

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE CANADIAN Methodist Review.

[NEW SERIES.]

VOL. VI.]

JULY-AUGUST, 1894.

[No. 4.

RELIGIOUS CERTAINTIES; OR, "THINGS WHICH ARE NOT SHAKEN."*

ALLUDING to the infant giant who is represented in mythology as strangling the serpents that were sent to kill him, Professor Huxley ventured, some years ago, to assert that "extinguished theologians lie about the cradle of every science as the strangled snakes beside that of Hercules."

In making this assertion, Mr. Huxley meant, of course, that every science has confuted some argument, or disproved some theory, or exploded some doctrine, once maintained by theologians; in short, that some school or some system of theology has been destroyed in part, if not in whole, by every branch of scientific study.

There are those, no doubt, who would resent this representation by retorting that, if critical inquiry has extinguished theological thinkers, it has extinguished scientific thinkers, too; and possibly the number of strangled scientists is equal to the number of strangled theologians. Let that be as it may. No practical purpose can be served by ridicule, retaliation or resentment.

In the opinion of all wise apologists, it is better, vastly better, to admit the force of what Prof. Huxley says, so far as what

* Reprinted by permission from the fourth series of Sunday Afternoon Addresses, delivered in Convocation Hall, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., during the Session of 1893-94.

he says is true, and then to learn the lesson that is taught; because it cannot be successfully denied that scientific investigation has not only modified old views of Scripture, but also revolutionized old methods of presenting and defending Scripture truth. Indeed, so marked and manifold have been the changes in each of these respects that, as a consequence, a widespread feeling of uneasiness has been produced throughout the Church of Christ.

Various causes have conspired to create anxiety in religion at the present time. In its technical application, science is not alone responsible for the unrest that prevails. Other agencies also have been operative. German rationalism, philosophic atheism, scientific scepticism and Biblical criticism have each, in its own way, affected Christian faith and undermined traditional belief. Besides these agitating causes, other influences still have been at work. The recent revision of the English Bible has unsettled some; the proposed alteration of the Westminster Confession has excited many; and the constant clamor and persistent opposition of incompetent critics against the proved results of Christian criticism have disturbed, if not distracted, more. The natural effect of all these influences has been to beget a spirit—an almost universal spirit—of disquietude and doubt.

Amid the prevalent disturbance of religious thought, the apparent wreck of doctrines and the seeming crash of creeds, bewildered minds, on every side, are asking in dismay, "If this has gone, and that has gone, what have we left?" "If this be given up, and that be given up, what will remain on which to rest our faith and build our hope?" "Is nothing settled, nothing established, nothing fixed?"

To answer these inquiries as clearly and concisely as practicable is the purpose of this address. The subject chosen is Religious Certainties. A text, suggesting it, occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the 12th chapter and the 27th verse. The words which express the thought are rendered in the New Revision, "Things which are not shaken."

Studying the text in its relation to the context, one may see that the writer of this epistle is here referring to the shaking

of the heavens and the earth, connected with the coming of the Messiah. Among other things, this shaking is supposed to include the removal of everything temporal and transitory, of everything typical and preparatory, of everything imperfect and incomplete. In contrast to the temporary character of all other kingdoms, the Messiah's kingdom, he asserts, is permanent. Pertaining to His kingdom, there are certain things which are unalterable and imperishable. What things are these? They are the eternal and immutable elements of Gospel; in other words, the verities, or vital truths, of the Christianity of Christ.

I. God. The first religious certainty, or Gospel verity, to begin with the most fundamental of all religious conceptions, is God. Faith in God is not only the opening article of the Apostles' Creed, but also the foundation-truth on which religion rests.

That is to say, belief in God is fundamental to any kind of religion, amongst any race of people, in any age of the world. All religious worship is based on this belief. Without some sort of faith in a Divine Being, man does not bend the knee, or bow the head, or lift the heart in prayer.

The doctrine of Deity, which has almost universally obtained, in some form or other, ever since primeval ages, has not been shaken by any discovery in science, or by any development of truth. On the contrary, transmitted from any prehistoric times, belief in God has become more deeply cherished and more firmly rooted in the heart of humanity, as the centuries have come and gone.

This fact admits of easy explanation. Theistic belief is due, in part, to man's sense of dependence upon a power that is higher than human; in part, to his need of assistance from One who is wiser than he; in part, to his desire for fellowship with a Spirit that is holier than his; in part, also, to his inability to explain his own being without assuming the existence of an infinite and eternal Being, who has life, and power, and wisdom and holiness in Himself.

Man must postulate God's existence in order to account for his own existence. Comparatively few believe—comparatively few have ever believed—that things have come by chance, much

less that they are ruled by fate. Most thinking minds maintain that reason, not chance or blind necessity, is at the centre of the world. In virtue of the constitution of human nature, the great majority of men are led to believe in the existence of a Power invisible and eternal to which they stand, and to which they feel that they stand, necessarily related.

Although the doctrine of Deity has been the subject of unbounded speculation and discussion for several thousand years, yet, instead of becoming more weak or more vague, the idea of God becomes more pure, more prevalent and more comprehensive as the march of intellect advances. In one form or another, belief in God prevails to-day more widely than at any previous period of history. The cold, blank atheism of fifty or a hundred years ago has well-nigh disappeared in all parts of the Christian world. The existence of an invisible Power, acting behind the visible phenomena of nature, and determining those phenomena, is now conceived by scientific thinkers of nearly every shade of thought.

Doubt and difference exist in reference to the name they call it, or the attributes they give it; but its existence is everywhere observed, and almost everywhere acknowledged, by mankind. The sceptical Herbert Spencer recognizes an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed; the unbelieving Huxley also recognizes an infinite and eternal force with similar capabilities; and the agnostic Matthew Arnold designates this force a something, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness. Mark the significance of these expressions. No power can be infinite but a spirit, and nothing does make for righteousness but a person.

On the admission, therefore, of each of these three representative teachers in the modern scientific school, the Gospel conception of God is essentially involved, though not actually expressed. God is a spirit, infinite and eternal, and eternal because He has infinity; God is a spirit, personal and righteous, and righteous because He possesses personality. All nature points to the existence and activity of a personal Deity who is also imminent and omnipresent.

The Gospel represents God as a Being who is spiritually

present throughout the universe, not as an infinite force, but as an infinite intelligence, possessing will and wisdom, freedom and holiness; a Being who consciously operates by His inherent divine energy on all His works, ruling in the realm of matter and overruling in the realm of mind; a Being who voluntarily manifests Himself to His rational creatures as a wise Creator, a beneficent Ruler, a loving Father and an impartial Judge, whose every manifestation of Himself is for the purpose of making them like Him; a Being, in short, who is supremely blessed, as well as absolutely righteous, and "who is seeking to make men sharers in His blessedness by making them sharers in His righteousness."

II. *Immortality.* The second religious certainty, or Gospel verity, is *Immortality*. Like belief in God, belief in immortality is a doctrine vital to a practical religious faith. It exercises an incalculable influence on the human heart, inspiring hope, begetting trust, producing piety and purity, as well as resignation and submission to the divine will.

The date in history at which the idea of future existence was first conceived is not definitely known. Neither can it be determined. If the conception has not belonged to religion from the very commencement of human worship, an improbable conjecture, it has, at least, in some form or other, been associated with religious belief from an exceedingly early age.

Everything indicates that the idea passed through several stages of development. To verify this statement, one has only to compare the views of the Egyptians, as well as of the Israelites, with those of the Apostles, respecting immortality. While the doctrine of future existence is germinally taught in the Old Testament, the teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures on the subject is extremely indefinite and obscure. The developed conception of the doctrine, not the doctrine itself, it must be borne in mind, was first given to the world by Christ. It was He, the Apostle tells us, who, in the language of the New Revision, "brought life and incorruption to light through the Gospel." That is to say, by means of the Gospel He illuminated, or shed light upon, the notion of a future life which had already prevailed for ages when He came.

As taught by our Lord, the doctrine does not simply imply a continued existence after death, such as that supposed by Buddhism, for example, which represents the soul as slipping from the body, and as being absorbed into the Infinite, like the dew drop into the shining sea; but it implies a personal conscious existence in a future state of being, the nature of which existence is determined by man's moral development, or by his spiritual attainment, in the present state.

The problem of the hereafter, and of all pertaining to the hereafter, is one that causes serious questioning on the part of thinking men. To some natures the doctrine of a personal conscious immortality appears incredible, if not impossible. To other natures, of which the writer is among the number, the continued personal life of the spirit after death seems as conceivable as it is Scriptural, and as possible as it is conceivable. Paul speaks of immortality as a mystery, and it is a mystery, a profound mystery; but it is a mystery the probability, if not the certainty, of which investigation rather establishes than undermines.

Brought to light, as already shown, by Christ through the Gospel, proclaimed by His Apostles to the members of the early Church, and published by their disciples ever since, throughout the world, the doctrine has not been disturbed by science, or by speculation, or by criticism. Notwithstanding all the changes of opinion that have taken place on almost every other subject, "the old belief of Christendom in the personal immortality of each human spirit" is unshaken.

The doctrine of immortality remains unshaken, partly because of the arguments by which its probability is suggested, and partly because of the authority on which its certainty is maintained. The chief authority—the only infallible authority—for the doctrine is our Lord. The principal arguments for immortality are too well known to be repeated in a brief discussion of this kind.

It may be worth observing, however, that of all the arguments available for immortality the most Scriptural, as well as the most satisfying to the reflective Christian, is that deducible from the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood. To him who

believes in God as the omnipotent Father of us all, belief in immortality appears to be a natural, if not a necessary, inference. The thought that man has been created in the moral image of his Maker helps one to realize that he who is the child of an immortal Being by creation may also be the heir of his immortality by inheritance.

However that may be, belief in personal immortality continues to be cherished, and will continue to be cherished, by some, on the ground of the convincing arguments in favor of it, and by others, on the ground of the divine authority on which the doctrine rests. These arguments have not been shaken. This authority has not been touched.

Thus the two fundamental objects of religious faith—namely, God and Immortality—remain unmoved. Not only do these two doctrines stand unshaken, but the necessary outcomes of them also are unshaken. The necessary outcome of the doctrine of God is the relation of the human spirit to the divine spirit, involving conscience and obligation, freedom and responsibility; the necessary outcome of the doctrine of immortality is the relation of the soul here to the soul hereafter, involving duty and destiny, reward and penalty.

In view of what has been stated, therefore, one need not hesitate to express, in the language of another, the unqualified conviction that "man's consciousness of his own personality, with its freedom and its responsibility; his belief in a Father Almighty; his hopes of a life to come; his recognition of a moral law and of the authority of an inward monitor will stand firm, whatever discoveries may be made of the evolution of life, of the relation of soul to body, of the nature of atoms and force, and of the conceptions of space and time."

III. Christ. The third religious certainty, or Gospel verity, is Christ. The two foregoing verities are the fundamental objects of faith in all religions; the present verity is the distinctive object of faith in the Christian religion. He is a religious man who believes in God and immortality, and acts accordingly; he is a Christian man who, in addition to the cherishing of this twofold belief, also cherishes belief in Christ, and lives in harmony with his faith.

In theological literature, it is customary to distinguish between the person of Christ and the work of Christ. Owing to the special doctrinal significance of that which is implied in each of these two terms, when used of Him, it seems expedient to discuss them separately, considering first His person, and secondly His work.

(a) The person of Christ. The word person, when employed in reference to Christ, is a technical term in theology, implying that there was something peculiar or unique about the character of our Lord. It means that His person was not merely unlike that of any ordinary man, but that it was distinct and different from that of any other being the world has seen. As His appearance among men was a phenomenon in history, it properly demands an exceptional explanation.

That a man called Jesus was born at Bethlehem, that He was nurtured at Nazareth, that He was educated at Capernaum, that He was resident in Judæa, that He was arrested in Jerusalem, that He was crucified on Calvary; in other words, that such a being lived and labored, taught and travelled, preached and prophesied, suffered and died, can be proved as positively as we can prove that Tacitus wrote, that Pontius Pilate governed, or that Julius Cæsar reigned. In the Gospel narratives, we have a record attested by competent eye-witnesses, and established by trustworthy evidence, that Jesus of Nazareth, the founder of Christianity, was a veritable historic personage.

In these narratives, moreover, there are recorded certain facts about His life and certain features of His work which have been authenticated by all the laws of evidence; facts and features which no science can disturb and which no criticism can disprove; facts and features which could be substantiated, it is claimed, from subsequent, if not from contemporaneous, history, even though the canonical writings were destroyed. These records present a picture of a figure so majestic, of a character so original, of a being so sublime, that His personality could never have been counterfeited. Even sceptical writers have admitted that, had the twelve disciples not associated with Him intimately in the manner described in the Gospel, the evangelists

could not have drawn such a figure, or portrayed such a character, or delineated such a life.

But this is not the point at issue when men speak of the agitation over the person of our Lord. The disputed point about His person is not its historic character, but its divine character. Everyone acknowledges an historic Christ, but everyone does not acknowledge a divine Christ, or a perfect Christ. The divinity of Christ is the prime question in dispute to-day. In this question, the main interest centres; around this question, the chief controversy rages; and on the settlement of this question, the future evangelical faith of Christendom depends.

In claiming that the person of Christ remains unshaken, this discussion means that the manifest teaching of the New Testament on the subject stands unchanged. It means that Jesus Christ was what He claimed to be, that He knew what He claimed to know, that He did what He claimed to do, living as never man lived, preaching as never man preached, teaching as never man taught, and doing the works which none other man did. It means more.

It means that Jesus was the Messiah of God, anointed of Him, commissioned from Him, and raised up by Him, to accomplish His purpose, to reveal His character and to manifest His love. It means more.

It means that He was "the effulgence of His (the Father's) glory and the very image of His substance," being the Son of God on the divine side, and the son of man on the human side, of His character. It means more.

It means that He was the Word that became flesh and tabernacled among men, and that "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," because "it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell."

(b) The work of Christ. The word work also is a technical term in theology, when employed in reference to Christ. By the work of Christ is meant all that pertains to His twofold mission of revelation and redemption, including His incarnation, His mediation, His crucifixion, His resurrection, His ascension, and His intercession.

In saying that the work of Christ remains unshaken, it must be understood that nothing has impaired the integrity of His work, as declared by Him in the Gospel. Nothing has impaired the revelation that He gave, the salvation that He offered, or the atonement that He made. It must be further understood that nothing vital or essential to His Gospel has been touched by criticism or by investigation.

To be more explicit, nothing has touched the truths He taught respecting sin and repentance, faith and pardon, redemption and salvation; nothing has touched the precepts He uttered respecting prayer and piety, reverence and worship, service and sacrifice; nothing has touched the principles He proclaimed respecting purity and progress, self-denial and cross-bearing, hope and trust, joy and peace; nothing has touched the duties He enjoined respecting meekness and gentleness, mercy and compassion, forgiveness and forbearance, holiness and righteousness, judgment and restitution, obedience and love; nothing has touched the doctrines He promulgated respecting conversion, regeneration and sanctification, responsibility, reward and penalty, the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the agency of the Spirit, and the immortality of the soul.

These features of the work of Christ remain as fixed and firm as they stood before the days of Biblical and historic criticism. Men may doubt them or deny them; they may reject them or refuse to accept them; but no essential feature has been weakened, much less explained away.

The religious certainties, or things which are not shaken, therefore, are God, Immortality and Christ—His person and work; that is, everything vital to Christ and Christianity.

The being of God and the immortality of the soul do not admit of demonstration. We can neither prove them nor disprove them. They are matters partly of argument, partly of evidence, and partly of authority. The person and work of Christ, however, may be proved—the one historically, the other experimentally. Everything vital to His person may be established by historic evidence; everything vital to His work may be verified by practical experience.

What, then, *has* been shaken? For that something has been shaken is a fact too patent or apparent to be questioned. The most superficial observer must have noticed it. What things have been *shaken*? In general, it may be answered the obsolete theologies have been shaken by the recent sciences. Dogmatism in opinion has been shaken; scholasticism in theology has been shaken; traditionalism in Biblical interpretation has been shaken. To speak more plainly or specifically, old views of Scripture, old theories of doctrine and old conceptions of truth have been shaken. A few examples under each of these three heads will illustrate what is meant.

Of old views of Scripture that have been shaken, the following may be given:—(1) The inerrancy and infallibility of the Bible; (2) The unity and integrity of some of its books; (3) The character and composition of their subject matter; (4) The date and authorship of the Pentateuch, of the Psalms, of Deutero-Isaiah and of other parts of Scripture.

Without discussing these views, it should be stated that, if the revelation of the Bible has not been given in the manner men have claimed, there can be no harm in reverently searching the Scriptures to ascertain their testimony on the question. The substance of divine truth is the important thing for us, not the form in which it may have been presented. As the author of all spiritual truth is God, and as the purpose of all inspired Scripture is to bear witness to the truth, the moral truths and spiritual principles of the Bible are inerrant, whatever may be shown to be the case respecting unimportant matters, or matters of detail. It should also be stated that infallibility is a term properly applicable to a person, not to a thing. There is only one infallible authority in religious doctrine; that is, Jesus the Christ. When speaking of the authority and trustworthiness of the Bible, therefore, we should apply the terms inerrancy and infallibility rather to the truth contained in the book than to the book itself. There may be errors in things unessential, but there is no error in essential truth.

Of old theories of doctrine that have been shaken, the following may be named:—(1) The age and origin of matter; (2) The antiquity and creation of man; (3) The origin and

transmission of sin; (4) The nature and degree of depravity; (5) The institution and significance of sacrifice; (6) The nature and extent of atonement; (7) The substitution of suffering; (8) The imputation of guilt.

Without discussing these theories, it should be noted that a theory is one thing, but that a fact is another thing. The one may be disproved; the other cannot be disturbed. In reference to all vital doctrine, the important matter is the acceptance of the fact indicated rather than the theory invented to explain it.

Of old conceptions of truth that have been shaken, the following may be mentioned:—(1) The mode and extent of inspiration; (2) The character and scope of revelation; (3) The import and interpretation of prophecy; (4) The purpose and importance of miracles; (5) The nature and duration of future punishment; (6) The re-collection and re-construction of the materials of the human body at the final consummation of all things.

Without discussing these conceptions, it should be observed that conceptions are simply the notions of men, while truth is the manifestation of God. Conceptions are changeable, but truth is unchangeable; conceptions die, but truth endures; conceptions pass away, but truth abides forever.

It may thus be seen that, though the view or form may change, the substance remains; though the theory may explode, the fact continues; though the conception may vanish, the truth abides. Nothing can destroy the substance; nothing can disprove the fact; nothing can disturb the truth. These are things which no science can shake, which no criticism can touch, and which no investigation can remove.

Whenever we read a discussion that is taking place, whenever we hear an agitation that is going on, whenever we see an excitement that is getting up, nay, whenever we behold the superstructure of old traditional teaching toppling and falling into ruin, we need not fear that the foundations of our faith are giving way. The inspired Scriptures are still the impregnable rock of divine truth. "The word of Christ is sure, and never can remove."

Nothing vital or essential to religion is imperilled by the critical study of the Scriptures. On the contrary, the great

central facts of the Christian faith are thus made to stand out more prominently in all the purity and simplicity that are in Christ. Since such a study of them merely removes the excrescences and misconceptions that have gathered about the Bible in the course of centuries, the truest friends of Christianity are beginning to acknowledge that, if anything pertaining to the Scriptures can be shaken, it should be shaken.

Neither science nor criticism has emasculated the Gospel, or shorn it of its saving strength. It is still the wisdom of God and the power of God. It is, as it has always been, the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. To those who receive its truths, it is a fountain of life; to those who practise its precepts, it is a wellspring of joy; to those who realize its principles in their hearts and lives, it is the earnest of heaven on earth.

Timid Christians, therefore, should feel reassured. Instead of doubting the integrity of the Gospel, they should trust; instead of fearing for its safety, they should hope; instead of opposing science or criticism, they should rather encourage the one with all their might and welcome the other with all their heart. Our modern Christianity is under large and lasting obligations to them both.

What has been said of science may be as truly said of criticism, for criticism has itself become a science. "The business of science is not to deprive the world of religion, but rather to make religion possible for all men, by removing the intellectual difficulties that have, in the past, more or less hindered its acceptance by enlightened minds."

Multitudes of students feel and confess that Biblical criticism has already made the Bible practically a new book. What Christian criticism has done, Christian criticism will continue to do. It will make the precious old Bible a blessed new book—new in the interest it awakens, new in the doctrine it teaches, new in the beauty it reveals, new in the authority it imposes and enforces, namely, the authority of established truth.

Criticism does not diminish, much less undermine, the true authority of the Scriptures. Its proved results are calculated not to unsettle, but to establish faith, not to disturb, but to promote peace, not to disquiet, but to produce rest. Criticism

simply removes those things which have obscured, if not concealed, the proper meaning of the Bible, and transfers its authority from the writings to the Spirit which inspired the writings, or from the book to the truth which the book contains.

