JUNE 1890

The Theological Monthly

WELLHAUSEN ON THE PENTATEUCH.

ONE of the reviewers of a recent volume of Essays, which has made some sensation, relates an anecdote of Dr. Pusey, which, in connection with recent events, is remarkable enough. He tells us how many years ago he was walking with Dr. Pusey in Oxford, and how the famous theologian remarked to him that when the excitement connected with the Tractarian movement had subsided, we should have to face an onslaught on Holy Scripture.[1] This prophecy is now in process of fulfilment. As regards the New Testament, the assault has been delivered, and has been successfully repelled by the masterly papers of the late Bishop Lightfoot in the *Contemporary Review*, and by the labours of men like the new Bishop of Durham and the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. As regards the Old Testament, however, the case is different. The theories which, in one shape or other, have become dominant in Germany are received in England with the utmost favour. Professors in both Universities have stamped them with their patronage, and the greatest possible sensation has been caused by the practical adoption of some of their main features by clergy placed in charge of an institution raised to the memory of Dr. Pusey himself, who, while he lived, was the most uncompromising opponent of the "free-handling" theory. It is surprising how little attention these facts are attracting among English Churchmen in general. They are disputing about Sacerdotalism and Ritualism, and the doctrine of the Presence and Sacrifice in the Eucharist, and seem utterly unaware of the danger that

[1] *Foreign Church Chronicle*, March, 1890, p. 55.

is menacing them in an altogether different direction. While they are contending about details, principles are being questioned. The ground on which both parties to the Bishop of Lincoln's trial stand is being undermined beneath their feet. For the question at issue is nothing less than this, Has God proceeded on a definite plan in His training of man since the foundation of the world, or was Christianity an entirely new thing? The real tendency of the new movement may be concealed for the present. English Biblical critics so far have only accepted a few of the conclusions of their foreign brethren. They have hesitated to adopt their method, and to follow it out boldly to its legitimate results. But sooner or later we shall have to face the consequences involved in the present fashion in Old Testament criticism. It lands us in the position which the early Church distinctly refused to accept. In the second century Marcion subjected the Old Testament Scriptures to the destructive criticism in vogue in his day. He rejected the Old Testament altogether, and declared Christianity to be entirely a new religion. The Christian Church at once repudiated his opinions. They have entirely disappeared for seventeen centuries, and almost all we know of them now is derived from the elaborate refutation of them by Tertullian. But the old Marcionite doctrine is again before us in modern dress. The new criticism practically sets aside the Old Testament as the channel of a Divine revelation, and its ultimate result is to deny the existence of any Divine scheme for the training of man, carried on by means of supernatural interpositions, until the coming of Jesus Christ. Nor is this all. The denial of the supernatural character of the revelations made by God to Abraham, Moses, and the prophets (for it is one characteristic of the German criticism that all prophecies must have been written after the event) does a vast deal to rob the supernatural element in Christianity of its credibility. If the miraculous were never heard of before Christ, the evidence for the Christian miracles is weakened, and the evidence of prophecy vanishes. There is but a short step from this to the entire elimination of the supernatural from Christianity. Such teaching is a dangerous approxi-

mation to the views of those who regard Christ simply as a moral teacher of extraordinary elevation of character, capable of awaking the most intense enthusiasm, and gradually deified by the affection of His followers.

The same thing may be said of the limitation of our Lord's human knowledge, which is fast becoming an article of faith among those who deny the authenticity of the Old Testament. We cannot, it is true, in the face of such passages as Luke ii. 52, and Mark xiii. 32, contend that the omniscience of the Godhead extended in every case to the manhood. But in imposing limits to the human knowledge of Christ, we should at least feel that we are on dangerous ground. We might well distrust theories which force us to postulate a great deal more ignorance in Christ than we are willing to admit in ourselves. If a German critic in the nineteenth century can see so plainly that the Hexateuch was a composite work, full of obvious inaccuracies, and unquestionably written long after the recorded events, it casts, one would think, somewhat of a slur on the authority of the Incarnate Word of God, to be compelled to admit that He, coming among men in the shape of a Jew of Palestine, had not the slightest suspicion of such inconsistencies, absurdities, and dishonesties as excite now the mirth, now the contempt, and not unfrequently the indignation of a Julius Wellhausen. Wellhausen, it is true, is specially severe on the writer of Chronicles. But he represents the Hexateuch as a jumble of the most palpable contradictions and incongruities. Are we to suppose that the Incarnate Wisdom failed to see this, or that in quoting Scripture He wilfully concealed what He saw? Before we commit ourselves to opinions which involve, or may ultimately be found to involve, such vast consequences, it is our duty to consider the important interests which are at stake, and to demand an amount of evidence proportionate to the magnitude of the issue.

A brief account of the history of the theories which are now becoming so popular among us may not be out of place. As far back as the time of Aben Ezra, it was recognized that there were signs of interpolation and editorship in the

Pentateuch, but that able critic did not deny that it had on the whole a Mosaic origin. Spinoza, and after him, Astruc, contended that it was a compilation; other critics, among whom the well-known De Wette may be numbered, followed in their train, until at last the theory of disintegration took definite shape and form in the conclusions of Ewald, which were confidently accepted some thirty years ago by "liberal" theologians and critics as the "conclusions of modern critical science." His theory is elaborate indeed. He postulates (1) a few fragments of works contemporary with Moses, embedded in a mass of later matter. These consist of (*a*) the Book of the Wars of Jahveh, quoted in Num. xxi. 14, (*b*) the Biography of Moses, (*c*) the Book of Covenants. Then (2) follows the Book of Origins, written about the time of David. Then (3) the narratives written by the prophets, attributed to three different authors; and, lastly, the Deuteronomist, who reduced these various materials into shape, with the addition of supplementary matter of his own, suited to the purpose he had in hand; that purpose being to induce people to accept his view of Jewish institutions as the voice of Moses himself. No other word but "dishonest" can fitly describe an attempt on the part of the sacerdotal class, how excellent soever may have been its intentions, to secure attention to the religious system it desired to establish, by representing it as the work of Moses. These conclusions are put forward by Ewald, as by all other Old Testament critics it has been my fortune to meet, with a lofty infallibility which disdains argument. Questions of style are settled by an *ipse dixit*, and matters of history are dealt with as suits the critic's taste. Other writers of the same school, as might be expected, differ from Ewald in his conclusions. Each thinks for himself, and each is equally infallible. Knobel reduces the number of writers on the ground that Ewald's system is "so complicated and obscure a fabric"[1] that it will not bear investigation. Hupfeld proposes a different arrangement, which is further simplified by Nöldeke, who is still too elaborate for Bleek. Ewald, in turn,

[1] Ein so verwickeltes und unklares Gewebe. *Kritik des Pentateuch und Josua*, p. 496.

denounces Knobel's conclusions as "unsatisfactory and perverse." Originality, no doubt, there was in these speculations, but there was certainly very little unanimity. It has not lessened the confusion that the solution of this intricate problem of language and history, the results of which are so confidently offered to us, was meanwhile being sought in a different direction. Deuteronomy had hitherto been regarded as the latest form Mosaic institutions had adopted. But as this theory broke down in its application, a new one has been invented in its stead. The school of Reuss and Graf, popularized in this country by Kuenen and Wellhausen, selects somewhat arbitrarily portions of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, which it calls the Priestly Code, and makes this the latest development of Jewish institutions, and its authors the men who brought the historical narratives into something near their present shape. A forgery of a very elaborate kind certainly, and it might be said one rather difficult to palm off successfully on a nation not altogether destitute of literary culture.[1] If it be asked what evidence these writers give for their theories, it must be confessed that it is slight enough. It consists very largely of unproved assertions. Some evidence of this statement will be found below, and it could be added to almost indefinitely. Not one shred of direct historical evidence is offered in support of the theory. The ground on which these conclusions are offered to our acceptance is simply critical, and the critics themselves differ on every point except one, which we shall presently mention. As Professor Freeman has lately complained in the case of certain speculators on the origin of the English race, they

[1] Delitzsch's adhesion to the new criticism, as announced in the last edition of his commentary on Genesis, has been received with much delight by its supporters. But thirty years ago and more he had accepted the theory of the "Elohist" and "Jehovist," and thus, as Mr. Bissell says (*The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure*, p. 69) has "placed himself in a very stiff and ugly current," from which a hope is expressed that "he may get safely out." The coarsest form the new criticism has assumed is in Renan's *History of the People of Israel*. Yet its leading principles of the impossibility of the supernatural and the possibility of reconstruction of ancient documents by purely critical methods once conceded, there seems no reason why we should stop short anywhere.

make their theories first, and then strive to manipulate the facts so as to square with them.

The history of the new criticism in England is remarkable. Its supporters are to be found in both Universities. But they speak with bated breath. The freedom with which Wellhausen picks to pieces the Hexateuch and the Book of Chronicles, the scorn with which he flings charges of deliberate falsification against the compiler of the latter volume, disappear in their passage across the seas. In England the Old Testament is treated with some respect. The charges of deliberate falsification vanish. The language of the critics is less arrogant and more reverent, and the conclusions are very considerably toned down. All that we find asserted is that there is a general consent among critics that the Pentateuch is a composite work, and that criticism has established the fact that the mode of composition among the Hebrews was largely compilation. The discrepancies which undoubtedly exist are cited as evidence of the growth of the Mosaic institutions from their germ in the days of Moses to their fully developed condition under the exile. The Pusey House, in the person of Mr. Gore, is willing to accept this theory of development, and to admit that the account in Chronicles may have been "idealized," whether in the interests of the sacerdotal class, as his authorities would tell him, or not, does not appear. But there are not wanting indications that the way is not quite so smooth for the new theories as has been supposed. Just as the Tübingen school was compelled, in support of its violent theories in regard to the New Testament, to deny the genuineness of most, if not all, of the literature of the sub-Apostolic age, so some later critics have been driven to the sweeping assertion of the post-exilic origin of nearly the whole Psalter, in spite of the immense historic and linguistic difficulties of the theory, including evidences of literary growth so obvious that they cannot be overlooked even by the most superficial student of the Psalter in its English dress. Here, at least, the common consent of critics cannot be assumed, and it may safely be predicted that this short cut

to the goal will involve those who take it in the difficulties in which short cuts proverbially result.

Such is a brief review of the past history and present condition of the new theory respecting Jewish institutions. There needs no apology for submitting it to the test of criticism, even by those who have not studied all the latest literature on the subject. For the question involves the very gravest questions, both of religion and morals; and it is one on which every Christian teacher is bound to have an opinion. The theory is not propounded to us on authority, for, as we have seen, the authorities differ on almost every point; and even where they are agreed, we have some ground, as will hereafter appear, for considerable suspicion of their methods. It must therefore be decided by the verdict of the enlightened Christian conscience, and then every Christian man has a right to state his difficulties. There is, as has been said, a serious moral question involved. The declaration required from our clergy that they "unfeignedly believe" a compilation in the main unhistorical, but containing a not very easily verifiable substratum of fact, to be the inspired Word of God, is surely a remarkable use of language. By all means let such a declaration be expunged from our Ordinal, if the truth demands it. But it is our duty to inquire most fully and closely whether the truth *does* demand it. It is a serious matter to unsettle traditional beliefs. It is difficult to decide which is the more culpable, to disturb the foundations of men's faith on insufficient grounds, or to talk solemnly of the duty of "unfeignedly believing" that which is untrue. Yet on one or other horn of the dilemma we are impaled. Either the new or the traditional theology of the Church of England is guilty of an outrage upon the first principles of morality and common sense. Nor is this all. It is difficult to see how we can commend writings to our people as inspired which conflict with the fundamental principles of morality. If the institutions of the Jewish people were not Mosaic in their origin, but were slowly developed out of the Mosaic regulations, in the course of after ages, it is a simple untruth to represent

them as the work of Moses. If the narratives in Chronicles be not authentic history, but history tampered with in the interests of the sacerdotal class, it is an abuse of words to speak of them as inspired by God. "God is not a man, that He should lie." We cannot conceive of Him as the inspirer of ingenious literary frauds. And to represent such productions as in any sense inspired by Him is to strike at the root both of morality and religion. It were better to embrace Agnosticism, with its frank confession of ignorance about God, than to worship a God who not merely winks at the deliberate falsification of facts for a purpose, but is actually in collusion with those who have done so. In saying this, it is not in the least degree desired to narrow unduly the liberty the Catholic Church has ever allowed to her children on the subject of Inspiration. It has always been an open question whether there be any liability to error on the part of the writers of the Old and New Testaments, and if there be, how far such liability extends. But to deny that they were the channels of a revelation whereby God was pleased to speak to His people, is a virtual denial of their inspiration. To admit that their writings were "idealized," for any purpose, however excellent, is to place their credit far below that of an ordinary Christian historian, and scarcely on a level with that of any respectable moral or religious work.[1] We should all cry shame on the Roman Catholic Church if she attempted at the present time to palm off on the Christian world a Bible remodelled to suit her system as the veritable Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. We may make what allowances we please for the spirit of the age and the circumstances of the compilers ; but if the Jewish sacerdotal class, subsequent to the exile, attempted and accomplished a similar feat, it was a dishonest act, even if excusable, and we

[1] Mr. Gore now writes to say that no one would think of stigmatizing the books of Chronicles as unhistorical. They are, he adds, the faithful record of tradition. In other words, they are not "idealized" history, conscious or "unconscious," as he represents them to be in *Lux Mundi*, p. 353. There is no reading into the history anything that was not there originally, but they contain a faithful record of what has been handed down. The traditions may be true or false. That is matter for argument. But they are at least honestly narrated as they reached the writer.

cannot without impiety declare that a volume so composed was given by inspiration of God.

As has been already intimated, however, the theory, in its English dress, comes before us in so vague a form that we may fairly call upon its English supporters to place it in a little more definite shape. Since it is on the general agreement of German writers, working on principles not hitherto accepted in England, that they found their claim to be heard,[1] we may ask how much of the German system they are prepared to adopt. They tell us that there is no desire to regard any other than Moses as the "ultimate founder" of Israelite institutions. Do these institutions consist of anything more than the "original form" of the Ten Commandments?[2] We may ask, again, whether they are ready to adopt the *tone* of their German *collaborateurs*. Will they, with Wellhausen, treat the narrative in Chronicles as a subject for ridicule, for contempt, for a lofty tone of moral rebuke?[3] Do they ask us to embrace his canons of criticism, which not only preclude the possibility of actual prophecy, but of any remarkable prevision of coming events?[4] Must we accept the dictatorial and dogmatic utter-

[1] Canon Driver in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1890, p. 224.

[2] "It need not be repeated here that Moses bequeathed no book of the law to the tribes of Israel. *Certainly* nothing more was committed to writing by him or in his time than 'the ten words' in their original form" (Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 7). The italics are mine. It seems likely that a good many Englishmen will be found who will attach no weight whatever to criticism of this kind, unless it be put forth with somewhat more modesty, and unless a little argument be added.

