

MARCH 1889.

The  
Theological Monthly

THE PHARAOH AND DATE OF THE  
EXODUS :

*A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE CHRONOLOGY.*

1. SINCE the time of Josephus Flavius there has been no lack of works on Biblical and profane chronology, and their number is rapidly increasing in our day. If the ambitious student, who has the courage to wade through a formidable array of several thousand volumes, desires to ascertain the results attained by the combined chronological wisdom of the past 1800 years, he is at once met by a pleasing variety of choice. The date of the creation, for instance, has been placed as high as 6174 B.C., and as low as 3616 B.C. If he select so comparatively a modern date as the exodus from Egypt, he may take his choice between several hundred dates, ranging all the way from 1825 B.C. (Seyffarth) to 1143 B.C. (Floigl). In Egyptian chronology the choice of dates is equally varied, and equally dissatisfactory. Menes, the first king of Egypt, reigns, according to Henne von Sargons, 6467 B.C.; while Palmer is sure there is here an error of calculation of 4243 years, since he places the same Menes in 2224 B.C. There is scarcely a single date in profane history that is agreed upon by all chronologists until we come to the death of Alexander the Great in 324 B.C.; and even this date has been disputed by Seyffarth.

2. It would be a thankless task to analyse and criticise a title of the chronological systems that have had their day,

and it would be a hopeless labour, compared with which that of Sisyphus was child's play, to attempt to deduce from these discordant systems a consistent and harmonious scheme of comparative chronology. Happily, at least nine-tenths of the chronological theories heretofore devised may be dismissed as more or less ingenious systems of guesswork. Since the discovery of the key to the reading of hieroglyphic and cuneiform inscriptions, we are in possession of a mass of contemporaneous documents which, in many cases, enable us to check a chronological system at every step. The amount of material of this kind at our disposal is now so large, that it is time that the whole subject of comparative chronology should be reconsidered *de novo* in the light of monumental evidence. The following essay is an attempt in that direction, in which we hope to show that, by means of the monumental helps at our disposal, together with the written evidence, it is possible to determine not only the year, *but the exact day* on which the exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt took place. If our attempt should be considered successful—and of this the reader must himself be the judge—it will furnish to future chronologists a fixed and absolute starting-point for their researches; to biblical scholars a new proof of the truth of the Bible; and to Egyptologists a new study of the Egyptian calendar.

3. Most Egyptologists of the present day, following the lead of Bunsen and Lepsius, seem to be agreed that the Hebrew exodus from Egypt must be placed about 1314 B.C., in the reign of Menptah, the son of Ramessu the Great. In fact, Brugsch<sup>1</sup> is so sure that this date is correct, that he uses the following emphatic language, italics included: "The new pharaoh 'who knew not Joseph' . . . is no other, *can be no other*, than Ramessu II." As Brugsch gives no additional proof for this dogmatic assertion, beyond what may be found in Lepsius,<sup>2</sup> we venture to assert with equal emphasis that, inasmuch as Manetho, the monuments and astronomy, are all in accord in placing Ramessu the Great nearly two hundred

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of Egypt*, i. 98, 99.

<sup>2</sup> *Chronol. der Ägypter*, translated in pp. 357-506 of his *Letters from Egypt*, etc. (Bohn's edition).

years after the exodus, *he cannot* be the pharaoh of the oppression, nor, consequently, can his son Menptah be the pharaoh of the exodus. Lepsius' argument rests mainly on three proofs: (1) That Manetho's story of the leper exodus is the Egyptian version of the Hebrew exodus; (2) that Menptah is the pharaoh of the leper exodus; (3) that Menptah is the same king as the Menophres of the astronomer Theon, and therefore began his reign in 1322 B.C. If these three points can be disproved, it will follow that Menptah is not the pharaoh of the Hebrew exodus, and that we must look for some other candidate. Lepsius advances various minor arguments in support of his theory, but they all depend on these three main arguments, and must stand or fall with them.

4. Now in the first place it must be conceded that Manetho, as an Egyptian priest, professedly translating from the sacred books and other records into the Greek language, must have been well versed in his own language, and consequently that he must have known that Amenhotep (= Amenophis) and Minptah (= Menophath) were two distinct names, differing both in form and meaning. In the story of the leper exodus, both in Manetho's as well as in Chæremon's version, the king is *always* called Amenophis, never Menophath. As Manetho says the king's name was Amenophis, there is no ground whatever for assuming that he meant a king of another name, and we are therefore directed to the 18th dynasty, in which there were three kings named Amenophis, or four, if we count in the heretic usurper Atenchura (the AtENCHERES of Manetho), who at first reigned under the name Amenhotep IV. If any doubt remained it would be at once dispelled by a fact mentioned by Manetho, which is confirmed by the monuments, which shows that Amenhotep III. and no other king is the pharaoh of his leper exodus story. Manetho says that the chief adviser of his Amenophis was *his namesake* Amenophis, *the son of Papis*.<sup>1</sup> Now, the monuments show that the principal personage in the reign of Amenhotep III. was, in fact, Amenhotep, surnamed Si Hapi, that is, *son of Hapi*, or Apis.

---

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Contra Apion*, i. 26.

5. That Minptah is not the same king as Menophres is clear: (1) from the difference of names, for Menophres is as purely Egyptian as Minptah, and there is no necessity whatever for emending it to Menephtes, with Lepsius; (2) because Minptah, as will be shown in a later section (§§116, 19), reigned after the building of Tyre, hence not before 1198 B.C., and therefore he could not have been the same as king Menophres who reigned 124 years earlier, in 1322 B.C.; and (3) because the monuments offer us, in the throne name of one of the kings of dynasty 19, the exact equivalent of Menophres, and both Manetho and astronomical evidence prove that the king in question reigned in the year recorded by Theon.

6. The only remaining point to consider is, whether we are to identify the Amenophis of the leper exodus with the pharaoh of the Bible exodus, with Lieblein.<sup>1</sup> A brief analysis of Manetho's story is sufficient to show that this identification is impossible, and that the leper exodus refers to an entirely different event. Manetho says that a number of *Egyptian* lepers had been gathered from all parts of Egypt, and were sent to work in the quarries by Amenophis; that they were incited to revolt by an *Egyptian* priest named Osarsiph, who, with the aid of the shepherds who had been driven out of Egypt by Tothmosis to the city called Jerusalem, succeeded in usurping the throne for thirteen years, during which time Amenophis was living in Ethiopia, whither he had fled at the outbreak of the revolt; that Osarsiph and some other confederate *Egyptian* priests introduced a change of religion; that Amenophis took his [grand] son Sethos, the son of Ramesses, who was five years old at the time of the revolt, to Ethiopia; and that, at the end of the thirteen years, "the shepherds from Jerusalem and the polluted people were driven out of Egypt to the bounds of Syria"<sup>2</sup> by Sethos. In another extract<sup>3</sup> Sethos and Ramesses are joined together as reigning at the same time after Amenophis. According to this story, the succession of kings was as follows:—Amenophis III., Osarsiph, Ramesses I., Sethos I. The monumental lists give us: Amen-

<sup>1</sup> *Egypt. Chronol.*, 117-125.

<sup>2</sup> Josephus, *Contra Apion*, i. 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 15.

hotep III., Har [Horus], Ramessu I., Seti I. From this it is evident that Osarsiph is the same king as Horus. It is perfectly clear from his own account<sup>1</sup> that Horus was an usurper, and there are some indications that he was originally a priest. We also know, from the monuments, that after the death of Amenophis III., a change of religion was introduced as Manetho states, namely, the worship of the sun's disk, and a fanatic intolerance of Amunra and other state gods of Egypt.<sup>2</sup> There is not a word in Manetho's narrative that justifies us in connecting his story of the revolt of native *Egyptians* with the Hebrew exodus. If the Jews appear in his story at all, they can be only the shepherds who were called in from Jerusalem to assist the rebellious *Egyptians* to place Osarsiph on the throne. The statement attributed to Manetho that Osarsiph changed his name to Moses, is probably an impudent interpolation of Apion, from whom Josephus, no doubt, copied this and other extracts. That Manetho, with the Hebrews' own version of their expulsion before him in the LXX., and with his knowledge of the monumental lists of kings, should have represented Moses as usurping the throne of Egypt for thirteen years is too preposterous for belief. Apion's attack on the Jews was stuffed full of the most ridiculous, malignant, and impossible slanders, as Josephus' extracts therefrom prove, and it is more than likely that this conceited and venomous Alexandrian boldly added the name Moses to Manetho's narrative, without troubling himself as to consistency with Egyptian history.

7. If Manetho's story of the leper exodus describes a purely Egyptian event, the question arises whether he referred at all in his history to the Biblical exodus. Manetho seems to have been a faithful and honest historian, and his story of the conquest of Egypt by the Hyksos, "without striking a blow,"<sup>3</sup> shows that he did not hesitate to sacrifice his vanity as an Egyptian to the truth of history. As the LXX. version of the Hebrew Scriptures had probably been in circulation in Egypt before

<sup>1</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. 464-469.

<sup>2</sup> Sayce, *Ancient Emp. of the East*, 40, 41.

<sup>3</sup> Josephus, *Contra Apion*, i. 14.

he published his *Aegyptiaca*, there was even less probability that Manetho would have ventured to pass in silence an event of such importance as the Hebrew exodus—whose disastrous effects must have long lingered in the memory of the Egyptians—since many of his Greek readers must have read the Hebrew version of the expulsion from Egypt, and they would naturally look to Manetho's history for the Egyptian side of the story. It is, therefore, pretty certain that Manetho did incorporate in his history the Egyptian version of the exodus from Egypt of the Hebrews, with a suitable local colouring, as might be expected. Fortunately, considerable fragments of this very story have been preserved in Josephus, although sadly mixed up with Manetho's history of the Hyksos invasion. In the story of the leper exodus there is an allusion to the *shepherds* who had been driven out of Egypt by Tothmosis *to the city of Jerusalem*, and if we turn to Josephus<sup>1</sup> we find a more detailed account of this expulsion. It is there stated, that "under a king, whose name was Alisphragmuthothis [Alisphra Tothmosis], the shepherds were subdued by him, and were shut up in a place named Avaris [= Tanis = Zoan]. Thummosis [Tothmosis] the *son* of Alisphragmuthothis came to an agreement with them that they should leave Egypt and go without any harm to be done to them, whithersoever they would; and that, after this agreement was made, *they went away with their whole families and effects; not fewer in number than 240,000, and took their journey from Egypt through the wilderness for Syria; that they built a city in that country which is now called Judea, large enough to contain this great number of men, and called it Jerusalem.*" In another book Manetho says, "that this nation, thus called shepherds, were also called captives *in their sacred books*" [that is, in the LXX. Greek version, published before Manetho's work was written]. Again Josephus<sup>2</sup> quotes Manetho as saying that the Jews "went out of [Egypt], and settled in that country, which is now called Judea, and there built Jerusalem *and its temple.*" These allusions to Judea, the wilderness, Jerusalem, the

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Apion*, i. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 26.

temple, the sacred books, and the *peaceable* departure from Egypt, can leave no doubt as to the identity of these "captive shepherds" with the Hebrew shepherds who were captives in Egypt. Manetho's version sticks as closely to facts as might reasonably be expected from a national historian of Egypt, anxious on the one hand to give a faithful account of the story of his country, and on the other hand desirous of putting as good a construction as possible on an event which placed one of the most famous of all pharaohs in a very unenviable light. That these captive shepherds are not the same as the Hyksos shepherds with whom Josephus, honestly perhaps, sought to identify them is evident: (1) because we now know from the monuments that the latter were *forcibly* expelled, whereas the captive shepherds were allowed to depart *peaceably*, as Manetho himself testifies; (2) because we also know from the monuments that the Hyksos were expelled by *Amosis*, the first king of dynasty 18, whereas the king who allowed the captive shepherds to depart was named *Tothmosis*. These two names are as distinct as Amenhotep and Minptah. There were four kings named Tothmosis in dynasty 18, but Manetho's Tothmosis was the son of a king of the *same name*, with the additional name of *Alisphra*. Tothmosis I., II., and III. reigned in succession, consequently Manetho's pharaoh of the exodus was either Tothmosis II. or III. As we see in the case of Souphis of dynasty 4 (the Cheops of Herodotus, and the *Chufu* of the monuments), Manetho read "Sh" in place of "Ch" or "Kh." Hence, Aa-kheper-ka-ra and Aa-kheper-en-ra, the throne names of Tothmosis I. and II., would have been rendered by him as Aasepercheres and Aasephra. By substituting an A for an  $\Delta$  in *Alisphra*, we restore the throne name of Tothmosis II.; that is, Aaisphra [= Aasiphra]. *Consequently Tothmosis III. was Manetho's pharaoh of the exodus.*

8. According to the monuments, Tothmosis reigned some time with his sister, Amenasu-hat (the Amenses of Manetho). Mesphres follows Amenses in Manetho with 12 years 9 months. Mesphris, or Misaphris (as it is also read), is evidently Mi(n)sheperra, the throne name of Tothmosis III. But the successor of Misaphris is Misptra Tothmosis with 25

years 10 months. This is clearly the same king, with the addition of Tothmosis. Why was his reign divided into two parts? If he was the pharaoh of the exodus, a simple and natural explanation is, that his 25 years 10 months represent his reign *after the expulsion of the captive shepherds*. Josephus, who perhaps honestly, perhaps purposely, confounded the captive shepherds with the Hyksos, in order that his nation should appear to be more ancient than the Greeks, by placing the exodus from Egypt as high as possible, has actually identified Amosis and Tothmosis. The confusion was more easily made if, as we think probable, each king reigned 25<sup>+</sup> years after expelling the shepherds. But all doubt on the subject is removed by Manetho's own words:<sup>1</sup> "When this people or shepherds were gone out of Egypt to Jerusalem, *Tothmosis*, the king of Egypt who drove them out, reigned afterwards 25 years and 4 months." If Tothmosis III. reigned 25 years 4 months after the exodus, as Manetho expressly testifies, then the 25 years 10 months now given to his double in Josephus' list of dynasty 18 must belong to Amosis, whose place is now filled by Tothmosis. If Amosis reigned 25 years 10 months after the expulsion of the Hyksos, and four years before, as the monuments assure us, then his whole reign was 29 years 10 months. This agrees with a variant of 30 years in Syncellus. The 25 years 4 months now assigned to the first king would allow only 29 years and 4 months, or, in round numbers, 29 years for his total reign, for the rule of Manetho's epitomators was to call everything over six months a year, and to take no account of a less sum.

9. If Tothmosis III. was the pharaoh of the exodus, the next point to consider is when he reigned, according to Manetho. Josephus, whose list is the earliest, and therefore probably the most correct version, gives 334 years to dynasty 18, for he counts 393 years from the expulsion of the Hyksos to the associated reigns of Ramesses and Sethos of dynasty 19, to whom he assigns 59 years.<sup>2</sup> Dynasty 19 has 194 years in Eusebius, the Old Chronicle and the Sothis book. But

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Contra Apion*, i. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*

Sethos I. has only 55 years in Eusebius, whereas Manetho, as Josephus informs us, allowed him 59 years; hence we must consider 198 years as the original sum. Dynasty 20 has 178 years in Eusebius, but the same chronologist has 348 years for dynasty 18, in place of the 334 of Josephus—that is, 14 years more. Four of these 14 years were deducted from dynasty 19 as we have just seen, and the remaining 10 years were probably deducted from dynasty 20, which is anonymous in Eusebius. This conjecture is confirmed by two facts: (1) The Sothis book, which gives the reigns in detail, has 189 years, or only one year more. (2) The Old Chronicle, which generally follows Eusebius in the length assigned to each dynasty, gives only *two* kings in dynasty 23, with 19 years. On comparing with Eusebius we find that these are the last two kings of that dynasty. If we restore the first king, Petubastes, with 40 years, it will require a corresponding reduction from some other dynasty, and dynasty 20 has 228 years, or just 40 years more than the sum of the Sothis book and Eusebius. Dynasty 21, as we learn from the monuments, was contemporary with dynasties 20 and 21, and dynasty 22 immediately succeeded to dynasty 20. Even the Sothis list indicates this; for, after a number of kings named Ramesses (=dynasty 20), it follows with a king named Koncharis—a mutilated form of Sesoncharis (=Sesonchis), as another part of the same list proves. Now dynasty 22 begins with Sesonchis, the Shishak of the Bible, who invaded Judah in the 5th year of Rehoboam. There are two readings for the length of the reign of Sesonchis: Africanus has 21 years and Syncellus 34 years—a difference of 13 years. We hold that where there is a various reading in Manetho's lists, one of the numbers sometimes indicates a synchronism with Biblical or Grecian history. As these lists have reached us solely in the works of Jewish and Christian chronologists, the most important synchronism of the reign of Seconchis, from their point of view, naturally was his invasion of Judah. Hence the 14th year of Shishak was marked as the date of that invasion, *as the 13th year of Tothmosis was similarly marked as the date of the exodus.* Hence 14 Shishak = 5 Rehoboam, and Manetho placed dynasty

19 (198+188+13) 399 years before the 5th of Rehoboam. In another section it will be shown that Rehoboam's 5th year must be placed in 924 B.C. (sec. 15), hence Manetho's date for dynasty 19 was (924+399) 1323 B.C.