No matter who asserts to the contrary, the authority of divine truth has not been shaken. As a recent religious writer has, in terms which all should note, correctly and emphatically said, "The divine authority of the written word is not only not undermined by Biblical criticism, but, read in the light of modern thought, all the beauty of the Bible and all its authority are intensified a hundredfold."

This discussion would be incomplete without a word of practical application. The possession of attested truth, like that of certified knowledge, imposes a twofold obligation. It places us under the responsibility, first, of receiving it; and, secondly, of proclaiming it.

In receiving the Gospel verities, we should prove our faith in God by being godlike, and our belief in immortality by living the eternal life, and our loyalty to Christ—the divinity of His person and the dignity of His work—by taking Him as our Teacher, by accepting Him as our Saviour, by following Him as our Exemplar, and by serving Him as our Master and Lord.

In proclaiming these verities, we should remember that the Gospel was not given for our advantage only. Its benefits are for all. If we possess its treasures, and are persuaded of their value, we are responsible for giving them to the world. Having been enriched and strengthened by them ourselves, we should enrich and strengthen others with them. We are further responsible for inspiring a spirit of confidence in others respecting the immutable and indestructible character of divine truth. To one and all, therefore, whether friend or foe, whether Christian, un-Christian, or anti-Christian, each one of us should say,

"Should all the forms that men devise,
Assault my faith with treacherous art,
I'd call them vanity and lies,
And bind the Gospel to my heart."

KOSMO-SABBATON; OR, THE SABBATH BEFORE MOSES AND AFTER CHRIST.

I.

THE Sabbath question is one of the most important questions of the day. It is felt to be such by all true Christians and earnest patriots, by all lovers of mankind. It is of vital moment to the family, the Church and the state. It is both a religious question and a social question. If we were always to remember this twofold character of it, much confusion of thought would be avoided.

It is a religious question, because the Sabbath is a divine institution; it finds a place in the moral law, is necessary to the preservation of a knowledge of God and to the maintenance of true religion. It is a social question, because the physical, intellectual and moral nature of man each requires the Sabbath, and will not grow and prosper without it. Without a Sabbath, man would soon become a physical wreck, an intellectual nonentity, a moral ruin.

As a social question, it comes within the province of civil law, and nations have as much right to enforce its observance as they have to enforce the observance of any other duty which is essential to the social welfare of the people. Sunday laws are no more an interference with our religious liberty than laws against intemperance and other vices.

Almost all Christians are united in observing the first day of each week as the Sabbath of the Lord. There are wide differences of opinion, however, as to the grounds of this observance. The Romanists, and some others, find its sanction only in the authority of the Church. Others base the duty on the example of the apostles and the early Christians. Others, again, see in the Sabbath merely the spontaneous expression of love and reverence for the great Founder of the Christian Church. And others argue that the Sabbath must be observed simply because expedient and salutary; while many regard the fourth commandment of the Decalogue as still in force, and consider that the essential features of the Sabbatic law are preserved in the Christian festival.

But there is a small yet growing body of Christians which has revived the Judaizing tendencies that disturbed the early Church, and caused so much trouble and annoyance to the apostles and their associates. By the Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists, the Saturday Sabbath of the Jews is held sacred, and the sanctity of Sunday is denied. These denominations, although small in numbers, are very active in the propagation of their tenets, and circulate their books and pamphlets upon the Sabbath question with untiring diligence. As a great part of their time seems to be devoted to this work, and their most strenuous endeavor is to set the Christian world right in regard to this one matter, it is not to be wondered at that they should exert an influence out of all proportion to their numbers.

This doctrine is called the Sabbatarian view, and its advocates reject all evidence outside of the Scriptures as unworthy of credence, or not proper to be cited in this discussion. And yet their theory would have much less to recommend it if it were not that they misrepresent the facts of ecclesiastical history. They confound the Christian Church of the first three centuries with the Papacy, thus admitting the absurd pretensions of the Roman hierarchy, and then affirm that the Sunday Sabbath was received by Protestantism from the Roman Catholic Church. They even circulate as a campaign pamphlet four editorials from a leading Roman Catholic journal, in which the Protestant Churches are bitterly attacked, and Luther is represented as having drawn his inspiration from the devil.

Against the teaching of the Sabbatarians the argument of this lecture will be directed. The whole question presents many inviting fields of inquiry; but to review this one field is as much as can be attempted in a single lecture. I shall endeavor to show that the Sabbath was instituted at the end of the Creation, and that the original Kosmo-Sabbaton was appointed to be observed upon the first day of the week. Then, I shall show how, in the time of Moses, the Sabbath law was re-enacted; and that the day was changed, for the Jews alone, from the first day to the seventh, as a sign of their

separation from all other nations. Further, I shall make it appear, I think, that the Sabbatic law was again enacted by our Saviour, "the Lord of the Sabbath," and the Kosmo-Sabbaton, which had lost among the nations its primitive significance, was restored to its ancient eminence, and clothed with a new lustre and majesty by its connection with the resurrection of our Lord, and was established forever by Christ and His apostles upon the first day instead of the seventh.

Genesis ii. 2, 3.—The first mention of the Sabbath in the Scriptures is in the record of events that transpired 2,500 years or more before the Exodus: "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

Any reader of these verses, whose mind is not preoccupied and prejudiced by some theory for which he seeks support, must regard them as descriptive of what actually occurred at that time immediately after the close of the Creation. That the Sabbath is not afterwards definitely referred to in the history of the ages before Moses does not prove that the Sabbath was unknown to the patriarchs. The history of all that period is a mere chronicle of important events, separated, many of them; by hundreds of years. If we follow the chronology of Archbishop Usher, the single book of Genesis contains the story of 2,300 years, and the first five chapters of it cover 1,500 of them. The omission of any allusion to the Sabbath in such a rapid outline can scarcely be regarded with surprise. There are indications, too, that the week, and the sacred character of the number seven, were known to the Hebrews long before the time of Moses, and no explanation of the origin of the week is satisfactory except that which connects it with the primitive Sabbath institution. It is not my purpose, however, to deal with this branch of the subject; and I shall assume that it is conceded by all that the Sabbath was revealed to Adam, and was God's first great gift to humanity.

It is not very clear that this first Scriptural reference to the

Sabbath connects it with any particular day in the septenary cycle. If it does, it is with the first day in man's first week. The record does not appear to require more than that one day in seven should be holy unto the Lord.

The argument from this record would be simplified, perhaps, if it could be conceded that the days of the Creation were literal days of twenty-four hours each. But few can be found at the present time that maintain this opinion. The testimony of the rocks is against it; the calculations of the astronomer are against it; and it has been shown, by those who are at least as zealous in the cause of Bible truth as in that of scientific truth, that there is no real conflict between the deductions of science and the Scriptural account of the Creation. It must be allowed that each of these first six days may have been thousands of years in duration; and therefore the seventh, in harmony with the narrative, must be indefinitely extended. And indeed the historian, while at the close of the sixth creative period he says, "And the evening and the morning were the sixth day," and so, too, at the close of each of the five preceding, makes no mention of the termination of the seventh day. And this omission is not without a sufficient and evident reason, for God's Sabbath has not yet reached its close. He ceased from the work of creation, and that work has never been resumed.

Our days are only a suggestion and a symbol of those creative days of God. Our week is but a shadow of His. But this conclusion does not disturb the foundation upon which the Sabbath institution rests. The essential thing in the record is not the length of the days, but their number and succession, and the hallowing of the same day in every series of seven as a Sabbath of rest.

If it be granted, however, that the creative days were literal days (which is the view generally taken by the advocates of the seventh-day Sabbath), the narrative is plainly against them. If God's Sabbath, at the end of the Creation, was a day of twenty-four hours, then it was the first day of man's existence, the first day from which human history was reckoned, the first day of man's first week.

Commenting upon the words "He had rested," in the third verse, a Sabbatarian writer says: "Then the blessing of God could not pertain to the first seventh day, as that was already past, and past time could not well be blessed. The blessing pronounced on the seventh day must, therefore, have been for *future* seventh days." ("Bible Readings," p. 36.) There is no force in this objection. In the Septuagint we read: "Because that in it he ceased from all his works;" and I suppose the Hebrew has the same meaning. It was at the end of the sixth day, which was the beginning of the seventh, or man's first day, that God ceased from all His works of creation; and the day that was blessed and sanctified by His resting upon it was the first day in human history, the archetype of all the Sabbaths.

But the objection noted does not affect the argument in the least. If the first day of Adam's life was not a Sabbath, the eighth was, according to the admission of the writer quoted. That eighth day after the Creation, to which he assigns the first Sabbath observed by man, was the first day in the second week of Adam's life, and, therefore, of human history.

A recent eminent writer upon the subject endorses this view. "It is at least unprovable and improbable that the original Sabbath was Saturday. . . . There is strong evidence that the primitive Holy Day was the first day of the week." (Crafts' "Sabbath for Man," p. 375.)

The Day of the Sun.—Among the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Chinese, and other ancient peoples, weekly sacred days were observed; and in general these festivals were celebrated upon the first day of the week, in honor of the Sun, at first probably the chief symbol of the glory of God, but afterwards regarded as the chief among the gods. As these nations must have derived their knowledge of the week, and their weekly festivals, from the original Sabbath tradition, their regarding the first day rather than the seventh as sacred furnishes collateral evidence that the primitive Sabbath was appointed to be observed upon the first day of the week.

The Day Changed.—As the Sabbaths of the nations all about the Jews were upon the same day as theirs, the first day of the

week, since all had received their Sabbaths from a common source; when God would create a safeguard against the intermingling of their worship, He appointed another Sabbath-day for the children of Israel. The Hebrew Sabbath was set back one day, from the first to the seventh. This seems to be made very plain by the narrative in Exodus xvi. 1-30.

"On the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt," which was the seventh day before the Sabbath-day on which they were commanded to abide "every man in his place," the Israelites performed a long and wearisome journey between Elim and the wilderness of Sin, the privations of which brought their discontent to a climax, so that they murmured against Moses and Aaron, and looked back with regret to the flesh-pots of Egypt. Johnston, quoted by Crafts, says: "It would have been a strange introduction to a series of Sabbaths of strict rest when no man was to move out of camp, either to gather manna or sticks to cook it, if the cloudy pillar had led the whole host on the previous Sabbath a toilsome march from the wells and palms of Elim into an arid region, without any apparent reason of necessity or mercy to justify such toil." (P. 55.)

The miracle of the manna, then, must have begun upon the ante-exodian Sabbath. The labor involved in the gathering of one day's supply of manna would be as nothing compared with the exhausting experience of the preceding day. Nor is it to be supposed that the idea of absolute cessation from work was so intimately connected with the Sabbath observance at that time as afterwards. This seems to be implied in the exceptional emphasis put upon the rest-feature of Sabbath-keeping in the Decalogue and by Moses. And yet it is impossible for us to believe that God would have led His people on a most difficult journey of twenty-five or thirty miles upon the Sabbath-day.

The view here advocated seems to explain satisfactorily the surprise of "the rulers of the congregation" when the people gathered a double quantity of manna upon the sixth day, the second day before the expected Sabbath, nor would their surprise be diminished by the fact that the manna had already been given upon the Sabbath which they had been accustomed to observe.

With this view, and with no other view so well, the reply of Moses agrees: "This is that which the Lord had said, To-morrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord," or, as it reads in the Revision, "To-morrow is a solemn rest, a Holy Sabbath unto the Lord."

From this time forward in the history of the Hebrews, their Sabbath, fixed upon the seventh day, was to be a sign and security of their separation from the surrounding nations, until, when the purpose of their independent existence should have been fulfilled, it might be made coincident again with the Kosmo-Sabbaton, or Sabbath of the world.

The Fourth Commandment.—The Sabbath of the fourth commandment, however, is not the Jewish one; it embraces the Jewish Sabbath, but it embraces more. The Decalogue is a cosmical code, and it contains the cosmical Sabbath. No reference to the day of Sabbath observance can be found in the fourth commandment. It requires that we shall remember the Sabbath to keep it holy, to do no work in it, because the Lord blessed and hallowed it; and that, because God made heaven and earth and all things in six undetermined periods, and then ceased from His creative labors, and has not yet resumed them, one day after every six days of labor is to be devoted by us to rest and worship, one-seventh of our time is to be sanctified to the Lord. This is all that a fair interpretation can deduce from the commandment, and it is to be expected that in a law intended for all men and for all time the temporary and changeable features of the Sabbath institution should not be found. These have been indicated in other ways as necessity required.

Watson, in his "Institutes," says: "It is not probable that the original law expresses more than that a seventh day, or one day in seven, the seventh day after six days of labor, should be thus appropriated, from whatever point the enumeration might set out or the hebdomadal cycle begin." (V. 4, p. 235.)

The Christian, then, who sabbatizes Sunday—or even the Mussulman, who sabbatizes Friday—is as faithful an observer of the original Sabbath law as the Hebrew, who sabbatizes

Saturday, if we have no other means of ascertaining the proper day of observance than the fourth commandment. If Christ had risen upon Tuesday, instead of Sunday, and His inspired apostles had, by His direction, transferred the Sabbath to the third day of the week, it would have been no violation, not even an alteration, of the Sinaitic law.

Probability of a Second Change.—I have shown that there are strong reasons for believing that the Sabbath, until the time of Moses, was observed upon the first day of the week. I have shown, also, that a change of the day to the seventh seems to have taken place shortly after the children of Israel left Egypt, to be a sign and guarantee of their separation from the other nations. This change was only temporary in its intention. When Christ came, the isolation of the Jews was no longer necessary; its purpose was fulfilled. The spiritual Israel was now to fill the world. What more probable, then, than that a return should now be made to the Kosmo-Sabbaton announced to Adam, the progenitor of all the nations of the world.

Then the narrow and absurd restrictions, the many petty regulations superimposed upon the Sabbatic command by Pharisaic interpretation and tradition, had made void the law, had reduced the Sabbath to a caricature of the original institution. It was scarcely to be recognized as the Sabbath of Moses, or even of the prophets. From "The Sabbath for Man" (Crafts), I select a few instances of the solemn hair-splitting indulged in by the Jewish doctors: "One might not walk upon the grass, because it would be bruised, which would be a kind of threshing; nor catch a flea, which would be a kind of hunting; nor, if he fed his chickens, suffer any corn to lie upon the ground, lest a kernel should germinate, which would be a kind of sowing; nor wear false teeth, because they would be a burden; nor leave a radish in the salt, for that would be making a pickle; nor pick fruit; nor pluck a blade of grass; nor cut the nails or the hair; nor take a shower-bath; nor set a bone; nor give an emetic; nor do anything which might seem like work. . . . If a laying hen should lay an egg on the Sabbath, it could not be eaten on that day; but

if the hen had been kept for fattening, and not for laying, the egg might be eaten. . . . If a wall should fall down on the Sabbath, and bury a man, it was lawful to clear it away enough to discover whether the man was alive, but, if dead, the body could not be removed." One sect of the Jews understood so strictly the command of Moses, "Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day," that in whatsoever place sunset on Friday found them, they did not dare to leave it until the Sabbath was over. In the same spirit thousands of the Jews, in the time of the Maccabees, suffered themselves to be massacred where they stood rather than move to the attack of their enemies or flee from them upon the Sabbath.

But, so long as everything which might look like work was avoided, the Jews were not very particular how the Sabbath was spent. In the intervals between the synagogue and temple services, social visiting, games and feasting, jesting and mirth, were in order. Well says the writer from whom I have just quoted: "the Pharisaic Sabbath is no more the Bible Sabbath than Romanism is New Testament Christianity."

As early as the times of Isaiah, God upbraided the Jews for the way in which they had diverted His Sabbaths from their wise and benevolent purpose. So changed from their original purity, they were no longer *His* Sabbaths, but *theirs*. "Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them." (Isa. i. 13, 14.) The words of the Lord, by the mouth of Hosea, may be prophetic of the change which was made at the resurrection of our Saviour: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." (Hos. ii. 11.)

Christ and the Sabbath.—Our Saviour did not repeal the Sabbath law, but His announcement that "the Sabbath was made for man," and His claim of sovereignty over it, seem to have been intended as a forewarning of some impending change. His attitude throughout His ministry on earth was

one of reverence for the purposes to which the Sabbath, rightly understood, was consecrated, rather than of an uncompromising attachment to the day itself. He offended the prejudices of the Pharisees, and was regarded by them as a Sabbath-breaker; yet the record does not show that He ever did anything, or even countenanced any action, upon the Sabbath, which was not a work of necessity or mercy. His works of healing He justified upon the ground that "it is lawful to do well upon the Sabbath days." (Matt. xii. 12.)

On one occasion, as Jesus and His disciples were passing through a cornfield, His disciples, who were hungry, "began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat." Meyer says on this incident: "Anyone was allowed to pluck ears of corn in another man's field till he was satisfied. It is customary and allowable even at the present day. But, according to Ex. xvi. 22-30, it might seem as if it were unlawful on the Sabbath, and it appears from tradition that it was actually so regarded." Certainly, when to pluck even a blade of grass was unlawful. The Pharisees remonstrated with our Lord as to the conduct of His disciples, and He justified them and rebuked the Pharisees for their blind punctiliousness by appealing to the example of David, when he entered the house of Ahimelech, at Nob, with whom the tabernacle then was, and, with his companions, ate of the shewbread, which was reserved only for the priests (1 Sam. xxi. 6); then to the labors of the priests upon the Sabbath, in slaying and offering the sacrifices and performing the services of the Temple; then to the words of God by the prophet Hosea, "For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings;" then to His own authority as "greater than the temple" and "Lord of the Sabbath-day." Thus He taught them that the law of the Sabbath must yield to the law of necessity, as in the case of David and of the disciples; to a particular law of equal authority, as in the case of the priestly labors; to the law of mercy, as in the miracle of healing which He afterwards performed; or to the supreme will of the Lawgiver himself. As Lord of the Sabbath, "greater than the Temple," He claimed the authority to deal with the Sabbath institution as

the welfare of mankind and the interests of His kingdom might demand.

If it was the custom of our Saviour to enter into the Jewish synagogue on the Sabbath-days and teach the people, this only proves that, in order to give the widest possible publicity to His message, He took advantage, as did Paul and the other apostles afterwards, of those occasions when the Jews were assembled in considerable numbers. It proves nothing either for or against the probability of any change which He might make at a later date, or instruct His apostles to make, in the Sabbath observance.

The Resurrection-Day.—On the day that our Saviour lay in Joseph of Arimathea's tomb, the Jewish Saturday Sabbath was buried beyond all hope of resuscitation. It was to remain as a sign only throughout the generations of the Jews, and the thrice fourteen generations from Abraham, given in the evangelist Matthew's table, ended in Christ. (Matt. i. 17.) If the words of Christ by which the change was announced to His disciples have not come down to us, the legislative act is upon record, and established by a chain of evidence that cannot be broken. Our Lord's resurrection upon the first day of the week changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday.

The Christian's heart asks for no words to confirm the decisive act. No words could shape themselves into such convincing eloquence as the bare fact of His resurrection upon the first day of the week. Why did He not rise upon the Jewish Sabbath? Why did He freight the Saturday Sabbath with sad and bitter memories of that day when the hatred of His enemies seemed to be victorious, and His disciples hid themselves in sorrow and despair? Why, if not to consecrate a new Sabbath for a new world? By His resurrection He declared the first day of the week to be henceforth the Queen among the days, a perpetual weekly memorial to the Christian world of the new creation: "Behold, I make all things new." He gave us a new commandment, which did not abrogate, but spiritualized and magnified the old; He clothed us with the new man, which did not destroy, but restored and ennobled our fallen manhood; He gave us a new and living way into the

holiest, and yet a way which was long taught in the type and promise; He gave us a new circumcision, which we call baptism; He gave us a new passover, which we call the Lord's Supper; and He gave us a new Sabbath, which we call the Lord's Day. "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."

The Lord's resurrection to the first Christians was the keystone of the Christian arch, the corner-stone of the Christian temple, the all-illuminating sun of their firmament; it is impossible to conceive that the commemoration of it was relegated to an annual festival. Easter was an afterthought. Every Lord's Day was a Sabbath memorial of the Resurrection. So strong was the attachment of the early Christians to the first-day weekly festival that they well deserved the title which Paul applied, perhaps in another sense, to the Church of the Thessalonians, "the children of the Day." (1 Thess. v. 5.) Could they who lived in the nearer light of that glorious day subordinate it to the Jewish Sabbath? make it secondary even to the memorial of the first creation, if the two were in conflict? To the Christian, the resurrection of Christ *is the creation*; he does not look beyond it. It brings order out of all his chaos, light into all his darkness, and peoples his world with unnumbered aspirations and inspirations. Read the writings of the apostles, and see what they thought of the Resurrection! Read the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians; and see what Paul thought of it! "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." Read the writings of the apostolic fathers, and see how they exalt the Day of the Resurrection, the first day of the week, above every other day, and especially above the Jewish Sabbath! That Christ rose from the dead on Sunday rather than Saturday went far with them, and it ought to go far with Christians now, in establishing the obligation to give that day the pre-eminence over all the other days of the week.

Upham, N.B.