[3] Thus "cunning, and treachery, and battle, and murder . . . . are passed over in silence" by the writer of Chronicles, in "a deliberate, and in its motives a very transparent mutilation of the original narrative as preserved for us in the Book of Samuel" (*History of Israel*, p. 173). The purpose is, of course, the unjust glorification of David. 1 Chron. xii. 29 contains a "naïve remark" (p. 174). 1 Chron. xv. "positively revels" in priests and Levites, "of whom not a single word is to be found in 1 Sam. vi." In chapters xviii.-xx. the author "seems to refresh himself with a little variety" (p. 177). The closing chapters of this book are "a startling instance of the statistical phantasy of the Jews which revels" "in artificial marshallings of names and numbers . . . . which simply stand on parade. . . . . The monotony is occasionally broken by unctuous phrases" (p. 181). His is a "law-crazed fancy" (p. 195). "Power is the index of piety, with which accordingly it rises and falls" (p. 209).

[4] As where Wellhausen says of the denunciations of disobedience contained in

ances, of which some specimens have already been given, while the readers of Kuenen and Wellhausen may discover for themselves almost as many more as they please ?[1] Are we to adopt all the results of the German method, or only some of them ? Are we, for instance, to regard as incontrovertible the remarkable assignment to their sources of the various sentences of the history of the Deluge, which is issued on the authority of two professors of a German university ? And if not, why not ? How much of it are we to receive, and how much to reject, and on what grounds ? Is the method which professes to yield such results a sound one, or, if not altogether sound, how far is it to be trusted at all ? These are the questions which our English critics have as yet not fairly faced. But they must be answered categorically, if English Christians as a body are to place any confidence in what is put before them as scientific criticism. The following is the arrangement to which reference has been made.[2]

The seventh chapter of Genesis, down to the 9th verse, is the work of the second Jehovist, with the exception of the words " male and female " in ver. 3, added by the " redactor," and the statement that " Noah was six hundred years old when the flood (redactor, " flood of waters ") came upon the earth," which was added by the author of the Priestly Code. We proceed with the narrative from ver. 9 onward, denoting

Lev. xxvi., " the words undoubtedly cannot have been written before the Babylonian exile " (p. 383).

[1] Thus Ewald, who, as a linguistic critic, was certainly better equipped for the task than those who have succeeded him, authoritatively pronounces Deuteronomy to be later Hebrew than Leviticus. Kuenen (*Religion of Israel*, p. 184) says of Knobel, " He makes Lev. xix. 5-8 younger than Lev. vii. 15-18. The converse is true." No attempt is made to prove this statement. Wellhausen is quite as infallible. He tells us that the " earlier prophets " of the Hebrew canon date, in their present shape, from the reign of Jeconiah (Introd., p. 1). The blessing of Moses is " an independent document of Northern Israel, which speaks for itself " (p. 135). Gen. v. belongs to the Priestly Code, while Gen. iv. is a compilation from the Jehovist and Elohist (p. 308). And yet Wellhausen complains of the " dogmatic way of making history " indulged in by other writers, who have used their authorities instead of picking them to pieces at pleasure (p. 40).

[2] *Die Genesis, mit äusserer unterscheidung der Quellenschriften.* Ubersetzt von E. Kautsch & A. Socin. Freiburg, I. B. 1888.

the work of the writer of the Priestly Code by P C, that of the first Jehovist by J^1, the second Jehovist by J^2, the Elohist by E, the passages in which it is impossible to distinguish between the Elohist and second Jehovist by J E, and the work of the "redactor," or final editor, by R.

"There went in two and two (J^2), male and female (R), to Noah into the ark, as (J^2) Elohim (R) had commanded Noah. And at the expiration of the seven days, there came the waters of the flood upon the earth (J^2). In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened (P C). And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights" (J^2).

The next four verses were written by the author of the Priestly Code, except the last five words, "and Jehovah shut him in," which are by the hand of J^2. We append ver. 17, which contains a striking instance of the minuteness of modern critical analysis, and the confidence with which its remarkable results are presented. It has been discovered that the sources of ver. 17 are as follows :—

"And the flood was (P C) forty days (R) upon the earth (P C). And the waters increased and bare up the ark, and it was lift up above the earth" (J^2).

The next four verses are by the author of the Priestly Code. Vers. 22, 23 are by the second Jehovist, down to the words "face of the ground." Then the final editor takes up his parable, and adds, "both man, and cattle, and creeping thing, and fowl of the heaven, and they were destroyed from the earth." The remainder of the verse is by the hand of the second Jehovist, and a paragraph from the author of the Priestly Code concludes the chapter.

Another instance of the perfection to which modern methods of critical analysis claim to have attained may be extracted from Gen. xxi.

[1] "And Jehovah visited Sarah as He had said (J^2), and (P C) Jehovah (R) did unto Sarah as He had spoken (P C).

[1] The "redactor" is responsible for the word "Jehovah" only.

And Sarah conceived, and bare Abraham a son in his old age (J^2), at the set time of which God had spoken to him (P C)."

The narrative of P C continues down to the end of ver. 5, when it is taken up by the Elohist, to whom ver. 6 belongs. Ver. 7 is the work of J^2, and then the Elohist narrative continues to the end of the chapter, with the exception of the concluding words, "And Abimelech rose up, and Phicol, the captain of his host, and they returned into the land of the Philistines. And Abraham planted a tamarisk tree in Beersheba, and called there on the name of Jehovah, the everlasting God. And Abraham sojourned in the land of the Philistines many days."

This specimen of the results of the new criticism will hardly inspire much confidence in England. It is given to the world without a shadow of proof beyond a casual reference to the works of Kuenen, Wellhausen, Budde, and Dillmann, who are, it must be remembered, by no means in agreement among themselves. When, therefore, we are asked to accept the hypothesis of documents of various ages, combined by a post-exilic redactor, on the ground of the general agreement of critics, we are at least entitled to ask, What is this general agreement worth, and how is it attained? Fifty years ago there was a general agreement among German critics of the Tübingen school that the Epistle to the Romans was a combination into one of five or six separate epistles written by various hands, and that the fourth Gospel was a Gentile fabrication of the latter half of the second century. Where is this general agreement now? What guarantee have we that similar and yet more startling results of Old Testament criticism are one whit more trustworthy, or that they are anything beyond the vague and random conclusions of a school in which assertion takes the place of argument, and history is replaced by flights of imagination? Is the theory based on linguistic considerations? We turn to Wellhausen, and we find the whole question of linguistic analysis dismissed by him in six pages, containing nothing which the extremest stretch of courtesy could be termed an argument.[1] We pass on to

[1] *History of Israel*, pp. 385-391.

Kuenen. There we find that the general consent on which so much stress is laid is already assumed as a basis of argument. It is, we are told, "universally admitted" that in chapters xviii.-xxvi. in Leviticus there is a difference of idiom and style.[1] Ewald, it must be acknowledged, has some qualifications for the task of analysis he has attempted. But as his conclusions regarding style and date altogether differ from those of the later school, the question of literary analysis is touched by them with a delicate hand. Indeed, Wellhausen admits, with something approaching to a sigh, that Hebrew critical knowledge is in its infancy."[2] But if so, it might be wise to wait awhile before taking anything for granted. We may, at least, very reasonably doubt whether it is safe to build any very decided conclusions upon so unsure a foundation. There is a yet more pressing reason for reserving our opinion. It is more than possible that the propositions Kuenen tells us are "universally admitted" may have been accepted not, as is professed, on critical grounds, but on the ground which has met with general acceptance on the Continent, that documents which relate to supernatural events must needs have been written at a considerable distance from the time when those events are said to have happened. If we in England do not accept the premises, we are certainly entitled to distrust the conclusion.

The subject will be resumed in a subsequent paper. Meanwhile it may be well to state that there is no desire to approach the question in a narrow or retrogade spirit. The fullest and freest discussion is not only a necessity, but a duty. Nor is it denied that there is at least an element of truth at the bottom of the arguments of the new criticism. It may very fairly be admitted—

1. That the author of the Pentateuch may possibly not be Moses himself.

2. That the author, whoever he was, made use of documents or of oral tradition in something approaching to a fixed and literary form.

[1] Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, chap. vii. vol. 2. His investigation of the whole question in the *Theol. Tijdschr* of 1870 consists of 26 pp.

[2] "The study of the history of languages is still at a very elementary stage in Hebrew."—*History of Israel*, p. 390.

3. That sundry inaccuracies in numbers and dates have crept into the text.

4. That there are various interpolations inserted into the narrative.

5. That there are indubitable signs of later editorship.

What may be considered as unproved, and what ought not to be accepted without much stronger evidence than has yet been adduced is—

1. That any part of the Old Testament is a fictitious narrative, invented, with how excellent intentions soever, on behalf of a religious system.

2. That the greater part of the provisions of the law were drawn up subsequent to the career of Israel as an independent nation, and had no part whatever in moulding the national life.

3. That the documents used in the compilation of the Pentateuch are subsequent to the age of Moses.

4. That the interpolations are so important and so numerous as to affect to a very great extent the structure of the book.

5. That the editorship consisted in anything more than the arrangement of matter previously existing in a written shape, with explanatory glosses and appendices.

These are points on which many of us are anxious for more light. If it is proposed that we shall accept conclusions so sweeping, we are at least entitled to ask that sufficient evidence shall be produced. We are not prepared to bow even to the general consent of writers whose methods appear to us startling and their conclusions extravagant and *bizarre*. We admit the existence of difficulties and discrepancies, but the new theories, we believe, account no more for these difficulties and discrepancies than did the old. And until we have fuller and more satisfactory proof of the truth of these theories than any that has as yet been given, we must continue to believe that it is impossible to dissect the Mosaic Scriptures and assign the various portions of them to authors of whose historical existence we have no evidence, and must regard the Old Testament as in the main an authentic account of Jewish institutions and Jewish national life.

J. J. LIAS.

THE CHURCH AND THE AGE.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has earned the gratitude of the Church of England by having published the Visitation Addresses he delivered last year.[1] They contain thoughts too valuable to be allowed to die in the hour of delivery; thoughts which are not for the diocese alone, but for the Church generally; thoughts that, coming from an Archbishop, will exert an influence which they would not have had if spoken by a meaner man. They will show the deep interest taken by the highest Prelate in the poorest person in the land. This is well, for there are many who, being utterly ignorant of their work, imagine the clergy to be solely occupied by praying and preaching, attending tea-meetings, and making themselves agreeable at bazaars. This book will prove to all such that their sympathies have a wider range, and that their activities are also exercised in the homes of the poor and the suffering. The author's stirring appeal to the laity for their assistance in works of benevolence and mercy must also bear good fruit, and will doubtless add many a recruit to the ranks of the Church Army. It would be unfair to the laity to ignore the fact that at the present time this assistance is being largely and generously rendered; still, however, there is scope enough for further exertions, and work waiting for willing hands. The thorough earnestness of the Bishop's tone which rings through every page will, it is hoped, prove to be infectious, and double the enthusiasm that may previously have been felt in the noble work of trying to make men somewhat better men than they were before. The language is terse, chaste, and scholarly; and is well calculated to win for the book a place on many a table where books of this class are but seldom seen. The volume is one for which we heartily thank his Grace; but it does not therefore follow that it must be considered perfect.

[1] *Christ and His Times.* Macmillan & Co. 1889.

The title "Christ and His Times" seems unfortunate, because it suggests something very different from what the writer means, and something not so interesting. We naturally think a work so named must be descriptive of some relation of Christ to the times in which He lived on earth; whereas it is really an examination of what ought to be a work of the Church on the present age. A title should be a title, and not a phrase needing explanation and justification. We have both given us here, for we are told that "it is of the highest importance to us to have it constantly in mind that *these* times, this century and decade, are the times of Christ, no less than was the reign of the Herods or the governorship of Pilate. The present day is one of His days, and we are His contemporaries." All this is fact; it is, however, the simple truism that Christ is not dead. But as Christ existed in all time before the Herods, as well as in all time since, the "Times of Christ" mean, as thus understood, the *time* since man was made. This vagueness in the title also hides the fact that different times have different characteristics, which mark them off as "Ages." The Archbishop acknowledges this when he speaks of "The Age of Augustus" and the "Napoleonic Era," saying that they "present distinct ideas." The distinctive character possessed by certain ages is a most important consideration in determining the nature of any work to be done in any age for the benefit of that age. That which would be suitable for an age of literary analysis would not be suitable for an age of physical analysis. Through all the ages there is one unvarying element, and that is Christ; on the other hand, there is ever-varying thought: intermediary between the two is the Church, which, being in contact with both, should partake of the character of both. There must be the permanence of Christ as Christ; developing, it may be, to us in greater clearness of apprehension, more general breadth of adaptation, purer spirituality of influence, but the same Christ still; as there is permanence of the plant from seed to leaf, from leaf to flower, and from flower to seed again. But while the Church is founded on the Rock, and obtains its

materials of structure from the Rock, the Age must be its architect. Some may say, " No, the Church must mould the age, and not the age the Church." We reply, That cannot be in the modes of presentation of the truth. Critics do their work regardless of the Church, naturalists do the same; they both bring the results of their labours to the Church, and ask, "What have you to say to this, and this?" The answer to critic and to naturalist must be on their own lines, or it will not be an answer, but an evasion, which is greatly worse than a confession of absolute ignorance. May we be pardoned for thinking that Dr. Benson has not sufficiently emphasised this consideration in his eloquent Charges? He has not altogether overlooked it, but the treatment is insufficient for so important a subject. For example, when speaking of poverty he says, " In a few lines we can state what we see to be some main causes, so far as we know them, which in the course of less than fifty years have accumulated these populations and their miseries—of course there were always poor. In the days of Job there were those who 'embraced the rock for want of a shelter.' In the days of David there were rich men who 'ravished the poor when they got him into their nets.' But the poverty of uncivilized tribes and of the victims of direct oppression is a different phenomenon from this poverty which rears its head in the midst of civilization, which liberal employers of labour see spring up around them without their being able to prevent it except at their own ruin, and then wider spread ruin still." He approaches more nearly a correct analysis when he states that " observation traces the steps by which new methods of production, with multiplied population, have turned whole classes of growers, makers, owners, sellers, who lived mainly by what they grew and made, into workers under others, and receivers of wages." These two quotations indicate his position as regards poverty; it is a fact of all time, but the poverty of the present time has special peculiarities. This latter fact is the point to be examined critically and exhaustively; but this is the point that is almost overlooked; and because it is so, the Church gets but little help and less

direction. There cannot be any doubt that it was the fervent wish of the writer to aid the clergy in battling with those evils which battle with all that is best and truest in man ; but we regret the feeling that he has not altogether succeeded ; he has centred attention on the mere description of the evils ; but this was a less important part of his subject, less important for instruction, inasmuch as they are universally acknowledged. The facts of poverty, impurity, and intemperance, are only too familiar to nearly all the clergy. The Archbishop has painted in vivid colours the lifelong wretchedness of suffering populations, the dangers of impurity, the vast proportions of intemperance ; but no word painting could arouse the sympathies so effectually as the sight of these sores, and plague-spots of humanity, met with in all pastoral visitation. He states with much truth that "there certainly is no drier fact within the ken of human beings and Christians than the Chancellor of Germany's blunt words express —'There *is* a social question. Something *wants* doing.' But what does it mean if you clothe the word with the thought of the fibre and nerve of humanity, the tension of souls, the darkening of spirits, that underlies that 'wants doing'?"

Yes, this is the point to which attention must be directed with all the earnestness demanded by so grave a problem. In the first place let us see

WHAT IS NOT TO BE DONE.

