

OCTOBER 1889.

The
Theological Monthly

DEFINITIONS WANTED.

It is generally considered somewhat important that when two persons are conversing each should understand the language of the other. Listening to an unknown tongue is neither interesting nor profitable ; yet there is more of this than is generally imagined. Words and phrases with which we have been familiar for years seem to convey some meaning to us, but if we try to translate many of them into terms of exact and clear thought we shall often fail. Such words and phrases are worse than useless, because they not only do not convey any information, but they lead us to imagine that our mental wealth is much greater than is actually the case. To be poor and know it is disagreeable ; but to be poor and think ourselves rich is disastrous. Beyond the deep, however, a lower depth, for bad as may be an unknown tongue, a misunderstood tongue is worse. The former leaves us in ignorance, the latter lands us in error ; and the latter is even more prevalent than the former. For example, Professor Huxley uses the word "infidel" in its general sense, as one who does not believe in certain doctrines ; while the *Spectator* means by it one who is unfaithful to a trust. The one aspect of it is intellectual, and the other moral. Suppose these two arguing whether a certain man were an infidel, one

might say "yes," and the other say "no," and both be right, from their own standpoint. The man might be an atheist, and so be an infidel to one ; but be faithful to any trust he undertook, and thus not be an infidel to the other.

Many discussions of the day, on all subjects, arise not so much from differing thoughts, as from a careless use of words. Sir William Hamilton well says in his *Logic*, "So copious a source of error is the ambiguity of language that a very large proportion of human controversy has been concerning the sense in which certain terms should be understood ; and many disputes have even been fiercely waged in consequence of the disputants being unaware that they agreed in opinion, and only differed in the meaning they attached to the words in which that opinion was expressed."

What we want, therefore, in the first place, is correct definition, so that every important word shall have a definite meaning ; and a meaning in which all agree, in order that it shall convey the same thought to all who use it. There are, of course, perils in definition, especially with reference to religious dogmas ; the peril, for example, of suggesting that all the significance of the word is contained within the definition, or of limiting thought by the assumption that the definition is final. These perils are, however, reduced to a minimum when it is remembered that the main object of definition is to aid uniformity and precision in the expression of thought.

Real definition should be adequate ; the subject defined and the predicate defining being equivalent, or of the same extension ; it should be precise, giving nothing unessential or superfluous ; it should be also perspicuous, the terms should be intelligible and not figurative. A few illustrations will suffice to show the logical incorrectness of definitions in current phraseology on subjects scientific or philosophic, and the absolute necessity for doing something to reduce the present chaos to order. This is necessary in the interests of theology, because there cannot be any line of thought that does not somewhere cross our beliefs regarding God, the soul, and hereafter.

In dealing with the matter of definitions, the meaning of

KNOWLEDGE

demands our primary consideration because of its primary importance. How many discussions and writings are tinted by the varied hues given to this one word. One maintains that we can know God, and yet with greatest inconsistency will say, "I believe in God," as though knowledge and belief were convertible terms. Another, who has an equally strong conviction that God exists, as stoutly asserts that we cannot know God, but only believe in Him; and so "we do" and "we don't," "we can" and "we can't," cannon each other into hopeless confusion; and thus after a circle of noisy assertions the assertors end where they began, in real harmony but apparent discord. Before they started on their turbulent tossings they ought to have determined the meaning they would attach to the word knowledge, or what it was to know anything. They would then have seen that knowledge does not admit of any uncertainty, for what we are uncertain about, or where there can be possible error, we may be said to infer, think, or believe, but we cannot be said to know. This, which must be acknowledged, would have led them to ask the further question, "Where can certainty be found?" and the answer must be, in consciousness alone.

As Sir W. Hamilton says, "Of consciousness I cannot doubt, because such doubt being itself an act of consciousness, would contradict and consequently annihilate itself." Elsewhere he states, "It is at once evident that philosophy, as it affirms its own possibility, must affirm the veracity of consciousness. . . . So far there is, and can be, no dispute; if philosophy be possible, the evidence of consciousness is authentic." But even now we are not in a position to define knowledge, because we have further to decide what we are conscious of, as this tells us what we know. Sir W. Hamilton and others think we are conscious of the *ego* and the *non-ego*. That in perception we are conscious of ourselves as perceiving subjects, and also of an external reality as the object perceived. Others think we are conscious of the *ego* only. In other words, that we are conscious alone of our own mental

states ; that all beyond this is inference ; more or less correct, but still only inference ; and that here the possibility of error is found. It is not the purpose of this paper to argue the point, but to show how useless all controversy about knowing and believing must be till the disputants have agreed about their base. It is clear, however, that if we can know only our own mental states, we cannot *know* God, though our rational conviction as to His existence may be almost as certain as knowledge. It may be as certain as our conviction that there is an external world, for neither do we know that ; and we may be convinced of His existence by the same reasoning that convinces us of the existence of our brother man.

Closely allied to knowledge is the fashionable, but foolish, word

AGNOSTICISM.

One would think there could not be much difference of opinion about the definition of this term ; for if *γνῶσις* be knowledge, then *ἀγνοῖα* must be ignorance. If this meaning be allowed, the term becomes utterly useless, as every one is at the same time gnostic and agnostic. Professor Huxley, however, who introduced the title in its modern sense, defines it as the rigorous application of a single principle, "Try all things ; hold fast by that which is good." But this is not a correct definition, because it is also the very essence of Christianity, and indeed of honesty in every department of thought. The definition is inadequate because the subject defined and the predicate defining are not of the same extension.

If, however, as we are told, the word agnostic was invented as an antithesis to the gnostic of Church history, "agnosticism" ought to be antithetic to gnosticism. But so far is this from being the case that they agree in many important points. Gnosticism and agnosticism both allegorise away in part, or in whole, the great facts of Christ's work and person. They both represent experimental Christianity as knowledge rather than faith, and make knowledge the standard of the moral condition. We may, therefore, well say to them, "Sirs, ye are brethren."

The Professor tells us that agnostics "do not pre-

tend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated nor demonstrable." In so far as this is correct it is not agnosticism, but veracity; but if it be agnosticism, its greatest champion is not an agnostic, for he affirms that the "Christianity that identifies itself with miracles is doomed to fall to the ground;" he also tells us that the coarser teleology has received its death-blow; in other words, that the eye, for example, was not made for the purpose of seeing. But as neither of these statements is "demonstrated nor demonstrable," he pretends what no agnostic can pretend and remain an agnostic.