M. R. KNIGHT.

THE GUIDANCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

III.

THE GUIDANCE OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE

CAME short of that claimed in this theory. An examination of several incidents will show this:—

1. As to the general membership of the Church. (Acts ix. 26.) Did the Spirit teach the whole Church directly all needed truth in the absolute sense? Scarcely. It became necessary for Barnabas to stand sponsor for Saul, and he brought him to the apostles and told his story before he was received. Also (Acts xi. 2), after Peter had received Cornelius, and came up to Jerusalem. Did these of the circumcision, who certainly had received the Spirit, have the guidance into all truth thereby? Not so. Peter had to expound and rehearse the whole matter with the convincing argument of fact before they would believe him guiltless.

2. As to the apostles themselves. (Acts xv. 37.) Now, if there was guidance for everything and every occasion, where is the manifestation? It will not do to impeach the genuineness of the religion of either Barnabas or Saul. In a peculiar degree, they possessed the enduement of the Holy Spirit. Nor will it do to charge the contention on the Holy Spirit that He led them to disagree; that would be a simple libel. If the degree of guidance claimed now to be available were so, surely they ought to have known of it, yet they seem not to have heard of it. Each formed his own judgment of what was wisest and most for the glory of God, and was therein true to his own nature and characteristics. Each was led by the Spirit in his intention and conscience, and stood by what he believed right. Neither Paul nor Barnabas asserted that the Spirit was responsible for guiding him to what was correct absolutely. It was simply a case of the exercise of godly judgment, where each was equally free to draw his conclusions as to what course was best. And (Acts xxiii. 1-5), when Paul was arraigned for judgment before the council at Jerusalem, as described in this chapter. Was this a case of being guided? Paul was evidently conscious of having made a mistake and having unwittingly:

violated an important precept. The language implying apology cannot be interpreted to mean, that for that action, the Spirit had any responsibility.

Paul declares also, "Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I, Paul, once and again, but Satan hindered us." Was this thwarting of Paul's purpose "once and again" a case of guidance? If so, it was rather a misnomer to charge the results to "Satan hindering."

"For, though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent." He wrote his reproving letter; it aimed at glorifying God in the correction of sin. He had no consciousness of absolute guidance, and, when the results seemed likely to be unfavorable, he says, "I did repent." Afterwards the results were more favorable, and, reasonably enough, he concludes, "I do not repent." The incident shows the play of mind in drawing conclusions which vary as the data of knowledge vary, showing that the guidance is not of knowledge, but of intention. In I Corinthians vii. the apostle, in answer to a letter of inquiry from the Corinthian Church to him, discusses numerous phases of the marriage relations of the Christians of that time and place. Now, without entering into the subject-matter of the discourse, there are some expressions which throw considerable light on the degree of guidance given to the apostles in ordinary affairs. Verse 6, "But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment," which Barnes paraphrases thus, "I am allowed to say this; I have no express command on the subject; I give it as my opinion; I do not speak it directly under the influence of divine inspiration." In verse 10, "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord." Verse 12, "But to the rest speak I, not the Lord." Verse 25, "Now, concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord; yet I give my judgment as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." Now here, it will be observed, are varying degrees of authority in the counsel. There is the distinct and positive guidance of the Spirit, "Yet not I, but the Lord." There is the permission of the Spirit opposed to that which is expressly enjoined. Then there are the two express disclaimers of any divine guidance or authority

for his utterances, "Speak I, not the Lord," and "I have no commandment, but I give my judgment." In verse 40 another shade is introduced, "But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment, and I think also that I have the Spirit of God." Barnes says, "The word *δωκω*, translated 'I think,' does not usually express absolute certainty. It implies a doubt, though there may be a strong persuasion, or conviction, or the best judgment which the mind can form in the case."

A godly man, with large experience and observation, and keen discernment of what prudence would dictate, gives his counsel. The force of the counsel lies not in the divine guidance or inspiration, but in his having been faithful. It is perfectly clear that he does not claim guidance on matters not vital to the Christian economy or system of doctrine or practice. In accord with these statements is the following, quoted from Dr. William Cooke's *Theology on the theme of Inspiration* :—

"Another small class of exceptions exists in those instances where a sacred writer tells us that he speaks not by divine authority, and distinguishes his own *personal* judgments from the commandments of God. For example: When the apostle, having no inspired direction to give in reply to certain prudential questions, simply gives his own views as a private Christian, stating, 'But this I speak by permission, and not of commandment.' 'But to the rest speak I, not the Lord.' 'Now, concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord; yet I give my judgment as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.' From these instances, we see that so fully are the Holy Scriptures a copy of the mind of God, a tablet inscribed by His Holy Spirit, that the sacred penmen themselves have not ventured to blend their own views, or mix up their own statements, without giving special notice of the fact, thus evidently implying that in *all* cases where this distinction is not observed their injunctions and teachings are expressly by the authority of God."

Again, in reference to the contribution for the poor saints at Jerusalem. (2 Cor. viii. 8.) A specific divine command or guidance is not alleged for this call. The call is the outcome

of the spontaneous generosity of others, acting as a suggestion and so leading the apostle to this counsel. The action of the Church in Macædonia starts a train of thought, the conclusion of which, by simple process of godly judgment, is that Corinth ought to contribute. It is a case of judgment, not of immediate guidance by the Spirit. And in 2 Cor. xi. 16. For his utterance in this connection he assumes entire responsibility. It "is not spoken after the Lord." It is "foolish boasting," which would be a strange characterization to give to an utterance guided by the Spirit. Against other human boastings he sets his own legitimate boastings as a prudential means of, at least, securing equal if not superior consideration on human grounds.

In Romans xiv. there are counsels given about matters indifferent, and concerning which there is perfect liberty of action accorded. Now, if the true conception be that men are not only constantly guided by the Spirit as to the intention (the moral and spiritual quality of their acts), but quite as much as to the prudential side (as to what is good and what bad in that respect), that the Word of God proclaims liberty seems very strange. The Spirit did not guide the apostles as to what was correct and what not, absolutely, but left it all undecided.

"One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself; but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean." "All things indeed are pure, but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence." "For one believeth he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs."

The Spirit did not guide the individual in taking either one side or the other. Which side was to be taken was a matter of judgment and of faith. Where that judgment believed that some perfectly harmless thing was unclean, or in the superiority of one day over others quite equal in importance, and acted conscientiously in the matter, "God hath received him," and he was "led of the Spirit," not in the sense of being guided to the absolute best line of action, but to the avoidance of what he deemed to be sin.

Other illustrations might be given, but these will suffice to show that neither the Apostolic Christian Church nor the apostles themselves received, or claimed, such complete guidance in all the details of life—the trivial, the indifferent and the secular, as well as the sacred, the spiritual and the important, as is now claimed by the advocates of this extreme theory of guidance by the Spirit.

THE HISTORICAL AFFINITIES OF THE DOCTRINE.

This doctrine now promulgated as the product of and brought forth from a *terra incognita*, when examined closely in the light of Church history, is seen to bear the mould and dust of the ages upon it, and to come to us clothed in the odors of the sepulchres from which it has been resurrected.

The heresy of Montanism arose about 150 A.D. The fundamental idea of it was that divine revelation was gradually and increasingly developed. The Bible was not a completed revelation of the divine character and will, but needed continued supplementation, as the progress and development did not reach its climax in Christ and the apostles. Montanism has been handed down to our day through Romanism, as their doctrine of a continued revelation by the Spirit became one of the pillars on which the Romish Church rested its claim to infallibility, both as to teaching and authority. If it could claim to be following the voice of the Holy Ghost speaking through certain bishops or priests, it could not be of so great consequence if the Bible were withheld from the people. Kurtz declares that, "If Montanism had universally prevailed, Christianity would speedily have degenerated into mere enthusiasm, and, as such, run its course." It is needless to point out how closely linked in principle is this doctrine of supplementary guidance with Montanism.

Towards the close of the twelfth century a pantheistic movement commenced in France and found expression in the so-called Sect of the Holy Spirit. The party originated with Amalric, a teacher of Paris. Mosheim speaks of his doctrine "as a chimerical system of fanatical devotion, which pretended to demonstrate the possibility of incorporating or translating

the human nature into the divine, and rejected all kinds of external worship as insignificant and useless." Our pantheistic tendency, in this theory, incorporates the divine into the human.

Closely following this came the proclamation of the advent of the age of the Holy Ghost, when, according to Kurtz, "All positive religion and every form of outward worship should cease, and God become all in all. As formerly, in Christ, so now, in every believer, did God become incarnate; and on this ground the Christian was God in the same sense in which Christ had been."

In the eleventh century, in Germany, there came to be known a sect of "Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit." In the thirteenth century, they had greatly spread. "They," according to Mosheim, "took their denomination from Rom. viii. 2 and 14: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." They maintained that the true children of God were invested with "the privilege of a full and perfect freedom from the jurisdiction of the law." "They rejected with horror every kind of industry and labor as an obstacle to divine contemplation and to the ascent of the soul towards the Father of Spirits." "Their system of mystic theology carried a striking resemblance to the impious doctrines of the Pantheists." "They held," among other things, "that every man, by the power of contemplation and by calling off his mind from sensible and terrestrial objects, might be united to the Deity in an ineffable manner, and become one with the Source and Parent of all things; and that they who, by long and assiduous meditation, had plunged themselves, as it were, into the abyss of the Divinity, acquired thereby a most glorious and sublime liberty, and were not only delivered from the violence of sinful lusts, but even from the common instincts of nature." "They drew this impious conclusion, that the person who had ascended to God in this manner, and was absorbed by contemplation in the abyss of Deity, became thus a part of the Godhead, commenced God, was the Son of God in the same sense and manner that Christ was, and was thereby raised to a glorious inde-

pendence and freed from the obligation of all laws, human and divine. Hence they treated with contempt the ordinances of religion and every external act of religious worship as of no sort of use to the perfect man." Among them were three classes of persons, the first consisting of persons of eminent probity, who extended the *liberty of the Spirit* no farther than to an exemption from the duties of external worship and an immunity from the laws of the Church. The whole of religion was placed by this class of men in internal devotion, and treated all rules and rites as beneath the attention of the perfect. The second class of these fanatics, by their extravagant defiance of decency, opened a door to the most licentious manners. A third class, pushing the theory farther, surpassed in fanatical impiety both the others, "apologized for all kinds of wickedness, and audaciously maintained that the *divine man*, or the believer who was intimately united to God, could not sin, let his conduct be ever so horrible and atrocious." "Some fell into the notion, infinitely injurious," says Mosheim, "to the Supreme Being, and maintained that the propensities and passions that arose in the soul of the *divine man*, after His union with the Deity, were the propensities and affections of God himself, and were, therefore, notwithstanding their apparent deformity and opposition to the law, holy and good, seeing that the supreme being is infinitely exalted above all law and all obligation."

This fanatical sect reappeared at various times and places during the next two or three centuries, and almost invariably in connection with some indecent tenets and practices which cast deserved reproach upon them.

In 1411 a sect appeared in Flanders, especially in Brussels, whose members distinguished themselves by the suggestive title of *Men of Understanding*. They pretended to be honored with celestial visions, with extraordinary measures of divine illumination, declaring the approach of a new revelation from heaven more complete and perfect than the Gospel of Christ, which was to be a new dispensation of grace and spiritual liberty through the Holy Ghost, along with other strongly pantheistic elements. Mosheim declares "that this sect seems

to have been a branch of that of the *Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit.*"

Time would fail us to trace out affinities in the modern religious life and world. One instance alone must suffice. Christian science adopts as one of its leading tenets the following:—"The Holy Ghost is Christian science guiding into all truth."

Let us examine how this extreme doctrine of guidance fits in with Methodist history and doctrinal standards:—

1: Among the rules originally devised by Wesley was this one: "Instructing, reproving, exhorting all they have any intercourse with; trampling under foot that enthusiastic doctrine of devils that 'We are not to do good unless our heart be free to it.'" It still holds its place. It has a history that makes it a valued comment on this doctrine.

For two years nearly the Wesleys labored in conjunction with the Moravians. In London, those who were awakened by their means were for the most part united to the Moravian societies. But at the close of the year 1739 Wesley's attention was called to the teachings of certain new arrivals from Germany. Among other mischievous tenets advanced, they affirmed that when a man believes he is not bound or obliged to do anything commanded in the New Testament—in particular, that he is not subject to ordinances—that is (as they explained it); is not bound or obliged to pray, to communicate, to read or hear the Scriptures; but may or may not use any of these things (being in no bondage) according as he finds his heart free to it. They further affirmed that a believer cannot use any of these as a means of grace; and that an unbeliever, or one who has not a clean heart, ought not to use them at all, ought not to pray, or search the Scriptures, or to communicate, but to be "still"—that is, leave off these "works of the law," and then he will surely receive faith which, till he is "still," he cannot have.

This was, manifestly, simply a waiting for special guidance of the Spirit, though the phraseology be somewhat different to that now employed. These ideas were still more strengthened by the French Quietism, a type of mysticism, which was being

propagated by means of a translation of the works of Madame Guyon. It taught that the means of perfect development were abstraction and contemplation to the exclusion of most of the processes of Christian life, emphasizing the illumination which comes from a passive waiting for the energy of the Holy Ghost. On Sunday, July 20th, 1740, Wesley read to the society at Fetter Lane a statement of his objections, and took leave, accompanied by those who agreed with him. On July 23rd, meeting in the Foundry, it was ascertained that twenty-five men and forty-seven or forty-eight women adhered to him after the separation. Charles Wesley says: "Nine out of every ten were swallowed up in the dead sea of stillness." Out of this incident grew the permanent rule of the Church. To plead the authority of Methodism for such a doctrine is at once to declare ignorance of her first internal conflict, or be simply dishonest as to its issues.

Wesley's journal—bearing date of June, 1741—contains the following striking and suggestive entry: "For these two days I had made an experiment which I had been so often and earnestly pressed to do; speaking to none concerning the things of God, unless my heart was free to it. And what was the event? Why, (1) That I spoke to none at all for fourscore miles together; no, not even to him that travelled with me in the chaise, unless a few words at setting out. (2) That I had no cross either to bear or to take up, and commonly, in an hour or two, fell fast asleep. (3) That I had much respect shown me wherever I came; every one behaving to me as a civil, good-natured gentleman. O, how pleasing is all this to flesh and blood! Need ye 'compass sea and land' to make 'prose-lytes' to this!" Wesley, in Sermon 81 on Perfection, thus discourses in direct contradiction to the theory of guidance, which makes the Lord approve of every act done by a spirit-led man:—

"The highest perfection which man can attain, while the soul dwells in the body, does not exclude ignorance and error, and a thousand other infirmities. Now, from wrong judgments, wrong words and actions will often necessarily flow, and in some cases wrong affections may also spring from the same.

source. I may judge wrong of you; I may think more or less highly of you than I ought to think; and this mistake, in my judgment, may not only occasion something wrong in my behaviour, but it may have a still deeper effect; it may occasion something wrong in my affection. From a wrong apprehension, I may love and esteem you more or less than I ought. Nor can I be free from a liability to mistake while I remain in a corruptible body. A thousand infirmities, in consequence of this, will attend my spirit till it returns to God who gave it. And in numberless instances it comes short of doing the will of God, as Adam did in Paradise. Hence the best of men may say from the heart:

‘ Every moment, Lord, I need
The merit of thy death,’

for innumerable violations of the Adamic as well as the angelic law. It is well, therefore, for us that we are not now under these, but under the law of love. ‘Love is now the fulfilling of the law’ which is given to fallen man. This is now, with respect to us, ‘the perfect law.’ But even against this, through the present weakness of our understanding, we are continually liable to transgress. Therefore, every living man needs the blood of the atonement, or he could not stand before God.

“What, then, is the perfection of which man is capable while he dwells in a corruptible body? It is the complying with that kind command, ‘My son, give me thy heart.’ It is the ‘loving the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind.’ This is the sum of Christian perfection: it is all comprised in that one word love. The first branch of it is the love of God; and as he that loves God loves his brother also; it is inseparably connected with the second, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.’ ‘Thou shalt love every man as thy own soul, as Christ loves us.’ ‘On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets,’ these contain the whole of Christian perfection.”

Among the local preachers of Wesley in London was George Bell, whose flighty imagination was so captured by the doctrine of deliverance from sin as to betray him into dangerous errors.

He pretended to be infallible, declared he was free from temptation, and, fully possessed with the idea of his own superior spirituality, entirely revolted against the authority of a Christian of less lofty pretensions. He believed himself endowed with the gift of miracles, and, accordingly, attempted to heal a blind man. The fanaticism spread, and Wesley was grieved to see Thomas Maxfield, the oldest of his preachers, rallying around its standard. The party thus formed, among other errors, taught that, when once sanctified, he need no longer watch and pray. These errors spread rapidly, and Wesley was compelled to exclude George Bell from the society. One hundred and seventy members of society followed. To those endeavoring to dissuade them, they replied: "Blind John is not capable of teaching us; we will keep to Mr. Maxfield."

In the minutes of 1766, the following suggestive paragraph is found:—

"But I read only the Bible. Then you ought to teach others to read only the Bible, and, by parity of reason, to *hear only* the Bible. But, if so, you need preach no more. Just so, said George Bell. And what is the fruit? Why, now, he neither reads the Bible nor anything else. This is rank enthusiasm."

Wesley's sermon on "Enthusiasm" bears internal evidence of having been prepared shortly after these occurrences, and probably with a view to preventing recurrence of such. Nothing will better define the attitude of Methodism, historically, to the doctrine of absolute and immediate guidance than some extracts from this not-too-well-known sermon:—

"Enthusiasm in general may be described in some such manner as this: A religious madness, arising from some falsely imagined influence or inspiration of God; at least from imputing something to God which ought not to be imputed to Him, or expecting something from God which ought not to be expected from Him.

"A second sort of enthusiasm is that of those who imagine they have such gifts from God as they have not. Thus, some have imagined themselves to be endued with a power of working miracles—of healing the sick by a word or a touch,

of restoring sight to the blind, yea, even of raising the dead, a notorious instance of which is still fresh in our own history. Others have undertaken to prophesy—to foretell things to come, and that with the utmost certainty and exactness. When plain facts run counter to their predictions, experience performs what reason could not, and sinks them down into their senses.

“To the same class belong those who, in preaching or prayer, imagine themselves to be so influenced by the Spirit of God as in fact they are not. I am sensible, indeed, that without Him we can do nothing, more especially in our public ministry; that all our preaching is utterly vain, unless it be attended with His power; and all our prayer, unless His Spirit therein help our infirmities. I know if we do not both preach and pray by the Spirit it is all but lost labor, seeing the help that is done upon earth He doeth, it himself, who worketh all in all. But this does not affect the case before us. Though there is a real influence of the Spirit of God, there is also an imaginary one; and many mistake the one for the other. Many suppose themselves to be under that influence when they are not, when it is far from them; and many others suppose they are more under that influence than they really are. Of this number, I fear, are all they who imagine that God dictates the very words they speak; and that, consequently, it is impossible they should speak anything amiss, either as to the matter or manner of it. It is well known how many enthusiasts of this sort also have appeared during the present century, some of whom speak in a far more authoritative manner than either St. Paul or any of the apostles.

“The same enthusiasm, though in a lower degree, is frequently found in men of a private character. They may likewise imagine themselves to be influenced or directed by the Spirit when they are not. I allow, ‘If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His,’ and that, if ever we either think, speak or act aright, it is through the assistance of that blessed Spirit. But how many impute things to Him, or expect things from Him, without any rational or Scriptural ground? Such are they who imagine they either do or shall receive *particular directions* from God not only in points of importance, but in

things of no moment, in the most trifling circumstances of life; whereas, in these cases, God has given us our own reason for a guide, though never excluding the secret assistance of His Spirit.

“To this kind of enthusiasm they are peculiarly exposed who expect to be directed of God either in spiritual things or in common life in what is justly called an extraordinary manner; I mean by visions or dreams, by strong impressions or sudden impulses on the mind. I do not deny that God has of old times manifested His will in this manner, or that He can do so now; nay, I believe He does in some very rare instances. But how frequently do men mistake herein! How are they misled by pride and a warm imagination to ascribe such impulses or impressions, dreams or visions, to God, as are utterly unworthy of Him! Now, all this is pure enthusiasm, all as wide of religion as it is of truth and soberness.