His Grace, when treating of "Suffering Populations," commences by telling us what is *not* to be done. Of the "remedies conceived" we are told that "Of course, some are not just or peaceful ; conscience will never set seal to them. Some assume that men may rightly or wisely, 'to do a great right, do a little wrong ;' some pronounce the 'little wrong' to be no wrong, but a righting of wrongs ; some are willing to make, as they think, one plunge more themselves into the worst wrong-doing of the past they condemn, hoping to find themselves, after a deluge of crime, in a land of equality and content." So far as poverty is concerned, we have here a fair warning where failure will face us. As regards "purity," or

rather impurity, we are also cautioned against preventives that will not prevent. Publicity is shown to be without hope; the confessional is, we are glad to find, condemned unsparingly. The question is asked and answered, "What was the effect of the confessional before the Revolution, when the Roman Church had absolute command of all education and of every official rank and worked through the confessor's access to every home?" "Great men went from a mass to an orgy, and numbered great clergy among their intimates. A famous courtesan boarded in a convent, and astonished no one." "It had no effect upon public morals, and the experience of its operation in families has done more to alienate educated men in France, Italy, and Spain, and now to hold them aloof from Christianity, than even fictitious doctrines." These are wise and timely words, and it is to be devoutly hoped they will be taken to heart by those amongst our clergy who are trying the experiment in rose-water form.

Intemperance is treated in the same fashion; first description, then negation. Legislation, it is asserted, will not cure it; culture is comparatively powerless. "It is not so long since dining-rooms and clubs saw daily—with finer clothes and more polished manners—the scenes that the public-house and the liquor saloon still enjoy."

A change for the better has taken place, but that has not been produced by culture alone. It is well that we should have thus clearly marked out for us the paths along which we need not travel. Still the question remains unanswered,

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

It may be instructive to note the answers given by other systems than the Christian, so as to enhance our appreciation of the value of our own belief. Herbert Spencer says, Do nothing, human nature will elevate itself by the process of evolution into the highest altruism! Higher and higher humanity will rise; purer, more unselfish, and more sympathetic it will become by an inherent necessity. Mr. Spencer tells us in his *Data of Ethics*, "Lack of faith in such further evolution of humanity as shall harmonize its nature with its

conditions, adds but another to the countless illustrations of inadequate consciousness of causation." He who has this conciousness "will infer that the type of nature to which the highest social life affords a sphere such that every faculty has its due amount of function and accompanying gratification, is the type of nature towards which progress cannot cease till it is reached." "Far off as seems such a state, yet every one of the factors counted on to produce it may already be traced in operation among those of highest natures. What now in them is occasional and feeble, may be expected with further evolution to become habitual and strong; and what now characterizes the exceptionally high, may be expected eventually to characterize all. For that which the best human nature is capable of, is within the reach of human nature at large." It is difficult to think that so celebrated a philosopher as Mr. Spencer can believe such baseless statements. Let us banish Christianity, close the churches, demolish the prisons, and discharge the policemen; and human nature, we are told, will of itself march steadily towards perfection! Mr. Spencer is tolerably familiar with the civilisations of most nations, can he name one tribe that has elevated itself in the scale without contact with any culture higher than its own. We fancy he will find it difficult. It may be sufficiently accurate to say that "that which the best human nature is capable of, is within the *reach* of human nature at large." This, however, is a very different thing from human nature reaching to that within its reach. Honesty is within the reach of the thief, but it remains outside his grasp; sobriety is within the reach of every drunkard, yet how few reach out for it.

It would be an interesting calculation for our philosophic friend to find how many years would be required for the *lowest* human natures, unaided by external beneficial influences, unchecked by external penalties, to attain the heights of altruism. Such fancies as these are surely a parody on the facts both of history and human nature.

Dr. Draper would give the same answer to the question, "What is to be done?" but for an opposite reason. Do nothing—for society which is but an aggregation of units must

partake of the character of units ; and as the individual man passes from childhood to youth, from youth to manhood, and from manhood to decay, so does society. First, savagery and ferocity, then civilization and industry, then wealth, next immorality, and lastly decay. When the citizens of Spencer have attained the pink of perfection, those of Draper will have sunk into the blackness of chaos !

In considering the treatment of vice we must remember that we have two factors to deal with : one is the permanent viciousness of our fallen nature, which is found in varying degrees in all persons ; the other is the special circumstances that develop any form of vice in a particular age. These two require different treatment. Let us first consider the antidote to the corruption of our nature. Where is this antidote to be found ? Is it in secular education ? What relation have the subjects of a secular education to vice ? A man may be an excellent astronomer or chemist, and yet be a bad man. Is it to be found in art ? Most assuredly not. A sculptor may carve an almost living figure ; a painter may crowd his canvas with incidents of most ennobling suggestion, yet both may be bad men. As Miss Frances Power Cobbe eloquently says, " What would be the introduction of the wisest, justest, most perfect political and social organizations which could be planned, compared to the elevation, even by a single degree, of the sense of universal brotherhood and of the kindly sympathies of man with man ? " And again she states, the great hope of the human race " does not lie in the 'progress of the intellect,' or in the conquest of fresh powers over the realms of nature ; not in the improvement of laws, or the more harmonious adjustment of the relations of classes and states ; not in the glories of art, or the triumphs of science. All these things may, and doubtless will, adorn the better and happier ages of the future. But that which will truly constitute the blessedness of man will be the gradual dying out of his tiger passions, his cruelty and his selfishness, and the growth within him of the godlike faculty of love and self-sacrifice ; the development of that holiest sympathy wherein all souls shall blend at last, like the tints of the rainbow which the seer beheld around the great white

throne on high." But alas! Miss Cobbe has left her thought unfinished, for tiger passions do not die out of themselves, nor does selfishness instinctively give place to self-sacrifice. We must turn to the Master to supply the motive power that will produce such great results, and we shall not turn to Him in vain. "To open to every dark soul the knowledge of Christ is the first thing."

The first and greatest duty of the Church to the age is to preach, faithfully and fearlessly, Christ and Him crucified. It is not to settle trade differences; it is not to magnify ecclesiastical pretensions; it is not to enthrone Episcopacy; it is to lead sinners to the Cross of Calvary, to the Christ of love, to the Spirit of holiness. This is the solution of the problem, and this is the only one. It has solved the problem in every soul where it has found a lodgment. Once a life is led to love Christ, poverty becomes wealth, purity becomes the spirit's atmosphere, and temperance becomes the pleasure of the days. Whatever other obligations the Church may owe to the peculiarities of the times, this is its cardinal function, without which all the rest were useless.

We cannot agree with his Grace when he says, "No young man can be considered as fully equipped for ordination until he has some knowledge of these social subjects." It may be safely affirmed that the knowledge of social problems possessed by young men at the time of ordination is somewhat crude. Be that as it may, there can be little doubt that a young man entering the ministry with much love of Christ and little knowledge of these problems, will do more to solve them, than a young man with much problematic knowledge and little love. Of course, there is not any reason why the two should not co-exist in the same person, and frequently they are found combined in those of mature experience; but they can scarcely be expected in a candidate for ordination.

Coming now to the differentiæ of the present age, there is but little to be said with reference to impurity and intemperance, as they have been pretty much the same in all ages. There is no specific cause at work just now producing impurity, unless indeed it be the democratic feeling that expresses itself in that

strange, senseless, saying, "I am as good as you." The girl who thinks herself as "good" as her employer, will feel herself justified in dressing with equal costliness, let the money to pay for it come whence it may. Intemperance is at present strongly curbed among the higher classes by the force of public opinion; but where public opinion is inoperative, drunkenness is on the increase: the great additional amount received last year for duty on spirits is evidence of this. The cause of it, as stated in the Report of the Lords' Committee, is mainly the "rapid rise of wages, and the increased amount of leisure enjoyed by the manufacturing and mining classes." As the Archbishop rightly tells his clergy, the work of the Church is to teach such men how to use these objects when they obtain them. But surely every true pastor feels that this ought to be the practical outcome of all his teaching. The general advice of our chief Pastor on these subjects is admirable, but there was a something expected, from his high position, his varied experience, and his judicial temperament, that has not been said.

CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

The great social, as distinct from the moral, problems of the day, however, are those concerned with the inter-relations of capital and labour. We are told that these are problems about which something must be done by the Church. The social difficulties and solutions "are Church questions of the deepest moment." The parochial clergyman meets the difficulties at every turn; the solutions are not so plentiful; nor are they to be found in the pages of this volume. Trade corporations, nihilism, and *laissez faire* are lightly touched on, but that is all. Perhaps this is as well, for it is not by any means self-evident that the solution of labour difficulties is the work of the Church as such. Any individual clergyman who has had leisure enough to study carefully these knotty points may do his best to read the riddle, or to mediate between angry capitalists who would not pay so much, and angrier labourers who want to be paid more. Ignorant meddling in such matters would be infinitely mischievous,

resented by both parties, and do much harm to the Church. And, on the other hand, if every cleric is to study the works of Adam Smith, of J. S. Mill, of Owen, of Schäffle, of Lassale, of Karl Marx, and a hundred others, it is to be feared the Bible-class would become a vanishing quantity, the penny bank be minus coppers, and the Dorcas society be sending trousers to old ladies and petticoats to elderly men. Yet the difficulty must be faced if parishes are to be visited, for it is met abundantly; for example, whenever there is a strike. While the husbands are listening to orators, wise or otherwise, the wives and children are too frequently crouching round grates without fire, or tables without food. The visitor to the impoverished homes soon learns that his only solution lies in adding food to that supplied from the Union, which is always scanty, and often absent. This can scarcely be wondered at when, as shown by Mr. Bartley, the strikes between 1870 and 1879, cost the men £4,500,000; while the loss to the men of all the strikes for the last twenty years at the same rate would be about £200,000,000! There are undoubtedly cases, such as that of the recent strike of the London Dockers, where clerics *perhaps* did good, but such cases are exceedingly rare, and they will become rarer still. With reference to this, Sir J. Colomb said, in an instructive debate on Capital and Labour in the House of Commons on 22nd April, "There was one thing he strongly deprecated in those matters—the action of the amateur conciliator, who often stepped in to meddle with things he did not understand." But the difficulty of the clergy understanding the principles of these disputes, so as to use their knowledge effectively, was shown in this debate when, on the apparently simple point of the workers sharing in the profits, those so conversant with the subject as Messrs. Bartley, Graham, Bradlaugh, and Sir M. Hicks-Beach were hopelessly divided. When Mr. Bradlaugh said that men who had acted with Mr. Graham (John Burns and Tom Mann) had interfered in labour disputes they did not understand, and had led poor and hungry men to waste money they had saved for good and useful purposes in maintaining a hopeless struggle."

Another and permanent form in which this labour difficulty is found is the existence of limited liability companies. Formerly there were masters and men; now there are managers and hands. Then not only the master, but frequently his wife and family, took a personal interest in those they employed. The parson could appeal with confidence for help in times of sickness or distress, and the sight of any one of the ladies ministering to the suffering ones of his home did more to knit together capital and labour than volumes on political economy. Now there is no master, only shareholders, who are scattered over the earth, and care alone for dividends. Can we wonder that it has become war to the knife in such cases, and that men, feeling they are regarded only as hands, should try to grasp all they can, and come to regard all property as robbery. Still, the fact cannot be denied that the condition of the working classes has greatly improved within the last fifty years. As his Grace observes: "It is a consolation to know that vast numbers of working men are better paid and housed than ever they were, can purchase more with their money, have more time and means for self-improvement, more funds in the bank, and excellent habits." The "excellent habits" may be doubted by some who have public-houses in their parishes, but the other portion of the description is happily true, as statistics show. Mr. Bartley, who is a competent authority, has told us that the working class had increased between 1840 and 1877 from 4,300,000 families to 4,600,000 families, and their holdings had risen from £44 per family to £86 per family; while Mr. Giffen states that the income of the working classes had increased from £235,000,000 in 1843 to £620,000,000 in 1879. In face of this Mr. Graham was not ashamed to speak of the "great misery which undoubtedly existed in almost every portion of the country and *in almost every trade*," and to add that "He had never incited to violence, because he believed it would do the working classes no good. But the very moment that the power was in their hands, and could be effectively used without injury to themselves, he should then incite to

violence!" (*Times*, April 23rd, 1890). It is to be hoped that Parliament will do something, as is now proposed, to indicate means of harmonising capital and labour, and so far show what is to be done. Meantime there seems to be only one solution for the clergy, and that is to be faithful to their own sacred functions.

The dividend receivers attend churches for the rich; and the dividend earners, when they attend anywhere, attend churches for the poor. Now the pastor of the latter must not shirk his duty, but tell the artisans that they have a responsibility towards their employers, and teach them their part in the drama. While the pastor of the palatial House of God must also tell his rich congregation that money has duties as well as pleasures, and that they are morally guilty if they take all and give nothing. Many of the wealthy churches are not doing as they ought, for they fare sumptuously every day, while they leave poor Lazarus at their gates uncared for and full of sores. If the preachers of our land, in all churches, were more lovingly faithful than they are, caring not for the sneer of the landed squire, or scowl of the monied deacon, there would be fewer labour difficulties than now are found.

Whether, therefore, we consider the aspect of fallen human nature as it exists in all time, or the special wants of the present time, it appears that the function of the Church is the same, to enforce the love of Christ, and the brotherhood of men. If this will not right social wrongs, nothing in the world will. By all means let the Church lead the van in developing more refined tastes, in encouraging a higher education, in fostering an appreciation of the beautiful in art and nature. Let her enter heartily into the amusements of the masses, and encourage all that is healthy in them; have her clubs and classes, and do her utmost to secure cleanly and healthy homes. These are sacred duties, and will bring a rich reward. But she must never allow any of them to hinder the great work for which specially she exists—to disciple all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. JAS. McCANN, D.D.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL BEAUTY—A PROOF OF DESIGN AND PURPOSE.

THE beauty of nature! what a field does it not offer for contemplation? How vast is its extent! How endless its varieties! How exquisite its details! How perfect its harmonies! Man in all his varying conditions marks it, wonders at it, and admires it. The savage is not totally insensible to its charms; the rude barbarian, whose semi-civilized condition raises him a step above the wandering hunter of the woods, or the hidden dweller in the rocks, feels its influence and embodies its scenes and images in the rude traditions which surround his superstitious worship. Civilized man testifies to its enthralling power by portraying its colours and outlines in the varied creations of his imagination. The poet never tires of describing its changeful aspects; the artist ever delights to depict its tints, forms, and figures; the builder reproduces its details in the structures reared by his skilful genius; and the moralist ever and again draws from it illustrations to enforce his arguments and to simplify his teachings. There is in man a natural longing for the beautiful, a pleasure in beholding it, and a delight in representing it. Symmetry of form, beauty of colour, perfection of detail, harmony of parts, all these combine to call forth that admiration for natural beauty which manifests itself so powerfully in human nature. The existence of the two facts—beauty without, and the instinct of an admiration for it within—shows a subtle correspondence in the design of both, and points back not merely to some law of development or evolution, but also to a purpose, which, residing in a Personal Will, originated the law at its beginning, and controlled its course, until it was at length led to a special consummation.