10. Dynasty 18 is in a great deal of confusion in the present lists of Manetho's dynasties. Its sum of 334 years in Josephus must be reduced, in the first place, by the 87 years of its three last kings, who are simply duplicates or repetitions of dynasty 19, as nearly all Egyptologists are now agreed. Secondly, if Ramesses I. and Sethos were the immediate successors of Horus, as the monumental lists and Manetho's story of the usurpation of Osarsiph proves, then the five successors of Horus in Josephus, reigning 49 years 10 months, must be identified with the heretic disk worshipers contemporary with the first part of dynasty 19. From the 13th year of Misptra Tothmosis to the last year of Horus, Josephus gives us the following list, with which we compare the succession according to the monuments:—

MANETHO.	Years.	Months.	MONUMENTS.
1. MISPHRA TOTHMOSIS reigned after the expulsion of the "captive shepherds,"	25	4	1. MI(N)SHEPERRA TUTMES III., 53 yrs. 11 mths. 2 days.
2. TOTHMOSIS, . . .	9	8	2. AMENHOTEP II., over 30 yrs.
3. AMENOPHIS, . . .	30	10	3. TUTMES IV., over 6 yrs. 4. AMENHOTEP III., over 35 yrs.
4. HORUS, . . .	36	5	5. HOR.

A mere glance at this table shows that Amenophis II. and Tothmosis IV. have been transposed in Josephus' list, and that Amenophis III. is entirely omitted. Manetho himself allowed only 13 years to the usurpation of Osarsiph-Horus, hence the 36 years 5 months of Horus in Josephus' list must belong to Amenophis III., whose 36th year is found

on the monuments. Manetho's original list was therefore as follows :—

	Yrs.	Mths.
1. Misaphris Tothmosis III., after the exodus, . . . . .	25	4
2. Amenophis II., . . . . .	30	10
3. Tothmosis IV., . . . . .	9	8
4. Amenophis III., . . . . .	36	5
5. Horus or Osarsiph, . . . . .	13	0
Total, . . . . .	115	3

Consequently Manetho placed the Hebrew exodus 115 years 3 months before dynasty 19, that is, in (1323 + 115) 1438 B.C., and the chronology down to 14 Sesonchis I. is as follows :—

Misaphris Tothmosis III., after the exodus, . . . . .	25 yrs. 4 mths.	1438 B.C.
Amenophis II., his son, . . . . .	30 ,, 10 ,,	1413 ,,
Tothmosis IV., his son, . . . . .	9 ,, 8 ,,	1382 ,,
Amenophis III., his son, . . . . .	36 ,, 5 ,,	1373 ,,
Horus or Osarsiph, a usurper, . . . . .	13 ,, 0 ,,	1336 ,,
Ramesses I., son of Amenophis I., . . . . .	1 ,, 0 ,,	1323 ,,
Sethos I., his son, . . . . .	59 ,, 0 ,,	1322 ,,
Ramesses II., Miamun, his son, . . . . .	66 ,, 0 ,,	1263 ,,
Menophath, his son, . . . . .	20 ,, 0 ,,	1197 ,,
End of dynasty 19 (198th year), . . . . .		1126 ,,
Dynasty 20, 12 Ramessides, . . . . .	188 ,, 0 ,,	1125 ,,
Dynasty 22 begins; Sesonchis, first king, . . . . .	13 ,, 0 ,,	937 ,,
Invasion of Judah, in 5th year of Rehoboam, . . . . .		924 ,,

II. The monuments offer the following proofs of the correctness of this table. It will be noticed that, with only two exceptions, all our arguments are based on astronomical evidence—the most absolutely certain of all proofs—

(a) Gladstone has shown<sup>1</sup> that the legend of the Pseudo-dusseus has been borrowed from the account of the expedition of the Achaiusha (Achaians) and other Grecian tribes in the 5th year of Minptah, and elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> he says: "that expedition took place shortly before, or near [rather "after"] the date of the War of Troy." In our table Minptah's accession coincides exactly with the year of the fall of Troy (sec. 18).

(b) The building of Tyre, by which we should probably understand its rebuilding, and, as Movers supposes, the transference of the Phœnician hegemony from Sidon to Tyre, took

<sup>1</sup> *Time and Place of Homer*, 183-187.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

place, as we shall show, in 1198 B.C.; consequently Minptah, who was in communication with Baal-merom-gabu, king of Tyre, in his 3rd year, must have commenced to reign after 1198 B.C. According to our chronology, the rebuilding of Tyre, and the transference of the seat of government from Sidon, must be placed in the 66th year of Ramessu II. There seems to be an allusion to the occasion for this rebuilding in the travels of the Egyptian Mohar, in the latter part of the reign of this king, for he states that Tyre had then been recently burnt.<sup>1</sup>

(c) Riel<sup>2</sup> has shown that the Ramesseum indicates that the rising of Sothis took place on the 16th day of Thoth, in the reign of Ramessu II. This indicates the years 1265-62. In our table Ramessu II. begins to reign in 1263 B.C.

(d) Sethos I. has a title, *nem mesu*, which has been interpreted to mean the "new birth," and has been supposed by Brugsch to refer to the Sothic epoch of 1322 B.C. It is seen by our table that this conjecture is correct, and it is probable that the name Seti (= Set, the Egyptian name of the dog-star) was assumed on his association with his father in the latter's 2nd year, in the last year of the coincidence of July 20 with Thoth I. of the vague year.

(e) The astronomer Theon says the Sothic cycle, beginning July 20, 1322 B.C., was called by the Egyptians the era of *Menophres*. This is an exact transcription of *Menpehora*, the throne-name of Ramessu I., who associated his son Sethos with him in 1322 B.C. Hincks was the first to point out this identification, and his conclusion is adopted by Mr. Basil Cooper.<sup>3</sup>

(f) "On the first day of Athyr, in the year 11 of Amemphis III., the king ordered an immense basin to be dug, and on the 16th of the same month he celebrated a great panegyry of the waters."<sup>4</sup> "If," as Browne observes on this extract, "the waters were let in when the Nile had reached its

<sup>1</sup> Sayce, *Anct. Emp. of the East*, 183.

<sup>2</sup> *Sonnen u. Sirius-Jahr der Ramessiden*.

<sup>3</sup> In E. de Bunsen, *Chronol. of the Bible*.

<sup>4</sup> Hincks, as quoted by Browne, art. "Manetho," in *Kitto's Cycl. of Bibl. Lit.*, v. 3.

highest point, which is from 90 to 100 days after the summer solstice, this would indicate in the 14th century B.C., about Oct. 4-14. The 16th of Athyr fell on these days of the Julian year 1369-1326 B.C." In our chronology the 11th of Amenophis III. is 1363 B.C., which agrees exactly.

(g) Floigl<sup>1</sup> assumes that the coronation of the kings of Egypt always took place on the first new moon after their accession, and he calculates that Amenophis III., whose coronation day was Epiphi 13,<sup>2</sup> ascended the throne in 1398 B.C. But the date already ascertained in the preceding paragraph proves that Amenophis III. could not have ascended the throne *before* (1369 + 10) 1379 B.C. The new moon of Epiphi 13, 1398 B.C., was visible on the same day, at intervals of 25 years, hence also in 1373 B.C., our date for the accession of Amenophis III. This and the preceding astronomical date seem to render it certain that this king's accession cannot be moved up higher than 1373 B.C., consequently we have here astronomical proof that Horus reigned only 13 years, as Manetho testifies. For, from I Amenophis III. to I Rameses I. are (1373-1323) 50 years, and Manetho's figures give us (36.5 + 13) 49 years 5 months.

12. According to the inscription of the captain Amenemhib,<sup>3</sup> who plays an important part in the numerous campaigns of Tutmes III., this king died on the 30th of Phamenoth, in the 54th year of his reign. He began to reign on the 4th of Pachons,<sup>4</sup> from which to 30 Phamenoth are 332 days: hence his reign lasted exactly 53 years, 11 months, and 2 days. These figures are of course reckoned according to the official vague year of 365 days. In the fixed Egyptian year of Manetho (equivalent to the Julian) there were 13 leap years in 53 vague years, consequently in Julian time Tutmes III. reigned only 53 years, 10 months, and 19 days. As Manetho's lists give no *days*, he would necessarily count only 53 years 10 months. During the early part of his reign Tutmes III. was only nominally king: the real ruler was his sister Amenasu-hat (the Amenses of Manetho), and towards the end of his reign he

<sup>1</sup> *Gesch. des sem. Alterthums*, 46, 47.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 355.

<sup>2</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. 439.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 321.

associated his son Amenhotep II. with him.<sup>1</sup> How long this joint reign lasted is not recorded, but there is a clue on the obelisk of the Lateran which enables us to determine this point. Tutmes IV. completed this obelisk in the 7th year of his reign, probably shortly after the record of his alleged victories in the same year, on the 8th day of Athyr;<sup>2</sup> for the inscription on the obelisk alludes, in the usual grandiloquent style, to his great success in subduing his enemies. Now the obelisk also states that it had remained in the hands of workmen *after the death of Tutmes III.*, until it was completed by Tutmes IV., 35 years "and upwards."<sup>3</sup> Amenophis II. reigned altogether 30 years 10 months, which, added to the 6 years 2 months of Tutmes IV., make exactly 37 years. If we allow only 4 months over the 35 years to account for the "upwards" of the inscription, we have (37-35 years 4 months=) 1 year 6 months as the duration of the associated reign of Tutmes III. and Amenhotep II. As the whole reign of Tutmes III. was 53 years 10 months, we can now divide his reign, with great exactness, into its component parts, as follows:—

1. With his sister Amenasu-hat,	14 yrs. 3 mths.	1465 B.C.	{ Pachons 4. April 20.
2. Alone until the exodus,	12 ,, 9 ,,	1451 ,,	{ Mesore 4. July 20.
3. Alone after the exodus,	25 ,, 4 ,,	1438 ,,	{ Pachons 4. April 20.
4. With his son Amenhotep II.	1 ,, 6 ,,	1413 ,,	{ Thoth 1. August 4.
Total,	53 yrs. 10 mths.	to 1411 B.C.	{ Phamenoth 30. February 3.

If we assume that Sethos was associated with his father Rameses I. on July 20, 1322 B.C., then the 116 years 3 months that Manetho reckons from this reign to the exodus, bring us to precisely the same point, April 20, 1438 B.C., as the above table.

<sup>1</sup> Wiedemann, *Ægypt Gesch.*, 321.

<sup>2</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. 413.

<sup>3</sup> *Records of the Past*, iv. 15.

The monuments show us that in the 15th and 16th years of Amenasu-hat, Tutmes III. is mentioned as joint ruler. These years refer to the 21 years 7 months of Amenses, and not, as has been erroneously assumed, to the years of the joint reign of Amenses and Tutmes III. They simply indicate that the brother and sister reigned together *at least* (21-14) seven years, but they throw no light on the first year of association. According to our chronology, the sole reign of Tutmes III. falls in the fifteenth of his 53 years' reign. Now there is an inscription of this very year, of which an abstract has been given by Brugsch,<sup>1</sup> who has no doubt that it refers to *the coronation of the king*. In the course of the inscription Tutmes III. speaks of his sister driving him to the marshy country difficult of access. "There Tutmes III. remained without office or position in the temple of Ammon. For it is no fable: as long as I was a child and a boy I remained in his temple; never once as a seer of the god did I hold an office." From this we may infer with certainty that his sister was dead, as he hardly would have thus publicly spoken of her cruel treatment while she was alive.

13. The following astronomical dates confirm the preceding restoration:—

(a) In the 23rd of Tutmes III. there was a new moon on the 21st of Pachons.<sup>2</sup> As this could happen only once in 25 Egyptian vague years, this notice is of great chronological value. Mr. B. Cooper's calculation<sup>3</sup> shows that a new moon fell on Pachons 21, in 1493 B.C., and he therefore places the accession of Tutmes III. in (1493 + 22) 1515 B.C. But the same coincidence happened in 1468 and 1443 B.C., and this last date is exactly the 23rd year of Tutmes III. in our system, and the next two dates prove that 1443 B.C. is the only possible year.

(b) One of the inscribed blocks in the island of Elephantine, a fragment of an immense temple erected there by Tutmes III., informs us that, in some unmentioned year of his reign, the rising of the dog-star Sothis happened on the 28th of Epiphi.<sup>4</sup> As this fragment was once part of a com-

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of Egypt*, i. 378-83.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i. 324, compare 396.

<sup>3</sup> E. de Bunsen, *Chronol. of the Bible*, 105.

<sup>4</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. 395.

plete catalogue of the local yearly feasts, the rising of Sothis must have been noted for the day on which it was visible in Elephantine. The Sothis rose on July 20 at Memphis, but about six days earlier, on July 14, at Elephantine. The first of Thoth coincided with these dates in 1325-22 B.C. at Memphis, and in 1301-1298 B.C. at Elephantine. As 28 Epihi is 38 days before the 1st of Thoth, and as the Egyptian vague year loses one day every four years, this implies an interval of  $(38 \times 4)$  152 years, which, added to 1301-1298 B.C., will place the Sothis rising in the reign of Tutmes III. in 1453-50 B.C.<sup>1</sup> Now this very temple at Elephantine, of which the inscription is a fragment, was erected in the *second* year of Tutmes III.<sup>2</sup> This cannot mean the second year of his nominal reign, beginning in 1465, for he was then a mere child, probably not more than ten years of age, banished to the inaccessible marshes of the *north* of Egypt by his ambitious sister, who, besides, was hardly the kind of woman that would have allowed the building of temples without taking all the credit to herself. The second year must mean the second year of his *sole* reign, commencing with his 15th, in which, as we have shown from the monuments, he was *re-crowned* after the death of his sister. Now his 16th year, or second of his sole reign, falls in 1450 B.C., or in the last of the above four years.

(c) The rising of Sothis fell on Epihi 28, *at Elephantine*, on July 14, in 1453-50 B.C., but on Mesore 4 or July 20 *in Memphis*. This, as our table shows, is the date of the beginning of Tutmes III. as sole ruler, and we can now understand why such an ordinary event as the rising of the dog-star, which happened every year, should have been thought worthy of special record: *it marked the year of his accession as sole king*. This conclusion is confirmed by the only two other reigns in which such risings are recorded. The Sothis rising of 16 Thoth in 1263, and of 1 Tybi in 842 B.C., both indicate the year when Ramessu II. and Takelut II. began their sole

<sup>1</sup> Lieblein, *Agypt. Chronol.*, 38, 39, also advocates 1453-50 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. 394.

reign:  
reign  
also  
place  
Sothi  
than  
8 day  
that  
the S  
this i  
first  
(  
brati  
Phar  
supp  
to hi  
agree  
I  
place  
and  
bring  
to T  
Man  
(  
there  
capti  
featu  
"ins  
lord  
labo  
this  
i. 14  
iden  
reas  
Bibl

reigns. And there is another notice of a Sothis rising in the reign of Tutmes III., which not only confirms this view, but also proves beyond a doubt that our 28 Epiphi is rightly placed in 1453-50 B.C. In the 33rd year of Tutmes III. the Sothis is recorded as rising on Mesori 12—that is, 8 days later than the rising on Mesori 4, in his first year as sole ruler.<sup>1</sup> As 8 days indicate an interval of 32 years, this proves conclusively that the first of these 33 years was reckoned from 1450 B.C., for the Sothis star did in fact rise on Mesori 12 in 1421-18 B.C., and this implies 1453-50 B.C. as the earliest possible dates for the first of Tutmes III. The exact year in question was 1419 B.C.

(d) In the reign of the same Tutmes III. there was a celebration of a festival of one of the seasons on the 21st of Pharmuthi of the vague year. Biot, the French astronomer, supposes that the vernal equinox is referred to, and, according to his calculations, the year 1444 B.C. is intended.<sup>2</sup> This year agrees with our chronology.

14. In the preceding sections we have shown that Manetho placed the exodus in the reign of Tutmes III., in 1438 B.C., and that the monuments confirm this date. We will now bring two facts from the same monuments that point directly to Tutmes III. as the pharaoh of the exodus, confirming Manetho's statement.

(a) In a chamber of a tomb in the hills of Abd-el-Qurnah, there is a graphic representation of the making of bricks by captives of Tutmes III., many of whom have strong Jewish features.<sup>3</sup> The overseers are represented with sticks, and "insist with vehemence obeying the orders of the great skilled lord" . . . and the overseer (Rois) speaks thus to the labourers: "*The stick is in my hand, be not idle.*" Compare this with the Biblical account of the making of bricks (Ex. i. 14), especially Exodus v. 17, where we have almost the identical words of the overseer, and there can be scarcely any reasonable doubt that this pictorial representation and the Biblical account of the oppression refer to the same thing.

<sup>1</sup> Browne, art. "Manetho," in Kitto's *Cycl. of Bibl. Lit.*, v. 3, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Nash, *Pharaoh of the Exodus*, 129.

<sup>3</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. 375, 376.

(b) But to make the identification doubly sure, there is a curious fact brought out by Palmer<sup>1</sup> as follows: "The monuments supply another indication, approaching still nearer to a proof, that he [viz., Tutmes III.] and no other is the king under whom the exodus took place. For in the mounds of Heliopolis, one of the cities according to the LXX. which were fortified by the labour of the Hebrews, many sun-baked bricks, bearing the stamp of Thothmes III. have been used, which, on being broken, show that they were made *without straw*; whereas ordinarily the earth, of which these bricks are made, is held together by a mixture of chopped straw. It is impossible not to see how this singularity is accounted for by the Scriptures."

In the light of all the preceding facts and astronomical confirmations, there can be no doubt THAT TUTMES III. WAS THE PHARAOH OF THE EXODUS, and that an important division of his reign ended about APRIL 20, 1438 B.C., our date for that event. We will now examine the evidence of Biblical chronology, which ought to lead us to the same year, if the preceding deductions are correct.