The term agnosticism, consequently, as the designation of the important school of thought represented by Professor Huxley, is insufficient, illogical, and misleading, and therefore a better name for it is much to be desired.

There is another term more vital than even agnosticism to philosophic science, and one where accurate definition is of the utmost importance, but where, unfortunately, there is confusion of the worst kind; and that is the term

CAUSATION.

Some writers say that cause implies a substance with potency, and consequently we use the word "produced" with reference to any change. Others define it as "that which immediately precedes any change, and which, existing at any time in similar circumstances, has been always, and will be always, followed by a similar change." Power is defined to be nothing more than antecedence. The illustration given by Professor Bain is the falling of a wall when struck by a cannon-ball (injuries, that in order when we pray we may be forgiven). The moving ball he calls the antecedent, and the falling wall the consequent. The ball has no power to knock the wall down; in theory it does not knock the wall down, but the wall falls when struck, and will, somehow, always fall when struck with that weight coming with that velocity. This seems to be coincidence rather than causation. Invariable antecedence is not a definition of causation, because it ignores any necessary connection between

the antecedent and the sequent, and by the constitution of our minds we are compelled to think that the connection is necessary. Dr. Tyndall correctly states that "the scientific mind can find no repose in the mere registration of sequences in nature. The further question intrudes itself with resistless might, Whence comes this sequence? What is it that binds the consequent with its antecedent in nature? The truly scientific intellect never can attain rest until it reaches the forces by which the observed succession was produced." Moreover, the definition is again logically defective, because the extension of subject and predicate is unequal. There are a thousand invariable antecedents to the fall of the wall. There are the manufacture of the gun, the powder, match, etc., without which the ball could not go. These are invariable, but they are not termed the cause. Look at it as we will, this definition is radically defective. It is utterly useless for the disciples of these different schools to attempt any discussion of natural phenomena, till they have determined whether by "causation" they shall mean necessity or chance.

Again, what word is more frequently in use than

NATURE,

and what word is more unnaturally tossed to and fro; we have not a single naturalised usage. It is sometimes opposed to grace, sometimes to ghosts, and sometimes to God. The man who does unnatural things, the theologian would call the natural man; while he of the highest nature is supposed to be the greatest recipient of the supernatural. The exquisite nature of a flower proves it not to be the product of nature. A well-known writer says, "the term embraces all space, all matter, all causes, and all effects!"

In German philosophy it is generally expressive of the world of matter as contrasted with the world of intelligence. In Huxley's *Hume* we find it strangely defined as "that which is; the sum of phenomena presented to the experience; the totality of events, past, present, and to come." "That which is" seems a little too comprehensive, for as it is just possible there may be a God, and as God cannot well be included in a

definition of nature, this definition must be discarded. Indeed, the Professor seems to have thought it too far-reaching, for he immediately limits it to "phenomena presented to experience." Now, as there are myriads of phenomena in the universe which never have been, and never will be, presented to our experience, "that which is" falls far short of that which is. But while in one breath he thus limits "that which is," in the next he extends it to that which is not, but shall be hereafter—"events to come." It will be readily imagined that definitions of this kind will not much aid philosophic thought. Prebendary Reynolds says that "nature means all that exists in time; all that has being in space, material and immaterial; all that we can obtain knowledge of by means of our senses; the outwardness and inwardness of things." This definition is perilously like that of Professor Huxley; for what difference is there between all that exists in time and space and "all that is"? Prebendary Reynolds would be the last to frame any definition of nature that should include God; yet this does, for God most certainly exists in time and space. He may fill both, but He exists in both. Again, if nature includes both the material and immaterial, what is meant by stating that it is "all that we can obtain knowledge of by means of our senses"? Elsewhere the Prebendary speaks of "knowledge of ourselves and of nature." If we be a part of nature, how can there be "ourselves and nature"? A better illustration of this prevalent confusion of thought could scarcely be found than in the title of that deservedly popular work, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. The meaning of this phrase it would not be easy to conjecture. There seems to be a notion that the spiritual world is not natural; because, if it be natural, natural law must, of course, prevail there; and yet it must be natural, as natural law is there. It is all very perplexing, and almost enough to cause one to give up the unnatural study in despair. And yet, a definition free from all ambiguity, and not committing to any Theistic statement, seems feasible. For example, let it be "all that is, minus God." Those who believe in God would thus express the totality of all being by "God and nature," and

those who were without God would express the totality of being, to them, by the one word "nature." The supernatural and the Divine would be synonyms, and all confusion would be avoided. In this "nature" are many modes, but each is already provided with an adjective, such as "angelic," "disembodied," "embodied," "human" and "superhuman," so that all necessities of language are fully met. It would force precision of description, and banish the unbounded vagueness too prevalent at the present time.

Directly resulting from the haziness of the term "nature" is the haze regarding the meaning of

LAWS OF NATURE.

The materialistic philosophy of the day has almost deified "laws of nature." We are told, in fact, that they are omnipotent, producing all phenomena, and inexorable, refusing to be influenced; yet, literally, they have no existence. We speak of the law *of* the land; but there is no law *of* the land, though there is law *for* the land. The law exists not in the land, but in the minds of the legislators; it is the authoritative expression of human will enforced by power. In like manner, laws for nature exist, not in nature, but in the mind of One who has power over nature; they exist in God and not in nature, and are His decisions as to the order in which the phenomena of nature shall be produced. Professor Huxley speaks of the "ascertained or unascertained rules which we call 'laws of nature.'" But who makes the rule? Not the phenomena themselves, because there cannot be a rule made where there is no consciousness; not the human mind, because we have no power to make any "rule" for nature; and as the Professor does not acknowledge any higher mind, his use of the word "rule" must be pronounced defective; besides, a rule is something more than antecedence, and thus it would negate his own theory. It would be much better if this term "law," as applied to nature, were never used at all; or limited to natural theology, as in the great majority of cases it is utterly misleading. What is really meant by law is the observed

ORDER OF NATURE,

or, as it is sometimes named, the "uniformity of nature." This will be made clear by one quotation from Professor Huxley, who, in justly condemning the realism that would make laws of nature agents, says, "A law of nature, in the scientific sense, is the product of a mental operation upon the facts of nature which come under our observation, and has no more existence outside the mind than colour has." This observed order, or uniformity, points to law or rule in a mind; but is not itself that law, any more than the arrest of a thief is the law against theft. It would save a world of misunderstanding if this distinction were carefully observed, and the word "order" used when order was meant, a word about which we are all agreed, and which involves no theory whatever. Especially inappropriate is the use of the term "law" by those who deny all necessity in the successions of phenomena, and all force in their production. Such cannot do more than register sequences in nature; and as such registration shows a certain order, and nothing more, they ought not to be allowed to use any other word than this when they wish to express this fact.