The enthusiastic admirer of nature realizes in some way

these feelings when he beholds a lovely landscape. It is a summer's evening, and the setting sun throws a flood of golden light high up into the deep blue sky, while the clouds, glowing with crimson and amber, seem like waves of flame breaking upon a sapphire sea. Hill and dale are bathed in yellow sunlight, and the very shadows appear tinted with gold. Dark woods with varied tints clothe the hillsides ; the fields gleam with standing corn, across which waves of shadow sweep, as ever and again clouds pass athwart the heavens. The brown moorlands assume a purple tint, and even the grey rocks, which are piled high upon them, show softer colours than they wore in the light of the noonday. The flowers hang motionless, as if in silent adoration, as the dew steals noiselessly upon them. The streams in the valleys look like threads of silver as they wind through meadows or beneath dusky woodlands. Luxuriant orchards show their charms, and a thousand humble herbs and bushes luxuriate in the fading light of day. Films of thin rising smoke stand out clear against the dark green of the woods, and the blue sea in the distance forms the background of the picture. While the mind is delighted with the scene the thought rises, " Surely there is some intimate connection between all this beauty, and the sentiment which observes and admires it ? Surely there is a purpose revealed here, and the existence of the beautiful in nature must have some relation to that of the being who, beholding it, rejoices in it ? Surely in some way the one was designed for the other ? " A matter-of-fact friend, however, who stands by, and to whom these thoughts are communicated replies, " It is, indeed, a fine landscape, and would form a striking picture if transferred to the canvas of an able artist. But do not imagine in sentimental and somewhat egotistical rapture, that beauty on the earth was specially formed for man's delight and admiration. Such thoughts may be pleasing, but they are utterly unscientific. Look over the earth at present, and do you not notice some marvellous developments of natural beauty in those wastes which are either without human inhabitant or are tenanted by the rudest savages ? The flowers of the solitary wilderness are as

bright and sweet as those in a densely peopled, civilized country. The very desert has its glowing hues and brilliant tints. The lonely weed prairie is covered with such myriads of brightly coloured flowers that those who have beheld the spectacle have been so entranced with its beauty that they have called it 'the garden of God.' Inaccessible chasms deep in the heart of dark mountains are filled with gorgeously bright vegetation ; while the solitudes of the seas are adorned with exquisite and fragile forms, which, lovely and gaily tinted, and perfectly independent of showers or sunshine, are the cherished flowers of the sea.

> 'Full many a gem of purest ray serene
> The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear ;
> Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
> And waste its sweetness on the desert air.'

If it be said that man is soon to behold these beauties as he forces his way into lands hitherto unexplored, so that they are placed in their position in anticipation of his speedy arrival, then let us look back into the past, and we speedily discover that long, long before man appeared on the earth, natural beauty existed ; ages before rational beings lived on this world, natural beauty flourished in it in full splendour. Geological discoveries have shown us perished faunas and floras full of beauty—beauty of form, of colour, and of harmony. There were long ages in which our earth was solitary ; the busy din of civilization never rose from the land ; the blue expanse of the ocean was never whitened by the sails nor ploughed by the keel of the vessel of the adventurous mariner ; the grassy hills were unoccupied by the flocks of the shepherd ; the rivers flowed through silent forests : silent so far as man was concerned, but they were tenanted with teeming myriads of forms of animal life, they were filled with strange, bright birds, they were thronged with gorgeously-coloured insects, and they were adorned with a marvellous profusion of brilliantly coloured flowers. In all these past ages no man existed on the earth ; no human beings admired its beauty. How, then, is it possible to suppose that natural beauty exists in any way for the gratification of human senses, or for the

cultivation of human instincts? Beauty existed long before man appeared on earth, and for aught we know to the contrary, it may continue to exist after man has passed away."

There is, of course, much that is true in all this. Natural beauty is no new thing upon the earth, and did not appear simultaneously with man. Creation manifested beauty from its very beginning, and none who are acquainted with its history through past ages would attempt to deny this. Still, there is one fact which is often overlooked, and it is *the gradual increase of beauty throughout the course of creation.* As we traverse in thought the eras through which our earth's life history has passed, as we see scene after scene of the grand panorama pass before our eyes, so the truth rises before us, that beauty has been increasing and developing until the time of man's appearance. Thus we may, in a special sense, speak of the evolution of beauty, while putting the cause on one side altogether, and considering only its development. Let us briefly notice some of the leading elements in natural beauty, and then observe their positions in the present, and their development in the past. One of the first essentials for beauty in nature is surely a clear sky. A mist may present many striking effects as it rolls off when a heavy fall of rain clears away, or when the sun disperses the mists of the night in the early morning. Long wreaths of mists winding amidst the hanging woodlands, or penetrating the details of the landscape, give a charming variety to the scene, and impart a character of ghostly weirdness to the landscape. But days and nights of fog, weeks of damp, depressing haze, and warm, steaming mist, hide all the beauties of nature by spreading over everything a vapoury shroud. Unless the sky and air be clear, there can be no beauty visible on earth or heaven; no rosy dawns, no gorgeous sunsets, no landscapes glittering in the sunbeams, no soft and silvery moonlight, no starry skies. We should be deprived also of all that wonderful cloud scenery which in its ever-changing forms, brilliant colours, and varied effects so charms and fascinates the mind. Well indeed has it been remarked of this glorious cloud-scenery, "A cloudless

sky has a beauty of its own ; and though it is possible in some climes to feel the ceaseless vision of intense blue day after day, for weeks and months together, wearisome and monotonous, yet in our own land this satiety can scarcely be experienced. In England a clear blue cloudless heaven is too rare a sight to weary men, and presents, in its deep purity and perfect peace, a spectacle that is well fitted to please, to calm, to elevate ; and if, as commonly happens, clouds alternate with the blue expanse and break its uniformity, then there is at once placed before us a source of keen interest and abundant enjoyment. The mystery of the clouds is so great, their forms generally so majestic or so graceful, their tints so pleasing, their variety so charming, their movements so curious and attractive, that few persons are not, at any rate, occasionally impressed by them ; while to many they are, to all they might be, an almost ever-present object of delight. . . . . Every sort of beauty and of majesty is to be found in some kind, or some combination, of these air chariots which are placed before the eyes of all mankind in countless profusion, and with so much variation, that no one of the innumerable cloud pictures is ever exactly reproduced."[1]

The first essential, then, to natural beauty in all its power is certainly a clear sky. Then, further, a world in which the sea occupied nearly all its surface would have far less beauty than one in which sea and land were more equally associated. For sublime as the sea is, whether sleeping in its tranquillity or heaving in mountainous billows, it does not present that infinite variety of details and pictures exhibited by the land. Monotony is continually oppressing to the voyager, and he delights in the sight of the land ; whilst it is often at the point where sea and land meet that the greatest development of beauty is to be found. Again, a world totally devoid of vegetation would be a gloomy place of abode, and in its barren wastes and rocky solitudes would perhaps resemble some of those scenes of savage wildness which the telescope

[1] *The Religious Teachings of the Sublime and Beautiful in Nature.* By Rev. G. Rawlinson. pp. 24-25.

reveals to us as existing in the moon. Woods and copses, grass and herbage are all necessary for natural beauty. Variety of size, difference in form and colour also constitute a beauty in vegetation which is absent from many forests, which appear monotonous from being almost entirely composed of trees of one colour and character. Surely also mountains are necessary if we would seek the highest kind of beauty? A flat country, or one gently undulating, does not present those features of beauty which are so strikingly prominent in mountainous regions. The wondrous play of light and shadow on the mountain forests; the wild scenery of the chasms, overhung by towering precipices; the foaming cateracts that leap down the mountain sides, and the sublimity of outline, with graceful curves, sharp, needle-like peaks, on which the snow is often unable to rest, all combine to bring before us a picture both beautiful and sublime. Some mountains present at different heights all the varied characteristics of the vegetation of different regions. In warm countries we perhaps find the base of the mountains clothed with palms, mimosas, and the luxuriant profusion of tropical verdure. Higher up the slopes are seen great woods of majestic timber trees. Above these the eye wanders over vast forests of pines, which cover the upper portions of the mountains like the waves of a dark green ocean. Then the vegetation becomes dwarfed and stunted, herbage taking the place of trees, and open grassy swells roll upward, which are the home of the mountain-sheep and wild goat. Still higher up come beds of snow, the gathering grounds for glaciers, which like rivers of ice creep downwards over the mountain sides. Then high above all rise the snowy peaks, rearing their gleaming white forms against the deep blue sky, types of spotless purity and everlasting rest. All the seasons of the year would seem to be represented on the mountain sides: summer around its feet; spring on its waist; autumn on its shoulders; winter on its head. Many on looking at such a spectacle of varied mountain scenery have, it may be, recalled the lines of Moore which so picturesquely describe these details :—

"Now, upon Syria's land of roses
Softly the light of eve reposes;
And, like a glory, the broad sun
Hangs over sainted Lebanon,
Whose head in wintry grandeur towers,
And whitens with eternal sleet,
While summer, in a vale of flowers,
Is sleeping rosy at his feet."

Nor are barren mountains utterly destitute of beauty. Their forms are often remarkable, their colouring brilliant and striking, and the play of light and shadow amidst their chasms often gives rise to marvellously lovely effects. Some years ago a most beautiful collection of paintings depicting the scenery of the unexplored regions of Chinese Tartary was brought to this country by Mr. T. W. Atkinson, and few who have seen these vivid representations of the barren mountains in that grand but desolate region, and have read the powerful description written by this talented artist, will deny that even barren and sterile crags and peaks have a wild and romantic beauty peculiarly their own.[1] These features are also graphically described by a recent traveller, who wandered into the lonely regions of Tibet, and who thus depicts them: "Of all the mountains I have ever beheld, those of Zanskar were the most picturesque, weird, astounding, and perplexing. For several marches, all the way down the valley of this river and through almost all the valley of the Tsarap Lingti, the precipice-walls were not only of enormous height, but presented the most extraordinary forms, colours, and combinations of rock. Even the upper Spiti valley has nothing so wonderful. There were castles, spires, plateaus, domes, aiguilles of solid rock, and spires composed of the shattered fragments of some fallen mountains. At the entrance of many of the ravines there were enormous cliffs thousands of feet high, which looked exactly as if they were bastions which had been shaped by the hands of giants. . . . . Then the colour of these precipice-walls was of the richest and most varied kind. The pre-

[1] See *Oriental and Western Siberia, and Travels in the Region of the Amoor*, by this Author.

dominant tints were green, purple, orange, brown, black, and whitish-yellow, but I cannot say how many more there might have been ; and the green, purple, and deep brown were most frequent. It can easily be imagined that, with such colours, the dazzling sunlight and the shadows of the mountains falling over the valley worked the most wonderful effects. Sometimes the sunlight came down through a dark-coloured ravine like a river of gold. In certain lights the precipices appeared almost as if they were of chalcedony and jasper. The dark brown manganese-like cliffs looked exceedingly beautiful ; but no sooner was one extraordinary vista left behind than a different but not less striking one broke upon the view."[1] Again, birds of bright plumage greatly increase the beauty of the land, for who does not admire the brilliant colours of the kingfisher or bird of paradise? And what a vast amount of beauty is manifested by insect life? Take the butterflies of the tropics as an example. How gorgeous are the tints of their wings, and how wonderful are the devices traced on their delicate membranes! A world without brightly coloured birds and gaily tinted insects would be sadly deficient in beauty. Then take the larger animals, how wonderfully beautiful many of them are! With what delight have travellers gazed on the marvellous myriads of wild animals which defile in endless troops over the grassy plains of South Africa! The zebra, the giraffe, the antelope, and their numerous allies, are singularly beautiful ; while the tiger, jaguar, hyæna, and leopard are marked and spotted in a manner which, when beheld without fear, constantly awakens wonder and admiration. These instances could be multiplied indefinitely; every one who has studied nature being able to supply fresh cases. Then consider the harmony of them all, and the combination of the varied details so that they might be all blended together *at one time* in our earth's history. Surely that period would contain the very perfection of natural beauty?

Now let us examine the different ages of our ea[illegible]s existence, and let us see as we come down the course of its

[1] Wilson's *Abode of Snow*, pp. 290, 291.

history if the beauty of nature has not been constantly increasing until the time when man appeared on the earth.

In the earliest ages of the world's history there could have been but little beauty. The earth was tossing in waves of fire, and dense clouds enwrapped it as a pall. Even when comparative quietude settled down, heavy mists enveloping the sky and sea would veil their colours. In the Cambrian era we meet with the first traces of life, but the forms are all marine. There was (so far as we can discover) no land vegetation, no flowers, and no higher forms of animal life. The Silurian age succeeded, and here we find a marked advance. In the earliest eras there was but little land, no terrestrial vegetation, a complete absence of grass, trees, and flowers, and no animal life save that which existed in the depths of the sea. But in the Silurian era of our earth's history extensive tracts of land were covered with vegetation, amongst which lowly forms of life existed. Nevertheless, the character of this earliest vegetation would, in our eyes, have appeared strikingly deficient in the higher characteristics of beauty. Strange trees and weird-looking plants flourished, growing in a strange manner ; and the special feature of these primeval woods was their monotonous appearance, so that they would not have presented that pleasing aspect which is shown by the varied forms and colours of the forest vegetation of the present day. Sir James Dawson, speaking of these earliest forests, says, "Imagination can scarcely realize this strange and grotesque vegetation, which, though possibly copious and luxuriant, must have been simple and monotonous in aspect."[1] Nevertheless, these primitive forests of the Silurian age marked a great advance in vegetable life and in the progress of terrestrial beauty. The ocean, too, was beautified in this era by the presence of innumerable reefs of coral, which were absent in the earlier ages. Entering the Devonian period which immediately followed, we find that natural beauty made a still further advance. The forests were more extensive and more varied, and they must have

[1] *The Geological History of Plants*, p. 41.

been more beautiful, as they were less monotonous in aspect than their predecessors. Graceful tree-ferns reared their exquisitely beautiful forms on every side ; tall conifers, allied to the pine, abounded ; club-mosses waved their weird and dark forms aloft ; and every hollow and glade was filled with the feathery fronds of graceful ferns. Still, to our eyes, the landscape would lack many beautiful features, and the colouring would be wanting in vivid tints and soft tones, while the absence of bright flowers, of gaily coloured birds, and of graceful animals would be a great deficiency to the lover of the beautiful. We come further down the stream of time, and now the grand flora of the Carboniferous age (the coal-measures) rises before us. Never had the earth produced so luxuriant a vegetation before ; never since has it brought forth so vast a profusion of trees, plants, and herbs, for ferns, pines, equisitacea, club-mosses, and abnormal forms of vegetable life grew in countless millions. There was much beauty of form. The trunks of the sigillariæ were marked and fretted in a most wonderful manner ; the delicate marsh plants, with their circular whorls, were most graceful ; and few objects could have been more beautiful than the exquisitely fashioned tree-ferns. " In walking among the ruins of this ancient flora, the Palæontologist almost feels as if he had got among the broken fragments of Italian palaces erected long ages ago, when the architecture of Rome was most ornate, and every moulding was roughened with ornament ; and in attempting to call up in fancy the old carboniferous forests, he has to dwell on this peculiar feature as one of the most prominent."[1] Still, although beauty had again taken a step onward, it was but in its incipient stages, for the colouring of these vast forests was sombre and monotonous. Brilliant flowers do not seem to have been very abundant ; no bright birds winged their way through the dusky woods ; and no soft green mosses or brilliant lichens flourished beneath the trees, or adorned their scaly trunks with glowing incrustations. Thus, all through the primary ages we find a

[1] Miller's *Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 38.

steady advance in natural beauty, but at the same time we observe that vividness of colouring and profuseness of variety, seem to have been much less abundant than at present.