“Perhaps some may ask: ‘Ought we not, then, to inquire what is the will of God in all things? and ought not His will to be the rule of our practice?’ Unquestionably it ought. But how is a sober Christian to make this inquiry? to know what is the will of God? Not by waiting for supernatural dreams; not by expecting God to reveal it in visions, not by looking for any *particular impressions* or sudden impulses on his mind. No; but by consulting the oracles of God—‘To the law and to the testimony.’ This is the general method of knowing what is ‘the holy and acceptable will of God.’ ‘But how shall I know what is the will of God in such-and-such a particular case? The thing proposed is in itself of an indifferent nature, and so left undetermined in Scripture.’ I answer, The Scripture itself gives you a general rule applicable to all particular cases, ‘The will of God is our sanctification.’ It is His will that we should be inwardly and outwardly holy; that we should be good and do good in every kind and in the highest degree whereof we are capable. Thus far we tread upon firm ground. This is as clear as the shining of the sun. In order, therefore, to know what is the will of God in a particular case, we have only to apply this general rule. Suppose, for instance, it were proposed to a reasonable man to marry or to enter into a new business. In order to know whether

this is the will of God, being assured 'It is the will of God concerning me that I should be as holy and do as much good as I can,' he has only to inquire, 'In which of these states can I be most holy and do the most good?' And this is to be determined partly by reason and partly by experience. Experience tells him what advantages he has in his present state either for being or doing good, and reason is to show what he certainly or probably will have in the state proposed. By comparing these, he is to judge which of the two may most conduce to his being and doing good, and, as far as he knows this, so far he is certain what is the will of God.

"Meantime, the assistance of the Spirit is supposed during the whole process of the inquiry. Indeed, it is not easy to say in how many ways that assistance is conveyed. He may bring many circumstances to our remembrance, may place others in a stronger and clearer light, may insensibly open our mind to receive conviction, and fix that conviction upon our heart; and to a concurrence of many circumstances of this kind in favor of what is acceptable in His sight, He may superadd such an unutterable peace of mind, and so uncommon a measure of His love, as will leave us no possibility of doubting that this, even this, is His will concerning us.

"This is the plain Scriptural way to know what is the will of God in a particular case. But, considering how seldom this way is taken, and what a flood of enthusiasm must needs break in on those who endeavor to know the will of God by unscriptural, irrational ways, it were to be wished that the expression itself were far more sparingly used. The using it as some do on the most trivial occasions is a plain breach of the third commandment. It is a gross way of taking the name of God in vain, and betrays great irreverence towards Him. Would it not be far better to use other expressions which are not liable to such objections? For example: Instead of saying on any particular occasion, 'I want to know what is the will of God,' would it not be better to say, 'I want to know what will be most for my improvement, and what will make me most useful?' This way of speaking is clear and unexceptionable; it is putting the matter on a plain, Scriptural issue, and that without any danger of enthusiasm.

"A third very common sort of enthusiasm (if it does not coincide with the former) is that of those who think to attain the end without using the means, by the immediate power of God. If, indeed, the means were providentially withheld, they would not fall under this charge. God can, and sometimes does, in cases of this nature, exert His own immediate power. But they who expect this when they have these means, and will not use them, are proper enthusiasts. Such are they who expect to understand the Holy Scriptures without reading them and meditating thereon; yea, without using all such helps as are in their power and may probably conduce to that end. Such are they who designedly speak in the public assembly without any premeditation. I say designedly, because there may be such circumstances as at times make it unavoidable. But whoever despises that great means of speaking profitably is so far an enthusiast. Against every sort of this it behoves us to guard with the utmost diligence, considering the dreadful effects it has so often produced, and which indeed naturally result from it. Its immediate offspring is pride; it continually increases this source from whence it flows, and hereby it alienates us more and more from the favor and from the life of God. It dries up the very springs of faith and love, of righteousness and true holiness, seeing all these flow from grace; but 'God resisteth the proud and giveth grace (only) to the humble.' Together with pride there will naturally arise an unadvisable and unconvincible spirit. So that, into whatever error or fault the enthusiast falls, there is small hope of his recovery, for reason will have little weight with him (as has been frequently and justly observed) who imagines he is led by a higher guide, by the immediate wisdom of God. As he grows in pride, so he must grow in unadvisableness and stubbornness also. He must be less and less capable of being convinced, less susceptible of persuasion, more and more attached to his own judgment and his own will, till he is altogether fixed and immovable. Being thus fortified both against the grace of God and against all advice and help from man, he is wholly left to the guidance of his own heart and of the king of the children of pride. Such is the nature, such the dreadful effects, of that many-headed monster, Enthusiasm!"

This ought to settle the question as to whether this extreme theory of guidance is new or not, and as to whether Methodism has any authoritative deliverance on the subject, the more so as Pope quotes extensively from Wesley's stern cautions about enthusiasm, and with the highest approval of them.

Tilsonburg, Ont.

J. W. COOLEY.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S ATONEMENT.

A CONTRIBUTION TOWARD THE FORMULATION OF A CONSISTENT ARMINIAN THEORY.

ARTICLE VI.

THEORIES INTO WHICH THE THOUGHTS OF THE CENTURIES HAVE CRYSTALLIZED.

SECTION V. PENAL SATISFACTION.¹

THE theory of penal satisfaction took its present form from the continental churches which were moulded by Calvin, his coadjutors and successors, as opposed to those which were moulded by Melancthon and his German co-laborers. According to this theory the essence of atonement consists in Christ's being punished instead of sinners. Writers of this school do not agree among themselves as to the measure of that punishment, but they are a unit as to its necessity and as to the ends it was intended to serve. We shall, however, permit them to speak for themselves. Owen, as a representative of the older school, taught that the sufferings of Christ were identical with the punishment human sin deserved.

1. The readers of the REVIEW will, I am sure, pardon a personal reference just here. My old and honored friend, Rev. M. Randles, D.D., Professor of Theology at Didsbury, and successor to Dr. Pope, commenced, in the last issue of the REVIEW, a series of articles in criticism of the series on the "Atonement," from my pen. I am genuinely grateful for any attempt on the part of anyone who will candidly and kindly show me where I am in error, for truth has been the sole object of my investigations from my youth; nevertheless, in my judgment, it would have been better if Dr. Randles had waited until I had got through with the statement of my views; it is certain that if he had done so he would not have made some statements which appear in the last issue. Under the circumstances I deem it wise to defer any reply to Prof. Randles until my whole case is before the readers of the REVIEW. The article in this number, therefore, is not to be regarded in any way as a reply to my old friend, as it appears just as it was before any of the articles were published in the REVIEW. It is simply and only one of the *eight* articles I promised to furnish on the subject of the "Atonement." With the permission of Providence and of the Managing Editor, I purpose a reply to the criticisms of the friend of my youth in a *ninth* article.—W. J.

"To say that the death threatened by the law was one, and that Christ underwent another, that eternal, this temporal, and so also of the curse and desertion threatened, would render the whole business of our salvation unintelligible, as being revealed in terms equivocal, nowhere explained. . . . It is strange to me that we should deserve one punishment, and He who is punished for us should undergo another, yet both of them be constantly described by the same names and titles."¹ "On these conditions, it is evident that the sufferings of Christ in relation to the law were the very same that were threatened to sinners, and which we should have undergone had not our Surety undertaken the work for us."² "Satisfaction is properly made to the law when the penalty which it threatens and prescribes is undergone, as in the case insisted upon it was."³ "I do believe that Christ underwent *the very same punishment for us*, for the nature and kind of it, which we were obnoxious unto, and should have undergone had not He undertaken for us, and paid the *idem* that we should have done."⁴ (2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13.)

Jonathan Edwards insisted as strongly as Owen on the penal character of Christ's sufferings, but differed from Owen in regarding them as a penal infliction equivalent to what human sin had deserved. He says: "Thus Christ bare our sins; God laid on Him the iniquity of us all, and He bare the burden of them; and so, His bearing the burden of our sins may be considered as something diverse from His suffering God's wrath. For His suffering wrath consisted more in the sense he had of the other thing, viz., the dreadfulness of the punishment of sin, or the dreadfulness of God's wrath inflicted for it. Thus, Christ was tormented, not only in the fire of God's wrath, but in the fire of our sins; and our sins were His tormentors. The evil and malignant nature of sin was what Christ endured immediately, as well as more remotely, in bearing the consequences of it."⁵

Turretin held that Christ offered satisfaction by enduring

1. Works of John Owen, D.D., edited by Rev. W. H. Goold. Ed. 1853, Vol. XII., p. 494.

2. *Ibid.* p. 496.

3. *Ibid.* pp. 516, 517.

4. *Ibid.* p. 615.

5. Complete Works. London, 1853. Vol. II., p. 574.

a penalty equal to that which sin had deserved. "The satisfaction respects Christ, from whom God demands a punishment, not numerically, but in kind, the same with that which we owed."¹ Dr. Hill has always been considered a cautious and discriminating writer on the Calvinistic side of this question, and though we believe him to be in error, we have pleasure in testifying to the candor and fairness with which he usually treats those who differ from him. He takes the same view as Turretin; for he says, "In the substitution of Jesus Christ, according to the catholic opinion, there is a translation of the guilt of the sinner to Him, by which it is not meant that He who was innocent became a sinner, but that what He suffered was upon account of sin. . . . Although the sufferings of Jesus Christ, in consequence of this translation of guilt, became the punishment of sin, it is plain that they are not that very punishment which the sin deserved."² The views of Dr. C. Hodge and of Dr. A. A. Hodge are in substance the same as those just quoted, and have already been alluded to in a previous article. It would be quite easy to fill many pages with similar quotations. Assuredly there can be no objection to the above on the ground that they are not representative. Authoritative they are not, but simply personal; nevertheless, they are in thorough accord with whatever authoritative statements have been made, and are recognized as the interpretation and expansion thereof.

We object to this theory because we find that in the history of the development of doctrine, it grew out of the adoption of the doctrine of absolute personal election to eternal life. Calvinistic writers try to show that their view of the case has been the prevailing one from the Apostolic age. With that particular aspect of the question we purpose to deal in a subsequent paragraph. It is undeniable that the doctrine of penal satisfaction, as taught in the preceding paragraph, did not receive a definite and authoritative shape upon the continent until after the Synod of Dort (1618), nor in Great Britain until after the meeting of the Westminster Assembly (1643). The

1. "On the Atonement of Christ." Tr. by Rev. J. Willson, D.D., p. 17.

2. "Lectures in Divinity." Book IV., p. 435.

attempt to fasten this theory on the *Cur Deus Homo* of Anselm is as unfair as it is unsuccessful. There are points where the two theories converge, but they are essentially divergent. As we have seen, Anselm's theory is in essence satisfaction or punishment, while that of Calvinistic writers is satisfaction by punishment. Now, our contention is simply this, that this theory of penal satisfaction was shaped for the harmonious working out of the previously adopted theory of "God's eternal decree." Dr. A. A. Hodge is our authority for affirming that "the unconditional eternal election of individuals to eternal life, founded on the good pleasure of God" is "the fundamental doctrine of Calvinism."¹ On this subject the Westminster Confession is clear and strong: "By the decree of God; for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished."² The articles of the Synod of Dort are equally explicit.³ "That Christ did not die for all men, but for those of every nation who are in the end to be saved," in other words, the elect, is, according to Dr. Hill, "the fundamental principle of the Calvinistic system."⁴ That these quotations fairly present the views of the school they represent can be easily verified by consulting Dr. A. A. Hodge, "The Atonement," Part II., ch. 5. Prof Smeaton, alluding to the Synod of Dort, says: "The sum of the matter as stated by the Synod was that the merits of Christ, considered in themselves, were of infinite value, or amply sufficient for all, but of efficacious validity for the elect alone."⁵ This position we deem indefensible on any ground. Let us have no dust thrown in our eyes regarding the benefits which come to non-elect persons through the death of Christ. Dr. Candlish makes out a poor case on that line when he tells us that the death of Christ "procures a uni-

1. "The Atonement," p. 344.

2. Ch. 3, sec. 3 and 4.

3. Articles of Synod of Dort, ch. 2, sec. 8. See Hodge, "Atonement," p. 393; Foster, "Calvinistic Controversy," p. 118.

4. "Lectures in Divinity." Book IV., p. 538.

5. "Apostles' Doctrine of Atonement," p. 538.

versal dispensation of forbearance,"¹ for on subsequent pages he tells us that even this "dispensation of forbearance" is "extended towards all for the sake of the elect."² Atonement on this theory does not save the non-elect, was never intended to do so, does not even make them salvable. Now, either God could not or would not make the atonement efficacious for all. Our friends can take which horn of the dilemma they please, their theory is impaled on either. If, however, we understand Prof. Smeaton, he admits that the atonement of Christ was sufficient for all, but efficacious only for some. When we ask the Professor why, he answers, it "must be traced to the purpose of God appointing who should be partakers of His merits,"³ or as Dr. Shedd has it, "After the atonement has been made, it is still the property and possession of the Maker, and He may do what He will. with His own. He may elect to whom He will apply it, and to whom He will not apply it."⁴ To put it plainly, then, man's damnation is purely of God's purpose. He simply willed it, and they have no hope, though Christ's atoning work was sufficient for all. With such conflicting conceptions of God as this hypothesis must of necessity beget, how can it be said that God loves mankind, or how can salvation be sincerely offered to the numbers for which no such thing is possible?⁵ We do not wonder that John Wesley declaims against such a theory in words that scald and burn.

It represents Jesus Christ "as a hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity; for it cannot be denied that He everywhere speaks as if He was willing that all men should be saved, and as if He had provided the possibility. Therefore, to say that He was not willing that all men should be saved—that He had provided no such possibility—is to represent Him as a hypocrite and dissembler. It cannot be denied that the gracious words which came out of His mouth

1. "The Atonement," etc., p. 173.

2. *Ibid.* p. 189.

3. "Apostles' Doctrine of Atonement," p. 533.

4. "History of Doctrine," Vol. II., p. 375.

⁵: It being no part of our plan to discuss the extent of the Atonement in these articles will be sufficient explanation to the intelligent reader for the great brevity of the argument just here.

are full of invitations to all sinners. To say, then, that He did not intend to save all sinners, upon proffered and possible conditions, is to represent Him as a gross deceiver of the people. You cannot deny that He says, 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden.' If, then, you say He calls those who cannot come—those whom He knows to be unable to come—those whom He can make able to come, but will not—how is it possible to describe greater insincerity? You represent Him as mocking His helpless creatures by offering what He never intends to give. You describe Him as saying one thing and meaning another—as pretending a love which He had not. Him, 'in whose mouth was no guile,' you make full of deceit, void of common sincerity; then, especially, when drawing nigh the city, He wept over it, and said, 'O Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, and ye would not!' Now, if you say that He would not, you represent Him—which who can hear?—as weeping hypocritical tears over the prey which himself, of His own good pleasure, doomed to destruction."¹

The formulation of the theory of penal satisfaction, as taught by Calvinistic writers, being subsequent to the formulation of the doctrine of unconditional election is admitted to be for the purpose of working it out. "St. Augustine and all consistent Augustinians, Calvin and all reformed churches, held that REDEMPTION IS IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THE PURPOSE OF ELECTION."² "The entire analogy of the spirit of Calvin's system was as a whole broadly characterized by the subjection of redemption to election as a means to an end."³ Dr. Candlish's able volume on the Atonement is constructed with the unexpressed but evident intention of supporting the same idea that atonement is subordinate to election. To us this is to reverse the teaching of the Bible, the whole trend of which shows that election is possible because of atonement. While we continue to believe that God is "our Father," that He is "without respect.

1. Sermon on "Free Grace."

2. "The Atonement," A. A. Hodge, p. 370.

3. *Ibid.* p. 389.

of persons," that He "so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," that He hath "no pleasure in the death of the wicked," that He is "long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," that He "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," that to accomplish this purpose He gave His beloved Son to "taste death for every man,"¹ we must reject any doctrine which conflicts with these declarations and any theory of atonement which it logically requires to maintain it.

We object to this theory of penal satisfaction, because it involves the distinction of sin as personal demerit and sin as guilt. "But if guilt expresses only the relation of sin to justice, and is the obligation under which the sinner is placed to satisfy its demands, then there is nothing in the nature of God, as revealed either in His providence or in His Word, which forbids the idea that this obligation may on adequate grounds be transferred from one to another, or assumed by one in the place of others."² This quotation states the position clearly enough but we deny the fact of the transfer of human guilt to Christ, and of consequence the theory built upon it. This point has already been argued at length in the article on "Penalty and Punishment," to which we refer the reader. We regard guilt as inseparable from the person of the sinner. This is the rock on which the theory of penal satisfaction splits. Why must sin be punished? The only answer that covers the whole question is because of its demerit, graduated according to its turpitude. Was the demerit of sin transferred to Christ? The older Calvinists said yes, but the moderns say no. What was it, then, that was transferred? Guilt—guilt in the sense of liability to punishment; but guilt without demerit is a mere conception, it has no correspondence in reality. If sin must be punished according to its demerit, and the demerit of sin was not transferred to Christ—was not even transferable—has sin been punished in Christ? To harmonize this theory with facts is to

1. Luke xi. 2; 1 Pet. i. 17; John iii. 16; Eph. xxxiii. 11; Pet. iii. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 4; Heb. ii. 9.
2. "Sys. Theo." Hodge, Vol. II., p. 532.

destroy it. It is inconsistent with itself. Its root principle is not met in working out the details of the scheme. In the sense in which satisfactionists would have us understand, the affirmation, "God must punish sin,"¹ introduces that element of necessity which, for us, vitiates the whole system, dragging both God and man at the wheels of an inexorable fate.

We object to this penal satisfaction theory, because its logical sequence is the ultimate, infallible and eternal deliverance from sin and its consequences of all for whom it was offered. Granted that Christ endured the penalty of human sin, we contend that it is simple justice that all whose sins have been thus punished in Him should ultimately enjoy absolute immunity from any further penal suffering on that account. The Westminster Confession of Faith says: "To all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, He doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same," etc.² Owen, speaking of "the compact or agreement between God and the Mediator," says: "It became just and righteous, with reference to God's justice as supreme governor and moderator of the creatures and all their concernments, that those for whom He died should all be made partakers of all the good things which Christ, by His death, procured for them, in the season appointed by the sovereign will of God."³ Symington says: "If the punishment for sin has been borne, the remission of the offence follows, of course. The principles of rectitude suppose this, nay, peremptorily demand it; justice could not be satisfied without it. Agreeably to this reasoning, it follows that the death of Christ, being a legal satisfaction for sin, all

1. "If we say that the sufferings of Christ were not indeed the punishment of *Christ*, but, nevertheless, they were strictly the punishment of *sin*, we have an idea not easily digested, that a thing without sense or consciousness can be punished. The whole confusion arises from the attempt to prove too much;—we may demonstrate that God may justly punish sin, as also that without some equivalent, His wisdom, conjoined with goodness, demands such punishment; but to prove nakedly that it is impossible He should not punish it, is, according to the best of my judgment, to prove that when once committed, there can be no relief on any terms: a melancholy result beyond all thought! The mistake arises from a conception secretly entertained, though never, except by Supralapsarians, actual" avowed, that the expiation of Christ was really and truly punishment."—"The Christian Atonement," J. Gilbert, p. 364.

2. Ch. 8, sec. 8.

3. "Works," Vol. XII., p. 616. See also p. 608.

for whom He died must enjoy the remission of their offences. It is as much at variance with strict justice or equity, that any for whom Christ has given satisfaction should continue under condemnation, as that they should have been delivered from guilt without a satisfaction being given for them at all."¹ This reasoning is unimpeachable. If the premises be granted, the conclusion is inevitable. Our modern defenders of this satisfaction theory say, "No, no; you confound the penal with the pecuniary." "There are two kinds of satisfaction, which, as they differ essentially in their nature and effects, should not be confounded. The one is pecuniary or commercial; the other, penal or forensic. When a debtor pays the demand of his creditor in full, he satisfies his claim, and is entirely free from any further demands. In this case, the thing paid is the precise sum due, neither more nor less. . . . It matters not to him [the creditor] by whom the debt is paid, whether by the debtor himself or by someone in his stead, because the claim of the creditor is simply upon the amount due, and not upon the person of the debtor. In the case of crimes, the matter is different. The demand is then upon the offender. He himself is amenable to justice. Substitution in human courts is out of the question. The essential point in matters of crime is not the nature of the penalty, but who shall suffer. The soul that sins, it shall die. And the penalty need not be, and very rarely is, of the nature of the injury inflicted. All that is required is that it should be a just equivalent. . . . Another important difference between pecuniary and penal satisfaction is that the one, *ipso facto*, liberates. The moment the debt is paid the debtor is free, and that completely. No delay can be admitted, and no conditions can be attached to his deliverance. But in the case of a criminal, as he has no claim to have a substitute take his place, if one be provided, the terms on which the benefits of his substitution shall accrue to the principal are matters of agreement or covenant between the substitute and the magistrate who represents justice. The deliverance of the offender may be immediate, unconditional and complete, or it may be deferred, suspended on certain

1. "The Atonement and Intercession of Christ," p. 190.

conditions, and its benefits gradually bestowed.”¹ Yes, in human affairs the benefits of mediation may be thus conditioned (and it must be borne in mind that it is of human affairs Dr. Hodge is here speaking); but does Dr. Hodge believe that there is any condition, properly so called, in the application of the benefits of Christ's atoning death? Can any contingency arise through which some for whom Christ made atonement may be deprived of its benefits? Let us see. Dr. Hodge says: “It is a matter of justice that the blessings which Christ intended to secure for His people should be actually bestowed upon them. This follows, for two reasons: first, they were promised to Him as the reward of His obedience and sufferings. God covenanted with Christ that if He fulfilled the conditions imposed, if He made satisfaction for the sins of His people, they should be saved. It follows, secondly, from the nature of a satisfaction. If the claims of justice are satisfied, they cannot be again enforced. This is the analogy between the work of Christ and the payment of a debt. The point of agreement between the two cases is not the nature of the satisfaction rendered, but one aspect of the effect produced. In both cases, the persons for whom the satisfaction is made are certainly freed. Their exemption or deliverance is, in both cases, and equally in both, a matter of justice. . . . What reason can there be for the infliction of the penalty for which satisfaction has been rendered?”² Reason! none whatever, on the reasoning of Dr. Hodge; and in this we believe he is in harmony with Scripture and common sense. Our objection to this theory is sustained, not by any argument of ours, but by the admission and contentions of its advocates. Dr. A. A. Hodge follows closely in the footsteps of his honored father when he says: “The law has no further demands upon those persons with respect to whom all its conditions have been once fully satisfied. . . . The demands of the government with relation to an individual are satisfied when the service of another as his substitute are credited to his account. It depends simply upon the will of the substitute and upon the

1. “Systematic Theology,” Dr. Hodge, Vol. II., pp. 470 and 471.