The next aid to clear thought is to determine the exact character of this order, because through neglect of this we have much nonsense talked about the improbability of an answer to prayer, and of miracles. The day for urging the impossibility of miracles has happily passed away. Scientists now see that it is a question of evidence only, but the evidence demanded is all the greater because of their supposed improbability; and they are considered improbable because they are imagined to be deviations from, or violations of, the order of nature. Even so clear a thinker as Dr. Cairns becomes confused here, for he says, in his pamphlet on *Christianity and Miracles*, "It is to be remembered that while, in one sense, miracles set aside law, in another and deeper sense they uphold it." It is evident that by "law" he means "order," for to set aside law is inherently impossible; and in his definition of miracle he speaks of God's ordinary working, but this is the order of nature. If he had first determined what he meant by the order of nature, he would

not have spoken of its being "set aside" or "displaced," or have treated miracle as a "disorder of nature." The observed order, as acknowledged by all schools, may be simply stated in these words, "like antecedents have like consequents." Applying this to a miracle, such as Christ raising a dead man to life, we see that the recognised order of nature is not set aside in the slightest degree; for Christ, with superhuman power, is a new antecedent, and so his action has a new consequent. Thus regarded, a miracle is found to be an illustration of the universal order under "unique conditions," as they are termed by Professor Dubois. At the same time, it must not be thought that, even if such a miracle as has been named did set aside the order of nature, that would be any argument against the miracle; because this order is not the result of any inherent necessity, but only the revelation of the Divine will, and that will could decree any other order as easily as that with which we are familiar. Only, as there is not any violation of that order, nor any interference with the regular course of nature, it is as well that the fact should be thoroughly understood. The position of Professor Huxley, and those who agree with him on this matter, is at once consistent and inconsistent. They say that the question of miracles is one of evidence only. "Theoretically they have no sort of objection to our miracle," that is consistent with science. In all seriousness, however, they may be asked, What evidence would prove to them the activity of God in miracle, when all creation will not prove to them even His existence?

These few illustrations would be incomplete were nothing said about that much-abused word

EVOLUTION.

If ten men were asked, "Do you believe in evolution?" they might all answer "yes," or all answer "no," though no two of them believed alike. By it some mean the working out of a Divine plan, so that the present order of organic life is the manifestation of God's purpose. But how many other theories are there all named "evolution"? Some think everything to be the result of forces immanent in the world itself; others,

such as Czolbe, that organic forms are eternal; while yet others hold that all are the product of the fortuitous course of atoms; and the belief of the Darwinians is, that species are generated by the survival of the fittest. The writer of the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* rightly says that evolution "included all theories respecting the origin and order of the world," of course excepting creationism. This is hopeful, and eminently conducive to concise expression and definite teaching. But Herbert Spencer is the man who puts the confusion in the clearest light. He defines evolution to be "the integration of matter and the concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent heterogeneity, to a definite, coherent homogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation"; or, as he himself puts it in its simplest form, "the integration of matter and the concomitant dissipation of motion." This is clear enough, but it strikes one as being more like involution than evolution. And Spencer confirms this, for he says, "Evolution has other meanings, some of which are incongruous with, and some are even directly opposed to, the meaning here given to it. The evolution of a gas is literally an absorption of motion and disintegration of matter, which is exactly the reverse of what we here call evolution. To evolve, as ordinarily understood, is to unfold, to open, to expand; whereas, as we understand it, it is to contract." Where are we now? We do not wonder that astronomers feel themselves at liberty to call any possible process in space "the evolution of stellar worlds." Sometimes it is the clashing of meteorites into gas, sometimes it is the condensation of gas into meteorites, sometimes it is both; but whichever it be, it is this chameleon evolution. If we are to take into account the origin of the word, it would appear as though the Theist were the only one who had a right to the term, for he believes it to be the unfolding of predestined order. Nothing can be unfolded where there is nothing to unfold; and in any non-Theistic theory there is not anything to unfold. The better generic term for these non-Theistic

hypotheses would be "the Becoming Hypothesis," for it is only the fact of "becoming" that they affirm; and both Hegel and Schelling conceive that the problem of existence is one of "becoming." What kind of a chemistry should we have if acids, alkalies, and salts, sulphates, carbonates, and nitrates had only one name? Why should there not be a terminology, as exact as that of chemistry, found in every department of scientific thought?

The list of definitions wanted might be greatly extended, and illustrations given of the hopeless confusion that arises from their absence, but the want of space prevents it. Enough has been said to show that something must be done, but what? How are we to obtain such a general consent in the use of leading terms as shall make misunderstanding difficult, and thus get some hope of mental progress, of diminishing the number of controversies, and of realising more clearly the great agreements that underlie our differences. Surely this is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Would it be possible to have a conference of the leading men of different schools of thought—a sort of temporary happy family—who for once should agree to differ, who would meet to determine in what sense certain words should for the future be employed. It might be difficult to divest some of these terms of the different, or opposite, meanings they have borne, and of a consequent teaching power they possess; but as in every phrase of argument there is some ground common to all, this might decide the usage, and disputed points be represented by words employed as algebraic symbols, carrying in themselves no controversial significance. Be this as it may, there cannot be any doubt that much might somehow be done towards lifting the fog. It has been said, and with some truth, that "there are too many conferences already;" but these are mostly on minor matters, and do not bar the way for one on a subject of such moment as this—and there can be little doubt that earnest thinkers on all sides would welcome anything that tended to bring them nearer, both as students and as men.

JAMES MCCANN.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS SELF-INTERPRETED.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS UPON THE METHOD OF STRUCTURAL DISPLAYS.

IN the matter of Biblical aids little attention has been paid to the method of structural displays of the sacred text itself. Indeed, this department of literary enterprise is one of the few now unoccupied, which, if rightly utilised, would much promote the intelligent study of the Word and the more profitable use of commentaries and similar helps. The ordinary procedure with Bible readers is not productive of the highest results, and inevitably limits the horizon of truth. To take a cogently if not closely reasoned treatise as a collection of isolated texts, and to pore over voluminous notes upon single verses without remembering that such single verses are an integral part of an organic whole, is, to say the least, far from a natural, wise, or satisfactory course: still it is frequently adopted.

