

revelation to scriptural revelation. Why should we go no further than the apostolical model? Other wants have arisen; other positions have presented themselves; an ecclesiastical and dogmatical development has been made; the deviations of the fathers were legitimate! The Church of Rome was perhaps legitimate also! It is thus that our resistance to the actual evil has been deadened; as soon as history has something to reveal, the authority of the scriptural revelation is in jeopardy.

With much to commend in this lecture, we would yet take exception to the statement that the Christian congregations of the first century were "all independent," recognizing no "central government." This is in manifest contradiction to a statement immediately preceding it, that they obeyed "one and all the directions and letters of the Apostles." It likewise contradicts the fact that the decisions of the Council at Jerusalem were received as sacred decrees by all the Churches. The Church constitution, it is true, had not then attained its normal development. Her work at that time was chiefly missionary. Many congregations would, as in every mission field, be necessarily isolated, and apparently independent. The historical error of Gasparin is that he accepts the inchoate as the complete form, and elevates the unorganised and scattered into the position of the organized and united family of God.

We must also take exception to his gloss of that passage of Scripture which says that the "elders which rule well are worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine." This he represents as an injunction of the Apostle "to give to some elders a double salary, because they are more specially required to teach and to direct." How the text can be made to bear such a sense passes our comprehension. Were the word "honor" to be understood as "salary," which we cannot but regard as a miserable conclusion; still were it so, then the text would mean that the *ruling elders* who ruled well should receive a "double salary," and that those who laboured in word and doctrine should have something more. We wonder that the Count did not see that by this gloss he was doing violence to the sacred text, for the integrity of which he is so stout an advocate. It is amusing to find him describe Clemens Romanus as one "occupying the position of an elder enjoying a *double salary* as teacher and director." These are the only serious blemishes which we find in the otherwise admirable lectures of Gasparin.

The lectures which follow in the volume are by Drs. Bungener and D'Aubigné, and are of so much interest that we shall defer their consideration till next month. In the meantime we would cordially recommend this volume to our readers. Its learning is most thorough and trustworthy, its piety is both pure and deep; its style possesses that lively naïveté for which the best French writers are celebrated. Clear and concise, these lectures are at the same time comprehensive and interesting, and will amply repay a careful perusal.

We have received from B. Dawson, Montreal, the third volume just issued of the "Spanish Conquest in America," by Arthur Helps. Messrs. Harper and Brothers have produced the New York reprint in their usual excellent style. The History is composed from the original sources of information, and will compare favourably even with the celebrated works of the American writer, Prescott. With the single exception of Lord Macaulay, there is not an historical writer in England master of a more attractive style than Mr. Helps. To say this is to say much, while such historians as Hallam, Grote, and Lord Stanhope (better known as Lord Mahon) survive.