2. *Ibid.* p. 472.

pleasure of the Government whether these services shall be credited to one or to another. For whomsoever they are designed, they avail to cancel their obligations."¹ That the satisfaction offered by Christ does not on this theory, *ipso facto*, deliver from sin the persons for whom it was offered, is a piece of special pleading such as ought not to find a place in discussing so momentous a subject as this. It may not do so immediately, but on this theory it does ultimately, and that is the very point on which we join issue. It is, comparatively, an indifferent thing that sin may inhere in a human soul for a brief period of time, if that soul is infallibly sure of being ultimately delivered alike from it, its limitations and its consequences. The usual answer to all this is that no man is thus saved from sin until he believes in Christ, and this faith is said to be the condition of salvation. But what sophistry have we here? God selects a certain number to salvation, Christ satisfies divine justice on their behalf, the death of Christ ensures such a measure of the influence of the Holy Spirit as secures the regeneration or conversion of these selected individuals; then, when these individuals have been remade, they become capable of faith: and, finally, this faith is said to be the condition of salvation.² To talk about faith being the condition of salvation in such a system as that is an utter subversion of words, and at war with every offer of salvation made on the pages of Holy Scripture. To offer salvation to a man outside the charmed circle is, on these terms, to mock his misery and make light of the utter hopelessness of his soul. The revealed word of God unfolds to us a plan of salvation more in harmony with the facts of man's moral nature. Thus my old friend, Rev. M. Randles, D.D., of Didsbury, says: "The remedial plan corresponds to the moral nature of the being on whom it is to operate. The highest and most god-like attribute of the human soul is its freedom, the evidence of which is found in its universal consciousness of spontaneity, moral character and responsibility. It matters not that the workings of the elective

1. "The Atonement," pp. 400 and 401.

2. That this is no misrepresentation of ours may be seen by referring to the Westminster Confession, ch. 10, secs. 1, 2 and 3. See also Hodge's "Systematic Theology," ch. 14, secs. 4 and 5, and Hill's "Lectures in Divinity," Book V., ch. 1.

Spirit are too intricate and mysterious for self-analysis. Beneath all the natural and moral forces that play upon the power of choice, and in harmony with the supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit, there remains the sense of free agency, with its consequent accountability. Had the work of Christ overlooked this corner-stone of moral probation by procuring irresistible salvation, it had been ill adapted to its end, and shed but a lurid glory around the ways of God.¹ Mr. Spurgeon may be less cautious as a theologian than the learned Princeton divine; but, granted this theory of penal satisfaction, he is at once more frank and consistent when he says: "It would be injustice to lay the sin upon the Substitute and also upon the sinner."² The determining principle is, on this theory, the extent of the atonement. If Christ died for all men, and if the theory of penal satisfaction be true, the inevitable logical sequence is the ultimate salvation of all men. This conclusion we regard as alike contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture and to fact. The atonement is "an expiation for all, an acquittal for none." In other words, salvation is possible to all, but truly and properly conditioned on repentance and faith. On the other hand, if Christ died only for a portion of the race, their salvation is, on the theory of penal satisfaction, certain. This is as contrary to the Word of God as the theory of universal salvation is to fact. To buttress our position, it will be quite sufficient to point to those Scriptures which plainly imply that souls may perish for whom Christ died, and to those which attribute the failure to obtain salvation to man's own fault. Take the following as an illustration of the former class: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died." "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died."³ As illustrative of the latter class, we select the following: "Because I have called, and ye

1. "Substitution," p. 128.

2. "Clerical Symposium on the Atonement," *Hom. Mag.*, 1882, p. 32.

3. 2 Peter ii. 1; 1 Cor. viii. 11; Rom. xiv. 16.

refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof." "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how oft would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."¹ Dr. Candlish fills six pages with an elaborate attempt to break the force of the former class of passages, with what success the reader may judge by his closing words: "Beware how you deal with him [your weak brother], lest you should have his blood to answer for . . . He is to you simply a brother who, through your knowledge and by your eating, is placed in extreme danger of perishing and being destroyed for ever."² If this language is to be understood in its plain, common-sense meaning, it teaches exactly what we understand the Scriptures to teach, viz., that those for whom Christ died may perish. When Dr. Candlish comes to the thought embodied in the latter class of Scriptures quoted, he abandons textual criticism and runs off into many pages of irrelevant disquisition. Now, if "the death of Christ has a certain reference to all men universally, such a reference as to impose on all men universally the obligation to hear and to believe;"³ if the "universality of the Gospel offer is an aggravation of the sin of unbelief," and it is "an essential ingredient in its criminality," and it leaves the sinner "without excuse,"⁴ then we contend, in opposition to Dr. Candlish and the school he represents, that Jesus Christ must have made atonement for all men; otherwise, their rejection of the Gospel offer could not be regarded as a sin, nor could their failure to comply with the conditions of salvation be deemed their own fault.

1. Prov. i. 24, 25; John v. 40 and iii. 19; Matt. xxiii. 37.

2. "The Atonement," p. 76.

3. *Ibid.* p. 36.

4. *Ibid.* p. 260. These quotations are to be regarded as representative. The reader may find virtually the same in Hodge's "Systematic Theology," Part III., ch. 8; Hodge's "The Atonement," Part II., chapters 6 and 7; Hill's "Lectures in Divinity," Book IV., ch. 7, sec. 3; Symington's "On the Atonement and Intercession of Christ," sec. 11.

We object to this theory because, if it be true, we are left without any rational or consistent idea of the forgiveness of sin. If we could consider forgiveness as consisting in the mere communication to the believer of a knowledge of his discharge from legal liability, which discharge actually took place at the time when Christ made atonement by the death of the cross, then this theory of penal satisfaction would be logically consistent with itself. This, however, would be regarded as the rankest Antinomianism, the type advocated by Dr. Crisp and modern Plymouthism. If Christ actually "occupied our law-place, and the sentence due to the principals was executed upon Him,"¹ we confess we do not see where or how forgiveness of sin, properly so called, comes in. With Dr. Hodge's premises, the conclusion of Dr. Channing is unimpeachable. He says: "How plain is it, according to this doctrine, that God, instead of being plenteous in forgiveness, never forgives, for it is absurd to speak of men as forgiven when their whole punishment is borne by a substitute."² Indeed, we do not need to go to Unitarians for a refutation of this groundless assumption; the words of Dr. A. A. Hodge will serve us better: "The law has no further demands upon those persons with respect to whom all its conditions have been once fully satisfied."³ These words, we submit, leave no room for forgiveness, properly so called, for the simple reason there is nothing to forgive. From its very nature, we must regard forgiveness as an act of mercy; but, on the theory of penal satisfaction, it becomes a right which may be claimed, nay, justice demands that it be bestowed. Grace may have a place in providing such an atonement; there may even be grace in the communication of the knowledge that such an atonement has been made; but forgiveness as an act of mercy that is at all consistent with such a theory of atonement there cannot be. When the guilt of sin has been transferred, when the penalty has been suffered, what remains to be forgiven? Man and God are then at one. Such is not the teaching of Holy Scripture.

The advocates of the theory of penal satisfaction have a

1. "The Atonement," A. A. Hodge, p. 399.

2. Quoted by "Dr. Wood's Works," Vol. IV., p. 74.

3. "The Atonement," p. 400.

perfect right to their own opinion, and may legitimately urge others to adopt it; but we most decidedly object to their claim that theirs has been the prevalent doctrine of the Church from the beginning." Prof. Smeaton, Prof. Crawford, Dr. Shedd and Dr. A. A. Hodge all assume this position, though not with an equally dogmatic air. Prof. Smeaton, as we have already seen, reads into the Apostolic Fathers the penal character of the sufferings of Christ, and what he calls the "special destination of the Atonement."¹ Sufficient has, we think, been written already to show that these assumptions are not warranted by Scripture nor by large numbers of the writers to whom the learned Professor makes his appeal.

Prof. Crawford's favorite form of designating the theory he advocates is "The Catholic Doctrine." Now, it cannot be called an excess of modesty which thus quietly ignores a host of writers, from the earliest times down to our own, who have maintained theories of atonement the antipodes of that held by Prof. Crawford. If this vital matter is to come to a counting of heads or is to be submitted to a plebiscite of the ages, then the whole history of the Church is demonstration that the theory of Prof. Crawford would not be found at the head of the poll.

Dr. Shedd aims to make his readers believe that the theory he advocates has been held by the great body of the Church from the age of the apostles to our own. While admitting that the Apostolic Fathers were less distinct than later writers, he nevertheless claims that they contain "an unequivocal statement that the purpose of Christ's death was judicial, and expiatory of human guilt."² We have already seen, in the section that treats of the period, that the Apostolic Fathers entertained no such doctrine as Dr. Shedd here ascribes to them. And if their statements on this subject had been so "unequivocal," why did Dr. Shedd need to add on the same page: "Examining them, we find chiefly the repetition of Scripture phraseology, without further attempt at an explanatory doctrinal statement. There is no scientific construction of

1. "The Apostles' Doctrine of the Atonement," pp. 483 and 486.

2. "History of Christian Doctrine," Vol. II., p. 207.

the doctrine of Atonement in the writings of these devout and pious disciples of Paul and John; yet the idea of vicarious satisfaction is distinctly enunciated by them."¹ Again, it is said: "They did not, however, venture beyond the phraseology of Scripture, and they attempted no *rationale* of the dogma. . . . The evangelical tenet was heartily and earnestly held in their religious experience; but it was not drawn forth from this, its warm and glowing home, into the cool and clear light of the intellect and of theological science. The relations of this sacrificial death to the justice of God on the one hand, and to the conscience of man on the other—the judicial reasons and grounds of this death of the most exalted of personages—were left to be investigated and exhibited in later ages, and by other generations of theologians."² These quotations do not look as though the Apostolic Fathers were, after all, so "unequivocal" in their belief of the doctrine of penal satisfaction. Let Dr. Shedd produce such statements from these writers, and we will acknowledge ourselves in error. Besides, such statements would have saved Dr. Shedd all the trouble to which he has been put in the construction of carefully-guarded sentences and qualifying phrases, for, if the statements are so "unequivocal," plain men could have understood them without explanation or qualification. The only reason why they have not been produced is because they are not there. Hence, we have these assertions and qualifications instead. Let Dr. Shedd bring out these "unequivocal statements," and all controversy would abruptly end.

The same line of argument is adopted with reference to the later patristic writers, and nullified by the same admissions on the part of Dr. Shedd. Thus he says: "Taken as a whole, the body of patristic theology exhibits but an imperfect theoretic comprehension of the most fundamental truth in the Christian system."³ The dominant views of Origen are said to be "incompatible with the doctrine of a satisfaction of divine justice."⁴ His conclusion from a review of the soteriology of

1. "History of Christian Doctrine," Vol. II., pp. 207 and 208.

2. *Ibid.* pp. 211 and 212.

3. *Ibid.* p. 212.

4. *Ibid.* p. 236.

the Alexandrine School is contained in these words: "Only a very defective and erroneous conception of this cardinal truth of Christianity is to be found in the Alexandrine soteriology."¹ Even Augustine's views are said to have been about the same as those of Irenæus "respecting the judicial aspects of the doctrine,"² and that his treatment of soteriology is disappointing.³ These admissions speak for themselves. If the writers of this period had advocated the doctrine of Dr. Shedd, with the unanimity we have been led to suppose, there would have been no necessity whatever for these apologies and explanations, for it must be borne in mind that we have quoted but for the sake of illustration. To have quoted all the instances of a similar kind would have been to fill page after page. The utmost that can be said of this period is that, in a few solitary instances, individuals began to give utterance to views closely resembling those of Dr. Shedd; but that the great body of the Church held those views cannot be established. The reader is referred to a former article of this series for proof of the position here taken.

Perth, Ont.

W. JACKSON.

THE INDWELLING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

II.

IN the sixteenth chapter of John, the third of the three chapters which contain the last discourse of Christ, there is one definite and significant result of the Spirit's indwelling promised, which has not been considered in the former paper. It is this: "He shall show you things to come." "He shall declare unto you the things that are to come," is the Revised Version. That this, like the other benefits promised, is a supernatural endowment, is certain, for the Spirit is given to supply a lack which could not otherwise be supplied. This is a gift of predictive power. Every man who is filled with God is a possible prophet in the predictive sense of the word. More than one instance is given in the Acts of where Paul had

1. "History of Christian Doctrine," p. 237.

2. *Ibid.* p. 253.

3. *Ibid.* p. 253.

intimation given him of what was, at the time, a future occurrence. No doubt, such intimations were given for purposes of warning and encouragement, for the event proved it so. It is just as easy for the Omniscient and Omnipotent to transcend the limits of human intelligence in revealing the otherwise unknown future as in the otherwise inscrutable present. Let it be here noted that the "all" which is found in the promises of teaching and guidance is not found in this promise. Whenever the grand purposes of God require that His child shall know the future, He will not withhold that knowledge. There have been thousands of instances during the centuries of Christian experience since these words were uttered in which this gift was bestowed; and there would have been many times more if the Spirit's claims of supremacy over the human mind had been implicitly accepted by the pious. Some think that the promise is exhausted when it is applied to the showing in the future the things needful to be fully understood as they occur; but such a showing as that would be is amply provided for by the promises already considered. It is also supposed that "the things to come" refers to what theologians call "eschatology," or the things concerning "what after death for me remains." But the eschatology of post-pentecostal writers in the New Testament differs very slightly from, and is but little more than what Christ himself said on these subjects. So there is no reasonable doubt that the promise refers to the endowment of predictive power, not always like the other gifts, but given like the power to heal the sick and other miraculous endowments, as the Sovereign wills in His infinite wisdom.

Up to this point we have considered what the Master uttered in His last discourse to His disciples at Olivet. Let us now look at the account given in John vii. 37 to 39: "Now on the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." "They that believed on him" were to become inexhaustible

springs of living water. Jesus had said to the woman of Samaria that He should give living water to men ; now He promises to so endow and enrich those that believe—simply those that believe ; believing is the only condition mentioned—that they also should become unfailing sources from whom should flow, not faint drops of good, not tiny streamlets of blessing, not intermittent and sporadic freshets, but rivers of living water. And how are they to be so enriched ? By asceticism ? by profound thought ? by prolonged and exhaustive study ? by frequent and regular religious exercises ? No ! “But this spake Jesus,” says the evangelist, “of the *Spirit*, which they that believed on him were to receive.” Yes, and they *did* so receive, and from them *did* flow out those rivers of living water on and after the day of Pentecost, because Jesus was then glorified. Any hint anywhere from Jesus that this grand enrichment was to cease after A.D. 34 or 50 ? None whatever. How much more, abundantly more, than mere salvation from sin, from its curse and disease and penalty, is contained in this promise of the Master ! Instead of painful conflict with doubt and fear, with the ever-present flesh, an unseen devil and an all-surrounding world, the believer is himself a centre of healing, light and life to others. The living water flows from him whether others are wise enough to drink or not.

One more utterance of Jesus concerning the benefits that the indwelling Spirit brings to the believer is that one in Acts i. 8, which is probably another report of the words given in Luke xxiv. 49 : “Ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost is come upon you.” The indwelling Spirit shall make you moral stalwarts ; there shall be in you no weakness, no inefficiency, no moral cowardice ; ye shall not be endeavorers, but achievers ; not experimenters, but satisfied and victoriously successful performers. “Power.” It “goes without saying” that this is not chemical, mechanical, muscular, or merely intellectual power, for these are otherwise obtained ; but it is power to be worthy witnesses to an absent but divine Christ—witnesses by word and deed, flowing both from the same central power in the inner man. “I,” says Paul, “am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the *power* of God. The king-

dom of God is not in word, but in *power*. My speech and my preaching was in demonstration of the Spirit and of *power* that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the *power* of God." So believers are by the Spirit, and by Him *alone*, "strengthened with might in the inner man" for every good word and work.

This is the last item in the list, the parting but crowning gift which the Master promises as the certain result of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The chronicles of the days which begun at Pentecost show unmistakably that the Master kept His word of promise and fulfilled it gloriously. But is not the lack of this power a theme of general complaint in the churches of to-day? Why those sad confessions of weakness, those earnest expressions of desire, those half-hopeless aspirations, with which religious conventions of evangelical people so frequently conclude? "O for a mighty baptism of the Spirit! What we need, above all, is the pouring out of the Holy Ghost! Shall we not unite, brethren, in earnest pleading in this behalf?" Thus it goes on from year to year; but we do not hear the note of victory and success, we do not hear the Miriam song for which we wait, which would fill the startled air with the plaudits of a Church rejoicing in the fulness of God. If the attitude of the Church in 1894 were the same as the attitude of the Church in 33, the results would not be so terribly diverse. In A.D. 33, and following years, the attitude of the Church towards the Holy Spirit was one of reverent submission, of absolute trust, of entire obedience. It recognized Him as God dwelling in individual human consciousness, ruling human notions as well as elevating human emotions, dominating human will, and thereby constituting the man His instrument and agent. What is the general conception of Him now prevalent in the Church? The best way to describe it is to say that He is thought of as the Spirit of God in the same way as we conceive of the hand of God, the eyes of God, the wisdom of God, the wrath or the love of God. This is the undeveloped, imperfect and dim conception which we find in the Old Testament; and until the Church acquires, cherishes and acts on the post-pentecostal truth concerning Him, aspira-

tions, however eloquent, and prayers, however intense, will never bring Pentecostal endowments.

The teaching of Christ himself, and that teaching alone, has been developed "in these papers. His personal teaching is immeasurably above all others, whosoever they may be. It is absurd to raise the utterances of prophets and apostles to a height of authority equal to what should be claimed for His teaching, for He is Master, and they are servants. He is the authoritative teacher; they the pupils taught. He is origin and centre; their best teaching is about Him. He is principal; they are subordinate. He is proprietor; they are His property. He is the Saviour; they are the saved. He is the Sun of Righteousness; they are but planets. And He uttered no word to indicate that they would write oracles, and that such writings were to be accepted as of equal value with His own deliverances. And not one of those writers is found laying claim to such equality of authority. Prophets saw Him through the dim vista of the future as the One who was to come; and apostolic writers ever show, by the way in which they speak of Him, how deeply they feel their own inferiority. Yet nothing is more common in current theology than to find the words of prophets and apostles quoted as though they weighed as much in the balance of ideas as the words of Him who "spake as never man spake."

Jesus declared that His words were the test of what is eternally right: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin." That they are the conditions of human safety: "He that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened to a foolish man which built his house upon the sand." They furnish the conditions of successful prayer: "If my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you." "The words," He avers, "that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life;" and, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." The Jews are blamed in this fashion: "Ye have not my words abiding in you; ye are of your father the devil." "The words that I have spoken, the same shall judge

him at the last day." That John was in perfect accord with Jesus on this line is evident, for he says: "Whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected;" and Paul, to the Colossians, says: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly." These men did not forget that the words of Christ are the words of the foreordained Judge of mankind, the second of the Divine Trinity, into whose name all are to be baptized, who is the sole Redeemer of the human race, by whom the worlds were made, the First and the Last, who shutteth and no man openeth, who openeth and no man shutteth.

Systematic and scientific theologians accumulate proofs of the true Deity of Christ, differentiating Him from all and every one of the grandest of God's agents in heaven and in earth; and in their next chapter will show, by the use they make of the words of men who owe their salvation to Him, that they consider their words as truly decisive of all controverted points as are the words of the Supreme Master himself. This is dishonoring to Him before whom all angels bow. Paul's intricate and sometimes difficult reasoning, which was called forth by special and temporary developments in the churches, furnishes the foundation and superstructure, and the Master's words come in conveniently sometimes because they agree with Paul. Paul himself declared, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ;" and the context shows that "any man" may claim the same right to build on that foundation that Paul himself possessed.