15. The chronology of the period of the divided kingdoms of Judah and Israel must be entirely reconsidered since the discovery of the Assyrian Eponym Canon, which is confirmed by Ptolemy's astronomical canon, and its chronology is proved to be absolutely certain by the eclipse of 763 B.C. The writer of this paper has attempted elsewhere to show<sup>2</sup> that the Bible, rightly considered, agrees exactly *to the year* with this famous chronological document. It is sufficient for our present purpose if we start with the accession of Jehu, king of Israel, which, in agreement with the Eponym canon, we place in 841 B.C. As Ahab was fighting at Karkhar against Salmanassar II., king of Assyria, in 854 B.C., according to the same canon, and died fighting against Benhadad of Damascus at Ramoth Gilead, according to the Bible, we cannot place his death any

<sup>1</sup> *Egyptian Chronicles*, i. 194, 195.

<sup>2</sup> In a paper entitled "A Newly Discovered Key to Biblical Chronology," art. 3 of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1888.

high  
a co  
of A  
dom  
were  
dedu  
and  
only  
853  
Ahal  
first  
of A  
the f  
the  
[(16  
ently  
date  
pract  
not h  
his  
was  
I  
to be  
Bible  
alrea  
prob  
date  
does  
the  
poin  
Tyri  
num  
ing  
156  
of T  
Vell

higher than 853 B.C. Nor can we place it any lower, because a comparison between the years assigned to the predecessors of Ahab, and the corresponding synchronisms with the kingdom of Judah, shows that the reigns of the Israelitish kings were reckoned according to a system which obliges us to deduct one year in every case. Hence the 2 years of Ahaziah, and the 12 years of Joram, the successors of Ahab, are really only  $(11+1)$  12 full years, and added to 841 B.C., bring us to 853 B.C. for the death of Ahab. According to the Bible, Ahab died in the 17th year of Josaphat, king of Judah, whose first year is the 4th of Ahab. Ahab begins in the 38th of Asa, whose 2nd year is the 22nd year of Jeroboam I., the first king of Israel. Hence the era of the beginning of the Israelitish monarchy cannot be placed any higher than  $[(16+3+37) 56 - 1 + 21 = 76 + 853 =]$  929 B.C. Solomon apparently died after Nisan in that year, and Jeroboam probably dated his first official year from Tisri. In agreement with the practice of the Assyrian monarchs, Rehoboam probably did not begin his first official year until Nisan of 928 B.C. Hence his 5th year, in which the invasion of Shishak took place, was 924 B.C.

16. If Solomon reigned 40 years, his first year would seem to be 968 B.C., and his 4th 965 B.C. But we learn from the Bible (I Chron. xxiii. 1, compare xxix. 22) that he was already associated as king during David's lifetime, and it is probable that, like Josaphat and Jotham, he did not begin to date his regnal years until the death of his father. The Bible does not say how long this joint-reign lasted, but fortunately the contemporary Tyrian annals enable us to determine this point with great exactness. According to Menander<sup>1</sup> the Tyrian annals counted 155 years and 8 months, or in round numbers, 156 years from the accession of Hiram to the building of Tyre, and from the 4th of Solomon (= 12th of Hiram)  $156 - 11 = 145$  years. According to the unanimous testimony of Timæus, Dionysius Halicarnassus, Aristotle, Pliny, Cicero, Velleius and Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> the building of Carthage must be

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Contra Apion*, i. 18.

<sup>2</sup> See Unger, *Chronol. des Manetho*, 214, 215.

placed in 814-13 B.C., consequently the 4th of Solomon was (814+145) 959 B.C., so that Solomon's associated reign lasted for (965-959) 6 years.

17. But admitting that Carthage was built in 814 B.C., it might be argued that this need not necessarily coincide with the flight of Elissa from Tyre in the seventh year of Pygmalion, where the above 145 years terminate. There may have been an interval of several years, perhaps even enough years to save the credit of Ussher's chronology, which many people seem to think is a part of the inspired record, because it happens to be printed by Act of Parliament in the Authorised Version of the Bible. But Josephus<sup>1</sup> effectually disposes of this possibility by informing us, from the same Tyrian annals, that the fourth of Solomon and the twelfth of Hiram were also registered as the 240th year since the building of Tyre. Consequently, from the building of Tyre to the building of Carthage are exactly (239+145) 384 years. Now Justin (xviii. 3, 5) informs us that Tyre was built in the year before the destruction of Troy, hence there were from the year *after* Troy just 382 years. This last sum agrees exactly with Castor of Rhodes' list of the nations "who held dominion over the sea *after* the Trojan war,"<sup>2</sup> which has, from the Lydian dominion, which is named first, to the end of the Phœnician dominion (which obviously ended with the flight of Elissa with the navy of Tyre), exactly 382 years. The only point to consider then is the date of the fall of Troy.

18. The fall of Troy we place in 1197 B.C., for the following reasons:—

(a) The Lydian monarchy and dominion of the sea begins in Castor of Rhodes about the time of the fall of Troy. The Parian chronicle places the accession of Alyattes, the third king of the last dynasty, in 605 B.C. His father Sadyattes has 12 years in Herodotus. Ardys, the second king, has 49 years in the same author, but only 37 years in Eusebius. That the latter sum is right is shown by the cuneiform inscriptions which make Gyges, the first king, a contemporary, for some

<sup>1</sup> *Antiq.*, vii. 3, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *Chronicorum*, ed. Schoene, i. 225.

years  
667 B.C.  
death  
66 B.C.  
years  
the c  
692  
the l  
(  
here  
that  
cele  
year  
com  
as b  
(  
Man  
1195  
19, l  
nor  
(  
year  
and  
119;  
(  
the  
1686  
119;  
buil  
year  
of C  
indi  
year  
Egy

years, of Assurbanipal, who did not begin to reign until 667 B.C., and (12+37) 49 years added to 605 bring us to 654 B.C. for Gyges' death. Herodotus' 49 years would place the death of Gyges in the year of Assurbanipal's accession (667-66 B.C.). Perhaps Ardys was joint ruler with Gyges for 12 years. Adding the 38 years that Herodotus assigns to Gyges, the dynasty of the Mermnadæ cannot be placed higher than 692 B.C. Now Herodotus allows for the preceding dynasty of the Heraclidæ 505 years, which bring us to 1197 B.C.

(b) The era of the fall of Troy, that found the most adherents among ancient historians and chronologists, placed that event 418 years before the first olympiad, which was celebrated in 776 B.C. As an olympiad was a period of four years, the *institution* of that mode of reckoning must have commenced in 779 B.C., and adding 418 we come to 1197 B.C. as before.

(c) Africanus places the fall of Troy in the last reign of Manetho's dynasty 19. As he commences dynasty 20 in 1195 B.C., and allows seven years to the last king of dynasty 19, his date for the fall of Troy was not later than 1196 B.C., nor earlier than 1202 B.C.

(d) The Roman chronicle cited by Syncellus,<sup>1</sup> reckons 1153 years from the fall of Troy to the associated rule of Augustus and Antony in 44 B.C., therefore its date is exactly our year 1197 B.C.

(e) Lastly, Eustathius counts from the capture of Troy to the accession of the Greek emperor Anastasius, in April 491 A.D., 1686 years and 7 months, consequently his date is September 1197 B.C.<sup>2</sup>

19. If the fall of Troy was 1197 B.C., then the era of the building of Tyre was 1198 B.C., and consequently its 240th year (=4 Solomon) was 959 B.C., and its 385th year (=building of Carthage) was 814 B.C. The 4th of Solomon is therefore indisputably the year 959 B.C. The Bible says that the 4th year of Solomon was the 480th year after the exodus from Egypt, hence the exodus must be placed in (959+479) 1438

<sup>1</sup> *Chronographia*, ed. Dind., 587, 588.

<sup>2</sup> Unger, *Chronol. des Manetho*, 225.

B.C., or in the exact year already found according to the Egyptian evidence. This coincidence alone proves the genuineness and authenticity of the "480 years." As the writer has devoted a special paper<sup>1</sup> to the consideration of this number, he would refer his readers thereto for further proof, if any be needed.

20. According to the Egyptian evidence the exodus took place about April 20th. That it must be placed some time in April is evident: (1) Because Josephus<sup>2</sup> makes the month Nisan run parallel with the Alexandrian Pharmuthi, which began March 27. Therefore the 14th of Nisan—the day of the exodus—could not have been *earlier* than April 9. (2) The passover was celebrated on the full moon after the vernal equinox, which fell on April 3rd or 4th, in 1438 B.C. Hence any *later* month than April is out of the question.

21. The Egyptian evidence, both monumental, written, and astronomical, leads us to about April 20, 1438 B.C. for the year of the Hebrew exodus from Egypt. An independent investigation of Bible chronology, based on the astronomically proved date 841 B.C. for the accession of Jehu, and agreeing with the official chronology of the contemporaneous Tyrian kingdom, brings us to precisely the same year and month. We might therefore fairly rest our case here, confident that our readers will agree with us that we have proved our point. But we are fortunately in a position that enables us to offer an argument that leaves no possible room for doubt, since it demonstrates the *exact day* on which the exodus took place by one of those coincidences between Biblical and Egyptian chronology that could have happened only once in the whole course of pharaonic history. The importance of the subject and the length of this paper requires a separate article for the presentation of this final argument. Accordingly, in a future number of this review, we hope to have the pleasure of laying the results of our researches before our readers.

J. SCHWARTZ,

Librarian Apprentices' Library,  
New York City.

<sup>1</sup> Art. 4 in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July 1888.

<sup>2</sup> *Antiq.*, ii. 14, 6.

TH  
O

WE  
point  
betw  
new.  
the r  
their  
in it  
theo  
whic  
pass  
oper  
hint  
epis  
a si  
thirt

app  
ing  
seer  
the  
the  
to t  
Edi  
losi

tic  
pri  
les

THE DÖLLINGER-REUSCH HISTORY  
OF THE INTESTINE CONFLICT ON MORALS IN  
THE CHURCH OF ROME.

PART II.

WE have already in the former paper noted some few of the points involved in the controversy within the Jesuit Order between the old doctrines of Moral Theology and the new. The innovators called the old views Rigorism, and the new ones the Mild, or Benevolent, or Benignant Views; but their opponents called the new system Laxism when viewed in its tendency and effects, or Probabilism when viewed in its theory. We have also had a slight glimpse of the manner in which, by means of the Confessional, any received theory passed from the pages of an author into tremendously practical operation upon the conscience and life of "penitents." These hints and glimpses we gained in the main from the historical episode of La Quintinye, and now we shall proceed to cull in a similar manner from the episode of Thyrsus Gonzalez, the thirteenth General of the Jesuits.

Twelve years had passed since La Quintinye made his appeal to Innocent XI., years in which the dream of recovering all the lost Church property in England had at one time seemed ready for realisation; and the Jesuit plan of securing the whole of it for their own Order had almost come "within the range of practical politics." But though James II. had come to the throne, William III. actually filled it; and though the Edict of Nantes had been revoked, the *Grand Monarque* was losing ground, and Jansenist doctrines were running high.

In September 1691 Father Ambrogio Ortiz received authentic tidings that at Dillingen, in Bavaria, was being secretly printed a book on the *Right Use of Probable Opinions*, by no less a person than his own General, Padre Thyrsus Gonzalez.

The Order well knew that Gonzalez was a zealous opponent of the new morality. While still only a professor at Salamanca, he had written a book which the company refused him license to print. This, thought Padre Ortiz, is the same book, and lo, he is printing it without license! Ortiz himself had been one of the Revisers of the Society. So, under pretext of observing in Rome the festival of the Jesuit saint, Francesco Borgia, Ortiz took his way from Frascati, down the Alban Hills, and across the Campagna. Arrived in the eternal city he made for the Collegio Romano, now an extinct volcano, where, since the days of Minister Bonghi, the stranger finds the nucleus of a national Italian home of letters, under the name of the *Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele*. Padre Ortiz, however, found there the home of the Black Pope and his staff, and of the pretorians of Loyola's force. Knowing how unfavourable to the book in question were the Censors of the Company, he engaged fathers of great weight to remonstrate with the General on his intentions. Personally he adjured him to desist from publication. It could do no good either to the public or to himself, and would do much harm to both, especially to the General. In all countries he would have against him the whole Company. If, indeed, he had the work printed under the name of some one else the evil would be less, but as General he could not issue it without raising a storm. Above all he must take time. "I am not making haste," said General Gonzalez; "for twenty years I have pondered over it. Here is the book," he added, opening a drawer. "There it is, all right," replied Ortiz, "as long as it is nowhere else." The "Assistants" of the General added their urgent protests to those of Padre Ortiz; but Gonzalez "set his book before everything," to use the words of our authority.<sup>1</sup>

The fact is that both he and the Pope had spoken of his election as a special act of Providence, to give a check to Probabilism in the Society. But there was now a new Pope, and the "Assistants" being all five of one mind, were not to be appeased. Just as La Quintinye, on the one side, had

<sup>1</sup> See vol. ii. p. 45. An Italian document entitled *Fatto nel accuso del Libro d'Antonio Cella Dei*, etc., probably drawn up by Ortiz.

carrie  
other  
grou  
Gene  
that  
a pe  
judgi  
impr  
of th  
H  
and C  
shoul  
it to  
hand  
nicar  
hosti  
Rom  
print  
woul  
seize  
done  
were  
so un  
not p  
was c  
print  
that  
a lic  
inde  
had  
alrea  
othe  
these  
woul  
attac  
Grea  
offer  
in t

carried his case beyond the General, so now do they, on the other side, carry theirs. They know how to choose their ground. To the Pope they represent that not only is the General about to bring out a book in itself undesirable, but that he is printing it in secret, and that too out of Rome. As a penalty for this temerity, and to gain time for maturely judging of the matter at issue, His Holiness orders the whole impression to be seized and placed in the hands of the Master of the Sacred Palace, as the chief censor is officially styled.

Hereupon Padre Francesco Diaz came to Padres Ortiz and Caneda, urging that it was by no means well that the book should be suppressed in the manner prescribed; better allow it to be published, because when it should come into the hands of the Master of the Sacred Palace, himself a Dominican, he would give copies to Aguirre and other Cardinals hostile to the Jesuits, and they would blaze it abroad through Rome; would even send it off to Holland, where it would be printed, and spread in every corner of Europe. Nothing would meet the case but to burn the book in Dillingen, or to seize it by the way, and to spread reports that it had been done by the Marchese Bagni, or some one like him. They were of little use if they did not know how to act in a matter so urgent. Lively as was this counsel of Padre Diaz it did not prevail. Padre Ortiz had another. The General, he said, was only a follower of Elizalde, whose book had been furtively printed in Freiburg, with the name of the author, and also that of the Society, although the Society had refused him a license, and even laid on a prohibition. The General indeed had attempted to procure a license, but the Revisers had been very severe, declaring the book to be full of errors already condemned in the writings of Baius, Jansenius, and others. Now, the course to take was this—collect together these errors, and move for a prohibition of the book. This would find occupation for the General without any open attack upon him, and tend to cure him by indirect means. Greatly was Padre Diaz content with this scheme, and offered to be himself the accuser, well practised as he was in the tribunals of Rome. His time, however, was too

much occupied to permit of his applying himself to draw out from the work the erroneous propositions to be incriminated. This Padre Ortiz undertook to do; and he had his notes ready by Lent. From September to Lent drawing out the bad propositions in one book! In Rome the mills grind slow, even those of the *Dii minores*.

Padre Diaz for some days delayed the commencement of the suit, alleging his occupations. Meanwhile going to visit Padre Caneda in an illness, he met with a certain Monsignore Emanuel, governor of the well-known establishment of St. Giacomo de Spagnoli, and one of the formidable Court of the Rota. Upon him set Padre Diaz spitefully, alleging that he had harboured one of his friars who had got himself ordained bishop by the Greek patriarch.<sup>1</sup> Padre Caneda sought to appease him, and fearing they might come to action, at last told Padre Diaz to be gone. "I am not," cried Diaz, "a man to be turned out; and never shall I come back!" He knew that Ortiz was an intimate friend of Caneda; hence he took a grudge against him as well as the other. Not knowing this, Ortiz continued urging Diaz to proceed with the accusation, but all in vain.

At length Ortiz said, At least give me back Elizalde's book, and also my notes upon it. The book he did return, but the manuscript had been mislaid among his papers, and never could Ortiz get it from him. So he made a fresh copy, and proceeded before the tribunal of the Holy Office.

No sooner was the suit opened than Padre Diaz went to the General, showed him the manuscript of Ortiz, and told all he could in prejudice of him and Padre Caneda. He offered himself to defend the case, and boasted of his influence with members of the court. The General and other Padres named were to collect evidence favourable to Elizalde, but above all Ortiz and Caneda were to be sent away from Rome.<sup>2</sup> On the festival of the New Year, the General sent for

<sup>1</sup> So I read *Patriarca Reco* in our document. The editors place after *Reco* a note of interrogation. Cases of similar ordination are not unknown even in our own times.

<sup>2</sup> The document reads *era necessario mandar a Roma li P.P. Caneda et Ortiz*. I take it for granted that the *a* is a misprint for *da*, or else a fault of the MS.