Now let us enter the Secondary ages, and immediately we find ourselves in a new world. The flora is less exuberant than in former times ; but it is more varied and pleasing, as palms and bamboo-like plants present themselves, while the graceful cycads were objects of great beauty. Nevertheless, although an advance had been made, the flora of this time must still have presented a monotonous appearance. Animal life, however, now begins to show more varied and beautiful forms. Birds with bright plumage fly through the air or wade in the waters ; bright insects flit and hum amidst the sunlit glades ; while monstrous reptiles, glittering with scales, range the woods or plough the waves, lashing the waters into foam by the strokes of their mighty paddles. Once more, then, natural beauty has made another step in advance.

Immediately after this, beauty takes a vast stride forward, for in the later Cretaceous times we meet with woods of the present type, and with multitudes of brilliant flowers. Then, as the Tertiary era begins, beauty increases wonderfully in all its essential characteristics. The flora is marked by profuse variety of forms, adorned by the most brilliant colours, and characterized by an exuberance of types never in existence before. Flowers, too, abounded in number, vastly exceeding anything that the previous ages had produced. " It was in the Tertiary period alone " (says Müller) " that the more graceful flowers made their appearance." Animal life on land now (in Miocene days) reached its maximum, and the earth was full of graceful beasts, herbivora and carnivora, of bright birds, and of splendid insects, as it never had been before. The earth resembled a tropical garden. Then the climates became more varied. The zoological provinces were more definitely established. Mountain barriers and climatic zones more fully asserted their influence ; and the land was further prepared and fertilized by the great Glacial period. Thus at the close of the Tertiary (Cainozoic) era natural beauty seems

to have reached its highest development, for then *all* its elements in sky, earth, water, and air were at their perfection, and the harmony of *all* its parts appears then to have been most complete.

Now it is a remarkable fact that just at this time man is said to have appeared on the earth. Geologists are not agreed as to the precise period when the reasoning, moral, and self-conscious lord of creation came into the world, but the *exact* time is of little consequence for us here; it is enough to know that it was at the close of the Tertiary period, when beauty was more varied and perfect than at any of the earlier stages of the earth's history. Natural beauty had gone on increasing through the Primary and Secondary ages, until at the end of the Tertiary era it attained its perfection, and then *at that very time* there appeared by the advent of man a creature able to appreciate beauty, to enjoy it, and to reproduce it. Surely there is some grand design manifested here. There is a purpose in this gradual development of beauty, and in the accumulation of its details—a guiding principle at work and an end steadily kept in view. Is there not strong evidence that the Creator arranged the development of beauty, so that it should be a witness to His glory and a means of instruction to man on his appearing? It is not merely the existence of a measure of beauty from the beginning, but that beauty went on increasing step by step until man appeared on the earth. If it be argued that the rudest savages have no appreciation of beauty, we may ask, in reply, What evidence is there that the first men were utterly degraded savages? and the answer is, absolutely none. The men whose customs are revealed to us by recent researches, and who (so far as we know) present us with the first picture of human life in Western Europe, were not utterly bestial savages. They admired nature, for they painted themselves in imitation of its colours. They wore necklaces of beautiful shells; they polished their bone harpoons to give them an exquisite finish. They adorned their domestic animals, and they drew artistic pictures of the great beasts by which they were surrounded. They even surpassed their successors in their admiration of

nature's beauty; and this may teach us how savages may have gradually lost their appreciation of the sublime and beautiful in nature.

Let all these striking coincidences be thoughtfully considered. First, the gradual increase of beauty by the accumulation of details until the commencement of the present era. Next, the fact that just when natural beauty had reached its perfection man appeared, who alone could enjoy and appreciate it. And lastly, let it be pondered that the earliest men were not careless of this beauty, but keenly appreciated it, and did not pass it by as thoughtless, degraded savages, but copied and reproduced its details. Is it possible to resist the conclusion that a grand design is here manifested, and that man was intended to study and admire the perfections of nature, and to rise from its study to the contemplation of the glory, power, and benevolence of its Creator? This field of study lay open to the eyes of primeval man, and in it, as in a book, he could read lessons of his Maker, supremely valuable for his instruction and happiness. He may, indeed, have been ignorant of many of the mechanical arts; long ages of work alone could reveal these things to him, for the great achievements of science were to be gradually accomplished. But nature was all around him, and in her contemplation he felt the spell which she always casts over her admirers.

The constant effort of the Christian should be to drink happiness from the streams of nature. Possessing through Christ that peace which the world can neither give nor take away, let him add to his inner joy by contemplating the sublime and beautiful in nature, interpreting her marvels and harmonies by the light of the Word of God. And if at times the study seem dark, if the note of pain rise in discord with the hymn of praise, let him remember that "the creation was made subject to vanity not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." And also that in fulfilment of that same Word there shall come a day when "creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

D. GATH WHITLEY.

THE EVANGELISTIC SYMBOLS.

IN taking in hand to offer some remarks upon the interpretation of what are commonly known in Christian art as the Evangelistic Symbols, I venture to assume at the outset (without seeking to establish critically what appears to me sufficiently clear and abundantly proved) that the four living creatures of Ezekiel's vision in chap. i. are to be regarded as identical not only with the cherubim of chap. x., but also with the four beasts of St. John's vision (Rev. iv. 7),—notwithstanding some well-known points of difference,—and further that they represent certain mysterious aspects of the Deity manifested in creation, that they are "a fourfold vessel to reveal the Lord's glory,"[1] and as such must be regarded as bearing a special relation to the Person of Christ—God manifest in the flesh.

It is in accordance with this idea that from very early times, certainly from the second century after Christ, we find these symbolic beings regarded as fit emblems of the four Gospels.

Speaking broadly, each symbol has been held to find its counterpart in one of the Evangelists, but more strictly in the particular view of Christ's Person set forth most prominently by each.

Commonly St. Matthew is said to be represented by the man, St. Mark by the lion, St. Luke by the ox or calf, St. John by the eagle, as displaying respectively in their Gospels more especially the Manhood, Kingship, Priesthood, and Divinity of our blessed Lord. This application is found in Jerome, and it has the recommendation of agreeing with the order of living creatures in Ezekiel's first vision, which probably accounts for the fact that it has been most generally adopted. But the theory on which this interpretation is founded, viz., of seizing upon the opening verses of the Gospels taken in their traditional, but more or less arbitrary, order, is open to the charge of being artificial, and deserves,

---

[1] Juke's *The Characteristics of the Four Gospels*, p. 9.

I think, little serious consideration. St. Augustine is quoted by Mr. Andrew Jukes, in his valuable little work on "The Characteristic Differences of the Four Gospels," as saying of this, the common exposition of the symbols, "De principiis librorum quamdam conjecturam capere voluerunt, non de tota intentione Evangelistarum, quæ magis fuerat perscrutanda." The passage occurs in the *De Consensu Evangelistarum* (lib. 1, cap. vi.), but in point of fact St. Augustine is writing of another interpretation, that advocated by St. Irenæus, to which I shall have occasion to refer, but his words are at least *as* true and forcible when applied to that under consideration. As to its agreement with the order of the living creatures in Ezekiel i. 10, it may well be observed that there is no *primâ facie* reason for expecting this to be the order in which we should find the application to the Gospels more than that in Ezekiel x. 14, or Rev. iv. 7. But whilst I should be disposed to dismiss this traditional application without ceremony, before proceeding to propose any alternative theory I would draw attention to a passage in Mr. Isaac Williams' *Thoughts on the Study of the Holy Gospels*, which contains a truth, bearing upon the whole subject apt to be overlooked. On page 15, after quoting Ezekiel i. 10, "As for the likeness of their faces," &c., he proceeds, "Now if we take the man for our Lord's Incarnation, the lion as the regal animal, the emblem of Judah, for the sign of our Lord's eternal Kingship and Kingdom, the ox or calf as the sacrificial animal for the Atonement, and the eagle, as usually supposed, for our Lord's Divinity, we should have His Incarnation, His Kingdom, His Atonement, and His Divinity in each of the Gospels, and in all: whatever countenance may more peculiarly characterize each one severally. One face meets us more particularly, but all faces are in all, "they four had one likeness."

Bearing this in mind, we may go on to examine the different interpretations that have been at various times put forth; and as Irenæus is the first author in whose writings we find the subject treated, we shall do well to notice what he says. These are his words: "For the cherubim, too, were

four-faced; their faces were images of the dispensation of the Son of God; for, as the Scriptures say, the first living creature was like a lion, symbolizing His effectual working, His leadership, and royal power. The second living creature was like a calf, signifying His sacrificial and sacerdotal order; but the third had, as it were, the face of a man, an evident description of His advent in human form. The fourth was like a flying eagle, pointing out the gift of the Spirit, hovering with His wings over the Church. And therefore the Gospels are in accord with these things, among which Christ Jesus is seated; for that, according to John, relates His original, effectual, and glorious generation from the Father thus declaring 'In the beginning was the Word,' &c., also 'all things were made by Him, and without Him was nothing made.' For this reason, too, is that Gospel full of all confidence, for such is His Person. But that according to Luke, taking up His priestly character commences with Zacharias the priest offering sacrifice to God: for now was made ready the fatted calf, about to be immolated for the finding again of the younger son. Matthew again relates His generation as man, saying, 'the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham,' and also 'the birth of Jesus Christ, was in this wise.' This, then, is the Gospel of His humanity; for which reason it is, too, that the character of a humble and meek man is kept up through the whole Gospel. Mark, on the other hand, begins with a reference to the prophetical spirit coming from on high to men, saying the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it is written in Esaias the prophet, pointing to the winged aspect of the Gospel; and on this account he made a compendious and cursory narrative."[1]

Irenæus, it will be observed, assigns the man to St. Matthew, the eagle to St. Mark, the ox to St. Luke, and the lion to St. John. As there is something very like a consensus of later writers in favour of assigning the eagle to St. John, it seems to me that Irenæus' contrary opinion can have but little weight, and it will be seen at a glance that if we take the lion from St. John and replace it by the eagle, the lion obviously

[1] Iren. iii. 11.

falls to the lot of St. Mark ; and then the order agrees with that commonly received. St. Augustine, whilst he agrees with the general body of the Fathers as to St. John being represented by the eagle, and with Irenæus and most other authorities St. Luke by the ox, sees the man in St. Mark and the lion in St. Matthew; and wherein it differs from the common application, I am disposed to consider his is the more forcible and apt interpretation of the two. Whatever may be urged for considering St. Matthew as represented by the man, there seems to be scarcely anything at all in St. Mark specially distinctive of the lion, unless the opening words, "the voice of one crying in the wilderness," be thought so, as has generally been the case, because the lion is an animal to whose roar the Greek word *βοῶντος* might well apply, and his haunts are in the desert. When we come to look closely at the evidence that may be brought forward in support of the different theories, the matter seems practically to reduce itself to this: that we have to decide between two interpretations, that of St. Augustine, supported with much ability in modern times by Mr. Isaac Williams (lion, man, ox, eagle), and that no less ably argued by Mr. Andrew Jukes, adhering to the order of the living creatures in Rev. iv. (lion, ox, man, eagle). A glance will show that these two applications agree in respect of St. Matthew and St. John, I will, therefore, briefly sum up what may be said in support of these two Evangelists being assigned respectively the lion and the eagle, and then endeavour to weigh the contradictory evidence as to the interpretation of the man and the calf.

Let us take St. John first, as his is the most clearly marked of the four Gospels. Even a very cursory reader will hardly fail to discover that it is replete with emphatic notices of our Lord's Divinity. The only one of the four mystic creatures which does not walk on earth, the bird, which of all others soars nearest to the sun, and is said to gaze with undazed eye upon its unveiled splendour, is a fitting emblem of that Evangelist who is singled out for the title of "the Divine," who leaned on the Master's breast at supper, and was alone of all the Apostles at the foot of the Cross on Golgotha; so that

in him the words in the Book of Job, written respecting the eagle, found literal fulfilment, although the application be mystical, "where the Slain is, there is he." But to turn our attention to the Gospel. How distinctive is its commencement! No account of the birth at Bethlehem, but "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him." He it is Who was made man, that He might declare God to be the Life and Light of men. The second chapter, containing the account of the miracle at Cana, has aptly been regarded as a parable of the failure of humanity and the re-creating work of the Divine Son, "Every *man* at the beginning doth set forth good wine," not so God, "*thou* hast kept the good wine until now." God had come in the flesh, because man had failed, and "He manifested forth His glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten." The third chapter, containing the teaching about new birth, is no less significant; and the fourth, beginning with the discourse at the well of Sychar—both having reference to the Water of Life and Christ's Divine work among the children of men. But, to be brief, it is abundantly evident St. John's aim throughout his Gospel is to introduce events which gave rise to high and heavenly teaching. Thus, for example, in chapter v. we have the account of the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda, followed by the profoundly mysterious declaration respecting the resurrection and the power of life which is in the Son, and His union with the Father. Similarly, although this Evangelist does not record the incident of the institution of the Holy Eucharist, yet he significantly devotes a long chapter to the miracle of feeding the five thousand, and the spiritual teaching about the Bread of Life which arose out of it. These and other sublime discourses such as those delivered at the Feasts of Tabernacles and the Dedication, indicate unquestionably a very clear and exalted purpose in the mind of the compiler, and are peculiar to the fourth Gospel. Similarly characteristic of St. John is the frequent use made by our Lord of the significant "Amen, Amen," in announcing certain solemn truths—words, it has been well remarked, themselves

conveying some notion of Divinity in the speaker, who is actually styled "the Amen" in Rev. iii. 14.

Again, it is worthy of notice how repeatedly the word "life" occurs in this Gospel. The very purpose of the incarnation is explained as the bestowal upon men of a new and supernatural life possessed in its fulness by the Galilean Teacher. And when the end of His ministry is reached in St. John's account of the Passion, much is omitted of what may be called the human side of that great mystery. For instance, in the Garden not a word is said of His prayer and agony, nor of an angel strengthening Him, not a word of His sweat "as it were great drops of blood." But on the contrary, St John alone records the fact that at His words "I am He," those who had come to arrest Him went backward and fell to the ground in sudden dismay at the momentary revelation, (as is probable) of His Divine nature, conveyed in His peculiar use of the deeply mysterious "I am," which, moreover, on a former occasion had, perhaps, indicated to the Jews the nature of His lofty claims, and was the immediate cause of their "taking up stones to cast at Him."

Such, then, are some of the points in the fourth Gospel which have led to the general consent in attributing to its author the symbol of the eagle. Were any further testimony needed to show how clearly the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity is brought out in this Gospel, I would draw attention to the frequent quotations from it introduced by St. Athanasius in his Orations against the Arians in defence of this very truth, by his opponents called in question.

I will now pass to the consideration of the applicability of the lion to St. Matthew. Observe first that Christ is set before us as the Son of David, the highest appellation of Israel's kings. Throughout the ensuing genealogy St. Matthew adheres strictly to the names of kings either *de facto*, or after the captivity *de jure* only, whereas St. Luke introduces others. Thus our Lord is represented as the Royal Heir in the kingly line of him of whom it had of old been written, "I have found David My servant, with My holy oil have I anointed him. I will make him My firstborn, higher than the kings of the

earth. His seed will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven." Next we may observe the significance of those circumstances of the Saviour's birth recorded by this Evangelist alone. At the outset there is the revelation to the Eastern kings who come to visit the new-born Infant, bearing gifts befitting a king. At the royal city of David they are led to inquire of Herod himself for Him who was born a King in David's native town. "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" And in answer the chief priests and Scribes draw attention to Micah's prophecy concerning Bethlehem: "Out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule My people Israel."