If Paul were now on earth, he would reject with holy horror the intellectual worship with which evangelical theologians seek to honor him. (See the first chapter of 1st Corinthians.) If the object is to construct a Pauline, Petrine or Johannean theology, then take the words of Paul, Peter or John for your foundation; but if it is a *Christian* theology you wish to develop, then build on the words of Christ himself. He says, "Learn of me." The common-sense way, the rational way, the true way, the way that honors that "God who was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," is to begin with the teaching of Jesus himself, and test the value of all other teaching by its agreement or disagreement with His word.

So, learning of Him directly and solely concerning the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, we find that—

1. He, the Holy Spirit, is truly and really God. He takes the place of Christ, whom all the orthodox believe to be truly God; to wield an authority equally absolute, but over an infinitely wider extension, over the whole human race, instead of the small minority of the Jews of Palestine, to which the Christ delivered His testimony. And that authority is wielded not for a few short years only, but for all the centuries of this dispensation.

2. He, the true God, is promised to dwell within every individual believer, and that perpetually. (John xiv. 16, 17.)

3. No other idea, influence, thing or person is promised by the Master to be a rival, associate or assistant to the Holy Spirit in His unique relations to the believer. Not literature, not reason, not conscience, not the Church; none but the Spirit of Truth, and Him only. He, being the personal God, is infinitely sufficient for the work of His mission. Christ used either a personal pronoun, or some personal designation, no less than nineteen times within the compass of the eleven verses which contain His teaching concerning Him, lest He should be thought of as an impersonal influence, attribute or emanation.

4. What the Master said of the results of His indwelling shows that all possible needs of the Christian life are abundantly met by that indwelling. In the late Sabbath School Convention for Ontario—held in Toronto, Nov., 1893—about a dozen representative Christian persons, in a meeting programmed for that purpose, testified to felt deficiencies in their religious lives, all of which would be more than met if they should become Christians of the post-pentecostal sort.

5. Christian living is nothing less and nothing else than the indwelling of the living God in man and its inevitable consequences, such indwelling being, first of all, the indwelling of the Spirit, who brings into the soul a consciousness of the presence of the Father and the Son, who make their abode there. (John xiv. 23.)

6. No person is a Christian after the model prescribed and produced by Christ himself, who fails to possess the Holy

Spirit as his permanent guest. The facts presented above prove this proposition. The history given by Luke in the Acts demonstrates it beyond the possibility of contradiction. Six recorded instances show the mind of the Christ who promised at Olivet, and who, from His throne at the right hand of God, fulfilled His promise: (1) The hundred and twenty men and women who were all filled with the Holy Ghost. (Acts ii. 4.) (2) The three thousand who gladly received the word of Peter, which word promised and offered the gift of the Holy Ghost. (*Ib.* 38 to 41.) (3) The Samaritans who believed. (Chap. viii. 5, 14, 17.) (4) Saul of Tarsus. (Chap. ix. 10 to 19.) (5) The Gentile company gathered by Cornelius at Cæsarea. (Chap. x. 44.) (6) The disciples whom Paul met at Ephesus. (Chap. xix.) The challenging question with which Paul met these men shows that the being consciously indwelt by the person called the Holy Ghost was the normal experience of Christian believers in those days. And if any should think that the instances now cited were in any sense exceptional, and that, therefore, they are not representative of the whole Church, we quote Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 13: "For in one Spirit *were we all* baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and were all made to drink of one Spirit." Paul was not present when the Master spake the words recorded by John, nor in the upper room at Pentecost; but he entered into and experienced what was universal in Christianity in his time. And, again, no one was so qualified to speak for the aggregate Christianity of the time as he was, on account of his wide itinerancy among the churches.

Does the above represent normal Christianity to-day? Do theological professors so teach? Does the ordinary pastor or evangelist so preach? The writer listened with eager ears to one address each, from two very popular evangelists, on the evening when, in a prominent city church, they delivered their charges to the converts of a three-weeks' protracted meeting. The Holy Spirit was not mentioned in either of the addresses, and no one of His titles was uttered until He had to be named in the closing benediction.

At the Sabbath School Convention mentioned above, a pro-

fessor from McMaster College read a thoughtful paper on "Christ's Method with the Apostles." He never mentioned how Christ taught them to wait for the Spirit's coming, and not to attempt their work of witnessing till He came. He entirely omitted all mention of the Holy Spirit, although his subject required that the last discourse of Christ to His apostles should be considered.

An able paper was read a short time afterwards at the Inter-Collegiate Missionary Convention, on "Christ and other Masters: a Comparison of Religions." There followed the reading of the paper a discussion, in which the representatives of several evangelical churches took part. Neither in the paper nor in the subsequent discussion was there a single allusion to the Teacher and Master to which the Church was committed by that very Christ whose influence was discussed—no notice taken of the important words: "It is expedient for you that I go away. When he, the Spirit of truth, is come he will guide you into all truth."

Is it any wonder that the late C. H. Spurgeon should say, as he did: "I believe in the Holy Ghost. This is one of the articles of the creed, but it is scarcely believed among professors so as to be acted on." A prominent Methodist minister of the United States, Rev. John Wesley Johnson, in his "Baptism of Fire," says: "There is no phase of our common faith regarding which there is such vagueness, such uncertainty, such indefiniteness, as that relating to the Holy Ghost. And though this is the dispensation of the Spirit, the last days spoken of by the prophets when the Spirit is to be poured out on all flesh, and though the Church is loud in its protestations of dependence upon the Spirit for light, and power, and guidance, yet withal we fail somehow to apprehend the real nature of the Spirit or to rightly appreciate His place and functions in the economy of grace."

These witnesses are competent and their testimony is true. If the modern Church could say, with Paul, "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might *know* the things that are freely given to us by God," then this "vagueness," this "uncertainty," this

“indefiniteness,” could not remain. Has the true Apostolic idea of the Holy Ghost been lost? Does the Church of to-day accept Him as the Son of God teaches that He should be accepted? Whatever answer the reader gives to these questions, it is certain that he who now surrenders will and intelligence to His incoming, indwelling and rule, will “know of the doctrine,” will enjoy the divine certainty of being right.

B. SHERLOCK,

Toronto, Ont.

THE ITINERANTS' ROUND TABLE.

UNDER this head, in our next, we hope to open an exchange of thought on any aspect of Christian work, symposiums on practical questions, and expositions of scripture texts. It will be open to all.

Sermonic.

LESSONS FROM MOUNT NEBO.

"And Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountain of Nebo to the top of Pisgah. . . . So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day," etc.—Deut. xxxiv. 1-7.

MOSES appears to us as the most conspicuous figure in Old Testament times. He was great in every sense—great as an emancipator, organizer, leader and legislator—and, as such, his name can never fade from the annals of time.

Every page of his life is instinct with interest, and every incident in connection with his unique death is full of suggestion, and fraught with lessons of great value to every student of the Bible.

Some of these lessons are :

1. The irreversible consequences of human action. It was one act that shut Moses out from the promised possession.

At Meribah he had committed a sin of passion and presumption: it was only the impulse of a moment, and no doubt it had long faded from the mind of Israel, and seems as nothing when placed in the balance against a life of the most exemplary and heroic obedience: yet at the last he is confronted by it on the very border-land of the promised inheritance. There it stands, a weird sentinel with flaming sword, sternly forbidding his entrance into Canaan.

Remember, the forgiveness of sin, as a matter of fact, does not involve the remission of all its consequences. One of the most solemn facts which confronts us every day, is what we may call the irreversible sequences of human conduct. Flowing from the most trifling action of our lives, there is a stream of sequence, which may be modified and diverted but never entirely arrested or reversed. Even the gospel of Divine Omnipotence, so far as we can see, cannot shut off certain

consequences of human wrong-doing. The atonement of Christ does not dissever the causal tie between a sinful deed and its *natural* results, because it does not undertake to change the nature of things or destroy the law of cause and effect. Just here we find ourselves in presence of a law at once of the material and moral world, that is, what is known as the "Law of Continuity." In this connection we may call it the self-propagating power of human action.

To-day philosophy tells us there is no such thing in the universe as annihilation. No atom can drop out of being, no force can be destroyed. The sigh of a child, the flutter of an insect's wing, in their effects will continue forever; they transmit influences which vibrate throughout all space and time, which touch every star and tremble through every sphere.

It is literally true that the universe is a great whispering gallery, so that every secret you whisper, or word you speak, floats throughout all space, and may repeat itself throughout all eternity. Fiske teaches that even the vibrations of the brain, as well as those of the lips, transcribe themselves upon an ethereal medium, by which we are permeated and enveloped, that all nature, within and without, is a kind of vast phonograph, which may repeat in other worlds the thoughts we think, as well as the deeds we do and the words we say, in this.

Whether this is really so in the material or not, it is certainly so in the moral world. Every act of ours becomes a fact, which in its turn becomes a force, a moral force which perpetuates itself forever. Human deeds, like human souls, are instinct with immortality. They never cease to be. They write themselves upon a material that is imperishable, and in characters that are indelible. Your destiny of to-day was determined by your deeds of yesterday, and your destiny of to-morrow is being determined now by the deeds of to-day.

That small secret sin of yours of the long ago, to-day exerts its demon influence over you or others; it has imparted a downward bias, which, as you may know, has cost you many a struggle, and many a tear.

Well may Binney say: "A right act strikes a chord that

extends through the whole universe, touches all moral intelligence, and conveys its vibrations to the very bosom of God." In the same way a wrong act sends a deadly tremor throughout the moral empire of God, exerts a baneful influence everywhere, and touches chords in the eternal world which will never cease to tremble. No. Sins may be forgiven, but as facts they cannot be obliterated, nor can the influences they set in motion be stopped or reversed. Thus the sweetest cup is tinged with bitterness, the most beautiful sky is fleeced with clouds, and even the glory of Mount Nebo is dimmed with the shadows of Meribah.

2. Another lesson we learn from Mount Nebo is the *illusiveness of life*. There is an illusive element running through all human life. Human life is not a lie, but its promises are seldom *literally* fulfilled. The things we anticipate the most seldom match our anticipations. Moses had hoped to enter Canaan, but the *earthly* Canaan he never entered. Canaan, with its beautiful skies, its fertile soil, its romantic hills and valleys, had been the goal of this great man's ambitions and the subject of his fondest dreams. For this he had trod the burning sands and endured all these years the hardships of the desert, and in this fair and free country he had hoped to die; but now, when the object for which he had so long lived and labored is just within his reach, the cup of hope is dashed to the ground and his lips are not allowed to touch its contents. Into that land promised to his fathers which had been the theme of song and story, and which had floated before his fancy amid the dusty marches and dire conflicts of the wilderness like a beautiful vision, he is not allowed to enter.

Is this not a true picture of human life? The future stretches before our fancy like some fair and fertile Canaan, and we are bending our energies and centring our hopes upon it; but at last, when we stand upon our Mount Nebo, we shall find on its earthward side it was but a dream, that we have mistaken shadows for substances, moving phantasms for stationary realities, and falling meteors for fixed stars.

No mirage of the desert can be more illusive than are the promises of our present existence. Human fancy flings around

every object in the distance an exaggerating photosphere, and thus things seldom prove to be just what we expected. The boy looks forward with bounding hope to the dawn of manhood, and his fancy builds and plants some enchanting paradise; but into that paradise he seldom enters. And so it is with manhood and old age. We never find that life's promises are fulfilled according to the letter. Things are not always what they appear to be, because by some optical illusion we seldom see them as they are.

Ambition points to the wreath or the bejewelled coronet, and the youthful aspirant strains every nerve to win and wear the same; but when the prize is won it soon fades upon the brow that throbbed and ached so much to obtain it. Ambition never gets what it panted for. Avarice sees in the possible or prospective fortune a gorgeous valhalla of sensuous delight; but when the fortune has come the valhalla has disappeared, and there is this illusive element everywhere in our present life.

Would you have it otherwise? Is not this one way in which we are being educated for higher and more substantial things? Though human life is illusive, it need never prove delusive. Though we do not get what we live for, like Moses we may rise to the possession of that which is better. You offer your child a trinket or toy as a stimulus to study, but when the prize is won even he will find that its value is as nothing compared with the intellectual benefit which his efforts to obtain it have secured.

What though the man of ambition finds that the wreath he has agonized so much for soon begins to fade, if the strain and struggle to win it has made him all the more of a man. What if the man of money finds at last that his heaps of glittering gold fail to satisfy the hunger of his nature, if the honest chase after wealth has secured that concentration of effort, that fixity of purpose, that discipline of mind, that development of faculty which expands the horizon and enlarges the whole scope and sweep of his being. These qualities are more important than earthly substance or worldly splendor. What if men do not get the lower if they get the higher. What if they do not get the lesser if they get the greater.

What if they do not get the shadow if they get the substance. What if Moses did not enter into the earthly Canaan, if from Mount Nebo's sacred summit he had an entrance ministered to him abundantly into that heavenly Canaan, of which the lower was but the most distant suggestion, the faintest shadow.

3. Again, this narrative suggests to us a true idea as to the nature of death. It is suggestive that in going to die Moses is commanded not to descend into mysterious valley or monotonous plain, but to ascend into the sunlit summit of the mountain. Is not this incident symbolic? Death is not a descent, but an ascent in the scale of being. The bodily nature descends to the dust whence it came; the spiritual ascends to the God who gave it.

Death, what is it? It is a spirit being disrobed of its material tegument in order to be clothed upon with its celestial enswathement. The essential man loses nothing by this painful process. Death is the angel hand removing the material scaffolding, but the inner structure remains unimpaired. It unveils the statue, but does not deface or mar its beautiful proportions. It unpacks that celestial instrument, the soul, for use in the upper orchestra, but its keys and chords are unbroken and untouched.

On the other side of this question there is no death. Dying here is being born yonder. The death of the body here is the birth of the soul there. We on this side the veil bend o'er the cold and sheeted clay, and with tearful eye and breaking heart we sob—a man is dead; the angels on the other side sweep their harps and sing—a child is born. Death on earth is birth in heaven. We robe ourselves in mourning; they array themselves in gladness. We weep and sigh; they smile and sing. We condole; they congratulate. We sadly toll our funeral notes; there they peal the marriage bells of heaven and cause the celestial air to palpitate with songs of welcome.

When shall we learn that death is not extinction but emanipation; not the light of life quenched forever, but only that light obscured for a moment by a passing cloud which projects on earth its shadow?

When shall we be able to say, "O Death! where is thy sting?" etc. Just when we get possessed of the Christ idea of dying.

By-and-by in speaking of life and death we will transpose our terms. What the world calls living is really dying, and what it calls dying is the soul beginning to live—passing into life. Here our spirits are cribbed, confined and confined in a diseased and dying body. We are prisoners. Here we have sinned, or our fathers have sinned, so much that each is a kind of moving penitentiary. Here we suffer so much that some of us have felt that this planet was a kind of floating hospital for incurables. On this side of the grave we are exiles, but on the other we shall be citizens. Here we are like orphans; there we shall feel that we are children. Here we are captives; there we shall be free men. On this side we are disguised and wandering about *incognito*—unknown to ourselves and others; there we shall be disclosed and proclaimed as children of God and peers, nay, princes of the royal family of Heaven.

4. Another thought suggested by our subject is the juvenility of godliness. "Moses was 120 years old when he died; his eye was not dim nor his natural force abated." I have an idea that if man had never sinned he would never have tottered beneath the burden of age. Godliness never gets old. There is no face in heaven furrowed with years, and no form decrepit with age. There perpetual youth blooms on every cheek and beams in every eye.

I know an old saint in this city whose eye is getting dim and across whose brow the years have traced their deepening furrows. He is certainly not the man he used to be; sense fails him and his footsteps falter; but though the outward man is thus in the last stages of decay, the inward man is buoyed up with an immortal hope and is animated by the spirit of eternal juvenility. He said to me the other day, "I am not old; the house in which I live is getting old, but the spirit within me, with hope and love, is young as ever."

On the other hand, here is a youth who has for years been shooting the rapids of dissipation and drunkenness, and though the sun of life has not yet touched the zenith, he is very old, the

springs of life are dry, his eye is bleared, his form is stooped, his hands shake and sin has drawn its lines upon his countenance, its "curves of guilt and shame." O how young and yet how old. How sensual pleasures blight and unbridled passions burn and leave the man a wreck before his time. Sin means premature age; godliness means perpetual youth. "Godliness is profitable unto all things," etc.

5. The last thought suggested by our text is the place which the dead are entitled to in the hearts of the living. "And the children of Israel wept for Moses in the plains of Moab thirty days; so the days of weeping and mourning for Moses were ended." There are duties that we owe to the dead as well as to the living. I sometimes think the time has come for Christians to inaugurate a revolution amongst us so far as our mourning and funeral customs are concerned. I will not, however, enter on that line of thought just now. I only wish to say that there are two extremes we ought to avoid in our behavior towards the dead. First, that of an affected stoicism; second, that of a silly sentimentalism.

There are those whose behavior towards the dead is coldly and cruelly stoical. They studiously refrain from every expression of fond remembrance or unnaturally repress every feeling of grief. This is wrong; it is both weak and wicked. You may just as well expect that while a limb is being amputated the conscious patient will not writhe or wince with pain, as expect that a heart whose most sensitive sensibility has been lacerated with bereavement, will be insensitive to anguish. It is no disgrace for such a man to yield to the inward pressure and to shed a sincere and manly tear over the bed or bier of the dead. In fact, such tears within limit ought to be encouraged. I thank God that he has given us the power to weep, for often the heart would break if it had no such outlet as that which tears afford. By all means let us at the proper time go to the grave, and, if we must, let us sprinkle the sod with our tears of gratitude and grief. But such grief must ever be controlled by rational and Christian considerations. It must not be nursed until our life is unhinged and our nature unmanned. It must not be prolonged until it has drivelled into sheer sentimental-

ism or until the feigned sigh and tear suggest the hypocrite. We must never appear as if our hearts were entombed with the dead. We must not allow grief for the dead to unfit us for the duties we owe to the living. The grief of Israel was great while it lasted, but we read, "So the days of weeping and mourning for Moses were ended." They were at last aroused by the bugle call of duty which they at once heard and obeyed. Then the billows of active life were allowed to close over the grave of their dead leader, their battalions were once more marshalled, their ranks filled up, and on they marched to other conquests and to other victories.

Let it be so with us. Let us who have been lately bereaved remember that we must not become dead while we live for the sake of those who live while they are dead. Let us embalm the memory of the blessed in our heart of hearts, enshrine their virtues in our character, perpetuate their influence for God in our lives, but let us not allow our grief to chill every feeling of the heart or paralyze every energy of our life. Listen to-day to the trumpet calls of duty, which is the voice of God, dash away the bitter tear, fall into line with the great army of God, draw your sword from its scabbard for the conflicts that are yet to be waged and the victories that are yet to be won. And at last when that sword shall drop from our nerveless grasp, may death be to us what it was to Moses—only the Father's foot-fall coming to escort his weary child home in the twilight of a long, busy and beautiful day; only the rustling of the angels' wings coming to convoy our emancipated spirits to the skies; only the opening of the morning gates through which our souls in triumph may sweep into the realm of unclouded and endless day.

Then shall we discover the unreality of death and understand that

"There is no death, the stars go down
To rise upon some fairer shore;
And bright in Heaven's jewelled crown,
They shine for evermore."

Editorial Reviews of Books and Periodicals.

A History of Philosophy, with Especial Reference to the Formation and Development of its Problems and Conceptions. By Dr. W. WINDEL-BAND, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Strasburg. Authorized translation, by James H. Tufts, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in the University of Chicago. New York and London: Macmillan & Co. 1893. Pp. xiii., 659. Price, \$5 net.

This is a monumental work. It covers the entire field from Thales to the present day. It is unique in its treatment of the great problems of thought with which it deals. It is a mistake to suppose that philosophical principles receive in the main their final expression at the hands of a single thinker, or in any one period of history. A correct principle is always enriching each subsequent age, and in turn is enriched by it. As a principle it is always fruitful, revealing a broader and deeper significance when tested by and applied to the practical demands of every-day life.

All truth is neither with the empiricist nor the apriorist, with neither the idealist nor the realist, the dogmatist nor the rationalist. All have their claims, and between these the pendulum of thought is ever oscillating. The route towards the goal of truth is not unlike the tacking of a vessel. The direction is now this way, now that, sometimes towards the haven aimed for, sometimes away from it, but both movements necessary to carry it forward. A direct course is impossible, but between counter influences and apparent antagonisms the harbor is finally won. So with truth. The buffetings it experiences in one age or by one investigator but furthers the efforts of another. Truth is capable both of being approached and being seen from many sides, and it is a great mistake for anyone to suppose that he monopolizes all the methods of access or all the points of vision.

The study of a work like the one before us is a good antidote against both dogmatism and intellectual bigotry. The great thinkers under review not only teach us intellectual humility, but they also show us how to think. The great problems that have been before the world for 2,000 years and more are here presented with the skill and handling of a master. The great facts in the history of thought are clearly outlined, their distinctive features noted, and the master spirits in each period historically and critically reviewed. It is an inspiring and bracing atmosphere from beginning to end, and no one can read its lucid pages without a clearer grasp of the forces that have played a prominent part in human history, a clearer conception of God and duty, and an increased intellectual power to bear upon life's problems and responsibilities.