Ortiz  
of th  
vince  
The  
they  
by th  
oppos  
On J  
*Roma*  
in thr  
the p  
his bo  
So  
to th  
which  
pages  
Here,  
pany,  
write  
Gene  
or w  
princ  
subje  
often  
opini  
of his  
"  
longe  
exhil  
name  
of th  
of th  
WHIC  
The  
a div

<sup>1</sup> E

<sup>2</sup> N

super

Ortiz and informed him that he had appointed him Rector of the College of St. Francis Xavier in Naples: the "Province" had requested it, and the Viceroy would have it so! The Province, adds our authority, had requested it because they (*i.e.*, the Jesuits of the province) were ordered or menaced by the General, and the Viceroy had declared himself quite opposed to it: which the General knew well, and knew early. On January 25, about fourteen of the clock in the *Collegio Romano*, notice was handed to Padre Ortiz to leave for Naples in three days; and at the same hour Padre Caneda received the precept of the General no more to speak to any one of his book on Probabilism.

So ends our interesting fragment, of which, keeping closely to the text, I have given the substance. The document which precedes it, a Latin dissection of Elizalde in twenty pages, is dated "*In Collegio Romano Idibus, Februarii 1689.*"<sup>1</sup> Here, then, we have before our eyes the Censors of the Company, in the head-quarters of the Company, at work upon a writer of their own Order, one favoured indeed by the General, but not in harmony either with the leading Casuists or with the practical Jesuits, who had to confess nobles, princes, and all manner of men and women, desirable as subjects of the Society. Throughout, the Censor is hostile, often damnatory, and while consciously making war on known opinions of the General, now and then adroitly cites writings of his against points in Elizalde. Estrix was the Censor.

"This posthumous edition," complains the Censor, "no longer appears under the feigned name of 'Cella Dei,' but is exhibited on the theatre of the world with the author's real name. Yea, more" (here I employ small capitals for the sake of those who are not familiar with the use made by the Jesuits of their denominational title), "WITH THAT DIVINE NAME, WHICH IS ABOVE EVERY NAME OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS."<sup>2</sup> The great crime of Elizalde is that he sets up in the Society a diversity of opinion, by contending against what its best

<sup>1</sup> Elizalde wrote under the name of "Cella Dei."

<sup>2</sup> Nunc vero aperta fronte, proprio notatus nomine, atque divino illo quod est super omne nomen Societatis Jesu. Vol. ii. p. 42.

writers contend for. In fine, he rejects "all the Probables", that is, the Equi-Probable, the Less-Probable, and the More-Probable, yea, even the reputedly certain.<sup>1</sup> He holds that all of these are incompetent as a rule for the conscience, that, nothing short of direct truth gives a competent rule, and that direct truth is necessary. Now in all this system of doctrine Padre Elizalde differs in opinion not only from (italics mine) the *entire school of the Society, but also from the whole republic of Catholic theologians* (vol. ii. p. 44).

One of the minor literary pleasures of the Döllinger-Reusch book is the quiet way in which the authors dispose of such assumptions as the one we have above, of ancient and universal authority for the *Relaxatores*. Shortly citing evidence in point, they, with a glance, pass on.

When Padre Ortiz resolved to flog General Gonzalez on the back of Elizalde, he knew of the instrument prepared by the Censors, and lying ready. Doubtless those of the others were equally severe with the one before us. Among the particulars laid to the charge of the erring brother, the following are a very few. In this point and that he reproduces errors already condemned in the writings of Baius and Jansenius. In fact, the charge of Jansenism is suggested all along. He says that a transgressor would not be excused of guilt, even though he followed the opinion of 600 bishops, citing in proof the Council of Rimini and others. He says that the Scriptures are epistles of Almighty God sent to us, therefore they are to be known. If the Corinthians or Romans had not read the epistles written to them, but had neglected and ignored them, their ignorance would not excuse them. In that case any transgressors against precepts contained in them, might indeed be in ignorance, but the ignorance would be voluntary. But the Holy Scriptures are an epistle to us all, written to teach us how to live. So to neglect or ignore them is a grave crime. Here, perhaps, I may add the words of the Censor:—

<sup>1</sup> Omnia enim, tam æque quam minus probabilia, et probabiliora, quin etiam certa existimata tanquam insufficientia pro regulanda conscientia repellit: et unicum veritatem directam sufficientem esse et necessariam contendit. Vol. ii. p. 44.

"In  
as mem  
of the C  
they ma  
Scriptur  
thereof.  
educate  
of Holy  
deed, t  
ignorant  
ignorant  
anythin

Th  
invinc

Or  
allegir  
kind  
mere

power  
often

*homo*  
that t

upon  
Cathc

follow  
charg

make  
more  
const

H  
Eliza  
woul

shall

"  
is the  
bull

if we  
did n

probables",  
the More-  
olds that all  
ience, that,  
e, and that  
of doctrine  
alics mine)  
ole republic

er-Reusch  
se of such  
and uni-  
evidence

onzalez on  
pared by  
the others  
g the par-  
following  
ces errors  
enius. In  
ong. He  
uilt, even  
in proof  
riptures  
ey are to  
read the  
ed them,  
case any  
ight in-  
voluntary.  
ritten to  
a grave  
ensor:—

quin etiam  
it: et uni-  
Vol. ii.

"In these terms Elizalde manifestly includes all who are reckoned as members of the Church of God. But, indubitably, the major part of the Church does not sin either personally or by inference, although they may be ignorant of the Apostolic Epistles, or of almost all Holy Scripture, or though they may neglect, or even shun, the reading thereof. To this class pertain all women, rustics, soldiers, and uneducated people generally, who, though they may come into possession of Holy Scripture in the vulgar tongue, are not bound to read it; indeed, they are held by precept of the Church not to read.<sup>1</sup> Is the ignorance of all these strictly voluntary and gross? Does their ignorance in no wise excuse them if they, through ignorance, do anything against the Epistles of Paul?" (Vol. ii. p. 32.)

The Censor, of course, holds that the ignorance of such is invincible ignorance, and does excuse them.

One bad place in Elizalde, according to the Censor, is this, alleging that vincible and invincible ignorance are "both a kind of blindness, but holds that both are invincible by mere human power, and both vincible by divine grace and power." Another bad point is that, by him, the *Laxatores* are often called the more recent writers. Seldom does the *novus homo* like to be called a new man. Furthermore, he teaches that the doctors of the synagogue sinned in teaching wrongly upon morals, and the people sinned in following them; so may Catholic doctors sin in teaching wrongly, and the people in following. "The false dicta," these are the words laid to his charge, "of those teachers—Scribes and Pharisees—did not make actions safe, nor yet did they constitute a rule; and no more do the false dicta of our doctors make actions safe, or constitute a rule."

Here, complains the Censor, is the language in which Elizalde attacks the *religious*, the sons of the Church, as if he would batter them down with this ram: "The gates of hell shall not prevail!" He actually says—

"If we call for Scriptures, these new men (*recentiores*) say that is the spirit of heretics, or flat blasphemy; if we adduce pontifical bulls and ordinances, they say the ones cited are not received; and, if we quote the Fathers, then they were not scholastic theologians, did not employ exact language, spoke only as preachers and differed

<sup>1</sup> Non tenentur legere; immo tenentur ecclesiæ precepto non legere.

among themselves. What remains? Plainly since all others are set aside, they are themselves everything. It will not do, they may rest assured, and the Church will prevail."

"Never," says the indignant Censor, "have I read any book by a Catholic writer in which I have found so little that is true." No wonder he holds it as a discredit to the actual authorities of the Society that they should think of giving to such a work their imprimatur; especially, seeing that in the Book of Terillus (an English Jesuit who lived and wrote in Flanders) the same imprimatur has been given to a solemn reprobation of Elizalde. Therefore, in a tone rather of command than of recommendation, does he insist that conflict of opinion shall not be permitted in the Society. He evidently thinks that men to sign a licence will hardly be found, not even through eccentricity or desire to comply with the will of the present Superiors. If they be found, great will be the disturbance. All the writers on morals belonging to the Society have opposed this doctrine. Many have directly written against Elizalde. If his opinions appear by permission, then will a throng rush into the fray, and "fiercer battle is never fought than one waged by men for religion and conscience." Moreover, the fight will spread beyond the Society to those "who commit to us the direction of their souls and the arbitrement of their spiritual affairs." This theology of Elizalde "condemns, as in sin, those whom, on the ground of ignorance, other theologians pronounce free of sin, therefore does it prescribe a strange Practice (remember the meaning of the word), one wide as the whole heaven from the old one; and that both in the administration of the sacrament of penance, and in the extra sacramental solution of cases of conscience. Therefore will spring up, with the concurrence of our superiors, a twofold school of morals, and with it a twofold Church."

This marks the point to which two years of the general ship of Gonzalez had brought the counter-movement against laxity, to lead which both he and Innocent XI. had believed to be his providential calling.

It was while itinerating in Castile, Toledo, and Andalusia as a mission-preacher, that Father Thyrsus Gonzalez first fel

into perplexity of mind touching the doctrine of Probabilism. He had taught it from his chair of theology in Salamanca, as he had been trained in it ; and, like his fellow-countryman, Cardinal Aguirre, had rested on it as a pillow of down, in his studies inquiring more if an opinion were probable than if it were true. In *practice* he had been wont to act on any opinion he deemed probable, and to counsel others accordingly. All Salamanca believed that you were safe in following a less probable opinion, so long as it was still a probable one.

The moral effects of this doctrine were often brought under the notice of Gonzalez in the course of his practice as a missioning confessor. Of the nature of these effects La Quintinye, from the other side of the Pyrenees, gives examples in three several lines. In the first place, the doctrine made confessors who were ready to console the perjured or the bigamous, confessors who adopted as their rule of judgment in any given case the conscience of the offender, even of such as might think wallowing in the mire to be no defilement—confessors who held that it was better to leave such consciences in innocent darkness than to disturb and tempt them by that entrance of the Lord's words which giveth light. In the second place, it made "penitents" who saw nothing to repent of in any action for which they might have obtained either the sanction of their own conscience or that of some writer or confessor. In the third place, it made preachers (this is a complaint most deeply felt by La Quintinye), who, though in general terms they would include such and such evil practices in an enumeration of sins, would not so preach against them as to send hearers away with a condemned conscience; ay, who bitterly censured La Quintinye for disturbing consciences, and stopped him in the midst of some courses of sermons, because, upon remonstrance, he would not desist from exposing what he held to be sins of the place and day.

If, south of the Pyrenees, the effects were not dissimilar to those on the north, we may understand how for Gonzalez the downy pillow began to change into one of thorns. He devoted the leisure months of three summers to the study of Probabilism. The consequence was a treatise, *De Recto Usu Opinionum Probabilium*. For this, through Oliva, the General,

he sought leave to print, but in vain. The five Revisers were of one mind: doctrines of his objected to were such as these—1. He teaches that no one may act upon a less probable opinion opposed to a safer and more probable one, even when the greater probability of the latter is not manifest; but only it is by the person acting held to be the more probable. 2. He teaches that of two equally probable opinions, we should always choose the safer. 3. He teaches that the confessor should not give absolution against his own opinion, though according to one held by his penitent to be probable or more probable. 4. He teaches that when one is asked for counsel, he should always give it according to the opinion by himself held to be the more probable, and he should not answer according to a less safe opinion, even though by others held to be exceedingly probable. 5. He teaches that the true moral rule is not the probability, but the truth (of an opinion), or firm moral persuasion. 6. He teaches that objective truth does not suffice (there must be also a subjective persuasion).<sup>1</sup>

Though a digression, it may not be out of place here to remark that the term *opinion* is throughout employed in a legal, not in a philosophical sense. The whole process and conception are forensic. Subjects of law are seeking to serve "in the oldness of the letter," and not in the "newness of the Spirit." Consequently the question, instead of being, Can I not do more to magnify the law? is, Can I do what I desire without coming under the penalty of the law? So the solicitor draws out his Case, and the counsel gives his Opinion. The solicitor is the "penitent," the counsellor is the confessor. But the counsellor of the counsellors is the Professor of Moral Theology, who collates cases, formulates opinions, and becomes an authority whose dicta sway the tribunal of the inner court, *i.e.*, the Confessional.

In accordance with this forensic sense of the word, Opinion is the usage of our authors, who for opinion in the philosophical sense use *Ansicht*, or some equivalent; but for opinion in the legal sense uniformly use *Meinung*; so also in Latin documents writers generally employ in the one case *sententia*, in the other *opinio*. This accounts for the form of Gon-

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 123.

zalez's title, "The right use of Probable Opinions." It is not a question of the truth of the opinion, that is the question for the counsel giving it! It is this question, A B having given the opinion that, in this case, acting so and so, I shall incur no penalty of law, and A B being a counsel learned in the law, this opinion is a probable one; now then shall I, or shall I not, proceed to act on this opinion, although I know that others more learned in the law hold differently from A B? In other words, is the right use of this opinion to act upon it as if it could never be overruled by the judge, or to take care to be safely within the liberties allowed to me by the law. It is only by getting a clear view of this purely legalistic posture of mind, as the key to the inquiries set up, that the discussion becomes fully intelligible to those whose habitual conception of service to Divine law is that of serving in newness of spirit, and not merely in the oldness of the letter—serving a law not only of restraint, but also of counsel, guidance, privilege, protection, holiness and delight.

No one will fail to remark the point where the analogy between the opinion of counsel and that of a confessor breaks down. In temporal courts the principal knows that if he has built his wall on the strength of a wrong opinion, the loss and cost will fall upon him, instead of upon the author of the "probable," but not true opinion. In the confessional the penitent believes that if he does wrong under shield of a probable opinion, then *by obedience* the responsibility is taken from off his soul, and laid upon the counsellor. The moral difference between the operation of the two systems is this: in the case of civil law the sense of personal responsibility in the principal is preserved, and if he break the law he will bear the penalty; but in the case of ecclesiastical law this sense of responsibility in the principal is destroyed, even if, on the advice of his confessor, he break the law of God, not he will have to answer to God, but the confessor. And in the second degree, if the confessor give wrong advice, on the strength of an opinion, emanating from a theologian, and therefore "probable," his responsibility is covered by the author of the "opinion." The sequel of our tale must follow in a third article.

WILLIAM ARTHUR.

## RELIGIOUS PARTIES IN SWITZERLAND.

THE principal difficulty of the subject to be considered lies in the extreme diversity of the ethnological, political, social and religious conditions of life in this small country, consisting only of three millions of people. Besides, however, this diversity of races—German, French, and Italian—account must be taken of the opposition of the two great religious confessions, of which the Roman Catholic community comprises about one-third of the population, and the Protestants practically the remaining two-thirds. The results of this opposition are different in different parts of the country. In German Switzerland there is the conflict of opinions and religious tendencies; whilst in French Switzerland we find the friction is considerable between the established churches and those numerous churches, diverse in character, which exist apart from the State. Again, Switzerland labours under the disadvantage of extreme sub-division; there are even now, after some considerable attempts at unification, 22 cantons formed from the 25 states and 25 peoples of which the confederation is made up. How can one trace the currents of religious thought, on account of these strangely mingled elements, and conditions of existence more complicated and more active than exists anywhere else? Though not sanguine of success, we will make the attempt, not however noticing the more excentric elements of the subject, and leaving the Roman Catholic portion of the Swiss nation out of consideration.

It may be well to note at the outset the existence, in the sphere of religious opinion, of three clearly defined parties who dispute among themselves alike in church matters or on individual concerns. We will call them by the names by which they are known in German Switzerland, the principal theatre of their struggles. *First*, there is the party called "*Positiv*;" its members remain attached to the definite

dogmas of religion and Christianity. *Secondly*, there is the party called "*Reformist*;" its members deny these dogmas. *Thirdly*, between these two there is the party called "*Juste-Milieu*," or the moderate party, named by its adversaries *der Vermittelung*, in German, but self-styled *die Mitte*.

German Switzerland Protestants have adopted also the name *Positiv*, to characterise the Conservative and Traditional party in religion, as opposed to the adjective *Reformist*, and keeping for themselves, as such, the name *Evangelisch*, as opposed to Catholic.

#### THE POSITIV PARTY.

This party, taken as a whole, whether in German Switzerland, or in French Switzerland, has without doubt ceased to be the true representative of the orthodoxy set forth in the time-honoured profession of the reformed religion. Their adversaries have reason to reproach them, and it will be my business rather to censure than to eulogise them. The doctrine of predestination only counts a few representatives even in the party of the Right; the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture has shed its last light with the venerable Gausson of Geneva; however, the Theopneusty of Holy Scripture reigns supreme in the believing party of the people in the church.

According to such authorities in religion and morals as Godet of Neuchâtel, Riggenbach, D'Orelli of Basle, Oettli of Berne, and Häring of Zurich, the party of Right in theology profess that the Word of God is written alike in the Old as well as in the New Testament; and, moreover, that it will bear the strictest historical criticism concerning its dates and authorship; and they place the whole Bible within the sacred canon. They affirm that Jesus is the personal existing Son, begotten from the Father, and that He descended to earth to accomplish the redemption of "lost humanity," to propitiate by His death, and compel us by His resurrection, to believe in His return to glory. Upon these points, indeed, rests the real question at issue between the various sections in the party: it is (so to speak) within these walls that the struggle goes on. Here

are the positions which we defend under the different names of *Positiv*, *Orthodoxic*, and *Evangelical* belief.

#### THE REFORMIST PARTY.

This party apparently avows all the opinions of the *Positiv* party. There is less everywhere in German Switzerland of the old Deism which admits the personality of God, and the general government of individuals, but rejects the doctrine of an actively and incessantly intervening providence in human affairs. This Deism of a former generation well deserves the title that has been given it of inconsistent Atheism. This form of opposition to the Christian revelation is rapidly dying out in Switzerland, as everywhere else on the Continent, and its fate strongly verifies the sentence of St. John: "Whoso denieth the Son the same hath not the Father" (1 John ii. 23). The denial of Christ as the Son of God, and only Mediator and Intercessor between God and men, soon entails the denial of the Divine personality; Deism leads on to Pantheism, Pelagianism, and Fatalism. Still we might quote Mons. le Professor Cougnard de Genev, as a representative of this old Rationalistic Deism. I do not think I am mistaken when I say the Left party in German Switzerland is entirely devoted to the system which confounds God and the world, inheriting the errors of Schleiermacher, without having the vital elements of his system.