Of all styles of writing none seems more to demand an entirely different treatment from this than the Pauline Letters. Here, so speak, we must not linger examining the details in the valley before first viewing the landscape from the summit, and discerning the relation between the various parts and their harmony with the whole scene. In a word, the logical reasoning and spiritual train of thought must be grasped in order to obtain a clear understanding of the epistolary portions of the New Testament, whether viewed in their separate parts or as an entire whole.

Of the several analyses furnished by competent hands, few fail to serve useful purposes; yet none have proved themselves generally acceptable, while sometimes they are regarded as bewildering rather than enlightening. The reason for this is not far to seek. Too many writers, whether consciously or not, seem to start out with the erroneous notion that either an Epistle was written from a fixed plan, or if not, yet by

some over-ruling providence it turned out to be the same as if so composed. There is little doubt that had the Pauline Epistles been penned from a previously arranged skeleton, skilled analysts would have been able before this to have practically reproduced it, and such would have served as a sufficient key to the general drift of the reasoning. But the failure to obtain this skeleton, coupled with the fact of the easy and unartificial style of Paul, clearly shows that none such existed or was used.

Still, this does not justify the view that there is no line of argument and any attempt to trace it is as futile as to frame a complete harmony of the four Gospels. In each Epistle we have a topic, or set of topics, worked out in the least artificial manner possible consistent with the laws which must govern all true reasoning. The connection of the whole, and the connection between the parts, cannot be readily followed by the means of an ordinary synopsis; such a method does not suit the special exigencies of the case. We require a much more natural and simple aid in order to observe the spontaneous flow of ideas. To appreciate the force and beauty of the reasoning, we need the power of tracing at every stage the movements of thoughts, without distracting artificial attempts to fit into a prescribed shape what defies such adjustments. In regard to compositions untrammelled by formal and artificial rules, a structural display in which the parts are integrated seems the proper and natural substitute for the regular analysis. A cut-and-dry method is singularly out of place. A key is no use to a keyless watch. In such cases, the right course is in stereoscopic fashion, to make the literary effort in all its parts stand up, as if by the stroke of a magic wand, before the admiring spectator as a self-exhibited whole. In other words, by some typographical ingenuity the Epistles of Paul must be made self-interpreting. Some means must be devised to render manifest to the eye of the reader every turn the mind of the writer takes, so that the travelling along the main roads of thought and the détours may appear without any ill-fitting structural framework or interspersed explanations.

To accomplish the task, we have proceeded upon the definite and simple principle of grammatical analysis stripped of its technical and uninviting phraseology, made eloquent to the eye and treated as the handmaid to logical reasoning and spiritual teaching. *Divide et impera* has been our guiding motto. Each sentence, and often each clause, have been so distributed that the correlations are shown at a glance by the degree of their indentations. As the thoughts flow from the pen of the Apostle, so they are, by the mode of presentation here adopted, readily received, and their naturalness felt almost as if springing from the reader's own mind. The collateral advantages of such a plan are numerous. Upon the minutest parts of a long paragraph the reader can rest, and stop leisurely and deliberately to weigh its meaning without losing the threads of the argument, and can at pleasure continue his reading without any inconvenience arising from the pause. The power of mentally removing each piece for separate examination, and the replacing it without disturbing the context, prevents it being left unconsidered, and at the same time fixes its import in an easy manner, and shows its place as a link in the logical chain.

Perhaps no portion of Scripture needs in a greater degree the employment of typographical contrivances than the Epistle to the Ephesians, on account of the extraordinary length of some of its sentences. For instance, in the first chapter, verses 3-14, containing 202 words in the Greek, and 269 in the English (R.V.), and verses 15-23, containing 167 words in the Greek, and 208 in the English (R.V.), though without a full stop, yet really form in both cases a series of sentences pregnant with truths which open up wide vistas of thoughts.

In popular writing, short and terse sentences are usually desirable; but in efforts of the highest order, long sentences have often a most important purpose to serve, and when once thoroughly mastered the reader would regard as literary sacrilege any attempt to break them up after the accustomed modern piecemeal fashion.

In regard to massive English classical writers, when the sentences are displayed as above all hermeneutical difficulty practically ceases. But the case is different with respect to the Pauline Epistles, which are not complete and systematic treatises (not even the Epistles to the Romans or the Hebrews), but writings in which the ideas are unusually compressed—due in a great measure to circumstances of the moment—and growing out of each other without any fixed or arbitrary laws. Consequently side-notes, apart altogether from the text of the Epistle, are given in order to signify the functions which each clause or phrase fulfils as discovered by the natural force of its connecting words. In some instances the reader might feel these remarks are unneeded, and might have been well omitted; but it is impossible to say what help of this kind could be omitted on account of the different training and aptitude of readers, and also on account of the varying mood of even the same reader. Besides, there is an evident advantage in such helps being furnished by one mind upon a definite principle and with special regard to the harmonious presentation of the connecting logical links.

It was also felt that a few headings giving brief summaries of each paragraph would be regarded as welcome stepping-stones, even if they served no higher function. These few insertions across the page in different type will not be found to interfere with the aim steadily kept in mind throughout, viz., that, while typographical arrangements should be unmistakable and pleasing to the eye, yet the Scripture text itself, however distributed for educational purposes, should be preserved and presented in unbroken entirety.

The uses of such a display will be found to be various. This method will tend to make the public reading of the Bible more intelligent and effective, since grammatical analysis is a prime necessity of good reading. It will afford guidance to the expositor, and also furnish topics upon single texts. It will enable the ordinary reader to grasp the meaning of an Epistle as a whole quickly and effectively, certainly more so than reading it with the sacred text printed in the usual manner.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS SELF-INTERPRETED:

A STRUCTURAL DISPLAY OF THE TEXT WITH PARAGRAPH HEADINGS AND SIDE-NOTES.