The book aims especially to show how in the various periods of thought "the foundation and development of its problems and conceptions" have taken place. It is thus not only a history of philosophy, but it is also a history of doctrine for the student of theology. These two cannot be understood apart from each other. If theology is necessary to a proper understanding of philosophy, it is even more true that philosophy is indispensable to the student of theology.

The present work is admirably adapted to meet this demand. We owe a debt of gratitude to the author, the translator, and the enterprising publishers for this valuable volume in which the subject is so uniquely, exhaustively, and satisfactorily treated.

The Early Religion of Israel; being the Baird Lecture for 1889. By PROF. JAMES ROBERTSON, D.D., of Glasgow University. Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons. Toronto: Fleming H. Revell. Cloth, \$3.

In this volume we have a conservative yet candid and scientific discussion of the question of the Pentateuch as presenting a true account of the foundation of the religion and history of Israel. It differs from most of the works written on this subject by laying down a broad and clearly drawn line of distinction between the literary structure of the Pentateuch and hence its date, authorship and method of composition, and the entirely distinct question of the trustworthy or historical character of its contents. The latter question he points out as vitally affecting our entire conception of Old Testament religion and by implication seriously affecting even Christianity itself. The former he regards as of minor importance. Having made this distinction clear, he very soon leads us in the course of the discussion to see that while the German critics make out a comparatively strong case in favor of their literary analysis, their attempts at a reconstruction of Hebrew religious history are exceedingly weak, if not an entire failure. The line of argument adopted is followed in a thoroughly scientific spirit. Like the defenders of the New Testament a generation since, he begins with the acknowledged books Hosea and Amos, the earliest of the written prophets correspond to the four acknowledged Epistles of St. Paul in the New Testament. As from the latter our New Testament scholars demonstrate the verity of the Gospel history, so from the former Prof. Robertson proceeds to demonstrate the impossibilities of the reconstruction, hypothesis and the substantial verity of the old Mosaic history. At the same time the writer is fully aware of the difficulty of maintaining that the books were written in anything like their present form by the hand of Moses. This he does not attempt to assert. The position taken is rendered still stronger by the collateral evidence of the ancient monuments with which the Mosaic history is in such complete harmony. The lines of thought worked out by Prof. Robertson are well deserving of the attention of our biblical scholars.

Anti-Higher Criticism, or Testimony to the Infallibility of the Bible. By PROF. HOWARD OSGOOD, PROF. W. H. GREEN, PROF. WM. G. MOOREHEAD, PASTOR T. W. CHAMBERS, PASTOR J. H. BROOKES, PASTOR G. S. BISHOP, PASTOR B. B. TYLER, PROF. E. F. STROETER, PROF. J. M. STIFLER, PASTOR WM. DINWIDDIE. Edited and compiled by REV. T. W. MUNHALL, M.A. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston and Curtis. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. Cloth, \$1.75.

In the summer of 1893, a Bible Conference was held at Asbury Park, N.J., where a series of lectures were delivered by prominent divines in refutation of the "assaults and assumptions" of the "Higher Criticism." In this book sixteen of these lectures are published, covering, among other fields of controversy, the Pentateuch, Job, the Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel, Esther, Messianic Prophecies, the four Gospels.

Although written in a popular style, some of these lectures enter well into the heart of their subjects, and present the arguments for the traditional view with telling effect. This is particularly true of Professor Green's lectures on the "Unity and Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch"; Dr. Brookes' lectures on "Isaiah"; and Professor Moorehead's on "Messianic Prophecies." In these, as in all the lectures, the fundamental position is taken that the devout critic must begin with Christ and the New Testa-

ment. Inasmuch as Jesus and His disciples evidently held the traditional view, to accept the results of the "Higher Criticism" is to impugn their authority. In so far as the higher critics do this to that extent are they convicted of infidelity, and their teachings are dangerous to the Church.

The authors, however, also meet the higher critics upon their own ground. Professor Green gives an outline of modern pentateuchal theories from Asbene to Kuenen and Wellhausen. These theories are maintained to agree in nothing except the negative conclusion that the Pentateuch is not a single, inspired, logically connected history, with Moses as its author. The contradictions and inconsistencies of the various theories are exposed to view and unsparingly criticised. The traditional view, though open to some trifling objections, is shown to be in every way superior to any theory of composite structure and post-exilic origin. "The great outstanding evidences of unity, which never can be nullified, is the unbroken continuity of the history, the consistent plan upon which the whole is prepared, and the numerous cross references which bound the whole together as the work of one mind."

Dr. Brookes repels the supposition of a "Deutero-Isaiah" as absurd, contradicted not only by tradition, but by internal evidence. To say that an author may not use a different style in different parts of his life-work is ridiculous, and to mention that prophecy must be of later date than the events foretold is to beg the whole question.

Professor Moorehead endeavors to show that Jesus and his disciples held and taught that the prophets spoke of inspiration of God and directly foretold the Christ of history. "The New Testament is the best manual of Old Testament hermeneutics in existence. Its principles are clear, exact, immutable. Its spirit is reverential and profound." The alternatives open to us are well stated by Prof. Kuenen: "We must either cast aside a worthless our dearly bought scientific method, or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament in the domain of the exegesis of the Old."

Dr. Brookes thus expresses the general position taken in these lectures: "Hengstenburg has truly said, 'It cannot be doubted that the Scripture is broken by those who assert that the Psalms breathe a spirit of revenge, that Solomon's Song is a common oriental love song, that there are in the Prophets predictions never to be fulfilled, or by those who deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.' This able scholar might have added that Scripture is broken by all who deny its plenary and verbal inspiration."

Perhaps the authors of these lectures at times present the traditional view in a somewhat one-sided manner, and perhaps they are too apt to insinuate that a certain moral perversity has possessed the higher critics from the time of the dissolute Asbene to the days of the radical Wellhausen, nevertheless the book is one of considerable value and most of the lectures will well repay a careful study.

The Gospels: A Companion to the Life of Our Lord. By CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., LL.D., late Vicar of St. Martin, at Palace, Norwich. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners St. Toronto: Upper Canada Tract Society. Octavo, pp. 520. Cloth, \$2.

The author of the book is too well known to need any formal introduction to the readers of the REVIEW. He began his ministry in this country in connection with the Congregational body: was some time pastor of the Congregational Church at Whitby; and, in consequence of the failure of his health, resigned his pastorate and spent some time in this city. He then removed to England, where he joined the Anglican Church; and while

discharging the duties of a parish clergyman, he has devoted himself largely to literature. His books, which are all of a high order, showing competent scholarship and literary ability, are intended to promote the study of the Word of God, and to assist the reader in getting a thorough comprehension of their meaning, and are well calculated to answer that end. His "Life of Our Lord" is too well known to need to be particularly characterized. It is doubtful whether even Archdeacon Farrar's "Life of Christ" has had a larger sale. His "Hours with the Bible," or "The Bible by Modern Light," as the new edition of it is called, has gained an equally wide acceptance. This work on "The Gospels" is in the same line. The author has made a careful study of the Holy Land, its history and its antiquities; and the object of the book is to so put the life of our Lord, as we have it in the writings of the evangelists, that the reader may be enabled to study its various incidents in the light of their original surroundings. It deals with such subjects as "Christ's Native Town," His "Early Home," "Jerusalem in the Days of Christ," "The Temple as He saw It," His "First Passover," "Judæa in the Gospels," "The First Apostles," "Andrew and Peter," "Jesus and the Samaritans," and "Christ's Own Countries." These are only specimens taken at random from the table of contents, but they are perhaps sufficient to indicate its scope and character. It cannot fail to do good, and we earnestly bespeak for it a wide circulation and many readers.

Outline Studies in the Books of the Old Testament. By W. G. MOORHEAD, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the United Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Xenia, Ohio. Price \$1.50. Toronto, New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co.

An Introduction to the Old Testament. By REV. CHAS. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., Ph.D. Second edition. Revised. Price 75 cents. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co.

Indispensable to the proper understanding of the Scriptures is a good *Introduction*, and as the study of the Sunday School world is just now in the Old Testament, we have pleasure in calling attention to the above two excellent works. They are written from different standpoints, and therefore do not occupy the same field.

The *Outline Studies* are not designed to be critical nor expository, but to be helps for beginners in Bible study. "The one aim has been to furnish for young people an analysis of the contents of each book, and some more prominent features." It opens with a chapter on Bible study, in which some good advice is given, but no definite plan suggested. After explaining the typology of the Bible, each book is taken up, and analyzed with suggestions upon each section. The treatment is safely conservative, and will prove an excellent aid.

The *Introduction* belongs to that excellent series edited by Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D., "The Theological Educator." It presents "the ascertained results of modern criticism, as far as possible, within very confined limits," and is a work for the student. The fact that a second edition was called for within five months of its first issue is an evidence of the value of the book. The author grapples with the problems connected with the Old Testament in the light of modern research and criticism in such a way that reverence for the sacred Scriptures is increased rather than lessened. While admitting that "the Divine and the human element meet together in the written Word, as well as in 'the Word made flesh,'" he maintains "that the Old Testament Scriptures are the work of

divinely inspired men." The book is divided into two parts; the first deals with matter related to "Introduction," as history, editions, versions, text, grammar, etc., and the second with the books of the Old Testament along the lines of the accepted results of modern criticism, though not the so-called "Higher Criticism."

Early Church Series: A Sketch of the First Four Centuries. By J. VERNON BARTLETT, M.A., late scholar in Exeter College, Oxford, and Lecturer on Church History in Mansfield College. London: Religious Tract Society. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. 16mo, pp. 160, 35 cents.

The Printed English Bible, 1525-1885. By RICHARD LOVETT, M.A., editor of "Demaus' William Tyndale, a biography," author of "James Gilmour of Mongolia," etc. Same publishers. 16mo, pp. 159. 35 cents.

These little books belong to the series entitled "Present Day Primers," in course of publication by the London Religious Tract Society, and by the Methodist Publishing House in this country, the object of which is to print in the smallest possible compass, and at the least expense, that kind of information which will be found most helpful to ministers and others engaged in the religious instruction of the young. The titles are sufficiently descriptive of their contents. The first contains an interesting, comprehensive and accurate summary of the chief events in the first four Christian centuries. The second gives in brief the history of the English Bible, beginning with Tyndale's version, and tracing it through all subsequent redactions down to the edition of 1885. The series is to be enlarged shortly by the addition of the following: "How to Study the English Bible," by Canon Girdlestone; "A Primer of Christian Missions," "A Primer of Hebrew Antiquities," by O. C. Whitehouse, M.A., Professor of Hebrew at Chestnut College; "A Primer of Assyriology," by Rev. A. H. Sayce, LL.D., and by other books equally helpful to the biblical and ecclesiastical student. These little works, it will be seen, are prepared by competent scholars, and the information which they contain is fully up to date, and it is difficult to conceive how any more valuable matter could have been crowded into such limited space. We heartily commend them to our readers, believing that they will prove most helpful, not only to the persons in whose interest they are prepared, but to all such as are anxious to know all that they can about the Bible and the Church, and who have not the time or opportunity to read many big books.

The Christian Society. By GEORGE D. HERRON, D.D., the E. D. Rand Professor of Applied Christianity in Iowa College, author of "The Larger Christ," "The New Redemption," etc. Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 12mo, pp. 158. Price \$1.00.

This well-printed and handsome volume is made up of a series of five lectures, which have been delivered by the author before theological and other Christian students at several of the colleges of the United States. They are earnest and eloquent, and are evidently intended to be both radical and revolutionary. They deal with "The Scientific ground of a Christian Sociology," "The Christian Constitution of Society," "The Gospel of Jesus to the Poor," "The Message of Jesus to the Men of Wealth," and "The Political Economy of the Lord's Prayer;" but whether these discourses have shed any new light upon these subjects is a question upon which there will be difference of opinion. That the state of society in Christian communities is not only what it should be, but is such as to

excite serious apprehension in thoughtful minds in respect to the future, is unfortunately only too true; and that nothing but Christianity can furnish the basis for an ideal state of society, is a point upon which one would think there could be no difference of opinion among Christians. That the Church, in the broad and general acceptation of the term, is not doing all that she should do to make society better, is a proposition which, it is to be feared, cannot be successfully controverted. Even the most earnest Christian workers will not be disposed to call it in question. And Dr. Herron has done good service in calling attention to these things with so much emphasis. But that the theologies, or the ecclesiastical institutions of Christendom, or the methods of those who have concentrated their energies upon the salvation of men as individuals, including the conversion of sinners and the perfecting of the saints, knowing nothing "among men but Jesus Christ and him crucified," and thus multiplying and scattering the seeds of the kingdom among men, are in any sense responsible for the evils of society—which seems to be implied in some of the vehement declamation of this volume—is what we are not prepared to admit.

The Raiders, being some Passages in the Life of John Faa, Lord and Earl of Little Egypt. By S. R. CROCKETT, author of "The Stickit Minister and Some Common Men," etc. Octavo, pp. 409. Paper, 60c.; cloth, \$1.25. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. Canadian copyright edition.

Those who have read "The Stickit Minister" will be pretty sure to read this, the latest and best of the author's works. The scene of the story is laid in Rathen, one of the Scottish Isles; the time being "the graceless and unhallowed days after the great killing, when the saints of God had disappeared from the hills of Galloway and Carrick, and when the fastnesses of the utmost hills were held by a set of wild cairds, cattle reivers and murderers, worse than the painted savages of whom navigators to the far seas bring us word." It is, therefore, full of thrilling narratives of adventure, but its principal charm lies in the pictures which it gives us of those rude and troublous times, its admirable delineation of character, and in the quaint and inimitable style in which the story throughout is told. Well printed and well bound, like everything else that proceeds from our Publishing House, it presents a highly respectable appearance.

Sketch of the Apostolic Church. By OLIVER A. THACHER, of the University of Chicago. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 12mo, pp. 309. Cloth, \$1.50.

This scholarly and well-written volume will be found both interesting and helpful to students who are anxious to get a correct view of the Apostolic Church, as it really was, including the preparation which had been made for the advent of Christ, and the establishment of the Kingdom of God, which it was His mission to set up, in the State of the Roman Empire, and especially in the wide dispersion of the Jews, and the influence which they had exerted upon the religious thought of the peoples among whom they sojourned; and who desire to trace the various steps in the evolutionary process by which the Church gradually took shape; and the Christian religion, from being little more than a Jewish sect, or being in danger of becoming such, came to take its place among the independent religions of the world, the greatest of them all, and that which is destined to take the place of all others. Justice has scarcely been done, until recently to the part which was played by Paul in the history of the Apostolic Church, but this is only

one of many books which have appeared within a short time, which tend to put that great man and his work in a true light. Of course we do not endorse every individual view expressed by the author, neither do we expect our readers to do so; but intelligent students will find it none the less interesting and helpful, because they may meet within it, here and there, a passage which requires to be read with thought and discrimination.

Bunyan's Character Lectures, delivered in St. George's Free Church, Edinburgh. By ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, Edinburgh and London. William Briggs, Toronto. First and Second Series, 90 cents each.

Bunyan's characters are here admirably portrayed. Evangelist, Pliable, Obstinate, Goodwill, Greatheart and many others are brought before us, and dealt with in a most practical and helpful way. In an age tending so to utilitarianism, it is refreshing to read these inspiring and helpful pages. Taking Butler as his ethical standard the personalities in "Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress," and "Holy War," are made to do again valiant service in the cause of virtue, truth and evangelical religion. They furnish admirable reading for the fireside, the Sabbath School, and for private meditation and devotion. Too much cannot be said in their praise.

The Religion of Science. By DR. PAUL CARUS. Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago. Price, 50 cents.

Primer of Philosophy. By DR. PAUL CARUS. Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago. Price \$1.

The first of these is an interesting little volume of questions and answers on a variety of subjects, including: "Ethics of the Religion of Science," "The Soul," "Immortality," "Mythology and Religion," "Christ and the Christians." A few quotations will give an idea of its principles and aims. "What are the principles of the religion of science? First, to inquire after truth. Second, to accept the truth. Third, to reject what is untrue. Fourth, to trust in truth. And fifth, to live the truth," "Truth is a correct statement of facts and the laws of its being; it describes a power independent of us." Again, "Truth is a correct representation of reality, it is a picture of God." "The religion of science accepts no special revelations, yet it recognizes certain principles. It has no creed or dogmas, yet it has a clearly defined faith. It does not prescribe peculiar ceremonies or rituals, yet it propounds definite doctrines, and insists on a rigorous ethical code." "The religion of science is not a substitute for the dogmatic and mythological religions of our Churches. On the contrary, the Church religions are a substitute for the religion of science; they are a mere temporary expedient proposing mythologies so long as the truth is not as yet forthcoming. When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. The mythology is of a passing value but the truth will abide."

The second of the above is somewhat more pretentious. It undertakes to present in the simplest possible form the author's view that experience is the sole basis of philosophy, to unfold the methods by which a correct system may be formulated from experience; and to explain the true significance of causation, psychology and religion. "It represents a critical reconciliation of rival philosophies of the type of Kantian apriorism and John Stuart Mill's empiricism."

Much of the matter has been before presented by the author, but it is

here brought together and systematized, making a most readable, instructive and suggestive volume.

The Witness to Immortality in Literature, Philosophy and Life. By GEORGE A. GORDON, Minister of the Old South Church, Boston. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York. Cloth, \$1.75.

This is a valuable book, not so much because of its depth of thought, but because of its deep spiritual tone and its wise adaptation to a large circle of readers. It is written in an easy, fluent style, and in deep, earnest sympathy with the sublime theme of which it treats. But few have access to what has been said by the great thinkers on this subject. Some of their best utterances are here presented to us in a way that makes the man of action feel that he has a common interest with the man of thought in a problem of supreme and transcendent importance. And yet the book is not to be viewed as a mere compilation of other men's thoughts and utterances. It is to all intents and purposes an original work, having the charm of originality from beginning to end. The Old Testament and the New, the prophets and the apostle Paul, the poet and the philosopher, and the Great Teacher Himself are all brought in review before us, their utterances recorded and explained, making a volume attractive in style, suggestive in thought, and spiritually inspiring and helpful.

The Public Life of Christ. A combined chart and map of Palestine, in colors, representing the recorded events of the public life of Christ, in chronological order, and as to geographical location, combined with a complete graphic harmony of the Gospels covering the same period. By Rev. C. J. KEPHART, M.A. Size, 36 x 18 inches. Prices, folded and bound in book-form, cloth, 75 cents; leather, \$1; mounted on rollers, map-form, paper, \$1.25; Cloth, \$1.50. One-third off these prices to our subscribers. Send orders to the Manager.

The Life of Christ. By REV. PROF. SALMOND, D.D., Editor of the "Bible-Class Primer" Series. Cloth covers, pp. 107. Price, 20 cents. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co.

Every student of the Sunday School lessons of this next year will find both of the above great help in the systematic study of the life of Christ. The *Chart* is a unique thing and surpasses any we have seen. It is impossible to describe this ingenious combination which is accompanied with a manual of Scripture texts and other helpful material. Every public act of Christ, with place and date, can be traced, from the baptism to the Ascension. The Gospel harmony is so arranged that the portion of Christ's life and teaching can be seen at a glance. This *Chart* should hang in every minister's study and Sunday School class-room as an invaluable help to students of the life of Christ. The "Bible-Class Primer" *Life of Christ* is a *multum in parvo*, designed as a useful help for teachers. In fact, senior scholars could use it with great advantage and those having larger lives of Christ will find it an excellent synopsis.

A Harmony of the Gospels, being the life of Jesus in the words of the four evangelists. Arranged by REV. W. H. WITHROW, D.D., F.R.S.C. Cloth, 50 cents. Toronto: Wm. Briggs.

This is the first attempt, so far as we know, of the harmony of the Gospels given in one continuous narrative, according to the Revised Version. The purpose of the author is to "give as full and flowing an account as possible of the life of our Lord," and he has succeeded admir-

ably in his difficult task. This monotesaron will give added interest, throw new light, rouse fresh inspiration, and make more vivid and real that matchless life. It, with the chart and life of Christ, above referred to, will afford a complete set of tools for every Bible student.

The Holman New Self-Pronouncing Sunday-School Teachers' Bible.
Toronto: McAinish & Kilgour. Sold only by subscription.