The principal points denied by the Reformist section have been collected and set down and compared with the statements of the Bible in a tract entitled *Entweder-Oder* (Either-Or), which appeared in 1886, the author of which is a "*Positiv*" pastor of Basle. His design is excellent: he endeavours to remove the haziness in which the *Reformist* pastors are enveloped, and which enables them to impose on the people. They go into so-called Christian pulpits at the sound of the bells, and clothed in the insignia of ministers of Jesus Christ, merely to give to their hearers the products of their own imagination.

As they are so skilful in clothing in Biblical terms statements entirely opposed to Biblical teaching, it is important to

know the real meaning of the formulas which they disseminate in their ordinary preaching, in order that no one may be ignorant of the nature of their tactics; and also that independent, autonomous, and sincere as they profess themselves, they ought to be more so.

Pastor Kambli has written, in a tract called *Fromm und Frei* (pious and free), the following words on the origin of the world: "Can we still speak of a creation of the world? Every conception of a God who created the world in six days, six creative periods, and rested from all His work, has long since become altogether superannuated. Further, he remarks: "To the eye, which more deeply searches out wonders, the world does not present itself as something once called into existence to gradually become old, till ruin lays hold upon it, but like a thing eternally coming and going."

We will take another illustration of their denial of scriptural cosmogony, notwithstanding their profession of Christ, and their use of Biblical language in the pulpit. In a report presented in 1882 to the Swiss Pastoral Society, Mons. Furret, pastor of Zurich, and one of the authorised champions of the Reformist doctrine, proclaimed the absolute identity of moral and natural laws. "As for me," he said, "the natural laws are nothing but rays of the identical and eternal Divine will infinitely multiplied. As God out of His eternal Majesty has written on the heart of man, 'Honour thy father and thy mother, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness,' so He has said to the light, 'Go more quickly than the thought of man through space;' to the stars He has said, 'Follow your fixed ways;' and to all living beings, 'Appear, grow, mature and die!'" The absolute incompatibility of the view taken by Mons. Furret and Biblical doctrine has not prevented him from lately arranging conferences at Zurich for the defence of Christianity! The wolf who offers himself to defend the sheepfold would not show more ingenuity. To this school of destructive criticism the person of Christ is only one of the terms of the long evolution of humanity; according to Biedermann, late Professor of Dogmatics, Christ has only been the

Beginner in humanity of the union of true Divine and true human quality, which the limited spirit takes from the unlimited. As a disciple of Hegel, he ignored the divine personality, and the personal government of the human soul.

The Swiss Reformist party, which once made great efforts to thrust out from its midst (*les enfants terribles*) troublesome people, or those who would compromise too much, has now learned to moderate its ways and soften its expressions, even to those who teach the most extreme doctrines. The late Mons. S. Vogeld, Professor of Æsthetics at the University of Zurich, in his youth, like many of the chief freethinkers, having been won for the new idea, did not hesitate to scandalise Switzerland by the audacity of his denials; and I still remember the impressions produced twenty-five years ago by the news that, as a Swiss pastor, he taught that the death of Christ was less honourable than the death of Judas Iscariot. Also, willingly or otherwise, he changed his profession by leaving the Church, and giving his services to the University without anybody, so far as I know, attempting to dissuade him. This draught was too strong to swallow. The Reformistic journal, *Schweizer Protestantenblatt*, readily took a sentimental view of the matter, and went out of its way to give prominence to M. Vogeld's audacious denial of Divine verities. In politics, however, this journal in general represents the extreme Left, even courting Socialism, and professes, like the dyke, to oppose the flood of Materialism and of contemporary Atheism, and speaks with pity and indignation of the following final conclusion of Mons. Rednan: "Otherwise, to tell the truth, would be to lose one's reason, like the functionaries of an institution called a Church, and like ministers of a historic personage called Jesus Christ."

The Reformist party without perhaps decreasing in numbers, as each year brings it electoral victories, has certainly diminished in intrinsic worth. Death has carried away some of its prominent figures. Its chief leaders, Pastor Lang and Professor Biedermann of Zurich, have not yet been replaced; and now its most eminent, and also most respectable

representative, is Dr. Furret, pastor at Zurich (whom we have mentioned before).

#### THE VERMITTELUNG PARTY.

Between the Left and the Right, as we have mentioned, there is the *Vermittelung* party, which comprises the *Juste-Milieu* and *Mitoyens*. At this part of our narrative our embarrassment begins. During the several years that I have written the accounts of German Switzerland in the *French Switzerland Review*, I have not yet succeeded in finding out clearly for myself what is the belief of the *Juste-Milieu* party, but I can safely affirm that the fixed and constant underlying principle of this party is indifference with regard to all the doctrines except the most extreme. Now, what value can a personal confession of a personal faith have, if you admit at the same time a perfect liberty to deny its articles. We state, moreover, that this neutral, and apparently conciliatory attitude, has so far brought on this party more suspicion and rebuffs than approbation, and one sees the *Mitoyens* face in turn against the Right and against the Left, accused of treachery at the same time by one and the other.

A symptom of this two-faced position has been the publication of a pamphlet written last year by one of the models of the party, Pastor Langhans, and entitled, *Das gute Recht der Kirchlichen Mitte* (the Good Right of the Ecclesiastical *Juste-Milieu*). The author begins by giving us a profession of his faith, which in itself would do less harm by what it contains than by what is left out. Christ, he says, is the Redeemer. By His holy life, by His passion, and by His propitiatory death, He has made amends for the bad consequences of our sin; that His cross has shown the enormity of our wrong, but, at the same time, the still greater immensity of the Divine pity. It is by this faith that we know His children; and the spirit which Christ gives us enables us to live like His children in grateful obedience. But looking forward at the end of our life remains the last problem to be solved, the last enemy to be vanquished—death! This life is the journey, the work, the combat, the effort, and conducts to the life eternal to which

we are called, and of which the risen Christ furnishes the assurance. In these tenets one sees everything; at least everything necessary seems to be there. It is left to be found out how the author and his party understand the resurrection—whether it is a bodily resurrection, or only an ideal one to which they refer. I should at this moment be greatly embarrassed if asked to answer this question. But what induces the author to address himself to the Right and the Left, and throw them in turn his sugared pill—a bitter blame covered with praise. He concludes that both parties are, at the same time, both right and wrong; and that parties, as in State affairs, are indispensable to the administration of the Church. In the like position, indeed, are all the ecclesiastical politics, and all pastoral theology of the *Juste-Milieu*. By the side of this desire to work smoothly the constitution, the exact and authentic definition of its true doctrines, supposing even that they exist, would only offer relative interests.

A party which may be grouped with the ecclesiastical *Juste-Milieu*, though affirming in Switzerland a distinct existence, are the followers of the famous Ritschl, Professor at Göttingen, who is the actual chief of the most powerful school in Germany, the school of Ritschl, which separates itself from the doctrine of the personal pre-existence of Christ, and from the original party, but separates itself in turn from the *Reformist* party, which affirms its belief in the miracles and resurrection of Christ. It is represented in Switzerland, besides its individual adhesion by a circle, or *Kränzchen*, who have meetings sometimes in one town and sometimes in another, and which counts a number of members. The strength of the *Reformist* chiefly rests in East Switzerland; the principal seat of the *Juste-Milieu* is the canton of Berne; the headquarters of the *Positiv* party are at Basle, though this town, not the most conservative in Switzerland, is to-day half dragged along by political and religious Radicalism. But we leave the consideration of the rivalries of these parties for our next paper.

A. GRETILLAT.

NEUCHÂTEL.

## ST. PAUL TO THE EPHESIANS.

- 1 1 PAUL, by divine appointment an apostle of Jesus  
 2 Christ, to the saints who are in Ephesus, His faithful  
 3 members, sends greeting—Grace be yours and peace from  
 4 God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.
- 5 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus  
 6 Christ for His full measure of benediction extended to us,  
 7 carrying every spiritual privilege which heaven contains and  
 8 Christ bestows ;—as shown by His choosing us into Christ  
 9 before the foundation of the world, to be holy and blame-  
 10 less before Him ; since he had in love fore-ordained us to  
 11 be made through Jesus Christ sons to Himself—such was  
 12 the fiat of His will—to enhance the grandeur of His  
 13 grace made gratuitously ours in that beloved Son. In that  
 14 Son we have the redemption which His blood obtained,  
 the forgiveness of our trespasses—ample as His grace was  
 ample, lavished upon us in every gift of wisdom, specu-  
 lative and practical. For instance, He made known to us  
 the Secret of His will, the outcome of that good pleasure of  
 His kept by Him steadily in view, to await the dispensation  
 which should consummate the times, viz., the gathering  
 up all under one head in Christ—all both in heaven and  
 earth in Him. In Him too we came into our inheritance, as  
 fore-ordained thereto, agreeably to His design, who works  
 out all as His own will has decreed. So that we Jews  
 enhance His glory, who first fixed our hopes on the Mes-  
 siah; in whom you Gentiles too, on becoming hearers  
 of the word of truth, the glad news of your salvation—aye  
 and believers also—were by the Holy Spirit, (promised  
 once and now bestowed in earnest of our title), sealed to  
 that redemption which makes you peculiarly His own :—  
 thus too enhancing His glory.

OPENING  
 SALUTATION  
 and  
 BENEDICTION.

PRIVILEGES  
 ENUMERATED.  
 We are

(1) *elected,*

(2) *foreordained  
 to adoption,*

(grace thus mag-  
 nified),

(3) *redeemed,  
 and thus*

(4) *forgiven,*

(5) *gifted with  
 wisdom.*

(6) *endued with  
 knowledge of  
 God's secret  
 purpose, held  
 from first to  
 last; viz.,  
 the consum-  
 mation of all  
 in Christ ;*  
 (7) *made heirs.*

Thus Jew

and Gentile (on  
 whose admission  
 to privilege spe-  
 cial stress is  
 laid) alike en-  
 hance the glory  
 of God.

PRAYER FOR  
SPIRITUAL  
GROWTH.  
I thank God for  
your faith.

I pray for your  
higher spiritual  
enlightenment,

in respect

(1) of hope,

(2) of due esti-  
mate of your  
heritage,

(3) of God's power  
in you,

parallel to that  
put forth in the  
Resurrection  
and Ascension  
of Christ, fol-  
lowed by

His superlative  
exaltation, as  
Head of the  
Church, His  
Body.

SURVEY OF  
THE SPIRITUAL  
HISTORY OF  
THE EPHESIANS.  
What you were  
—led by the  
world and its  
ruler;

such too was  
I as well.

God's love  
called us from  
death in sin to  
life in Christ,

to rise and  
ascend with  
Him,

On this ground I too,<sup>1</sup> on hearing of the faith in 15  
the Lord Jesus and love to all His saints which possesses  
you, give thanks incessantly for you, as I mention 16  
you amidst my prayers, entreating the God of our Lord 17  
Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, to give you a spirit of  
wisdom and insight into mysteries, through the fuller  
knowledge of Himself:—may the eyes of your intellect 18  
be opened, to know what is the hope derived from His  
calling you, what the wealth of glory among His Saints  
arising from the heritage which He allots to them, what 19  
the transcendent greatness of His power exerted on us who  
believe, as due to that energy of omnipotent might put 20  
forth in Christ when He raised Him from the dead, and  
seated Him at His own right hand in heaven above, high 21  
over the hierarchy of angelic potentates in all their ranks  
—yea, over every being, by whatsoever title called, not in  
this life only but in that to come. For beneath His feet 22  
He placed all that is, and gave Him a Head of suzerainty  
to the Church, which is His Body, the full recipient of 23  
His all-pervading fulness.

2 AND your case is that of being dead in your trespasses 1  
and sins:—I refer to the time when you followed secular 2  
and worldly ways, led by the Prince whose realm of power  
is the air, the spirit busily at work even now in the sons  
of disobedience; Among whom we too were all at one time 3  
occupied in the lusts of our flesh, doing the bidding of  
that flesh and its imaginings, and were (what nature made  
us) children of wrath, just as much as the rest.

But God, Who is rich in mercy, through the vast love 4  
which He felt for us, quickened even us, dead as we were 5  
in our trespasses, to new life in Christ—for by grace it is  
that your salvation is achieved—aye, and made us shar- 6  
ers in His resurrection and ascension, as though in Christ  
Jesus we were in heaven above:—His object being to dis- 7

<sup>1</sup>The "ground" is those privileges stated above, v. 3 foll. "I too" assumes the same thankfulness in those addressed.

play in the ages yet to come His transcendent wealth of grace shown in His indulgence towards us in Christ Jesus.

thus showing the richness of Divine grace.

8 For by that grace it is that your salvation is achieved  
9 through faith—yet not of yourselves—God's is the gift—not  
10 of merit, to exclude all conceit of self. For His handi-  
work we are, moulded in Christ upon good works which  
God laid down beforehand as our path to walk in.

Of grace, I say, for human merit is excluded ;

and good works follow, as God's appointment for us.

11 Never therefore forget that there was a time when you, heathens in bodily *status*, denounced as uncircumcised by the so-called circumcised (*i.e.*, through a bodily operation),  
12 were, while in that stage, outside Christ, cut off from the privileges of God's people, aliens from their charter of promise, unpossessed of hope and godless in God's world.

CONTRAST BETWEEN THE PAST AND THE PRESENT.

I charge you to keep in mind your former state of exclusion, alienation, and godlessness ;

13 Now contrast your present state in Christ Jesus :—you,  
14 once so far remote were in His blood brought near. For He Himself is our peace who made us, Jew and Gentile,  
15 both into one, by breaking down the barrier which walled us off and estranged us, and in His suffering flesh set aside the law with its hard and fast lines. Of both thus united in Himself He would create one new man, so  
16 securing peace. Both, incorporated in one, He would reconcile to God through His cross, after giving the death-blow to that estrangement thereby.

and that, once far off, you are in Christ brought near, as He abolished the barrier between Jew and Gentile, reconciling both to God and to each other. Thus

17 Thus He came with a Gospel of peace to you Gentiles  
18 that were afar—of peace to us Jews that were near, because through Him we have access both together in one Spirit unto the Father.

Peace and free access henceforth the lot of both. Hence

19 Now then you are no more strangers and outsiders, but  
20 fellow-citizens with the saints and denizens of God ; built up on the foundation of the apostles and prophets with  
21 Jesus Christ Himself for the corner-stone ; in Whom the whole structure is bonded together, and grows into a  
22 shrine holy in the Lord : in Whom you also are being built with us to form God's dwelling-place in the Spirit.

in full privilege,

on sure foundation,

you share the edification, which makes all a Temple of God.

3 1 THIS is why I Paul, who wear the chains of Jesus  
2 Christ on behalf of you Gentiles—but first, I presume you to have heard of the stewardship of Divine Grace given

DIGRESSION ON THE ADMISSION OF THE GENTILES.

I exhort them—but first claim

my own character—admitted to know God's hidden purpose (as above hinted),

once concealed, now revealed,

viz., the calling of the Gentiles,

for whom I minister, however unworthy so to do,

declaring to them

- (1) *the Gospel treasure,*
- (2) *God's long hidden counsel,*
- (3) *His wisdom revealed to angels through the Church.*

We enjoy freedom and access to God in Christ.

Do not despond on my account.

PRAYER FOR SPIRITUAL ENRICHMENT.

I intercede that you may have

- (1) *spiritual strength,*
- (2) *Christ for your indweller,*
- (3) *power to estimate love in all its fullness.*

A DOXOLOGY INTERPOSED.

me for you ; how by revelation He made known His 3  
Secret to me. I was briefly referring to this above [i. 9  
foll.] This will enable you, as you read what I have 4  
said, to appreciate my sense of that Secret, the key to  
which is Christ. In earlier ages this was not made known 5  
to the sons of men, as it now stands revealed to His holy  
apostles and prophets by the Spirit—viz., that the Gentiles 6  
are co-heirs, co-members, co-partners in His promise made  
in Christ by the Gospel ; of which I became a minister, led 7  
by the gift of God's grace bestowed upon me in virtue of  
the energy of His power :—on me the least in account of 8  
all saints was this grace bestowed—to evangelize the Gen-  
tiles with that treasure of Christ past finding out, and to 9  
enlighten all in the character of that dispensation<sup>1</sup>—the  
Secret which during ages past lay hid in God the All-  
Creator<sup>1</sup>—so that now, to the Princedoms and Powers 10  
sphered above us, the Church is the means of realizing  
the many-sided wisdom of God. For such was His eter- 11  
nal purpose carried out in Christ Jesus our Lord ; in 12  
Whom we have freedom alike of speech and of access,  
both assured through that faith of which He is the  
object. I beg you therefore not to lose heart amidst my 13  
afflictions borne on your behalf :—you ought rather to  
glory in them.

With this object I intercede on bended knee to that 14  
Father, from Whom all relationship in heaven and on 15  
earth takes its name, that He would grant you—as out of 16  
the wealth of His majesty He surely can—the mighty  
invigoration of your inner man through His Spirit, the 17  
indwelling of Christ in your hearts through faith ; so  
that, with love for your root and groundwork, you may 18  
develop power to take in, with all the saints, to what  
breadth and length, to what depth and height it reaches,  
and to know, what outstrips knowledge, the love of Christ, 19  
and so expand into the full sphere of God's completeness.