	CH. I. ver.	
Writer and his apostolic authority.....	1	Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God,
Persons addressed		To the saints which are at Ephesus, and the faithful in Christ Jesus :
Blessings sought.....	2	Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
Ascription of praise for redemptive blessings.		
<i>(This forms an introduction to the following prayer.)</i>		
Ascription of praise to God in which he is declared to be blessed.....	3	Blessed <i>be</i> the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,
Reason why God is to be blessed: because he has blessed usWho hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly <i>places</i> in Christ :
Mode of, and reason for, God blessing us (viz. his electing us)	4Even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world,
Present moral purpose of election.....	That we should be holy and without blemish before him in love :
Process in its bestowal (viz. foreordinating us) ..	5Having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself,
Principle, rule, and ground of foreordination....	According to the good pleasure of his will,
Primary design of this act	6To the praise of the glory of his grace,
Gratuitous nature and source of the grace thus exhibitedWhich he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved :
Specifications of the blessings (referred to in ver. 3): viz. Redemption and Forgiveness	7In Whom we have {our Redemption through his blood, the Forgiveness of our trespasses,
Principle, rule, and ground of redemptive blessings	8According to the riches of his grace, Which he made to abound towards us
Sphere in and direction along which the abounding grace of these blessings movesIn all wisdom and prudence,
Form in which the grace abounded	9Having made known to us the mystery of his will,
Principle, rule, and ground of the revelation ...	10According to his good pleasure, Which he purposed in him
Intention of the Divine purpose in Christ in accordance with which the gift was bestowed..	Unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times,

Explanation of this Divine purpose
 Accomplishment of these blessings in the case of
 believers
 Giving us a title in Christ to the privileges of
 redemption
 Process of the bestowal of this privilege (viz. fore-
 ordinating us)
 Principle, rule, and ground of foreordination....
 Primary design of redemptive endowments
 Description of the persons blessed.....
 Security of perfect redemptive blessings in the
 case of his readers
 Sealing of them with the Spirit
 Significance of this sealing
 Divine purpose involved therein
 As relating to man.....
 As relating to God.....

Reasons which called forth his thanks
 [His own knowledge of their spiritual status
 (already stated)].....
 Confirmatory reports of the same
 Expression of his thanks in the form of prayer....
 Purpose including purport of his prayer
 Result of the prayed-for spirit of wisdom....
 Purpose of the enlightenment following it....
 Measure of the power bestowed in the case of
 believers, and made known to those enlightened

.....To sum up all things { in Christ { the things in the heavens, and
 { the things upon the earth ;
 { in him, *I say*,
 11In Whom also we were made a heritage, (*ἐκκληρώθεν*)
Having been foreordained
According to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his will ;
 12To the end that we should be unto the praise of his glory,
We who had before hoped in Christ :
 13In Whom ye also, having heard { the word of the truth, } ye were sealed
 { the gospel of your salvation, } with the Holy
 In Whom, having also believed, Spirit of promise,
 Which is an earnest of our inheritance,
 14Unto the redemption of God's own possession (*τῆς περιποιήσεως*),
Unto the praise of his glory.

**The Apostle's Thanksgiving in the form of prayer for his readers' illumina-
 tion as to the glories of redemptive blessings.**

15 ...For this cause
 I also,
 ...Having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus { which is among you, and
 { which *ye shew* toward all the saints,
 16 Cease not to give thanks for you, making mention *of you* in my prayers ;
 17 ...That { the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, } may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and
 { the Father of glory, } revelation in the knowledge of him ;
 18Having the eyes of your heart enlightened,
 { what is the hope of his calling,
 19That ye may know { what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and
 { what the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe,
According to that working of the strength of his might

Description of this power as displayed in Christ when raised	CH I. ver. 20Which he wrought in Christ, when he	{ raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly <i>places</i> ,
Expiation upon the glories of the risen Saviour. As to the nature and extent of His exaltation ..	21Far above	{ all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, { not only in this world, but also in that which is to come :
As to His sovereignty, especially over His Church	22And he	{ put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church,
Description of the Church in relation to its Sovereign Head, in order to show its Divine endowments.....	23Which is	{ his body, the fulness (<i>πλήρωμα</i>) of him that filleth all in all.
First Address after Prayer in which he takes a survey of their spiritual history in order to show their experience of the redemptive privileges.			
Statement of their experiencing when morally dead a quickening power similar to that which raised Christ	CH II. ver. 1	And I	You <i>did he quicken</i> , when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins,
Prevailing direction in which they moved. [This shews the extent of their deadness]	2Wherein aforetime ye walked	{ according to the course of this world, of the power of the air, according to the prince { of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience ;
Identity of the moral condition of Jew and Gentile	3Among whom we also all once lived	{ in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind,
Their like state of condemnation	4And were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest :—but God,	...Being rich in mercy,
Principle and special motive which led to the Divine intervention	5	5	For his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, Quickened us together with Christ
Statement that they were subjects of God's quickening grace(By grace have ye been saved), and
Mention of the principle upon which they were saved, in order to remove misgivings as to the reality of their present state of privilege ...			
Statement that they were subjects of God's resurrectionary and glorifying power.....	6	Raised us up with him, and Made us to sit with him in the heavenly <i>places</i> , in Jesus Christ :	

Purpose of these acts of Divine intervention . . .
 Confirmatory explanation of the Divine grace
 in these acts

Statement of the perfectly gratuitous nature of this
 Divine salvation

Proof that salvation is due to grace entirely and
 not to works

Explanation as to the origin of good works in
 order to show that they form no ground of
 merit

Direction to recollect their former heathen condition,
 in which they were not marked out for blessing . .
 Mention of the sobriquet given to them by the
 Jews (often in a mistaken spirit) indicating
 their distance from covenant privileges

Direction to recollect their former exclusion from
 spiritual privileges, and also their hopeless
 position

Consequence of their state of exclusion

Statement of (really a direction to recollect) their
 present near and blessed position as sharers of
 common redemptive privileges

Explanation of the way in which they were
 brought near in Christ

The way in which Christ removed the
 occasion of the estrangement (viz. the
 law viewed as a system of privilege)
 between Jew and Gentile

Ultimate purpose of this removal

7 ...That in the ages to come he might shew { the exceeding riches of his grace
 8For by grace have ye been saved through faith ; { in kindness toward us in Christ Jesus :

9And that { not of yourselves : *it is* the gift of God :
 { not of works, that no man should glory.

10For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works,
Which God afore prepared that we should walk in them.

**Second Address after Prayer, in which attention is called to the contrast
 between their present and past position, thus further showing the
 glories of their redemptive privileges.**

Wherefore

11 Remember,
 ...That aforesaid ye, the Gentiles in the flesh,
Who are called Uncircumcision
 By that which is called Circumcision, in the flesh, made by hands ;
That ye were at that time { separate from Christ,
 { alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and
 { strangers from the covenants of the promise,
 { having no hope and without God in the world.

12That ye were at that time {

13 ...But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ.