Next Christ is persecuted as a rival king by Herod; and in Matthew alone it is recorded that, on returning from Egypt, our Saviour, "the King of the Jews," turned aside into Galilee, to avoid Archelaus, who was then king of Judæa. In the following chapter St. John the Baptist comes forth preaching and saying, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." In verse 17 of chapter iv. it is significantly asserted, "From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Then in delivering the sermon on the mount, it is remarked by Augustine that Christ sat, whereas during the sermon on the plain He stood; and in this he sees an indication of majesty. And the first beatitude concerns the kingdom, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom," and He proceeds with the authority of a law-giver to unfold the laws and regulations of this kingdom. It is remarkable how frequently mention is made in this Gospel of the kingdom. The phrase "kingdom of heaven" is peculiar to it, and occurs no less than twenty-eight times. Other indications of the kingship of Christ have been discovered by various writers, who favour the theory, and notably have been treated at length by Mr. Isaac Williams in the work already referred to. But these I have selected as seeming the more obvious and least open to the charge of strained interpretation, although in treating of a subject confessedly mystical the application of Scripture must not be tried by the touchstone of mere critical exegesis. I will only add that the fact of

St. Matthew's Gospel being addressed specially to Jews fits in well with the idea under consideration, as in itself leading us to expect what I have tried to establish is actually the case, that we should find in it our Lord's kingly office particularly dwelt upon and set forth.

The task which now remains is to decide, so far as an opinion on such a matter can be considered a decision, whether St. Mark and St. Luke are respectively represented by the man and the ox, or *vice versâ*. Let me once more remind my readers, "they four had *one* likeness;" and as the Gospels are records of the actions and words of the Son of Man, it is only natural we should find the likeness of the man clearly portrayed in all. The symbol of the ox or calf, typical, as is generally supposed, of sacrifice and priesthood, may be said to be of a more distinctive character, as indicating one only of Christ's offices as man. The question, therefore, resolves itself into deciding which Gospel is most clearly marked with the priestly or sacrificial aspect. I know of no ancient writer (though I am far from saying there is none) who assigns the ox to St. Mark, or regards his Gospel as peculiarly marked by sacerdotal characteristics. On the other hand, St. Irenæus, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Athanasius, St. Jerome, St. Gregory the Great, the Venerable Bede, and others, differing as they do in some respects, all agree in assigning the ox to St. Luke. Moreover, St. Augustine divides expositors into two classes, but adds, "Quod autem per vitulum Lucas significatus sit, propter maximam victimam sacerdotis neutri dubitaverunt." Isaac Williams lays great stress on this *primâ facie* support of the interpretation he upholds, and, I cannot but think, rightly. If it be urged on the one side, that, notwithstanding certain sacerdotal characteristics in St. Luke, the manhood is also prominently set forth, I would call attention to the truth so sharply brought out in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that our High Priest took manhood and suffered as man, because "in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Further, it is

natural enough there should be frequent indications of human sympathy in the Gospel of the beloved physician, springing from his minute and practical knowledge of the diseases he has occasion to notice. These, however, in no way interfere with the strongly marked sacerdotal features to be recognized in such facts as the following:—The Gospel opens with the history of the priest Zacharias, dwelling with some emphasis on the priestly descent of the Baptist. Moreover, Zacharias is represented in actual discharge of his sacerdotal office, standing in front of the altar offering incense. Then we have the circumcision—the first blood-shedding of the Divine Victim. Then the events of the childhood in the Temple—the presentation and disputation with the doctors; the later event, moreover, being connected with our Lord's entrance upon a share in the sacrifices of Israel. In the genealogy introduced at the time when Jesus began His ministry, at the priestly age of thirty, it is at least noteworthy that His descent is traced back not merely to David and Abraham, but to God. His declaration in the synagogue of Nazareth that to Himself referred the prophecy of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because the Lord hath anointed Me," seems to bring to our thoughts "the precious ointment upon the head which ran down unto the beard, even unto Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his clothing." In the last chapter of this Gospel our Lord is seen walking with the two disciples, expounding the Scriptures respecting His own sacrificial sufferings, and makes Himself known to them "in the breaking of the bread." Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the hidden meaning of these words, few will be prepared to see in them nothing of mystery. Moreover, all are aware that many consider them to have the highest sacerdotal and even sacrificial significance. Finally He is parted from His Apostles on the Mount of Olives at the very moment when, with hands outstretched, He is engaged in the priestly act of blessing.

We have, too, in this Gospel the greatest number of parables and passages speaking of mercy and forgiveness to the returning penitent. The injured father forgiving his

prodigal son; the glad shepherd bringing home his strayed sheep on his shoulder; the woman calling together her neighbours to rejoice with her over the finding of her lost piece of money, are instances out of many peculiar to St. Luke. Constantly, too, St. Luke tells us our Lord was *praying* when the other Evangelists are silent on the subject; and it has been observed, as well according with the idea that St. Luke represents our Lord especially as "the High Priest of things to come," that in his Gospel there should be so many passages bearing on the supernatural, *e.g.*, the various accounts of angelic appearances and the discourse between the rich man and Lazarus in Hades.

Let us now consider the fourth and last symbol. We shall find upon closer examination that the divergence in interpreting the special character of St. Mark's Gospel is more apparent than real. For although Mr. Jukes fails to see the sacerdotal or sacrificial element in St. Luke, he does not discern it any more in St. Mark.[1] The ox he takes (unlike the old expositors) to be the type of *service*, and in St. Mark's Gospel he sees Christ as "the servant of God toiling for men;" and if he faintly perceives the notion of sacrifice from time to time, it is because willing service *is* sacrifice, and "the ox strong to labour is also the chosen victim of the Lord's altar."

But to come to the Gospel itself. I would remark in passing that the opening words, "the voice of one crying in the wilderness," significant as undoubtedly they are, may certainly

[1] It is only fair to Mr. Jukes's theory to add that the ox is assigned to St. Mark rather as a *dernier ressort* than as being in itself strikingly appropriate. He makes out so good a case for St. Luke being symbolized by the man, that there is nothing for it but to make the ox fit St. Mark. It is certainly a strong point that, just as the Parables in St. Matthew are all, with a single exception, of the "Kingdom of Heaven," so those recorded by St. Luke are invariably introduced with words laying stress upon human agency, as "A sower went out"—"A certain man" (again and again used)—"A certain nobleman"—"What man of you"—"Either what woman"—"There was in a city a judge," &c. The contrast of all this with the prominence given in St. Matthew to the kingdom is very remarkable. The genealogy of St. Luke also favours this view, tracing up the ancestry of our blessed Lord to Adam, and thus showing Him as "Son of Man." It may further be observed that the author of *Ecce Homo* sees in St. Luke's Gospel (the quotation is made not without great distaste or its lack of reverence) the narrative of "a Young Man of promise."

be applied with as much fitness to the man as to the lion, for whatever may be said as to the force of βοῶντος it is obviously *written* of the Baptist. It is a special characteristic of St. Mark (owing doubtless in no small measure to his relations with St. Peter) that he makes mention frequently of small details, and as it were accidental circumstances respecting our Lord. Thus, for instance, he remarks on several occasions that He *looked* upon His disciples or those about Him. Similarly he notices certain exhibitions of human affection on the part of our Lord, *e.g.*, "He was moved with anger, being grieved"—"He looked up to heaven, and groaned"—"He marvelled at His hearers' unbelief"—"He took the little children into His arms." All this is indicative of the Man. There is, on the other hand, a striking omission throughout this Gospel of passages claiming any special power or authority for Christ. Mr. Jukes observes that the title "Lord" is conspicuously absent where the other Evangelists insert it. Only once in the Authorized Version is Christ so styled in St. Mark, before the resurrection, viz., in chap. ix. 24, by the father of the demoniac child, "Lord, I believe"; but the Revisers have expunged the word Lord even here. It harmonizes well with this absence of the assertion of authority, that there is no sermon on the mount; no sentence passed upon Jerusalem; in the garden no mention of Christ's right to summon twelve legions of angels; on the cross no promise of the kingdom to the penitent thief. But there are two particular cases of healing which demand a careful investigation, as setting forth, with much clearness, the Son of Man condescending to human infirmities, and in some mysterious way tied, as it were, and hampered by our unbelief, and stooping down to meet our weakness — those cures I mean recorded in chap. vii. 32, 33, and chap. viii. 22-25. The first is that of a deaf man with an impediment in his speech, whom our Lord took aside from the multitude and put His finger into his ear, and spit, and touched his tongue, and, looking up to heaven, sighed, and said unto him, "Ephphatha." The other is the case of the blind man at Bethsaida, whom He likewise took by the hand, and led out of the town,

and spit, and anointed his eyes, and, putting His hands upon him, asked if he saw aught. And he looked up, and said, I see men, as trees, walking. After that He put His hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up, and he was restored, and saw every man clearly. Such, then, are some of the points in St. Mark's Gospel which seem to justify us in considering the figure of the man specially set forth therein ; and if we see the Son of Man (as Mr. Jukes so beautifully draws out in reference to the ox) " toiling for men," this is by no means discordant with the interpretation suggested ; and, indeed, it appears to me we may with even greater reason expect to find " the service of the servant of God " under the figure of the human " servant," or rather " slave," of Jehovah, than under the figure of the beast of sacrifice.

In conclusion, I have nothing to do but to acknowledge with gratitude the valuable suggestions I owe to Mr. Isaac Williams, which I have not scrupled to make use of in the foregoing pages, nor do I think I can do better than close my remarks with a short extract from his work on the Gospels. "There is always," he says, " some danger when we confine our attention exclusively (as we often necessarily must) to one consideration alone. There is a danger in entering thus critically and closely on the structure of each of the Gospels, lest in examinations of the composition and nature of each particular part we lose the more general view, a sense of harmonious proportion and majesty, as a whole, of these four pillars upon which the Temple of God is constructed ; lest in dwelling on the diversity and characteristic beauty of those heavenly stones, on whose foundation the Temple is built—the jasper and the sapphire and the chalcedony and the emerald—we fail sufficiently to consider that 'the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple.' And it must, moreover, be remembered that, in explaining these symbols as closely applicable to the Evangelists, and, as we think, so intended of the Almighty, we do not confine them to these alone, or exclude other interpretations which tend the same way and have one end and scope as modes of God's revealing Himself to mankind."

F. F. IRVING.

THE RENDERING SYMMETRICAL OF ELLIOTT'S SYSTEM.

NO one can feel deeper admiration of *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, and more gratitude for the help derived from that wonderful work, than I do. It gathers up all the wisdom of preceding commentators, with a few exceptions ; throws fresh light upon many parts of the Book of Revelation ; and illustrates the whole with such a mass of learning gathered from every quarter, as in many respects to make what is considered the most difficult book in the Bible one of the most luminous.

On the assumption which I must here make of the substantial truth of that grand historical interpretation, which, from the days of Irenæus and Hippolytus to the present time, has been gradually taking shape as the events predicted have received their fulfilment, the very nature of the case involves an unfolding interpretation. It is not, and, in fact, cannot be, given to any commentator to do more than explain what is past, sketch the barest outlines of the far future, and see with more distinctness what is in his immediate horizon, and, therefore, most important for the warning or encouragement of his contemporaries. There has always been a natural temptation to see past or present events in prophecies yet future, which it needs some fresh turn in the world's history to counteract. It is no discredit to Elliott to say that he has sometimes yielded to this unavoidable temptation. Had his interpretation contained no gaps to be filled up by future investigators, the fact would have been nothing short of a miracle.

The purpose of this paper is to rectify an evident want of symmetry in his arrangement of the book. The frequent recurrence of the number seven—seven seals, seven trumpets, seven vials, in that portion of the prophecy which follows the opening of the seven-sealed book of history by the Lamb in heaven, and relates to things to come when St. John saw the Apocalypse, is too striking to escape the attention of any

reader ; and it was long ago pointed out by Mede that we ought to be able, by means of these divisions, to arrange the book in order before interpreting any part of it. This has, to a certain extent, been attempted by all commentators. As in this paper my only concern is with Elliott, whose great work substantially took the place, especially in arrangement, of all which preceded it, there is no necessity for recording their systems further than to say that none of them are more symmetrical than Elliott's, and that all of these writers were aware, as Elliott must himself have been, of the want of symmetry to which I am about to call attention. All of them, including Elliott, made efforts to supply the missing link, but none of them succeeded in so doing.

The difficulty all of them found was in the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters. According to Elliott's arrangement, just as the seven trumpets are included in the seventh seal, so the seven vials are included in the seventh trumpet. The seventh seal develops into the seven trumpets, and the seventh trumpet develops into the seven vials. But the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters, containing confessedly some of the most important and interesting visions in the book, come between the seventh trumpet and the vials, its supposed contents. In the midst of the explanation of the seventh trumpet's sounding he has to say, "The forward progress of the prefigurations is here suddenly interrupted. A new and parenthetic series of visons begins" (vol. ii., p. 495), and the result is that the heading of chapter and verse on the left-hand page, which is on page 496 of vol. ii. "Apoc. xi. 15-19," appears again, vol. iii. p. 328, "Apoc. xi. 15-19," where he comes back to the seventh trumpet in order to enter on the consideration of its supposed contents, the seven vials.

The symmetry is lost here, although, of course, it was the desire for symmetry which led Elliott and many others before him to adopt this arrangement and include the seven vials under the seventh trumpet. But I do not think that in his own mind the question of arrangement preceded, or was definitely separated from, the question of interpretation. We must remember the time when Elliott was preparing his

commentary. The first edition was published in the year 1844. The actual preparation took him seven years, and how many years before that must his mind have been saturated with the subject! All the beginning of this century was shadowed by the remembrances of the French revolution and the wars which followed it. The fifty years of Queen Victoria's reign, and the vast advances made during that period in material prosperity, not peculiar to England, but shared generally by the European nations, could not have been even imagined when the first edition of *Horæ Apocalypticæ* was preparing.

In the fifth edition, published 1862, remarkable changes were made in the chronology to meet the altered circumstances of the times, as well as some great improvements in other matters, but Elliott did not see how what was happening affected the arrangement as well as the chronology. When the first edition was published it was not difficult to suppose that the Turkish empire was on the very point of expiring, and that heavy judgments were about immediately to fall upon Christendom. Previous commentators believed that in the French Revolution the vials of God's wrath had begun to be poured out, and expected them still to continue. Elliott eagerly embraced this view, long before he actually commenced to write his great work and when it must have seemed far more probable; and illustrated it there with his own great power of pictorial representation. His arrangement of the Apocalypse made it necessary that the seven vials should fall under the seventh trumpet as the seven trumpets fall under the seventh seal. The evident fact that the seventh trumpet has, which the seventh seal has not, contents of its own quite sufficient to fill it was not allowed to stand in the way. The commencement of the seventh trumpet must, he saw, be past if the seven vials began with the French Revolution, and the sounding of the trumpet with its voices of heavenly triumph, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ," must, on that supposition, coincide with the French Revolution.