So now to Him Who is able to do for us, not merely 20

<sup>1</sup> Denotes that a reading is followed differing from the received text.

what we ask or think, but far in excess of both, as measured  
 21 by the power which puts forth its energies within us—to  
 Him be glory in the Church and<sup>1</sup> in Christ Jesus to all the  
 ages of endless eternity. Amen.

4 1 To resume then, I charge you—I who wear the Lord's  
 chains—that your course be one worthy of that calling  
 2 with which God has called you, with all humility, meek-  
 ness and long-suffering. Have a loving patience one for  
 3 another; studying to keep the oneness of the Spirit in the  
 4 bond of peace. For one is the Body, and one the Spirit to  
 which you belong, even as you were called in one hope  
 5 which all so called share. One is the Lord, one the faith,  
 6 one the baptism; one is God, the Father of all, Who is  
 above all, pervades all, and dwells in all.  
 7 Yet severally to each of us was His grace given, in pro-  
 8 portion as Christ endowed us. And so Scripture describes  
 Him as “ascending on high, reclaiming those whom the  
 9 enemy had captured and giving gifts to men.” What else  
 then can this ascending of His imply, than that He first  
 10 came down to earth beneath? He then Who thus came  
 down is the same as He Who ascended up above the  
 heavenly sphere that He might pervade all that is;—  
 11 the same again Who gave some to be apostles, some  
 declarers of His truth, some evangelists, some pastors and  
 12 teachers; but all to perfect the equipment of His saints,  
 all for the service of the ministry, all to build up the Body  
 13 of Christ; until we all arrive at the oneness in faith and  
 knowledge of the Divine Son, reaching thus our perfect  
 standard, our full-grown measure of Christ's complete-  
 14 ness. So shall we be no more babes, tossing and swaying  
 with every wind of doctrine, at the mercy of human trickery,  
 15 which sticks at nothing in laying its trains to mislead; but  
 holding truth in love, shall grow at every point into Him,  
 16 Who is our Head—Christ, I mean, from Whom the whole  
 Body knit and compacted through every joint which sup-

EXHORTATION.

I charge you, show graces worthy of your calling (several such touched upon).

Unity insisted on as an all-pervading principle. Its development, culminating in God.

Unity is possible notwithstanding individuality of gifts, as Christ is their common source, for Ps. lxviii. 18 applies to Him, in His Ascension, Who descended first; and, when re-ascended,

poured forth His gifts of office for the ministry of His Body,

that every member may reach the perfect standard in Christ.

Hence follows  
 1. *Subjective safety.*

This will safeguard from inconstancy and error,

2. *Objective vigour.*

Truth held in love will invigorate the whole frame at every point until perfected in love.

<sup>1</sup> Denotes that a reading is followed differing from the received text.

plies its life, in proportion to the energy developed by each part, carries forward the growth of the whole to its structural completeness in love.

**PRACTICAL  
ADVICE.**

(1) *Negative.*

Turn not back to heathenism with its ignorance, darkness, hardness, and desperation

—how unlike your lessons in the school of Christ!—

(2) *Positive.*  
Put off the old self and put on the new.

This then is what I have to say:—I adjure you in 17  
Christ's name, that the course of life pursued by the rest  
of the heathen world be yours no more. They, in their 18  
frivolity of mind and darkened moral sense, are estranged  
from the life of God through the ignorance which besets  
them, through their utter callousness of heart; whose case 19  
is that of all feeling lost, and of self-abandonment to sen-  
suality, to busy themselves in all uncleanness with greedy  
indulgence. But such was not the lesson you had in 20  
Christ—if indeed He it was you listened to, He in whom 21  
you were taught the truth, as embodied in Jesus. For 22  
this bids you put off—previous behaviour and all—that  
earlier self, which ever goes from bad to worse, led by  
the lusts which beguile; and be renewed in the principle 23  
which rules within, and to put on the newer self, moulded 24  
after God's image in the uprightness and holiness which  
that truth enjoins.

**BRIEF PRECEPTS  
against**

(1) *Falsehood,*

(2) *Anger,*

(3) *Theft,*

(4) *Foul lan-  
guage,*

(as offending the  
Holy Spirit),

(5) *All forms of  
unkindness.*

Their opposites  
inculcated,  
viewing

So then, drop falsehood and speak truth between man 25  
and man, as being members one of another: let not the 26  
sun set on your fit of passion, for that gives the Devil his  
opportunity. Let the thief thieve no longer, but rather 27  
betake himself to honest industry, that he may have to  
impart to any in need. Never let a word which bears a 28  
taint escape your lips, but only such as tends to edify  
when wanted, and bring a blessing to the hearers; and so 29  
abstain from vexing the Holy Spirit of God Whose seal 30  
was set upon you against the day of your redemption.  
Away with all asperity, wrath and anger, brawling and 31  
reviling with every form of ill-nature; and cultivate 32  
mutual kindness and tender feeling, forgiving one another,  
even as God in Christ forgave you.

God's per-  
fect love,  
and Christ's self-  
devotion, as  
our standards.

5 So become imitators of His perfections as His be- 1  
loved children; and walk in love, even as Christ loved 2  
us and gave Himself up for us, as an oblation and victim  
on our behalf, carrying the perfume of acceptance.

3 But as for fornication and all impurity or covetous-  
 4 ness, let them not be so much as named among you, as  
 5 unbecoming saints ; so with indecency, flippant talk, pruri-  
 6 ent jests—all of them out of keeping ; but let your spirits  
 7 find vent rather in thankfulness. For make up your mind  
 8 to this, that every fornicator, or impure or covetous man  
 9 (who is a sort of idolater), has no inheritance in the king-  
 10 dom of Christ and of God. Let no one mislead you with  
 11 empty phrases ; for these are the very things which  
 12 bring down God's anger on the sons of disobedience. Be-  
 13 ware then of sharing their practices.

8 Once no doubt you were all dark within, now you are  
 9 all light in the Lord. Behave then as children of light  
 10 (for that light has its fruit in all goodness and uprightness  
 11 and truth), showing your approval of what the Lord de-  
 12 lights in. And have nothing in common with the baneful  
 13 works of darkness—nay, rather show up their real char-  
 14 acter ; for their secret proceedings are too foul to be men-  
 15 tioned. Be sure that all things thus shown up stand by  
 16 contrast in a clearer light ; and in fact every such exposure  
 17 is a new light upon them : therefore, says some one,  
 18 “Rouse thee, thou sleeper, and start up from the dead in  
 19 sin, and Christ shall throw His light upon thee.”

15 Look well then to your behaviour, that it be strict, not  
 16 as heedless but as heedful of duty ; improving every oppor-  
 17 tunity as it arises, for the times abound with evil. There-  
 18 fore don't give way to thoughtlessness, but have a sense of  
 19 what the Lord requires. And don't drench yourselves  
 20 with wine, wherein is moral ruin, but be saturated with  
 21 the Spirit ; holding mutual converse in psalms and hymns  
 22 and devotional strains, with song and music in the heart  
 23 to the Lord. Never omit thanksgiving on behalf of all in  
 24 the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God the Father,  
 25 being submissive to one another in the fear of Christ ;

22 You wives, for instance, to your husbands, as to the  
 23 Lord ; because the husband is head of the wife, as Christ  
 24 also is Head of the Church—Himself the Saviour of that  
 25 Body saved by Him. But just as the Church submits Her-

(6) *Sins of impurity*  
 —banish their names—  
 avoid witty indecency,  
 and study thankfulness.

These things cast out from God's kingdom, and cause men to lie under God's wrath.

## EXHORTATION.

Children of light should walk as such and show its fruits,

and detect by its contrast the works of darkness ;

This duty illustrated by a quotation, perhaps from a Christian hymn.

## PRACTICAL CAUTIONS against

(1) *Heedlessness,*

(2) *Drunkenness ;*

## EXHORTATIONS.

Let the Spirit fill you with heart-melody and thankfulness ;  
 leading to mutual deference.

Such deference due in special relations of

(1) *Wife to husband,*  
 founded on the relation of the

Church to Christ.

(2) *Husband to wife*, founded on Christ's love to the Church, shown in His self-sacrifice, and His sanctification of Her, and glorifying Her in holiness.

Christ's love to the Church teaches husbands to love their wives: for the principle of Self-love is repeated in conjugal love, which is founded upon our closeness of incorporation in Christ. Gen. ii. 24.

Out of this mystical relation springs the individual duty of conjugal love and reverence.

self to Christ, so should also wives to their husbands in everything. You husbands love your wives, even as Christ 25 also loved His Church and gave Himself up for Her, that 26 He might sanctify Her, after purifying Her by the water-bath of baptism with its attendant form of words; and so 27 might Himself present to Himself His Church in all Her glory, without spot or wrinkle or the like, but that Her holiness might be without a flaw.

Men thus ought to love their own wives as their own 28 bodies. He that loveth His own wife loveth Himself. 29 For no one ever yet hated his own flesh, but nurtures and fosters it, even as Christ does to the Church; 30 because we are members of His Body, moulded of His flesh and of His bones. "For this cause shall a man for- 31 sake father and mother and cling to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." This mystery of the marriage- 32 tie is great; and though I refer what I now say to Christ and the Church, still let each of you individually so love 33 his own wife as he loves himself, and let the wife see that she reverence her husband.

(3) *Children to Parents.*

(Fifth Commandment quoted).

Converse duty of fathers.

(4) *Slaves to Masters,* as to Christ Himself,

sure that loyal service will bring its due reward.

Converse duty of masters. Over all is one Lord.

6 YOU children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this 1 is your duty; and the first commandment with a promise 2 annexed is, "Honour thy father and thy mother, that it 3 may be well with thee, and thou shall be long lived in the land." And you, fathers, don't exasperate your children, 4 but bring them up in the school and precepts of the Lord.

You slaves, obey your earthly masters with trembling 5 eagerness of duty, in sincerity of heart, as you would obey Christ Himself; not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but 6 as Christ's slaves should, doing with heart and soul what God requires, rendering loyal service, as it were to the 7 Lord and not to men; being sure that whatever good any 8 one does, that shall he have requited from the Lord, be he slave or be he free. And you masters, behave to them in 9 the same spirit, not indulging in that threatening way, being sure that you too have a Lord Paramount in heaven, and that there is no favoured class with Him.

- 10 I would only add, draw for your strength upon the  
 11 Lord and His omnipotent might. Put on the whole  
 armour of God, that you may be able to stand firm against  
 12 the wiles of the devil. Because with us the struggle is not  
 against flesh and blood, but against Princedoms and Potentates  
 who wield and marshal this dark world—the spiritual  
 13 agents of wickedness sphered above us. This is why you  
 must take up the whole armour of God, that you may  
 be enabled to make a stand in the day of evil, and after  
 14 overthrowing them all, to keep your post still. Keep it  
 therefore, belted round the waist with truth, cased in the  
 15 breastplate of uprightness, shod with that sure foothold,  
 16 the Gospel of peace; mounting over all the shield of faith,  
 to enable you to quench all the darts of the Evil One,  
 17 fire-tipped though they be. Assume too the helmet of  
 18 salvation, and that Spirit-sword, God's own word. Sustain  
 your prayer and entreaty, always praying in spirit, and on  
 the alert for this purpose, with unflagging perseverance of  
 19 entreaty for all the saints; and on my behalf too, that I  
 may have the gift of utterance, with open mouth and  
 20 unreservedly to make known the Gospel-secret (for which,  
 though its ambassador, I wear a chain), that I may plead  
 boldly for it, as I ought to do.
- 21 But that you in turn may know all about me and how  
 I fare, Tychicus, our beloved brother and faithful minister  
 22 in the Lord, will let you know all details. And for this  
 very reason I now send him to you, that you may know our  
 circumstances, and that he may cheer up your spirits.
- 23 Peace to the brethren and love attend their faith, from  
 24 God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. May grace  
 attend on all who love our Lord Jesus Christ without  
 alloy.

CONCLUDING  
 COUNSELS  
 RESPECTING THE  
 CHRISTIAN  
 WARFARE.

Make God's  
 strength,  
 God's armour,  
 yours.

War against  
 spiritual powers.

Put on the  
 armour

(1) *to resist  
 assaults,*  
 (2) *to keep your  
 post.*

Put on each  
 piece of this ar-  
 mour, viz.:-

(1) *Truth,*  
 (2) *Uprightness,*  
 (3) *Peace,*  
 (4) *Faith,*

(5) *Salvation,*

(6) *The Spirit-  
 sword.*

I charge you to  
 sustain prayer.

I request your  
 intercession

on behalf of my  
 evangelistic  
 mission.

MISSION OF  
 TYCHICUS.

Tychicus (who  
 brings this) will  
 let you know  
 all about myself.

CLOSING  
 BENEDICTION.

HENRY HAYMAN.

*Note.*—Certain features of evidence, both of early MSS. and internal character, suggest that this Epistle may have been a circular intended for the Church-group of which Ephesus was the chief centre, nearly corresponding with that group of "Seven" addressed Rev. i. 4 foll. Thus a latitude like that *expressed* in 2 Cor. i. 1, "With all the saints that are *in all Achaia*," may be *implied* in Eph. i. 1.

## THE "INEBRIATE" PROBLEM.

OF all the troubles which afflict the world, the State, and the Church, none can compare with drunkenness. This giant evil overtops them all. It is, too, the prolific parent of nearly all the others. Drink fills our prisons, crowds our police courts, contributes a large proportion of the accused at our tribunals of bankruptcy, and divorce. To drinking we owe the greater part of our workhouse and casual ward population, as well as the most of our enormous expenditure on pauperism. The cases of disease among us would be only about one-third of their present number but for alcoholic excess, and our annual mortality would be markedly diminished were we a nation of nephalists. Probably not less than 40,000 die prematurely in the United Kingdom every year from the effects of their own indulgence; while double that number succumb to poverty, starvation, accident, violence, or disease springing from the intemperance of others. No place is safe from the ravages of the alcoholic destroyer. The hearth is polluted, and virtue is sapped; the sanctuary is defiled, and by intoxication the light of many a brilliant pulpit ornament has been sadly dimmed. No other habit has so hindered our national progress, so stained our character as a people, so impaired the usefulness of the Christian Church.

The mischief flowing from drinking habits is not limited to our day and generation. More terrible than all the other lamentable fruits of alcohol poisoning is the increasing operation of the constantly accumulating narcotic inheritance. As we now suffer more severely than did our forefathers from the depressive influences of alcoholic heredity, in like manner will our successors in the battle of life suffer more seriously than we. As physical features are often handed down—witness the Judaic face, so are the drink crave and the drink

impulse themselves; so are the various bodily degenerations; so are the complex and multiform brain and nerve degradations begotten of narcomania, that dread disease, which is a veritable madness for intoxication. What is the outlook for those who will come after us? On the one hand, their overpowering narcomaniacal craving for narcotic gratification will be more intense, their susceptibility to the benumbing influence of narcotic drugs will be more delicate; and on the other their moral control will be weaker, they will have less power to resist the increased force of temptation to the Lethe of inebriation. All these hereditary factors operating to the greater liability of our descendants to inebriate indulgence will be aggravated by the undoubted increasing prevalence of intemperance among our women and children, the last of truly fearful import from a worldly as well as a religious point of view.

## REMEDIES ALREADY TRIED.

Attempt after attempt has been made to cope with this great and growing evil. Several hundred special Acts of Parliament attest the efforts of the Legislature. The magnificent temperance movement, of which the trophies in the shape of brands plucked from the burning have of themselves been ample justification, witnesses to the strong desire of the patriotic and the religious to abate the plague. The powers that be have tried innumerable plans to reform the drunkard and lessen drunkenness. They have put the sot in the pillory, for the populace to pelt him with rotten eggs. They have placed him in the stocks, as a spectacle for scorn and contumely. They have put a beer barrel on him, and set him, like our latter-day "sandwich men," to perambulate the streets with head and arms emerging from his wooden cuirass, for the mockery and reproach of the idle and the curious. They have driven him forth to sweep the highways in mud and snow, which probably they fondly hoped would "cool his coppers." They have ducked him (and especially her) in cool waters, jerking the culprit, unresisting because made fast to a chair attached to a pulley, up in the air and down through the cold depths till he felt

as if the very life had been frozen out of him. They have whipped and beaten him to a jelly, almost beyond recognition. They have adopted these and many other modes of rough and ready correction, but all such corrective experiments have egregiously failed, except perhaps Charlemagne's sharp remedy of killing, which certainly put an end to the accused's drunkenness by putting an end to his life.

Beside these heroic measures, our modern treatment of the drunkard appears tame and mild. English jurisprudence contents itself with a penalty of say "five shillings and costs," with the alternative of a few days' incarceration. Even this procedure is subject to modification. On the local authorities the apparent drunkenness of a town depends, much more than on the actual intemperance of the inhabitants. In some places the ruling powers are strict. There the cases are very numerous. In other localities the watch committee is lenient. In these places there are apparently very few drunkards. Indeed, there are communities in which a turn of the magisterial screw has all the appearance of suddenly changing the drinking habits of the residents. This attenuated and somewhat eccentric treatment has proved no more successful than the older and severer method. Under our present system, the innocent are punished. The head of a family, dependent on his wages for their daily bread, is fined or imprisoned. In either case, the family are punished more than he. If sent to prison, he is not allowed to starve, but, on the contrary, is fairly and healthily fed. So much so, that a short term by enforced abstinence from poison, and by nourishing food, only puts him straight, and capacitates him for, on his discharge, a vigorous renewal of his potations. The innocent wife and children are the real victims. Their resources are stopped, the police-court drunkard rarely having savings. Starvation and want are their lot. The injustice of such a penal process is as glaring as the process is ineffectual. Fine and imprisonment can no more reform a drunkard than they can cure a palsy.