14For he is our peace, who { made both one, and
 { brake down the middle wall of partition,

15Having abolished in his flesh { the enmity, *even*
 { the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances ;
That he might create in himself of the twain one new man,
 making peace ;

	CH. II. ver.	
Primary purpose of this removal	16And might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, Having slain the enmity thereby :
Further explanation of the way in which they were brought near in Christ, and share in common blessings	17And he came and preached { peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh :
Illustration of the work of Christ in bringing nigh of Jews and Gentiles, and of the eminence of their position	18For through him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.
Consequence of the reconciling work of Christ, and also a further explanation of the fact of the Gentile's nearness and blessedness	19So then { ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are { fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God,
Rationale of their privileged position Their admission into the Church whose head is Christ	20Being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone ;
The harmonious growth of the Church ..	21In whom { the whole (πᾶσα) building, } groweth into a holy temple in the Lord ; fitly framed together, }
Their admission to full privileges	22In whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.
	CH. III. ver.	
Exhortation based on their enjoyment of privileges (begun but broken off before finished)	I	...For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus in behalf of you Gentiles,
Assumption of their knowledge about his being entrusted with the apostleship to the Gentiles ..	2	...If so be that ye have heard of the dispensation { of that grace of God which was given me to you-ward ;
Nature of the knowledge upon this point	3How that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery,
Reason for assuming such knowledge on their part upon matters formerly a Mystery (<i>i.e.</i> , a secret) but now revealed	4As I wrote afore in few words, Whereby, when ye read, ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of Christ ; Which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, As it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit ;
Purport of the Mystery respecting the admission of the Gentiles.....	5To wit, that the Gentiles are { fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel,

Declaration of his appointment as Apostle to the
 Gentiles
 Divine power displayed therein
 Further declaration of his appointment despite
 personal unworthiness
 Sphere and duties of his apostolic office

Divine purpose of this apostleship to the Gentiles..

Personal experience of full admission to spiritual
 privileges through his apostleship
 Entreaty founded upon the certainty and glory of
 their spiritual knowledge.....

Prompting motive to his prayer

[Full admission of the Gentiles to spiritual
privileges].....

Purpose including purport of the prayer

Result of the prayed-for inward strengthening
 Consequence of the indwelling of Christ following
 the inward strengthening.....

Objects contemplated in the prayer for Christ's in-
dwelling and consequent steadfastness in love

Purpose of being strong in knowledge of Christ's
love.....

7 Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of that grace of God
 Which was given me according to the working of his power.
 8 Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, was this grace given,
 To preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ ; and
 9 To make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery
 Which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things ;
 10 To the intent that now
 Unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly *places*
 Might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God,
 11 According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord :
 12 In whom we have boldness and access in confidence through our faith in him.
 13 Wherefore I ask that ye faint not at my tribulations for you,
 Which are your glory.

Prayer for their Spiritual enrichment, viz., for the gift of inward strength
 the knowledge of the love of God, and the possession of the fulness
 of God.

14 For this cause
 I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom the whole family { in heaven and } is named,
 { on earth }
 16 That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory,
 That ye may be strengthened with power through his spirit in the inward man ;
 17 That Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith ;
 18 To the end that ye,
 Being rooted and grounded in love,
 May be strong
 To apprehend with all the saints what is the { breadth and length and } and
 { height and depth, }
 19 To know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge,
 That ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God.

CH. III. ver. 20 **Doxology arising from the contemplation of the Divine purposes in regard to the Church.**
 Now
 Unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly { above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us,
 21 Unto him *be* the glory { in the church and in Christ Jesus } unto all generations for ever and ever. Amen.

CH. IV. ver. 1 **Exhortation to walk worthily of the Christian calling, especially in regard to the principle of unity which is consistent with diversity of gifts.**
 I I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you
 2 ...To walk { worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love ;
 3 giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. one body, and
 4 *There is* { one Spirit, Even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling ;
 5 one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all,
 6 Who is over all, and through all, and in all.
 7But unto each one of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ.
 8Wherefore he saith,
 When he ascended on high, he { led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.
 (Now this,
 9He ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?
 10He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens, That he might fill all things.)
 11And he gave some { some *to be* apostles ; and some, prophets ; and some, evangelists ; and some, pastors and teachers ;
For the perfecting of the saints,

Prompting motive for exhortation [Their admission to such glorious privileges]....
 Exhortation to various duties, especially unity...
 Inculcation of unity
 Further inculcation of unity by specifying the purpose for which the grace of Christ was given..
 Scripture predictions of such gifts to be bestowed..
 A brief comment in order to show the pertinency of the quotation
 General purposes involved of Christ's ascension....
 Further specification of the general purpose for which the grace was given
 Ends (ultimate and immediate) of this gift of grace

Limit to the continuance, as well as future accomplishment of these designed ends Negative purpose contemplated in such arrangements..... Positive purpose contemplated Reason for this growing up in Christ..... Rationale of growth in Christ as the Head.....	12 13 14 15 16	Unto the work of ministering, Unto the building up of the body of Christ :Till we all attain unto the unity { of the faith, and } unto a full-grown man, { of the knowledge of the } unto the measure of the stature { Son of God, } of the fulness of Christ :That we may be no longer children, { tossed to and fro and } { carried about with every wind of doctrine, By the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error ;But speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things into him,Which is the head, <i>even</i> Christ ;From whom all the body fitly framed and knit togetherThrough that which every joint supplieth, According to the working in <i>due</i> measure of each several part, Maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love.
Exhortation to them as enjoying full spiritual privileges to walk not according to Gentile, but Christian principles.		
Warning against a walk inconsistent with their present spiritual status Sphere in which not to walk Causes leading to such a walk Description of the heathen whose walk they were not to imitate..... Statement (in the nature of an appeal) as to the opposite nature of the lessons taught them in the school of Christ Grounds justifying this appeal Lesson taught them in the school of Christ.... Enforcement of this lesson Further lesson in the school of Christ	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, ...That ye no longer walk as the Gentiles also walk,In the vanity of their mind,Being { darkened in their understanding, } because of the ignorance that is in them, { alienated from the life of God } because of the hardening of their heart ;Who being past feeling gave themselves up { to lasciviousness, { to work all uncleanness with greediness. But ye did not so learn Christ ; ...If so be that ye { heard him, and } { were taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus :That ye put away, as concerning your former manner of life, the old man, ..Which waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit ; and That ye { be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and } { put on the new man,

