons is expounded at considerable length—a distinction being clearly made between books of which the canonicity has been disputed and those which even Baur and Strauss admit to be authentic. In the course of this appeal to Holy Writ, the Arian, Sabellian, and kindred heresies are tested by the declarations of Scripture, and other objections to the Trinitarian view examined in order. We come now to the philosophical statement of the doctrine:—“The received dogmatic theology of the Church distinguishes between an essential (immanent Ontological) Trinity of persons in the Godhead, and an Economical Trinity, *i. e.* a three-fold manifestation or self-revelation of the God to us. The Church believes in and affirms both. But many in the present day, and amongst them not a few sincere believers in revelation, deny the scriptural authority of the former, while all receive and acknowledge the latter.” In other words, there is a tendency to believe that there are three successive phases of development (Sabellianism) instead of three contemporaneous distinctions of the Divine Nature, as the Scriptures teach. The remainder of the lecture is occupied by an examination of the collateral proofs such as the existence of the Trinitarian conception in heathen religions. In the words of Schelling:—“The philosophy of mythology proves that a Trinity of Divine Potentialities is the root from which have grown the religious ideas of all nations of any importance that are known to us.” Dr. Christlieb further contends that abstract Monotheism is utterly empty and lifeless, and leads, as it did with the Jews and Mohammedans, who denied that Christ was of the same Divine essence as the Father, to a cold and cheerless Deism. We cannot follow our author in the conclusions he draws upon this subject; to the English reader they will no doubt appear novel and original, and therefore their force will strike him perhaps with more effect than they intrinsically deserve. It appears to us, also, that Dr. Christlieb's position on the so-called Athanasian Creed is indefensible. It is not necessary to enter here into the metaphysical distinctions.