All these plans of treatment have been based on the belief—a belief as perilous as it is unsound—that only the badly-

disposed become drunken; that drunkenness is but a vice, a sin, and a crime. Strange to say, among those who most stoutly contend that intemperance is not a disease, and is simply the fruit of depravity of heart, are to be found those who most loudly proclaim the alleged efficacy of quack, and other "cures" and "specifics," in creating an aversion from strong drink. Such belie their faith. If they really believe that drinking is a moral vice, they cannot believe that any purely physical talisman can remedy the mischief or destroy the propensity. Yet the vaunted perfect cure by material substances has been persistently claimed by good and godly men.

The latest physical temperance fad is a striking illustration. An excellent religious journal recently stated that the injection under the skin of one-fortieth of a grain of strychnine was a simple and safe remedy which was declared to have been an effectual destroyer of the drink crave, so powerful that, after one administration, a rooted loathing for alcohol was, like the emergence of Semele from the thigh of Jupiter, forthwith born. Wondrous discovery! Verily the wisdom of the ancients and the wisdom of the moderns must have been sadly at fault, not to have found out long ago that one prick of a hollow needle and the hypodermic injection of an appreciable dose of a virulent poison would not only render future drinking of intoxicants loathsome, but actually be an antidote to alcohol, and prevent any mental or moral mischief if, notwithstanding the infallible prophylactic, alcohol by any chance should thereafter be swallowed. Such a discovery would, of course, bring to an untimely end the promising career of the Church of England Temperance Society, for all that would be needful to prevent any future taste for, or evil result of, strong drink, would be the arming of every adult with a hypodermic syringe, and a few charges of strychnine, so that any person exhibiting the slightest suspicion of intoxication might be at once secured against all possible harm. In short, if there were any truth in the alleged virtue of strychnine, a new and compulsory vaccination of every human being with this potent poison would avert alcoholic disaster for the future. The only

drawback to such a non-alcoholic millennium would be an occasional death from an overdose of the deadly remedy. Need I say that the belief in these miraculous virtues of this poisonous potion is but a delusion. Unhappily, though not unexpectedly, alcohol *habitue's* have already begun to press strychnia into their service. Some are carrying "pocket pistols, of preparations of this dangerous substance in the guise of confections, set forth to be effectual against "dipso-mania." Others have armed themselves with a hypodermic syringe and a store of strychnine charges, and are becoming adepts at this latest form of medicinal self-administration.

Various other articles have been proclaimed as specifics from time to time. Kola nut (*sterculia acuminata*), for example, was held out to be an infallible prevention of narco-mania. It was gravely announced—and a number of testimonials were cited in support—that workmen who indulged in a generous and steaming basin of Kola infusion, invariably preserved their sobriety unimpaired, though bearing their part in a night's drinking. Not many years have passed since a wonderful tale of thousands of the worst drunkards, in an American city with no spotless reputation for temperance, having been in a twinkling transformed into models of sobriety, was wafted from across the Atlantic. Acquainted with the locality, besides knowing a little about the disease of inebriety, I was not taken in by this plausible romance; but a goodly number of Christian and temperance workers received the narrative with implicit faith. A searching inquiry revealed the fact that no drunkard in Chicago had been reclaimed by that agency, but that, on the contrary, not a few reformed inebriates had relapsed through partaking of the so-called infallible cure. This magic talisman was a strong spirituous preparation of red cinchona bark.

I have not yet heard of any alleged cure of drunkenness having been effected—as I was once solemnly informed by a learned professor in Ireland he had thus been completely cured of a severe and prolonged attack of rheumatism—by the swallowing of some cabalistic and illegible words written after sundry incantations by a "wise woman." But there is a

good time coming, and this cabalistic "cure" would be not a whit more instantaneous and miraculous than some of the alleged infallible specifics to which reference has just been made.

Apart from the marvellous cures believed by the credulous to have been wrought by physical charms, as wondrous results have been blazoned forth as having been effected by purely mental or moral agency. The hypnotic and faith cures are types of these. A very few cases of inebriety have been reported as having yielded to what is now called hypnotism, or treatment by suggestion, though this is simply our old friend mesmerism with a new name. The record of these alleged cures is by no means convincing of the efficacy of this expedient. In one case the seances were continued twice weekly for seven months, with a few months' abstinence thereafter at the date of the report. Indeed, all the cases so treated have been too recent to prove the reality of cure. The *modus operandi* of the remedy seems discredited by the record as furnished by the operator. It is claimed that while in a hypnotised or mesmerised state, the mind of the subject experimented upon is favourably disposed to receive and act upon the suggestions of the mesmeric experimenter. If this theory be sound, the sobering suggestion must be comparatively ineffective if it last for only three days or so, when a fresh suggestion to carry the patient safely on for three days more is required. Were, however, the treatment of drunkenness successful by this method, the process itself is unjustifiable. For if the hypnotised can be influenced for sobriety, he can be equally influenced for insobriety; if he can be impressed *volens volens* for good, he can be impressed in like manner for evil. The exercise of such a power for evil over any human being seems to me utterly without warrant either from Scripture, science, or common-sense. Better that drunkenness should decimate our ranks than that our thoughts, passions, and actions should be under the control of a frail fellow-mortal. Such a terrible power ought to be wielded by no fallible sinner. Better drunken liberty than sober slavery. So fearful is the possible mischief which a practised mesmeriser might, if the theory of this mode of

treatment be true, entail upon the body and soul of his hypnotees, that the Christian Church ought to set its face like a flint against all such unlawful devices at the professed amelioration or reformation of the drunkard.

The faith cure is another broken reed based on an imperfect conception of the true character and causes of diseased drunkenness. The expulsive power of a new affection is often of infinite value in aiding the reformation of the intemperate, as in the reforming of all bad and sinful habits, in the purification of the heart and of the desires. In cases in which any vicious indulgence is delighted in from purely moral depravity, the influences of morality and religion are our only real hope of better things. Even when the improper habit is the result largely or wholly of a diseased and perverted organism, the purifying, strengthening and ennobling influence of the Christian faith is of incalculable importance as a strengthener of the palsied will, and an invigorator of the enfeebled moral control. In the treatment of insanity and of inebriety, there is no mental or moral tonic comparable to true and intelligent religious conviction. Reliance on aid from on High is a tower of strength, alike in the despair of ill-health and in the exaltation of good health. Many an apparently dying sufferer, at the very gate of death to human vision, have I seen reanimated and recalled to life by the courageous effort at existence born of a perfect trustfulness in the All-wise Father, and an indomitable determination to live for God and for human-kind. Many a fainting spirit have I seen succumb to a comparatively weak attack of disease for lack of Christian fortitude and pluck.

What I mean by the "faith cure" is the employment of moral and religious agencies to the exclusion of all attempts at the physical treatment of the diseased intemperate. This thing (intemperance) goeth not out but by prayer and fasting. The body must be cared for, while the soul is not neglected. Yet in both public and private efforts at the reformation of the drunken, I have again and again seen no means resorted to but rebuke and punishment, preaching and prayer. In one case the heroine of more than a hundred and fifty terms

of imprisonment for drunkenness was paraded in public as saved and reformed. Just so long as she was constantly watched and guarded by abstaining friends did she remain firm and sober. But as soon as the human means of withholding the liquor was withdrawn, the "reformed" one was prostrated by her besetting sin, and forthwith was once more incarcerated for her wonted offence against the law of the land. This poor woman was as clearly under the dominion of a disease as was another in a northern city, of whom it is recorded that, from the greater part of her life having been spent in jail for drunkenness, and offences connected therewith, whenever she, in the brief intervals of her freedom, wandered past the prison of her district, she was invariably heard unwittingly to warble, "Home, sweet home." In one institution conducted on the principle of "the faith cure," so strong was the belief in the supreme efficacy of purely spiritual agency, and so rooted was the disinclination to see any physical affection requiring a physical remedy, that an allowance of intoxicating liquor was regularly put upon the table for each patient at the three chief meals of the day. There are continually coming before me cases of inebriate addiction for a long series of years, members of the learned professions, as well as active workers among the poor, who have run the gauntlet of religious and moral efforts of every kind, who have taken and broken the teetotal pledge times without number, who have been claimed as converts by religious organisations, and yet have been as uninfluenced, except during the excitement of the moment, as "the impassive ice on which the lightning plays." In several large cities were worn ribbons significant of professed abstinence, and more abstaining pledges were taken than there were inhabitants. Yet the number of public-houses and the extent of drunkenness have undergone little apparent change. I have seen hundreds and thousands of nephalian ribbons distributed and enthusiastically worn for a time, but in less than a year thereafter the licensed traps for the sale of strong drink, and the criminal offences resulting therefrom, I have found as numerous as ever. In one populous city, where no less than

28,000 temperance ribbons were dealt out, the opponents of temperance legislation outvoted the supporters of Sunday Closing at a public meeting held within six months of the ribbon issue. I have seen a wave of temperance roll over a community, leaving little more permanent impression on the general drunken habits than if the vows had been written on sand on the sea-shore. Temperance hysterics do not avail to build up an abiding temperance reformation. Reliance on moral and religious means alone, even if the morality and religion is presented in an intelligent and unexceptionable form, is defective as a remedial measure for the cure of indulgence, which is often largely, if not wholly, the outcome of a physical disease. Individuals, whose will-power has not been completely palsied, have been here and there reclaimed from inebriate indulgence, but little impression has been made on the seething mass of grovelling intoxication, which practically has defied the most strenuous and conscientious assaults of the Christian and the sober.

#### REASON OF PAST NON-SUCCESS.

Wherein has lain the practical failure of all these well-meant and honest attempts at the eradication and amelioration of the terrible load of intemperance under which we as a nation and as a church so sadly groan? The shortcoming has been in a defective conception of the mischief to be remedied. There was a time when madness, elder sister of drunkenness, was believed to be a divine punishment for sin, a righteous penalty for a breach of the moral law. Then the insane were treated with only harshness, imprisonment, torture, and death. When the madman was not denounced as an abandoned sinner, a reprobate deserving of no pity, but meriting reprimand and disgrace, he was regarded as possessed of a devil. In either case, he was subjected to such cruelties as would now bring imprisonment to the perpetrator. At one time the lunatic was chained in a dungeon like a wild beast, bread and water, with an occasional chunk of coarse meat, was thrown at him from a safe distance ; unshorn and unclothed

he had to wallow in filth and dirt. At another time he was taken into the open, and for successive days and nights was exposed to the raging elements, while cold water was continuously showered on his shivering frame, with a frequent variety in the shape of severe floggings. If he survived this heroic treatment, he was cured. All this was done in good faith to drive the devil out of him. Now all is changed. The unsound of mind are no longer the pariahs of humanity, are no longer accounted as outcasts and felons of the deepest dye. We do not even regard them as under demoniac possession. Tenderly and lovingly we care for the mentally weak. Science has shown that insanity is a disease—a departure from health, which merits no ecclesiastical censure or moral reproof, except in so far as, like other diseases, it is the legitimate issue of the non-observance of the laws of health, physical health, mental health. The afflicted in mind are relegated to the care of the physician; are, when necessary, restrained to protect them against their diseased selves, as well as for the protection of others, and are carefully treated medically, with a view to the restoration of sound health. The happy result of this improved and scientific method of treatment is, that no inconsiderable proportion of cures are effected, and that there has been a marked amelioration in the lot of the incurable. The former failure in dealing with mental alienation arose from an imperfect and mistaken idea of insanity. The present success is due to the knowledge that insanity is not a vice, a crime, or a sin, but a disease.

So has it been with drunkards. While good has been done in many cases of intoxication by faithful spiritual dealing, and by various intellectual and elevating agencies, though only a moral depravity has been acknowledged, the labour of love among the intemperate, and their punishment as criminals, have been to a great extent a practical failure. Individuals have been reformed in considerable numbers by the operation of moral and religious influences, especially when combined with the efforts of abstainers; but notwithstanding the magnificent spoils of nephalism, a huge mass of alcoholic excess has remained which has defied the most resolute

attempts at reformation. Of the literally enormous concourse of drunkards who have taken the teetotal pledge, the great majority have fallen back into their former unhappy ways, numbers having taken this pledge hundreds of times. I have had under my care men and women who have again and again been claimed as converts to abstinence and to godliness, who have in these occasional lucid intervals done good service for temperance and for religion, but who have as often relapsed into intemperance. It is usual, even among Christian people, to stigmatise such backsliders as hypocrites, but the accusation is a slander. Straightforward and sincere in their desperate and determined struggle to lead a sober and godly life, these weak brothers and sisters have been mastered by a dominating physical disorder as real and as powerful in action as are the morbid overpowering impulses of insanity. Here we have the secret of the failure of most of our moral, religious and legislative endeavours at the emancipation of the drunken from their awesome and degrading bondage, compared to which the Egyptian slavery of old was perfect liberty.

Many drunkards are drunken because they are mad, not mad because they are drunken. In them the habit of excess has been a symptom of brain disorder. Their cure cannot be effected until the preceding cerebral ill-health has been remedied. A variety of states of the brain may give rise to narcotic indulgence. If this diseased condition be functional a permanent cure may be looked for. If organic, the hope of cure is faint, but much can be done to lessen and mitigate the drunken bouts. Our police-court drunkards, especially the "repeaters" who have been convicted of drunkenness, or some offence connected therewith, for perhaps hundreds of times, are generally examples of a morbid impulse akin to the criminal impulse of some forms of epileptic mania. In about one-half of our drunkards there has been a history of narcotic heredity. In other words, a moiety of our intemperate population has been ushered into the world of temptation handicapped by an innate tendency to intoxication. Another inheritance, the neurotic, often operates to engender an unhealthful and very strong drink-impulse, and to induce a

defective moral control which is less able to resist the morbidly aggravated liability to excess. Intemperance has as physical an origin in a considerable proportion of persons whose brain and nerve centres have been literally poisoned by the alcoholic drink which they have regularly consumed for a long series of years, not necessarily to what is commonly regarded as excess. Alcohol is a powerful disturber, disorganiser, and paralyser. Its action on the human body is, in all appreciable doses, a progressive paralysis. By its insidious paralyzant influence the will-power is frequently as surely broken down, as is the office of the liver by alcoholic physical tissue-degradation, or the heart's function by alcoholic circulatory perturbation. The American was physiologically accurate when he said, "When I take a glass of whisky I am another man, and that other man wants a glass too."

Our jurisprudence has also been the occasion of not a little injustice to persons charged with having committed crime while in a state of intoxication. Men and women of good general character, apart from drinking, have been condemned for serious offences, though they, on recovering from their debauch, had no more remembrance of the criminal offence than they had any criminal intention, or even knowledge of the commission of the crime. In one case a young man was sentenced to death for a murder committed under a delusion similar to delusions which I have observed in patients under the influence of narcotics. In another case, a man was executed for a capital offence, though he was an inebriate, and had long been a prey to insane delusions begotten of strong drink. Weekly I see persons sent to prison, with the result that their criminal propensities have been fostered because they have been punished as criminals instead of treated as diseased individuals, with mind confused, morals depraved, perception clouded through alcohol.

#### SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM.

The truth is that drunkenness, in a very large proportion of cases, is either a disease, or the effect of disease. As there

is a disease called insanity, so there is a disease which may justly be called inebriety; or, more accurately, narcomania—a malady of the higher nerve-centres, characterised by a dominating impulse to, or crave for, intoxication. The unhealthy desire is not for liquor for its own sake, but for immediate, if temporary, relief of the intolerable agony of the diseased inebriate, which any kind of anæsthetic narcotic undoubtedly supplies for the moment. Our drunkenness is mostly alcoholic, simply because alcohol is the most readily available intoxicant in the United Kingdom. Indulgence, however, in chloral, opium, chlorodyne, ether, and other narcotics, is steadily gaining ground among us.

The recognition of a physical aspect of the drink question is the key to the solution of the "Inebriate" Problem. If the young were taught in all our schools the nature and properties of alcohol, there would be good ground for hope that a truer and more correct knowledge of the extent and causes of the intemperance which we all deplore would permeate the British people. The great truth which we must master is that inebriety is a true disease, a veritable madness for intoxication, an ungovernable mania for the Lethe of narcotic oblivion. Once this great central truth is grasped, its recognition will come upon us like a revelation. Light will be thrown upon the dark places of our festering heap of poverty, crime, violence, and premature death. The unwisdom and unfairness of our present unrighteous legislation in forcing upon the community the fearful incubus of licensed public temptations to easy indulgence in a paralysing, intelligence-poisoning anæsthetic will be manifest. Rescue-work will be more effective and encouraging. The prospect of cure will be infinitely brighter to the inebriate. Every effort at the improvement of the health, the morality, the prosperity, and the happiness of the people will be strengthened. The Church of the living God, emancipated from all narcotic defilement, once again bearing aloft the unsullied banner of Him who cared no less for the body than for the spirit of man, will reap a harvest of human souls of which in her present environment she has no conception.

NORMAN KERR.