	Ch. IV. ver. 24Which after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth.
Enforcement of this second lesson.....		
Reason for following precepts. [General character of the new man as con- trasted with the old.].....	25	...Wherefore,
Precepts.		
1st. Against falsehood, with recommendation of opposite course.....		Putting away falsehood, Speak ye truth each one with his neighbour :
Enforcement of the recommended course		...For we are members one of another.
2nd. Against sinful anger.....	26	Be ye angry, and sin not :
Rule to regulate anger.Let not the sun go down upon your wrath :
Reason for so regulating anger.....	27	...Neither give place to the devil.
3rd. Against theft, with recommendation of the opposite course.....	28	Let him that stole steal no more : but rather Let him labour, working with his hands the thing that is good, ...That he may have whereof to give to him that hath need.
Contemplated object of such advice.....		
4th. Against foul language, with recommendation of the opposite course.....	29	Let { no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth, but { such as is good for edifying as the need may be,
Contemplated object of such advice.That it may give grace to them that hear. And
5th. Against grieving the Spirit.....	30	Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, ...In whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption.
Enforcement of this duty.		
6th. Against all forms of unkindness, with re- commendation of opposite course	31	Let all { bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and } be put away from you, with all malice : and { clamour, and railing,
Motive for the recommended course.....	32	Be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving each other, ...Even as God also in Christ forgave you.
	Ch. V. ver.	Exhortation to various fundamental duties of the Christian life.
Exhortations.		
1st. To be imitators of God.	1	Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children ; and
2nd. To walk in love.....	2	Walk in love, even as Christ also { loved you, and gave { himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell. But

3rd. To avoid fornication, covetousness, and all forms of impurity.....

4th. To give thanks as a substitute to carnal lusts.....
Enforcement of foregoing exhortations...

5th. Not to allow any one to palliate the above sins
Enforcement of this duty.....

6th. Not to be sharers in palliation of such practices.....
Enforcement of this duty.....

7th. To walk as children of light.....
Enforcement of this duty on account of the benefits and beauty of such a walk...
Criterion to test the fulfilment of this duty.....

8th. To have no fellowship with heathen practices but rather to reprove them.....
Enforcement of the duty of such reproof.

Statement of the purpose of such reproof
Encouragement to fulfilling this duty ...
Scripture illustration of the necessity of this duty and of the advantages accruing from its performance

9th. To walk strictly.....
Manner in which they were to show this walk

10th. Not to be senselessly ignorant, but to know how each opportunity is to be used

11th. Not be drunken

Enforcement of this direction.....

3 Fornication, and }
All uncleanness, or } let it not even be named among you, as becometh saints ; nor
Covetousness, }
4 Filthiness, nor foolish talking, or jesting, which are not befitting : but rather
Giving of thanks.
5 ...For this ye know of a surety,
That { no fornicator, } hath any inheritance in
nor unclean person ; } the kingdom of Christ and God.
nor covetous man, which is an idolator, }
6 Let no man deceive you with empty words :
...For because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience.
7 Be ye not therefore partakers with them ;
8 ...For ye were once darkness, but are now light in the Lord :
9 Walk as children of light
...(For the fruit of the light is in all goodness and righteousness and truth),
10 ...Proving what is well-pleasing unto the Lord ; and
11 Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather even reprove them ;
12 ...For the things which are done by them in secret it is a shame even to speak of.
13 ...But all things when they are reprov'd are made manifest by the light :
.....For everything that is made manifest is light.
14Wherefore *he* saith,
Awake, thou that sleepest, and
Arise from the dead, and
Christ shall shine upon thee.
15 Look therefore carefully how ye walk,
16 Not as unwise, but as wise ; } because the days are evil. Wherefore
Redeeming the time, }
17 Be ye not foolish, but understand what the will of the Lord is. And
18 Be not drunken with wine,
...Wherein is riot, but

	CH. V. ver.	
12th. To be filled with the Spirit		Be filled with the Spirit ;
Way in which being filled with the Spirit would find expression	19	...Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, Singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord ;
	20	Giving thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ { to God, even the Father ;
	21	Subjecting yourselves one to another in the fear of Christ.
Exhortation to the right performance of the six principal relative duties.		
Relative Duties		
1st. Of wives to husbands	22	Wives, <i>be in subjection</i> unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.
Enforcement of this direction	23	...For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, <i>Being</i> himself the Saviour of the body. But
(Mention of one respect of difference between the headships)		
Reassertion of the duty of wives	24	As the church is subject to Christ, so <i>let</i> the wives also <i>be</i> to their husbands in everything.
2nd. Of husbands to wives	25	Husbands, love your wives, ...Even as Christ also { loved the church, and gave himself up for it ;
Pattern of the husband's love to be found in Christ for the Church		
Purposes (immediate and ultimate) of Christ's self-sacrificing love	26That he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, That he might present the church to himself a glorious <i>church</i> ,
Manner in which the Church was to be presented as the effect of Christ's love ..	27Not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing ; But that it should be holy and without blemish.
Reassertion of the duty of husbands	28	Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies. ...He that loveth his own wife loveth himself :
Axiom upon which the argument rests ..		
Explanation of how this axiom acted upon would lead to husbands rightly loving their wives	29For no man ever hated his own flesh ; but nourisheth and cherisheth it,Even as Christ also the church ;Because we are members of his body.
Mention again of the comparison of Christ as the pattern of conjugal love	30	
Reason why Christ nourishes the Church	31	For this cause { shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife : and the twain shall become one flesh.
Statement of the duties involved in the closeness of the conjugal relations		
Statement of the mystery of the marriage tie in itself, and still more so in its spiritual correspondence	32	This mystery is great : but I speak in regard of Christ and of the church. Nevertheless

Practical conclusion in regard to the mutual duties of husband and wife

3rd. Of children to parents

Motives for obedience to parents

On the ground of natural law

On the ground of revealed law

Incidental mention of the special acceptableness to God of such obedience

On the ground of personal profit

4th. Of parents to children.

5th. Of servants to masters.

Characteristics to mark their obedience..

Light in which servants were to regard their masters

Reason why they were to perform their service in such a spirit

6th. Of masters to their servants.

Reason why masters should rightly discharge their duties

Exhortations.

1st. To be strong in the Lord

2nd. To put on the whole armour of God.