Elliott also perceived and expressed with great force

that a further inference was inevitable. Just before the sounding of the seventh trumpet it is said (Rev. xi. 14), "The second woe is past, behold the third woe cometh quickly." Then, whatever the meaning of the third woe, the second woe, which all historical commentators agree in interpreting of the Turks, must have passed away before the French Revolution. "The cessation of the Turkish woe," Elliott thought "too plain in itself, and too plainly fulfilled in history, to need much inquiry or illustration" (vol. ii. p. 489); but the importance of the question as crucial to his whole interpretation of the death and resurrection of the witnesses, the seventh trumpet, and the seven vials, he never for a moment denied, but always most strongly asserted. This fact, so essential to this part of his system, he considered as proved, because after war between Turkey and the allied powers of Russia and Austria, a peace was concluded humiliating to Turkey in 1791, and "the Turkman power," as he expressed it, "was no longer a *woe* to Christendom, but Christendom to the Turkmans. The dissolution or conquest of its empire had become thenceforth, it was evident, only a question of time and European policy. The second woe had passed away" (vol. ii. p. 491).

What is Christendom? or, rather, who are those to whom the Turks have been a woe? They were an object of apprehension to Austria and Russia, and at one time of dislike to the Western powers, though even this must be said with considerable qualifications. But they were never a woe to the Roman Empire of the West. It was on the Roman Empire of the East, on Asia Minor, the Balkan peninsula, Constantinople, the Holy Land, Egypt, they were a woe, and are so still. The only sense in which Elliott could mean that "the Turkoman power was no longer a woe to Christendom" is this, that the nations of Western Christendom, for fear of Russia, have been glad of the continuance of Turkish rule over the East, great as has been the woe inflicted by that rule on Eastern Christendom. How differently from Elliott does Professor Freeman, the historian, speak on this subject. "For the Hebrew," he says, "seventy years only of sorrow were appointed; our captivity—for the captivity of the Eastern

Rome is the captivity of all Christendom—has gone on now for four hundred and two and forty years as it is this day. Now, as then, barbarians sit encamped as a wasting horde in the fairest regions of the earth; now, as then, the profession of the Christian faith entails an abiding martyrdom on nations in their own land. And heavier still is the thought that not a few in Christian lands love to have it so" (*The Chief Periods of European History*, p. 169). The second woe has not passed away yet.

And if the second woe has not passed away yet, then the seventh trumpet has not yet been blown, nor have the seven vials, according to Elliott's system included in it and already almost emptied, even begun to be poured out. No one could be more emphatic than Elliott himself in asserting the impossibility, according to his system, of believing that we were living under the sixth or any other vial, unless, which he thought too plain an historic fact to need much inquiry or illustration, Turks ceased to be a woe to Christendom before the French Revolution.

Elliott's arrangement of the book (which is not symmetrical because the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters come between the seventh trumpet and the vials supposed to be contained in it), his interpretation of the witnesses, and the seventh trumpet and the vials depend on the supposition, first, that the Turkish woe passed away between 1787 and 1791, while, as Freeman's words so forcibly express it, it remains in full force to the present day; secondly, that in 1789 "there were heard great voices in heaven, saying, 'The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ,'" which it is difficult to believe; and thirdly, that from 1789 to 1890 we have been experiencing the last vials of the wrath of God, which is really incredible.

What I maintain is that the system of arrangement, which is so wanting in symmetry as to require us to place three whole chapters into a parenthesis between the seventh trumpet and its contents, and which involves these three unhistorical statements must be faulty. There must be a missing link somewhere—what is it?

The missing link is to be found in the chapters which create the difficulty in Elliott's and all preceding systems. It exists there, so to speak, underground, for which reason it has escaped notice. It consists in another septenary.

In chapter xv. 1 we read of "another sign in heaven great and marvellous, seven angels having the seven last plagues," that is to say, as expressed in chapter xvi. 1, "the vials of the wrath of God." "Another" sign implies previous signs, and if we bear in mind that the word "sign" and the word "wonder" represent the same Greek word and substitute, as in the Revised Version, sign for wonder, we find at all events one of these previous signs in the first verse of the 12th chapter; that is to say, at the beginning of the passage which spoils the symmetry of Elliott's system, "And there appeared a great sign in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun." If we pass on to the third verse we have "Another sign in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns," which feature at once connects it with the ten-horned beast in Daniel vii., the fourth of the four kingdoms. The history of this ten-horned beast under different phases is carried on to the 10th verse of chapter xiii. In verse 11 the word "sign" does not occur, but the word "behold," which introduces the second sign, is repeated, and the two-horned beast described is expressly called "another," to point out that we are commencing a new configuration or sign, "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb." This third sign occupies the remainder of the chapter.

The next or fourth sign is so entirely distinct from those that preceded it that it was unnecessary to say so, but it is introduced by the words, "I looked, and lo," "And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the Mount Zion, and with Him an hundred forty and four thousand having His Father's name written on their foreheads." This occupies the first five verses of the 14th chapter.

In verse 6 St. John says, "I saw another angel," or, as a different reading has it, "I saw an angel flying in the midst of

heaven," who was followed by two other angels, the three being seen together flying one after the other, and therefore constituting a single configuration or sign, the fifth sign which reaches to verse 13.

The sixth sign is introduced by the same phrase as the fourth, "I looked, and behold." The whole passage from verse 14 to the end of the chapter, describing the harvest and the vintage is bound together by the word "another"—"another angel," verse 15; "another angel," verse 17; "another angel," verse 18.

And then this sixth sign is followed by the first verse of chapter xv., already referred to, "And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvellous," which is the seventh. Here is another septenary like the seals and the trumpets—the septenary of signs; seven seals, seven trumpets, seven signs.

And the seventh of these signs stands in precisely the same relation to the seven vials in which the seventh seal stands to the seven trumpets. The seven trumpets are the contents or development of the seventh seal, and the seven vials of the seventh sign.

Elliott has shown at length what is in itself plain but needed proof on his system, that the beginning of the twelfth chapter goes back to the Apostolic age. In his view it begins a parenthesis, interrupting the development of the seventh trumpet. But according to what has just been said, the seventh trumpet is complete in itself. It is the consummation, including the appearing of Christ, and the resurrection of the saints at the last trump, and closing with the great hail or third woe. The second series, that of signs and vials, begins at the same point, the Apostolic age, and ends like the first in the great hail.

Here there is perfect symmetry, the whole interval from chapter vi. 1 to chapter xvi. 21 being covered by the two series, corresponding, we may well suppose, to the writing "within," and the writing "without," of the seven-sealed book, the seals and the trumpets, the signs and the vials.

The rest of the book is common to both series, to both lines of prophecy. It consists of a continuation of the

history, and two distinct histories—one of the false woman, Babylon the Great, the other of the true bride, the heavenly Jerusalem; both actually marked as parentheses or notes, by being revealed each by one of the vial angels (Rev. xvii. 1; xxi. 9), and closed by the same action and the same words (Rev. xix. 8, 10; xxii. 8, 9); and each necessary to the understanding of the whole, but which could not be inserted in the midst of the vial visions without destroying their proportion and symmetry. The introduction of another septenary is entirely independent of any interpretation, whether historical or otherwise. If there were no interpretation of any kind, it would still be necessary to the symmetry of the book. But it is the interpretation which, as I have shown in my Commentary, gives its importance to the symmetrical arrangement.

The differences in the interpretation arising from this rearrangement may be very briefly stated.

First, we are not required to believe that the Turkish woe has passed away while the Turks still retain possession of Constantinople, and are still encamped on the territories of Greek Christendom, and there is therefore room for the fulfilment of the prophecy of the death and resurrection of the witnesses after the close of the twelve hundred and sixty years of their prophesying "when they shall have finished their testimony," and before it can be said "the second woe is past."

Nor are we required to believe that when it is said, "the seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ," the French Revolution was predicted; but we can take the words in their natural meaning as representing the coming of the Lord at the last trump.

Nor are we required to believe that we have ourselves been living all our lives long under the seven last plagues in which the wrath of God is filled up, a fact of which most of us have been quite unconscious, but the necessary result of the supposition that the sixth vial is now being poured out. I doubt whether those who think they see in present events

the drying up of the river Euphrates, and the going forth of three unclean spirits like frogs working miracles, have fully considered this inevitable consequence. What was not an unnatural thought in the beginning of this century is inconceivable now. That the last plagues in which the wrath of God is filled up may be near at hand is very possible, that we have been unconsciously enduring them for a hundred years is impossible. And if I am right in my arrangement of seals and trumpets, signs and vials we are not required to believe it by any necessity of prophetic interpretation.

This formal change, however, leaves the great bulk of Elliott's interpretations materially unaffected. All the seals and all the trumpet visions till the close of the sixth, in which the death, resurrection, and ascension of the witnesses is described, are untouched by it. The first sign is not altered in its interpretation by the fact of this changed arrangement. Nor is the greater part of the second sign. The close of it and the third sign I shall have to refer to in another paper on the Image of the Beast. The fourth sign so beautifully illustrated by Elliott as predictive of the Reformation, though he does not speak of it as a "sign" (not recognizing this septenary) remains without alteration. So does the first part of the fifth sign, that part which describes the present era of missions. Where the change takes place is in the drawing out into the future almost all which relates to the beast with two horns like a lamb, its connection with the ten-horned beast, and the image of the beast. There are other differences in the view I take of some of the predictions, especially of the seventh and eighth heads of the ten-horned beast, but these differences existed among commentators, notably between Elliott and Faber, before this rectification of the symmetry of the book was thought of and are therefore independent of it. The result of rendering Elliott's system symmetrical by the recognition of the septenary of signs is simply to draw out another slide of prophetic history which belongs to our own immediate future, and which it concerns us much more than it concerned our fathers to read and understand. SAMUEL GARRATT.

BIBLE STUDIES.

A NEGLECTED SON.

NO one of our Lord's parables, perhaps, is more popular than that of the prodigal son, and yet how seldom is it treated as a whole, just as our Lord delivered it! It consists of three parts, yet one at least of the parts is nearly always left out. Our Lord introduces it in this way, "A certain man had two sons," and in those few words we have the three principal characters introduced—a father and two sons—and the actions of each of these furnish us with a distinct lesson. There is the younger son, whose career is so often dwelt upon—that story so vividly described, of money wasted in a foreign country, of a poor destitute driven to thoughts of returning home by want and hunger.

Then there is the father, and his loving reception of the wayward boy back to his home again—that exquisite picture which represents the father as "seeing him afar off," as if it had been the habit of his life to betake himself to some hillock close by and gaze wistfully up and down the roadway. Were the wayward boy to come home he should not have to knock at the door. His father should run to meet him. All this is very beautiful; and who can say how many thousands of sermons have been preached about it? There is God ever watching for the return of erring ones. There is God ready to receive them as soon as they shall take the first step towards Him.

But we should not lose sight of the fact that this matchless parable does not end here. It does not end with the lesson, precious above all things though it be, that God stands ready to receive penitent sinners back again to His favour, even when, through their sin, they are brought very low. There is still another phase of humanity to be dealt with. The parable began with the words, "A certain man had *two sons*." Why is it that one of these sons is popularly dealt with to the

almost total exclusion of the other? After the loving reception given to the younger son is described, his elder brother is introduced and his actions, and his father's dealings with him, start our minds upon a fresh line of thought.

For it is very evident that the father regarded this elder brother as his "good son." "Son," he said to him, "thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine." We can well imagine the father saying of his two boys, when the younger was away wasting his goods in a "foreign country":—

"I have two sons. The younger of the two, I am sorry to say, has left me, and has taken all his own share of money with him, and I fear he is in a very bad way, far from home and exposed to all kinds of temptations. Though lovable in disposition, he was always headstrong and wayward. The firstborn, on the other hand, is a good, steady lad. He has remained at home with me, and has been true and loyal to me. I can always depend upon him. He works in the fields, takes a lively interest in everything connected with the place, and relieves me of a great deal of care."

And does not this, in the spiritual interpretation that is intended to be put upon this parable, represent exactly the difference between these two sons? And yet when we consult the usual authorities on such questions we find this difference either entirely evaded or hopelessly obscured. By one the elder brother is taken to represent the Jews, in which case, by all fair rules of interpretation, the prodigal must be taken to represent the Gentiles. And that, perhaps, to a certain extent, may be true; but we must confine it to that in the case of both sons. It will not do to put a general interpretation upon the actions of one son and a limited interpretation upon those of the other. By another the elder brother is taken to represent the Scribes and the Pharisees, and the parable as a whole is treated as an illustration of our Lord's declaration that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of heaven before them. But the loving commendation passed by the father upon the elder son will scarcely comport with the opinion almost invariably expressed by our Lord with regard to the Scribes and Pharisees. And in any case,

why limit the elder brother to a particular class of persons, while the younger brother is allowed to represent such a broad class of humanity as outcast sinners?

And this brings us face to face with the whole question. If the young son, the prodigal who went away from home and returned to it, represents a pardoned sinner, who is meant by the elder son, the one who never left his home, but stayed in the very position to which the prodigal with such great joy was restored? Let nothing, even the fear of treading upon dangerous doctrinal ground, tempt us to destroy the completeness of this parable. Whatever line of thought we take with one part of it we must in all fairness carry out with the others. If, for instance, as is done incessantly in popular interpretation, we picture the prodigal as doing wrong in leaving his father's house, and as doing right only when he came back to it again, can we be wrong in picturing the elder brother as forming a marked contrast to this and as doing right by remaining with his father? The one lost his position and regained it. The other never lost it.

And is not this intended to meet two great classes of persons who are continually spoken about and argued about in the religious world? For it is steadily maintained by some that every person must experience a radical and even sudden change before he can be a child of God; while others hold that this is not necessary in every case, but that it is quite possible that there may be a gradual growth in spiritual life from the very days of childhood. The prodigal needed a conversion—he needed a turning homewards. The only place for him was home. He had wasted all he had, far from home, in riotous living. He said, "I will arise and go to my father," and when he did so he found that his elder brother was still there, enjoying the undoubted confidence of the father, whose loving heart he had so cruelly wounded.

And this brings us directly to the question, What does Christianity do for us? We teach our children that at their baptism they were grafted into Christ's Church—that they were made members, children, and heirs, that God is their Father—the youngest child even being taught to say, "Our

Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name," and we teach them to thank their Heavenly Father that He has called them to this state of salvation, and to pray that "God will give them grace to continue in the same unto their lives' end." And may we not in all fairness say that those who are brought up to do this, and do it, "leading the rest of their life according to their beginning" at baptism, are those whom our Lord intended to represent by the elder brother, to whom the father said, "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine"? Is it not better to bring up a child with the idea that he *is* a child of God, not that he may be some day if he should become converted, but that he is such now?

Of course, if a man belies his Christian profession, wasting it all on riotous living, he needs a change of heart and action. He needs what is popularly called a "conversion." He is the *prodigal* son. He can scarcely be reconciled to God without knowing when the desire for such reconciliation took place, as the longing for home came upon the poor, hungry boy when he said, "I will arise and go to my father." And when he is reconciled to God, when his Father does receive him home again, will it not be an event well known to him? He knows that whereas he was once careless and even godless, he is now the reverse, and he can tell you when he gave up his evil ways and commenced to live righteously and soberly. But if a man has not been profligate, but on the contrary can honestly say, "I have served God from my youth up; it was always the dream and the joy of my life to serve Him, and I served Him out of gratitude and love for His having called me to a state of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ," there may not be, in all probability there would not be, any definite time from which he may date the commencement of new feelings and a "converted life."