## CURRENT POINTS AT ISSUE :

### AGNOSTICISM.

EVERY parent is in honour bound to safeguard the reputation of his own offspring ; it is, therefore, only natural that Professor Huxley should be at all times ready to ward off attacks on his beloved "Agnosticism"—the "invention" of his intellectual maturity, and the solace of his later years. His latest rush to the rescue is found in the current number of *The Nineteenth Century*, where he runs a tilt against the utterances of Dr. Wace at the late Church Congress, and at the paper of Mr. Harrison in the January number of *The Fortnightly Review*. With the Positivist we are not here concerned ; nor are we anxious to assist Dr. Wace to defend himself, as no man requires such assistance less than he ; but we wish in all courtesy to examine very slightly a few of the positions of both combatants, in so far as they bear on the general controversy, as both seem right, and both seem wrong.

The chief objections of the Professor are based on the following quotation from Dr. Wace :—"But if this be so, for a man to urge, as an escape from this article of belief, that he has no means of a scientific knowledge of the unseen world, or of the future, is irrelevant. His difference from us lies not in the fact that he has no knowledge of these things, but that he does not believe the authority on which they are stated. He may prefer to call himself an Agnostic, but his real name is an older one—he is an Infidel ; that is to say, an unbeliever. The word infidel, perhaps, carries an unpleasant significance. Perhaps it is right that it should. It is, and it ought to be, an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ."

Dr. Wace here defines with great precision the position of the agnostic, which Professor Huxley seems strangely to mis-

understand; for he asks the question, "Are there any Christians who say that they know nothing about the unseen world and the future?" We answer, Yes; all Christians say so when they say, "I believe," for belief is not knowledge. Our belief may be erroneous, but not so our knowledge. As Dr. Wace rightly puts it, the difference between the Christian and the agnostic lies, not in the region of knowledge, but in that of belief. In point of fact, all men are gnostics within the limits of consciousness, or knowledge; and all men beyond these limits are agnostics. The whole confusion on this subject has arisen from the disregard of this simple but most important distinction. What we know we *know*, and there cannot be any doubt about it; what we do not know we believe, or disbelieve, on evidence presented to us. The term agnostic, consequently, as generally used, is a mischievous confuser of thought, and we shall gladly oblige the Professor by calling it "miscreant." He has done much to help us to think clearly, and for this we owe him thanks; but for the "invention" of this unfortunate term "agnostic" we owe him less than none. The right name, therefore, for one who does not believe what we believe, is—Infidel. The Mohammedan has the same right to call the Christian "infidel," that the Christian has to call the Mohammedan by that name.

If we are ever to know what we are talking about, we must be more accurate in the use of our terms, and employ only those that convey an exact meaning, and whose *differentiae* are well marked. We would, therefore, in all seriousness, and not "in the name of all that is Hibernian," ask Professor Huxley to cremate his baby "Agnosticism," and call himself by the honest name—Infidel. By this we do not mean a name of reproach, but the expression of an undeniable fact—that the man so called does not believe in the faith of the country in which he lives. Why should there be any reproach in this? Many a man has nobler reasons for disbelieving in the creed of his country than another has for saying he believes. The honour or dishonour is found, not in the fact, but in the reason of it. The Professor is rather severe on the Principal for stating that "it ought to be an

unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ." Dr. Wace wrote this in the fulness of his Christian convictions and emotions, and, in one sense, it must be unpleasant for an earnest man to be out of touch on so great a question with the overwhelming majority of the truest and best of his countrymen; not only because it breaks the harmony of their mental life, but also because it must suggest the often wonder, whether, after all, they may be right, and he be wrong. Still we must echo the words of our critic: "It ought *not* to be unpleasant to say that which one honestly believes or disbelieves." We are well assured that Dr. Wace has here misrepresented himself, for he would be the last to say otherwise, or for one moment allow unpleasantness to bar the way of duty.

Professor Huxley very frankly tells us the origin of the term "agnostic," and with that little bit of autobiography most thinkers will heartily sympathise. He says: "It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the 'gnostic' of Church history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant." In this he was perfectly correct, for he did not know these things; and so he was, in fact, an agnostic; but neither did the others *know* them, and so they were, in fact, agnostics also, although they called themselves by a wrong name. Literally, all *believers* in Christianity are agnostics, though all agnostics are not believers.

The Professor properly, throughout his paper, treats the question as one of testimony and credibility, that is, of belief or unbelief, and therefore both gnosticism and agnosticism are out of court, and the article ought to have been headed "Unbelief." Our friend's notions of the value of testimony, and the nature of credibility, seem somewhat peculiar, but these points we leave to Dr. Wace. Meantime, it is most heartily to be wished that some harmony of difference might be discovered by which a man so cultured, so earnest, and so honest as Professor Huxley, might be welcomed by all cultured, earnest, and honest men as a brother student in the great universe of thought. He states the foundation principle of the agnostic to be, "Try all things; hold fast that which is

good ;" and as this is also the foundation principle of Christianity, the two, in so far as they are logical, cannot be so far apart, at least in thought. What then both have to try, in loving brotherhood, is this: Which is the best, or most scientific solution of all the facts of human, and all other nature, intelligence or non-intelligence, God or chance, Christ or chaos ?

#### POSITIVISM.

Mr. F. Harrison claims the lion's share of personal notice in the February Magazines. The pages of *The Nineteenth* are almost ablaze with the scorn heaped on his devoted head by the fiery Huxley. In *The Contemporary*, he claims attention on his own account by his reply to the Duke of Argyll on the Irish question ; while Earl Nelson deals with that portion of his annual address to Positivists, in which he appeals to Christianity to do what it can to remedy the social evils of the time. Mr. Harrison grants that "Christianity has a power over the moral lives of individuals, but refuses to see in it any influences for good in dealing with the pressing social questions of the day ;" and yet he appeals to Christianity to at least begin to deal with them. Lord Nelson, however, rightly shows that, when Mr. Harrison admits that Christianity has a power over the moral life of individual men, he yields the whole point in contention. "For it is a logical conclusion that, as the life of the nation is made up of individual lives, the power which can affect the moral lives of individuals must, in the long run, influence the nation." The thought is pressed upon us that, in the present divided state of Christendom, the religious zeal stimulated by these very divisions has taken a selfish and unloving turn. A most important question here arises, "how far our different views on Church Government and on the Sacraments, which are very great though capable of much modification, hinder the clear duty of united action against social evils." There can be no doubt whatever that Christendom would be better than it is were it not for these wretched antagonisms, for such the divisions practically become. The

moral improvement of mankind is surely a work worthy of greatest effort and noblest self-denial. To make men better men we ought to forget our differences and remember alone our affinities in Christ. We ought to do our best for the restoration of complete human unity in the Man, Christ Jesus. The Earl rightly says that "the acceptance of this Catholic and charitable view need not check our earnest advocacy of what we believe to be the will of Christ in His ordinary workings, though it will enlarge our hearts to all who show the fruits of the Spirit." Practically, however, how is this union to be promoted? He asks "whether a council could not be formed in every town or district, and, at some future time, a central council, to meet in London, of wise, sound, large-hearted men, chosen by each denomination as their representatives. These should meet regularly in friendly conference, studying earnestly, in the light of the revealed will of God, the intricate problems of society; exploring the accessible, but often remote and concealed, sources of human evil; and then guiding and systematising the various institutions for good, so that they could more effectually forward the common work in a co-ordinate way, and without any jealous interferences with each other, and then bring the full power of united Christian effort and example to deal more effectually with our many social evils." Beyond all controversy, the suggestion is worthy of all praise, but it is to be feared that, as yet, there are many difficulties in the way; too much of churchiness in the churches, and too little of Christ, in all the incomparable grandeur of His work and words. The bright era has however dawned, the light is breaking, missions of mercy are extending on all sides. Christians are responding nobly to the appeals of suffering humanity, and the work will yet be done, but by Christianity alone. We heartily echo the words of Huxley on this subject, "But that the incongruous mixture of bad science with eviscerated Papistry, out of which Comte manufactured the Positivist religion, will be the heir of the Christian Ages, I have too much respect for the humanity of the future to believe."

JAMES MACCANN.

## CURRENT LITERATURE.

*The Least of all Lands* (1). Unlike too many books of travel there is a distinct purpose, to which the writer steadily and praiseworthy adheres. He tries to promote a better understanding of the topography and history of Palestine. There are some useful and well-executed sectional maps and plans, and much of the letterpress marks the writer as a man of natural and acquired powers of observation. But a casual visit to the Holy Land is not enough to enable the most skilled traveller to obtain accurate and reliable information upon disputed points. With a certain nonchalance the author informs the reader that "when I visited Palestine last year, I had no thought of writing a book about it." Yet he expresses surprise at the thoughtlessness of the statement by the late Dean Stanley who, be it remembered, had several years of special preparatory study before he traversed the same ground under peculiarly favourable circumstances. Modesty, especially in respect to the Holy Land, becomes casual travellers. The book in parts may be read with profit, and furnishes side-lights to Scripture truth.

THOSE who have it in their power to visit Egypt, and to see for themselves the charm of the Nile, the beauty of its table-lands and deserts, the ruins of temples and tombs, we advise to put into their carpet-bags, together with Murray's *Handbook*, Canon Bell's *Winter on the Nile* (2). Those not so fortunate as to spare the time or money for such a trip, will find this attractive book a capital companion while studying stereoscopic views of Egypt. This country should be more studied, because it is second to none in interest, on account both of its wonderful history and its close connection with so many instances in Bible story.

(1) *The Least of all Lands: Seven Chapters on the Topography of Palestine in relation to its History.* By William Miller. Blackie & Son, 1888.

(2) *A Winter on the Nile in Egypt and in Nubia.* By the Rev. Charles D. Bell, D.D. Hodder & Stoughton, 1888.

STEP by step, with dogged persistency, Prebendary Reynolds follows upon the heels of the scientists, and shows that nature and the laws of nature, as yet understood, do not justify a single scientific argument against religion. Besides the facts and even the theories of scientists, when examined in a scientific manner, though not of course proving the statements and principles contained in the Holy Scriptures, yet are quite in harmony with them. Mystery or the supernatural is found to pervade all nature, and to force itself upon the observation of every student who does not drop his scientific methods, by which he originally obtained his scientific results, when he considers its relation to the written Word. The contest which the Prebendary had to wage with the scientists has not always been sufficiently understood by even well-intentioned and practised critics. His works are not text-books of Christian evidence, written on a painfully precise plan. One main governing purpose, nevertheless, pervades the whole work. The writer does not sit down in the professor's chair and simply instruct his readers, but he follows the materialist scientists of all orders through their hyrcynian wood, and conducts them to the true centre, which is the common meeting-ground of religion and science. The apparent or real want of order in the constructive parts of the work (3) are due to the labyrinths in which his opponents are perpetually losing themselves, and from which the Prebendary, as their true though sometimes cruelly candid friend, endeavours to conduct them to the highroad of truth. Special incidental advantages of the work are numerous. The opening up an entirely new field of Christian inquiry furnishes some splendid illustrations of the Divine Majesty, checks the deification of matter or human reason, and also supplies motives to adoring love, which tends to man's highest development. Another collateral advantage of Prebendary Reynolds' labours is to teach the devout believer, especially if not an advanced student, to hold his judgment in suspense, and not to be hurried hither and thither by the passing currents and eddies of modern theories, before skilled and competent writers like our author put them to the test. No one can carefully read his works without the conviction that science, properly pursued, is no other than an ally to Christianity.

(3) *The Supernatural in Nature: A Verification, by free use of Science.* By Joseph William Reynolds, M.A., Rector of St. Anne and St. Agnes, with St. John Zachary, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. Third Edition. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1888. 14s.

THERE is certainly abundant room for Professeur Gretillat's *Exposé de Théologie Systématique*, the second instalment of which lies on our table (4). The first volume, *Méthodique*, was issued in 1885. The author has decided to postpone the second, *Apologetique et Canonique*, until he has completed the *Dogmatique*, one moiety of which constitutes the volume before us. It contains "Prolégomènes de la Dogmatique," *i.e.*, definitions, methods, history, etc.; "Théologie Spéciale," which is limited to discussions concerning the Being and Nature of God as revealed in the two Testaments; and "Cosmologie," which treats not only of the creation of the world and man, but of the nature of angels, fallen and unfallen, of the fate of man, of providential government, and, first and foremost, "de la prédestination ou de la Prothèse divine." This arrangement differs from those commonly adopted by British theologians, but it is clearly logical, and enables us to study the doctrine of fore-knowledge and fore-ordination in a much calmer and more philosophical atmosphere than is often the case. Representing the evangelical orthodoxy of the French Reformed Churches, M. Gretillat adopts strictly Calvinistic principles. He puts them earnestly, but with a stringency that is almost out of date this side of the Channel.

Throughout the volume we have been impressed with the crispness and terseness of the divisions, and the lucidity and exactness of the definitions. M. Gretillat faces the scientific and moral problems raised by his subjects with rare courage and skill. His discourse of Providence, though comparatively brief, is full and very suggestive. The book has close upon 700 pages and a considerable quantity of small type, but there is scarcely a wasted line or word. As far as the method and general treatment go, this may be called a model treatise on systematic theology, worthy to stand side by side by the standard authority of American and, to a scarcely less degree, English Presbyterian Churches—the *Systematic Theology* of Dr. Hodge. M. Gretillat is less comprehensive than Dr. Hodge in his exhibition and examination of doctrines which he rejects; he rivals the American theologian in careful exposition of the Scriptures; but his great merit is the thoroughness and skilfulness with which he places himself *en rapport* with the thought and tendencies of the time, and yet preserves his reverence for and deference to Holy Writ.

(4) *Exposé de Théologie Systématique*. Par A. Gretillat, Professeur de Théologie à la Faculté Indépendante de Neuchâtel. Tome Troisième, Neuchâtel: Attinger Frères. 1888.

It is highly creditable to Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews, in his *Outlines of the Christian Ministry*, and to Dr. Witherow in *The Form of the Christian Temple* (5) that the differences between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism are discussed in such an admirable and able manner, with a view to their removal and adjustment. It would indeed be idle, now that both systems have deeply struck so many roots into society, that either one or the other should be absorbed. But both may be stripped of much that is hurtful, and both may return to more scriptural positions; both may learn to make less of accidents and more of essentials; and thus be drawn into closer spiritual bonds of fellowship. Nothing else but good can result from such a scholarly discussion of Church Polity.

The threefold divisions of Dr. Witherow's work—"Temporary Agents," "Divine and Permanent Elements," and "Human Additions," are exceedingly clear; but the first is a point which many might fairly challenge. The agencies named are Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, and Charisms. Strictly speaking, the first of these are agents, and the latter, properly speaking, is an agency. It must be borne in mind in this matter that the claims of Episcopacy rest upon the fact that some only of the offices of the Apostles were temporary, and that, in process of time, without any ecclesiastical revolution, certain offices, such as ordination and confirmation, were usually restricted to the Bishops, and not allowed to be performed without their intervention.

The book, independently of the particular question of Episcopacy or Presbyterianism, contains an immense amount of valuable information and sound Scriptural teaching upon Church Polity, and affords excellent weapons against sacerdotal encroachments upon the rights of the laity, and upholds the importance of Church rule against modern representatives of Montanus.

The style as well as the spirit in which this learned Treatise upon Ecclesiastical Polity is written merits high praise. Few, if any living Presbyterian divine, could have performed so difficult and delicate a task with more tact and judgment, or popularised without injuring an important question. This work will establish Dr. Witherow's reputation as one of the leading authorities upon ecclesiastical history, when viewed in the light of Scripture.

(5) *The Form of the Christian Temple*: being a Treatise on the Constitution of the New Testament Church. By Thomas Witherow, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in Magee College, Londonderry. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1889. Price 10s. 6d.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY doubtless once received too exclusive attention; to-day it is too much neglected, if not despised. Hence to a great extent may be traced a loss of power in the pulpit. The maudlin sentimentality, unhealthy excitement and unbecoming effeminacy in churches, are due to a wretchedly weak and thin theological diet. Few possibly, when once in the full rush of present-day activities, can secure the requisite leisure for investigating for themselves religious questions, through Patristic, Mediæval, Puritan and Caroline periods of literature. Hence earnest-minded but busy men, as well as regular theological students, should be thankful for the services of the Roosevelt Professor, as a guide through the range of theology by the nearest cuts, consistently with safe traveling (6). The lines are well laid down. All branches of dogma are grouped around its principal subjects, viz., GOD, MAN (it ought to have been "*His creatures, viz., angels and men*"); the GOD-MAN, His Person and Work (possibly there should have been added *The Church*). In the scheme presented there is no natural place for Angelology and Hagiography. As religion, philosophy and science meet in *Theologica Polemica*, it is rightly regarded as an appendix to theology. Again, there is no mistaking the standpoint of the writer. The general type of doctrine is the Augustino-Calvinistic, and it even differs from that of the general run of contemporary treatises by resembling the elder Calvinism rather than the later. The Traducian theory, too, of the origin of the soul, is elaborately maintained, and perhaps gives a tincture to the whole work. Still, whether the theological position be questioned, or in part only be accepted, the reader will find abstruse and knotty questions fairly handled in a powerful and remarkably perspicuous manner; while those who stand by the old as contrasted with modern thought need not be ashamed of their champion. The weakness, for instance, of the Evolutionist theory, as a rival to the Bible account of Creation, has rarely been so strikingly exhibited within a moderate compass, as in chapter VIII. The chief charm of the book is the reducing to a minimum the difficulty and dulness connected with many problems, complex in themselves or rendered so by controversialists.

Dr. Shedd possesses the art and the genius which enables him to express the truths which profound thinkers either saw indistinctly themselves, or were unable by mental exhaustion, or some defect in their mode of thought or training, to present in a straightforward and simple manner.

(6) *Dogmatic Theology*. By William G. T. Shedd, D.D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1889. Price 25s.