We are again assigned the task of reviewing another edition of the Bible. It is the same old book which needs no introduction nor explanation but tells its own story as the mouth piece of God. It is, however, the "Additional Matter" or helps that is to be the subject of our editorial notice. The special feature of the "Holman Teachers' Sunday-School Bible" is the pronunciation of every proper name in the text itself. This feature adds greatly to the usefulness and efficiency of the Bible as a student's or teacher's textbook. Under *Additional Matter*, there are "The Bible Student's Helper," which covers a great variety of topics that will be of great assistance in Bible study; "Bible lands, their inhabitants, conformation," etc., which covers Jewish ethnology, sects and parties, the natural history of the land and other needed information; "Words obsolete or ambiguous in the English Bible," which, together with the "Glossary of Antiquities, Customs," etc., explains many otherwise dark and difficult-to-be-understood passages; "A subject index," and a "Concordance," both of which are indispensable to the Bible reader; "Dictionary of all Scripture proper names and foreign words contained in the Bible," showing their pronunciation and meaning, with a reference to the verse of Scripture where each word first occurs; and a "Scripture atlas," indexed, which contains twelve maps. In addition to all this complete set of "Helps to the Study of the Bible," there is added "four thousand questions and answers on the Old and New Testaments, intended to open up the Scripture for the use of students and Sunday School Teachers." In later editions this is replaced with a most perfect set of archæological cuts. These "Helps" render inexcusable any Bible teacher, and make a comprehensive understanding of the Scriptures available to every one. This must stand among the most efficient "Teachers' Bible."

Samantha at the World's Fair. By "JOSIAH ALLEN'S WIFE" (Marietta Holley). Illustrated with over one hundred artistic and humorous engravings by Baron C. De Grimm. 8vo, 700 pp. Cloth, \$2.50; half Russia, \$4.00. Sold only by subscription. New York, London and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

No intelligent reader can fail to enjoy "Samantha at the World's Fair," and the side-splitting illustrations, of which there are more than one hundred. This is indeed a book that is able to remove the traces of care from the sad countenance and illumine it with the broadest of healthy smiles. The account of the meeting of Samantha with the Duke of Veragua is simply irresistible. The narrative of Miss Plank, the Chicago boarding-house keeper, with her "respectable and agreeable boarders," and her "fiery cook," is full of human nature and exceedingly droll. The meeting of Samantha with the Infanta, together with De Grimm's illustrations of the characters, are very effective. Josiah posing as Apollo in his bed-room, in the middle of the night, the result of a "brown study" in the art galleries, the dismay of Samantha, and her adroit management of the living "statue," under which he returned to rest, is exceedingly good. Among the illustrations especially good is the artist's portrayal, in a series of ideal portraits, of Columbus as represented in the minds of different nationalities—in fact the book is excellent all the way through its 700 pages.

Humbled Pride; A Story of the Mexican War. Vol. XI., "The Columbian Historical Novels." By JOHN R. MUSICK. Illustrated with eight full-page, half-tone engravings, and sixteen other illustrations, by F. A. Carter. Cloth, 12mo, 462 pp., gold stamps, etc., \$1.50. New York, London and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

This volume supplies a readable and interesting account of historical events pertaining to the administration of Presidents John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, Martin van Buren, William H. Harrison, John Tyler, Jas. K. Polk, Zachary Taylor, Millard Fillmore and Franklin Pierce.

In this book the slavery question almost rises to a climax. The romance of the volume is, perhaps, better conceived than in any of the preceding numbers of the series. Dr. Trunnel's underground railroad, the inveigling of slaves into belief that they were escaping their masters, and selling them into slavery in the West Indies, is all told in the story of Major Stevens' yellow boy, John; a tender and pathetic story, which begins in Kentucky and ends in Cuba with the close of the Cuban insurrection.

A Walk in a Christian Endeavor Cemetery, with comments by a Ghost. A bright booklet, wherein the author in happiest vein has described the diseases which sometimes kill Christian Endeavor societies. There is abundant refined humor, just biting enough to give zest. Paper cover. Price 10 cents, postpaid.

Hints on Bible Marking. A well-printed book of over seventy pages, with an introduction by H. B. HARTZLER, D.D. With new plates, diagrams and explanations of the system of Bible marking, the author has included valuable tables for reference, lists of chapter headings, new Bible readings, railroadings, marginal references, marginal notes, Bible facts, etc., etc. It is by far the most concise yet comprehensive book upon the subject published anywhere. Invaluable to all who desire to study the Word. It is packed with useful material. Stripped of husk, the kernels remain. Paper cover, 25 cents; cloth, 40 cents, postpaid. The above two valuable new books are by REV. J. BERG ESENWEIN, and sold by the Evangelical Publishing Company, Harrisburg, Pa.

The Missionary Review of the World for July is an even more than usually attractive number. The opening article by the Editor-in-Chief is an able and convincing presentation of "The Imperative Need for a New Standard of Giving." In it Dr. Pierson sets forth the tendency and results of the present standard and its contrast to the teachings of the New Testament. The wonderful work of God in Formosa is described by Dr. G. L. Mackay, by whom the work was started and under whom it has been carried on, until now the light of the Gospel is shining above the island, and hundreds of Churches are ministered to by native pastors, who but a few years ago were fierce and naked savages. This article is accompanied by five views from photographs supplied by Dr. Mackay, illustrating the progress of the work in the transformation from heathenism to Christianity. The subject of "Unoccupied Mission Fields of the World," is continued by Rev. James Douglass, who this month takes up Mongolia, Ili, Nepal and Bhotan, Afghanistan and Beloochistan, Siberia, Annam, etc. Other articles of especial interest in the number are: "Missions Among the North American Indians," by Egerton R. Young, author of "Stories from Indian Wigwams," etc.; "Christward Movements among the Jews," by George H. Schodde, Ph.D., and "Pekin and the Great Wall," by Rev. Arthur H. Smith, author of "Chinese Characteristics." The *Field of*

Monthly Survey contains valuable statistics on Circumpolar Missions, North American Indians and the Islands of the Sea, beside an able article by Rev. Joseph Nettleton, of New Guinea, on the last subject.

As becomes a July number of any magazine, the *Atlantic* for this month has its share of out-of-door papers. They show more than one way of getting a change of scene and air, for besides Mr. Frank Bolle's Nova Scotia paper, "The Home of Glooscap," and Mr. Bradford Torrey's Florida sketch on "The Beech at Daytona," an unsigned article, "The City on the House-tops," gives a vivid and sympathetic picture of the summer life on the roofs of houses in the most crowded quarters of New York. It is evidently the work of a man who has lived the life himself. Mr. W. R. Thayer has edited for the *Atlantic* the letters of Sidney Lanier to a Philadelphia friend. They are to appear in two instalments, the first of which, in the current number, shows them to be of uncommon literary interest and biographical value.

The Preacher's Magazine, for July, with its valuable contributions to theological and homiletical thought is received. A choice sermon by Joseph Agar Beet, D.D., upon "The Father's Business," is worthy of that prince of commentators. The Rev. Mark Guy Pearse has a sermon upon "Balaam," which is one of a course of sermons upon "Moses: His Life and Its Lessons." The second of a series of articles, which is commanding world-wide notice, on "The Teacher and The Class," is by James Stalker, D.D., entitled "The Qualifications." "The Lesson of Pentecost," by Rev. Wm. Crosbie, and an article on "The Lord's Supper," add to the value of its contents. The Homiletical Department, always attractive, is doubly so this month. The names of John Telford, B.A., John Edwards, Rev. Robert A. Watson, Joseph Parker, D.D., and Rev. I. E. Page, are found therein, and various outlines of vigorous thought presented. Notes and illustrations find prominent place. "Short Sermons for Busy Men," by Joseph Parker, D.D., is racy. "A Children's Sermon," "Notes on the International S.S. Lessons," "Outline Addresses on the Golden Texts," articles on "Systematic Beneficence," and "Why! How Much?" by Rev. R. M. Donaldson, with other papers, present an unusually good number of this steadily growing magazine, whose success is well established. It is now in its fourth volume.

Public questions of current interest discussed in *The Century* for July are: "The Attack on the Senate," an essay by Charles Dudley Warner; "What German Cities Do for Their Citizens: A Study of Municipal House-keeping," by Albert Shaw; "The New Woman-Suffrage Movement," "The Latest Cheap-Money Experiment," the "American Protective Association," and "A Martyr of To-day" (Robert Ross). A striking and important piece of expert writing will be found in "What German Cities Do for Their Citizens." In this "Study of Municipal House-keeping," Dr. Shaw contributes to the current discussion of the government of cities a large number of facts which are the result or close personal investigation. Among the topics treated are: "Public Works in German Cities," "The Modernizing of Berlin, its Water Supply and Drainage," "Its Thirty Square Miles of Sewage Farms," "Hamburg's New System of Filtered Water," "Reformed Water and Drainage at Breslau and Munich," "Street-Cleaning in Germany," "Success of Municipal Gas Works," "Public Control of Electrical Plants," "The Housing Question and the Berlin Death-Rate," "One-room Households in Various German Cities," "Municipal Measures Against Epidemics," "Abattoirs, Market-halls, and Food Inspection," "A Model System of Poor Relief," "The Municipality as the People's Banker and Pawnbroker," etc., etc.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science is issued bi-monthly, at \$1 a number, or \$6 a year, at Philadelphia, by the learned body whose annals it contains. The May number contains important papers on the following subjects: "Problems of Municipal Government," "Reforms of our State Government," "A Decade of Mortgages," "Failure of Biologic Sociology," "Minutes of the Proceedings," and briefer communications on "Money as a Measure of Value," "An Unfinished Study of Dr. Merriam," "School Savings Banks," "Personal Notes," etc. This simple statement is sufficient to indicate the character and importance of this work, especially to the statesman and the politician, and indeed to all who are interested in the study of the science of government, and the problems of reform, which are ever and anon calling for solution.

"Outdoor Sports" is the title of the opening article of the July number of *The Chautauquan*; in it John H. Mandigo writes of the various kinds of amusements from which the young men and women of to-day can choose. The article is charmingly illustrated. A notable story of adventure and finance by Kenzie Eton Kirkwood, "6,000 Tons of Gold," is begun and carried through three intensely interesting chapters; Ira H. Brainerd contributes a unique article on "The Cuisine of Large Hotels"; a French writer, Alphonse da Calonne, writes of "High Buildings in England and America"; the story of "Daphne's Cruise on a Man-of-War," which was begun in the June number, follows the charming heroine through four more chapters; the series of denominational articles is continued by the Rev. C. H. Eaton, D.D., who tells "What makes a Universalist"; "The Downfall of Coxeyism" is treated of by Shirley Plumer Austin; F. Martini, an Italian, writes of "The Universities of Italy." The department, Woman's Council Table, has short articles on "Lady Henry Somerset's Thrift Clubs," "The Child-Poet," "Women and Sanitary Science," "Berlin's Great Milkman," "The Restoration of Joan of Arc," and "The Honey-Bird of South Africa." The Editorial and Book Departments are full of current interest. The Chautauqua programme, with many illustrations of Chautauqua scenes, is an interesting feature.

The Treasury of Religious Thought for July is, like its predecessors, filled with excellent suitable matter for all preachers, Christian workers and families. Its frontispiece is a portrait of the Rev. Dr. Thos. W. Anderson, of the First United Presbyterian Church, New York city. His sermon on "The Advancing Kingdom" is a strong, sensible presentation of the truth. A view of the church building is also given, with a lengthy biographical sketch of the pastor. Other full sermons are by Drs. John Hall, J. H. Duryea, G. P. Mains and A. C. Dixon. There are also several excellent Leading Thoughts of Sermons. "The Creation of Air" is discussed by Prof. J. Murphy, D.D. A suggestive and helpful article is on "Choosing a Minister." "Light Holders," by Dr. T. L. Cuyler, is presented in an attractive style, well adapted to interest and benefit its readers. "How to Improve the Church's Spiritual Life" should be read by both pastor and people. Several short articles on "Family Life" will amply repay careful reading. Excellent, brief, pithy articles are given, helpful for young people's devotional meetings. There are also: "Thoughts for the Hour of Prayer," "Light from the Orient and from Mission Fields," "Thoughts on Secular and Religious Issues," "A Survey of Christian Progress. Also "Beautiful and Illustrative Thoughts," with Reviews of Books, Periodicals, Points of Wisdom and Bits of Humor.

The Yale Review, a quarterly journal of history and political science, is published by Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, 371 State Street, New Haven, Connecticut. The May number contains important papers on "The Existing Depression," "Currency Debasement," "Indications of Better Times," "Black Friday of 1869," "Historical Industries," "Corporations and the Legislature," "Ulrech Van Hutten in the Light of Recent Investigation," "The Condition of the Southern Farmer," "The Russian American Extradition Treaty." Among the books reviewed are the following: "Stevens' Sources of the Constitution of the United States," "Kid's Social Evolution," "Beloch's Griechische Geschichte," "Creighton's History of the Papacy," "Brough's Natural Law of Money," "Wylie's History of England." Students of history and political science can scarcely fail to find this review helpful.

Volume XXVIII. of *The Homiletic Review* opens with an able statement by Prof. George H. Schodde, of Capitol University, Columbus, Ohio, of the present condition of the Protestant Church in Germany. Rev. Edward M. Deems, Ph.D., writes on "The Ghost Theory of the Origin of Religion," presenting an able refutation of the positions of Mr. Herbert Spencer on this subject. Mrs. Aubrey Richardson, of London, contributes an interesting paper on "The Testimony of Science to the Truth of Christianity." Prof. Wm. C. Wilkinson sends a condensed extract from an extended poem, entitled "The Epic of Paul," in which he treats the subject of "The Imprecatory Psalms." Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward writes on "Chedorlaomer and Abraham," giving new light from recent discoveries upon the relations of those historic characters. Among the sermons worthy of special mention in the Sermonic Section is that of Dr. A. J. F. Behrends, of Brooklyn, on "The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment." Dr. B. F. Kidder, now travelling in the East, gives the first of a series of "Papers on Social Science and Comparative Religion." Suggestive "Lessons from Two Biographies"—those of Dean Stanley and Andrew Bonar—are drawn in the Miscellaneous Section, by the Rev. D. Sutherland, of Charlottetown, P. E. I. The whole number augurs well for the new volume just begun.

The June number of *The New World* (Houghton, Mifflin & Company, Boston and New York) opens with an exceptionally able article on "Baur's New Testament Criticism in the Light of the Present," by H. Holtzmann, of the University of Strasburg, an article which every student of the history of biblical criticism during the last hundred years would do well to read. This is followed by an interesting article, by F. H. Williams, on John Kelpius, Pietist; an article on "The Movement for Religious Equality in England," by Edward Porritt; one on "The Religious and the Historical Uses of the Bible," by Frank C. Porter; one by W. Kirkus, on "The Episcopal Polity"; Orello Cone treats "The Pauline Teaching of the Person of Christ"; R. A. Holland, jr., expounds "The Significance of Pessimism"; Nicholas P. Gilman discusses "Democracy and the Poets"; and Bernhard Duhm closes this part of the review with an article on "The Book of Job." The forty-three pages of "Book Reviews" which follow should be to the book-buyer, and, indeed to every religious and theological student who wants to know what is going on in the religio and the theologico literary world, worth more than the price of the whole number.

Love of country must be the foundation of national progress, and to cultivate patriotism the child must be taught it from the beginning. In the July number of *St. Nicholas* the young American will find valuable lessons in history and loyalty. "A Visit to the North Pole" is a bit of natural science that will cause much pleasant discussion. From the author, Thos.

Winthrop Hall, we learn that there is really and truly one spot on the earth where it is every time of day at once!—and where every wind is a south wind and cold at that!—and where every road leads south!

Among the topics of international interest treated in "The Progress of the World" department of the July *Review of Reviews* are the following: "The Miners' Conference at Berlin," "The Fall of the Casimir-Perier Ministry in France," "The Anglo-Belgian Agreement and the Objections of France," "The Resignation of Stambuloff in Bulgaria," "The Problem of the British House of Lords," "Ministerial Changes in England," and "The Inter-Colonial Conference at Ottawa."

The London Quarterly Review (Wesleyan) presents the following table of contents: 1, "Dean Stanley's Life and Influence;" 2, "Roman Portraits;" 3, "W. H. Smith;" 4, "Modern Views of Inspiration;" 5, "Four English Socialists;" 6, "The Poetry of Dante Gabriel Rossetti;" 7, "Sacerdotalism and the Succession;" 8, "Labor and the Popular Welfare;" 9, "Old New England;" 10, "Short Reviews and Brief Notices;" 11, "Summaries of Foreign Periodicals." It is scarcely necessary to say these articles are all ably written. The first, the fourth, the fifth, and the eighth will be found especially worthy of a careful reading.

The Reformed Quarterly Review, published by the Reformed Church Publishing House, 97 Arch Street, Philadelphia, is scholarly, able and orthodox. It discusses in the current issue, "The Theological Progress of the Reformed Church in the United States," "Thoughts on Liturgical Culture," "Plenary Inspiration," "The Objective Means of Grace and Religious Organization," "Christianity at the End of this Age," "The Moral Difficulties of the Old Testament," "Paul Before His Conversion," and "Bishop Coleman on Episcopal Claims."

The *Methodist Review* for July-August opens with a very interesting historical article on "Seventy-five Years of the *Methodist Review*," by Rev. Jas. Mudge, D.D., in which the rise, development and career of that periodical is reviewed in the hands of its different editors. Shall it be the privilege of anyone thus to sketch the history of the CANADIAN METHODIST REVIEW? Our own Dr. Withrow contributes an excellent article on "The Early English Drama." "Our Constitutional Problem" by Rev. B. F. Rawlins, is a discussion of "The Question of a More Clearly Defined Constitution for the General Conference" of the Methodist Episcopal Church, now before that Church and in the hands of a Commission. He closes the paper by suggesting "that all American Methodism be brought into counsel," to which we most heartily say, Yes, by all means. A kindred article is "General Conference Power and Procedure," by Judge H. L. Sibley. The theological articles are, "The Methodist Doctrine of Free Will," by Rev. T. M. Griffith, D.D., and "The Mystery of the Trinity," by Rev. Edwin Sherwood. "The Prophetic Writings," by Rev. C. W. Gallagher, D.D., is a contribution to Biblical study, and "Forms of Belief in Transmigration," by Rev. John Weir, D.D., on Anthropology. The departments of "Notes and Discussions," "The Arena," and "The Itinerants' Club," are always of great interest, and we expect to see similar work done in our own REVIEW.

The July number of *The Monist* has an able and entertaining series of articles. Prominent among them are the following: Prof. Adolf Harnack on "The Religion of Science"; and "The Message of Monism to the World," by the editor, Dr. Paul Carus; "Philosophy and Industrial Life," by Prof. J. Clark Murray; "Outlines of a History of Indian Philosophy,"

by Prof. Richard Garbe. In former notices of *The Monist* we have explained somewhat its purpose and aim. "The new philosophy which is dawning upon mankind has been briefly called Monism, or the theory of oneness, which indicates that the world, we ourselves included, must be conceived as one great whole. All generalizations, such as matter, mind and motion, are abstractions representing aspects of reality, but not entities or things-in-themselves, by a combination of which the universe has been pieced together; and all our notions of nature can be formulated in exact statements, which, when properly understood, form one harmonious system of natural laws." In "The Message of Monism to the World," the writer eloquently outlines its mission; but with his conception, of God, person, immortality, etc., his views will "struggle for existence" before they finally "overcome the powers which sway the mass of mankind." "We should neither call God personal nor impersonal, but superpersonal." ("The Religion of Science," p. 23.) This sounds badly enough, while the whole system—if such it may be called—seems to resolve itself into some sort of materialistic pantheism. The reference of his readers to Ribot's conception of human personality, and his adoption of that theory, may satisfy a few, but we are persuaded that the eloquent Frenchman has not given a final utterance upon the nature and significance of personality. Nor are we satisfied that ethics and religion are more significant from the standpoint of Monism than they are from what we may venture to call the orthodox conceptions of God and human personality. Neither religion nor ethics should be unscientific, but we have looked in vain for anything especially scientific in either when based upon a Monism that cannot be viewed as personal. That Monism is true, we believe, but it is the Monism that attaches to personality and will. In the light of these remarks we consider that he has failed to establish his contention as against Professor Harnack.

The Charities Review, organ of the Charity organization, published monthly for that body, by Oswald Weber, jr., 105 East 22nd Street, New York, is a journal of practical sociology. The May number has important papers on the following subjects: "Five Months' Work for the Unemployed in New York City," by Mrs. Charles L. Lowell; "An Attempt to Give Justice," by Dr. Arnold Milsart; "Friendly Visiting the True Charity," by Mrs. A. K. Norton; "Charity Organization Society of New York"; "General Notes"; "Charity Organization Societies"; "Gifts and Bequests"; "Summary."

The Cyclopedic Review of Current History (Garretson Cox & Co., Buffalo, N. Y.) is one of a class of works which are almost indispensable for the journalist and others whose duties require them to deal with current events. A very hasty examination of the number which covers the first quarter of the present year, creates the impression that the record is pretty full, that the compilation has been made with judgment and care, and that on the whole, it is calculated to serve a useful purpose.

Christian Thought for June contains the article upon which Dr. Deems, the late editor, was writing when stricken with paralysis, entitled "A Study in Biblical Psychology," which is characterized by his keen philosophy. In "The Part of the Race in Sins of the Individual," Dr. A. H. Bradford holds the solidarity of the race, regards the sin of the individual as also of the race, and that Christ is a social as well as an individual Saviour. The other articles of special interest are "The Pulpit and Modern Unbelief," by Rev. Y. B. Drury, D.D., and "Reflex Influence of Character Upon Intellect."