This seems to be the simple meaning of the parable of the prodigal son, which would have been better called the parable of the prodigal and his brother, for why should one brother be so neglected while the other is so continually exalted? Is there a merit in first becoming prodigal that a probable restoration may afterward exalt to heroism? The father

rejoiced because his wayward boy was found after having been lost, but his commendation was for the elder boy—"Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine."

But, it may be asked, how can this be when the elder brother seemed to be so surly, so envious of his brother who had returned, and spoke so unkindly regarding him? For it is quite true that his conduct is the only thing that mars the beauty of the prodigal's return and restoration. The poor creature was having, according to Eastern custom, his weary feet washed, the best robe and the ring were being prepared for him, the fatted calf was being killed, music and dancing were commenced in honour of his return, when the elder brother came in. Amazed at all this rejoicing, he inquired of one of the servants the cause of it all, when he was told that his brother had come, and that his father had killed the fatted calf because he had received him safe and sound. And we are told that when he heard this he was angry and would not go in. How unreasonable! The only one who did not rejoice at the prodigal's return, and that prodigal his own brother!

Now, this draws our attention once more to the father of these two young men. God has many classes and characters and dispositions to deal with amongst us mortals, all so strangely constituted, and this is well represented in the parable by the father's attention being so quickly called from one son to the other, both so widely different the one from the other. We are told that he went out to his elder son and entreated him to come in. What a loving father! How great his condescension! Equal only to the numerous entreaties of God, found everywhere throughout the pages of Holy Writ, exhorting His people to be faithful to Him. But the spirit of the elder son was evidently deeply stirred within him; his sullenness was not to be so easily removed. "Lo," he said, "these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment: and yet thou never gavest me a kid [to say nothing of a calf] that I might make merry with my friends: but as soon as this thy son [there is a little touch of bitterness here; he does not say 'my brother,'

but 'this thy son,' this poor creature whom thou art content to call thy son], as soon as he who has devoured thy living with harlots has come, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf."

An ungracious speech certainly; it was also rude and unfilial. He did not even address his father properly. The poor prodigal was only too glad to use the word "father." It was music in his ears to be allowed to use it. The other son could do without it, it seems. All he had to say was, "Lo, these many years do I serve thee!"

Yet let us not push this further than the circumstances of the parable demand. If the father in this parable is taken, as he always is, to represent God, then this only shows the difference between God's way of dealing with His children and man's way of dealing with his brother; and of this we have evidence sufficiently painful, not only from history, but from the experiences of our own lives. A brother's love is different from that of a father; man's love is different certainly from the love of God. A father has to overlook defects in the life and conduct of his sons. How many are the defects in the life and conduct of man which God has to overlook? This is all surely that can be fairly urged from this part of the parable. Sullen, ungracious, envious actions have never been thoroughly eradicated, even from well-acknowledged and active workers in the Church of God. And are there not to-day too many respectable church-goers, enjoying their own spiritual privileges in a manner sufficiently selfish to correspond with the conduct of the elder brother in the parable, and those even who are inclined to sneer at the efforts made to reclaim the lost and fallen, and welcome them to the Church? A little thought will furnish many parallels amongst acknowledged Christians of the present day to the prodigal's brother.

But can anything in the case before us be urged worse than this? We think not, for the elder brother did not forfeit his position as a son. His own words, doubtless, were true, for his father did not dispute them—"Lo, these many years have I served thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment." So far from disputing them, the father

seems undoubtedly to endorse them in the memorable words already quoted, "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine." All that can be fairly urged is an outburst of evil temper, a thing, alas! not so uncommon as to be entirely ruled out of the ranks of the baptized.

The perfection of loveliness in the father of these two young men, representing, as we take it, two classes of baptized Christians, forms pre-eminently the great beauty of this parable. The same father who seems to have watched night and day for the return of his erring boy and received him back with every mark of forgiveness and love, turns to his other son and soothes his ruffled feelings, reasoning him, let us hope, into a better state of mind. Perhaps he did not know the forlorn condition in which his brother had returned. Perhaps he did not know the deep penitence that rested upon him for the errors of his past life. Indeed, it is pretty evident that he did not know all this; but his father told him all, and we may well imagine his gentle reasoning, in keeping with the matchless words of the Saviour which formed the groundwork of the parable, as he would say to him :—

"Son, thou knowest that if, out of our hundred sheep, we should lose one, we would leave the ninety-and-nine in the wilderness and go after that which was lost; and that, finding it, we would rejoice for the moment more over that one than over all the rest that had not strayed away. So with thy brother. He was dead, and is alive again. He was lost, and is found."

We are not told whether this loving reasoning had the desired effect upon the elder brother or not, but there is nothing to show that it had not. We love to think that it had, that he came to himself, repented of his hasty words, and went in to add his welcome to the poor outcast that had returned.

When will the mass of well-to-do Christians be equally glad to welcome the outcast and the poor who are striving to leave their haunts and habits of vice, and struggle on to the light of the Father's House? When will they be willing, for instance, to welcome them into their churches as brothers?

Is not the tendency of church-going people too much in the direction of building costly churches and putting a high rental upon their sittings to the actual exclusion of the unfortunate and the lost, the only thing consulted apparently being their own comfort? And if some poor outcast should come to one such church and be welcomed by some large-hearted official, would there not be, in too many cases, from those comfortably seated in their pews a bearing as ungracious as that which marked the conduct of the prodigal's elder brother?

This parable, then, as it would seem, should always be treated as a whole. One part should not be divorced from the other. Its foundation is, "A certain man had two sons," and the key to it seems to be the words that our Saviour used as a sort of introduction to it, "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety-and-nine just persons that need no repentance." The prodigal was the sinner that needed repentance. The joy of the father over his return is as the joy of angels when a sinner renounces his sin and turns to God. The elder brother who stayed at home is as the just persons who need no repentance. Of course, all Christians need repentance, and so long as evil has access to the human breast it will be needed; yet the repentance alluded to by the Saviour in the words just quoted clearly refers to some special, overwhelming repentance, such as alone can drive a sinner from the devil to God, and change his whole life. But are there not just persons who never require such a special, definite, and converting repentance as that? This is the question of the whole parable, and it seems to assert that there are. It is not necessary to go through the experience of a prodigal in order to be a child of God. And for such, with all their apparent inconsistencies, with many faults that ought to be amended; but for such, full of faith in Christ and rich in good works, faithful in the external duties of a Christian life and in their attendance upon the means of grace; for such, strong in their allegiance to God as their Father; for each and all there are the loving words, "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine."

C. H. MOCKRIDGE, D.D.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Essays.

Moses and his Recent Critics (1) is a volume of essays written by several eminent divines of various schools of thought on the subject of the Criticism of the Pentateuch. It is something after the style of the Present Day Tracts issued by the Religious Tract Society, only keeping rather more closely to one point. The essays are all learned and well written, and, as a whole, constitute a strong set-off against the theories of Kuenen, Wellhausen, Stade, and other destructive crities. Where all is so good it seems invidious to mention any essays in particular; but while according a very high meed of praise to all, we may say that the essays of Professor Dwinnell on the Bearings of the New Hypothesis on the authority of the Bible, and that by Professor Osgood showing the light that Egyptian, Assyrian, and other ancient records throw on the problem, struck us as particularly valuable. The volume bears a noble testimony to the orthodoxy of the writers and their ability to maintain their views. It is edited by Dr. T. W. Chambers, who deserves the highest credit for the result.

Essays, Literary and Ethical (2) is the title of a volume of reprints by Aubrey de Vere, LL.D. There are ten essays altogether in the book, most of them long, some dull, and some rather out of date. The first lecture is literary and ethical too; some of the others are literary and some ethical. The literary essay on Sir Samuel Ferguson's Poems is interesting; that on Archbishop Trench's Poems is too diffuse. Dr. de Vere's ideas on Proportionate Representation are worth thinking about, but we hardly suppose they will ever become realities. His notes on Modern Unbelief and on the Philosophy of the Rule of Faith are too Romanistic to meet with acceptance beyond the pale of the author's own Church. Dr. de Vere writes good English, and is evidently widely read and of refined tastes.

Reminiscences of a Literary and Clerical Life (3) is an interesting record of the experiences of a well-known author who from his literary and clerical avocations had more than ordinary opportunities of seeing people and places, and more than usual facility in describing them. His anecdotes are always interesting, and frequently humorous; and related in a kindly spirit. For one who had such bad health the author must have been a wonderfully active man. He must have had a capital memory combined with great powers of observation. His opinions on all sorts of subjects are given with the air of one who has thought much, and thoroughly made up his mind, and, for the most part, they are worth listening to. The book is cheery and pleasant, and will form a useful companion

for many an hour which the author will help the reader to spend very happily.

In a little book entitled *Father Damien* (4), Mr. Edward Clifford relates how, being much attracted by the accounts of the character and work of that devoted missionary, he made a journey all the way from Cashmere to Molokai to see him. He gives us a charming account of the Hawaii Islands, and especially of that whereon Father Damien worked and died amongst the lepers who are segregated there by the Government; and draws a vivid picture of the missionary and his surroundings. Mr. Clifford gives all honour to Father Damien, as showing the true spirit of Christian devotion. He goes further, and expresses his conviction that the Roman Church can produce men of saintly lives and life-long testimony of their faith; but he also alleges five very sufficient reasons why he himself will never become a Romanist. We will only say that these reasons are powerful deterrents, sufficient if they stood alone, which they do not; and we are also quite convinced that it is not the Roman Church only that can produce saints and men and women of the most exalted devotion.

Under the title of *Life's Stages* (5), Mr. Stark has furnished a series of essays or addresses upon the various states and conditions of life, or rather of home life; for he has not, like Fuller, gone beyond the limits of home, nor has he treated the subject with the quaint terseness which has made the Holy and Profane States so famous. There are many things worth remembering in Mr. Stark's chapters, and the volume will form a pleasant companion for a quiet hour. In the first essay the author gives his view on Original Sin thus: "What is exactly meant by that familiar theological phrase? That every child shares in the guilt, the moral blame of Adam's transgression? If that be original sin, common sense as well as common justice should most vehemently protest against such a monstrous and God dishonouring doctrine. Is it not a metaphysical contradiction to affirm that guilt as well as evil can be transmitted? . . . . If by original sin is meant a liability to go wrong which every human being has inherited from the past, we have both Scripture and observation to support that doctrine." Mr. Stark is more of a moralist than a theologian.

(1) *Moses and his Recent Critics.* Edited by Talbot W. Chambers. London and New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1889. Price 6s.

(2) *Essays, chiefly Literary and Critical.* By Aubrey de Vere, LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

(3) *Reminiscenses of a Literary and Clerical Life.* By the author of "Three Cornered Essays," &c. London: Ward & Downey. 2 vols. 1889. Price £1 1s.

(4) *Father Damien.* By Edward Clifford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

(5) *Life's Stages.* By James Stark. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier. 1889.

Miscellaneous. *Pictorial Sketches from Bible Lands* (1) is the fourth volume of the Holiday Rambles Series. The three preceding works, the issuing Committee informs us, have been well received, and we may expect that the present volume will find a favourable reception. The pictures are fairly well done, some of them are very pretty, but those with regard to the Temple seem to us to give too great an idea of space; the Garden of Gethsemane is quite different from the usual representations of it, but it may be none the less true for that. The pictures are not arranged in any particular order apparently, so we are taken from Jordan to Ephesus, from there to Beyrout, then back to Hebron; from Bethlehem to Iconium, thence to Rephidim, and so on. The descriptions appended to the pictures are said on the title page to be "racy and interesting." We are willing to admit they are interesting, but we do not know why they are called "racy." There is still room for works of this kind, and there is no reason to resort to the questionable expedient of a silly sensationalism in describing their merits. The volume makes a nice present for a Sunday scholar, or other young student of the Bible.

The Church-Standing of Children (2) is a little work in which the doctrine and practice of Infant Baptism is stated and defended in a forcible manner. It is eminently a sensible tract, which everybody may read with advantage, especially in these days when the fundamental principles and initiatory ceremonies are not so strongly enforced as they used to be.

The same Publishers also send us *An Exposition of the Shorter Catechism* (3), part second, containing the summary of Christian duty, one of the Bible-class primers edited by Professor Salmond, of Aberdeen. We need hardly say that it is a good exposition. The question and answer are given, then Scriptural proof, and after that, an explanation in plain and simple terms.

Pegs for Preachers (4) has for its object "to help those who seek to speak for the Lord Jesus, and yet have little time at their disposal for the preparation of their message;" and the author hopes that it may be the means of stirring up some to search the Word of God. We trust it will be effective in this latter object, and that it will be very rightly of less use in the former. There is no royal road to preaching. Preaching without knowledge is presumption, and without preparation it will be a certain failure; and this failure will not be prevented by *Pegs for Preachers*, which, however, has one

advantage, that of being printed in such large type that anybody can read it easily.

The History of Christian Ethics (5), we venture to think, will form an important instalment of Messrs. Clark's Foreign Theological Library. The first volume of Prof. Luthardt's work is before us, containing the history of Christian ethics before the Reformation. In this volume there is first a sketch of Ancient Paganism, in four sections; 1st, the popular ethical ideas of the Greeks; 2nd, the philosophical system of ethics; 3rd, the popular moral philosophy; 4th, ancient morality in the ethics of mysticism. Then comes a statement of the difference between the ancient and the Christian ethics, with an appendix on Buddhism. After this we find discussions on the ethics of the Old Testament; then on the ethics of the New Testament. Then follow sections treating of the ethics of the Post-Apostolic Church, of the Greek Church, and of the Western Church; and finally the ethics of the Middle Ages. The chief writers of all time are brought under review, and there is a conspectus of the morality of each, together with that of the time in which he lived. By a careful perusal of the whole volume, the course of ethical teaching and its consequences may be gathered; and by reference to the excellent table of contents, any author may be found and a summary of his opinions on the subject of morality may be noted. Prof. Luthardt's work shows a wonderful amount of learning and research; the drawback in it is its extraordinary condensation. It reads almost like notes of lectures rather than a full discussion of the subject. But then such a discussion would have taken a library instead of two volumes; and therefore this shorter method is, after all, preferable; for from this volume any one may glean a very fair idea of the ethical teaching of all the Fathers and divines previous to the Reformation, and there are abundant references to the literature on the subject to guide the student who wishes to go more deeply into it. Prof. Luthardt has certainly furnished an admirable text-book on Christian Ethics. We must congratulate Mr. Hastie upon the readableness of his translation; and we need hardly say that the volume in its "get up" is worthy of the firm that issues it.

(1) *Pictorial Sketches from Bible Lands.* London: Joseph Toulson, Sutton Street, E.

(2) *The Church-Standing of Children.* By Rev. Norman L. Walker, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

(3) *An Exposition of the Shorter Catechism.* Part 2. By Professor Salmond, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

(4) *Pegs for Preachers.* By Charles Inglis. London: Morgan & Scott.

(5) *History of Christian Ethics.* Vol. i. containing the History of Christian Ethics before the Reformation. By Dr. Chr. Ernst Luthardt, Professor of Theology at Leipsic. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1889.

Henderson & Spalding, Printers, Marylebone Lane, London, W.

(3)
8 111