33 Do ye also severally love each one his own wife even as himself; and
Let the wife see that she fear her husband.

CH. VI.
 ver. I Children, obey your parents in the Lord :

2 ...For this is right.
 ...Honour thy father and mother

3(Which is the first commandment with promise),
That { it may be well with thee, and
 thou mayest live long on the earth. And,
 4 Ye Fathers, { provoke not your children to wrath : but
 nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord.
 5 Servants, be obedient unto them that according to the flesh are your masters,
 6 ...With fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ ;
 Not in the way of eyeservice, as menpleasers ;
 But as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart ;
 7 ...With good will doing service, as unto the Lord, and not unto men :
 8Knowing that { whatsoever good thing each one doeth,
 the same shall he receive again from the Lord, whether *he be* { bond or } And,
 9 Ye Masters, { do the same things unto them, and
 forbear threatening :
 ...Knowing that { both their Master and yours is in heaven, and
 there is no respect of persons with him.

Exhortation to put on the Christian armour, to prayer generally, and to special prayer for the Apostle, that he might be courageous in his imprisonment.

Finally,

10 Be strong { in the Lord, and
 in the strength of his might.
 11 Put on the whole armour of God,

THE QUESTION OF INSPIRATION.

PAPER NO. II.

HAVING ascertained the estimate of the Old Testament Scriptures entertained by our Lord and His Apostles, having shown that they regarded the entire record as inspired of God in its minutest historical details, as well as in its doctrinal statements, having seen that it was written under an actuating energy of the Holy Ghost which extended to the language employed by the sacred writers, we are now prepared to consider the claims of the New Testament to be regarded as the offspring of the same Divine agency in the same sense and to the same extent. It may facilitate our inquiry if we consider,

- I. The task assigned the New Testament writers, and
- II. Their native fitness to carry it into execution.

I. *The task assigned the writers.* This was no ordinary undertaking. We cannot separate it from the burden laid upon their predecessors of the old dispensation. Those men of the twilight left to their successors the task of expounding what they themselves understood not. *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet; Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet.* The New Testament, in its essential truths, lay hidden and veiled in the Old, and upon the New Testament writers and preachers devolved the task of lifting the veil and bringing forth the priceless, hidden treasure into the light of Gospel day. It behoved them to show that all things which were written in the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms concerning the person and mission of the Messiah have had their fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth. It was theirs to do what neither Moses nor the Prophets could do. They were commissioned to interpret the types and symbols of a shadowy dispensation, demonstrating their accomplishment in the mediatorial office of Christ. Under their hands the carnal ordinances of the Ceremonial Law were to start into spiritual life through the realisation of all they foreshadowed in the person and work of the Redeemer.

Such was their task ; and it is not too much to claim that the mere outline of it is sufficient to show that the men who should execute it must surpass the greatest of Israel's prophets.

II. This leads us to consider their native qualifications. On this point there does not seem to be much room for debate. Judging from their previous positions and engagements in life, they were not the men one would have deemed likely to possess the talents or culture necessary for such work. In harmony with the design of the economy of grace, the treasure was committed to earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power might be of God, and not of the agents He employed. John Stuart Mill, in his *Essay on Theism* (p. 252), puts the case with much force. "Who among the disciples of Jesus or among the proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels? Certainly not the fishermen of Galilee ; as certainly not St. Paul." It is true the Apostles had the great advantage of personal intercourse with our Lord for three years ; but notwithstanding the unspeakable privileges thus enjoyed, they gave evidence up to the very close of His ministry of an utter misconception of the nature of His kingdom and the means by which it was to be established. The sons of Zebedee were admonished for their misconception regarding the spirit of the Gospel they were afterwards to proclaim, and Peter received a stern rebuke for his ignorance of the one great central truth to which the whole Mosaic economy bore witness, viz., the doctrine of expiation through the shedding of blood, which must be regarded as the organic principle of both dispensations. He showed that he was not the man to give voice and utterance to the symbols and types of that ancient sacrificial economy. He had no conception of the necessity of Christ's death, or of the relation it sustained to the sacrifices that were under the law, or to the expiation of human guilt. Nor was Peter alone in this ignorance of type and antitype. The death of Christ took all His disciples by surprise. The language of the two disciples as they journeyed towards Emmaus expressed the common views and feelings

of the whole band. "We trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel" (Luke xxiv. 21). They had no idea that the redemption of Israel must be achieved through the Messiah's death.

It is true the Apostle Paul stands out pre-eminent above all the New Testament writers. His training under Jewish rabbis, who were learned in the sacred Scriptures, one might think, gave him peculiar advantages in the exposition of Moses and the Prophets. He profited in the religion of the Jews above many his equals in his own nation (Gal. i. 14); yet he never ascribes his knowledge of the Gospel he preached to his previous training or to his personal unaided duties. The Gospel he proclaimed he neither received from man, nor was taught it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. i. 12). Of course, the reference here is to revelation, and not to inspiration, to the informing of Paul himself, and not to the communication of that same information through him to others. The former, however, was subordinate to the latter, as the subsequent context (v. 16) shows. God revealed His Son in Paul (*iva*), in order that he might preach Him among the Gentiles. The revelation made to Paul was not for the sake of Paul alone, or for his own personal enlightenment in the way of life as its ultimate end. He was enlightened that he might enlighten others; and it is certainly not a strained inference to conclude that as great care would be taken to secure accuracy in the latter case as in the former. More of this, however, when we come to speak of the Apostle's own testimony on this point.

This estimate of the native qualifications and culture of the men employed to unfold the truths of the Old Testament dispensation is fully confirmed by the achievements of the Jewish rabbis in this department. We have specimens of their comments on the oracles committed to their care in the Talmud. These comments may be taken as fair illustrations of the views of the very ablest of them in regard to the import of the writings of Moses and the Prophets. In view of the trivial questions they have singled out for discussion, and the foolish and absurd conclusions they have arrived at, and the

rules they have laid down for the guidance of their disciples, we may fairly ask the opponents of a thorough verbal inspiration whether they would regard these men as capable of writing the Gospels or Epistles? If such rabbis were the biblical literati of the Apostolic age, we must conclude that the age was incapable of producing the writings presented in the New Testament revelation. The writers were all Jews, accustomed to Jewish modes of thought; and in view of this fact, it is hard to conceive how such men could have produced writings at variance with Jewish prejudices and in manifest antagonism with the most cherished convictions of the Jewish race. Apart from an inspiration extending to both thought and language, the Scriptures of the new dispensation had never been written by their reputed authors. All that is necessary to satisfy any intelligent mind of the justice of this verdict is simply to place these writings side by side with the Talmud.

In harmony with this estimate of the qualifications of the Apostles for the execution of the task assigned them is the verdict of the Lord Himself. He did not regard them as qualified to enter upon their mission either as speakers or writers, even though they had accompanied Him, going out and in with Him for the space of three years. Notwithstanding all the instruction they had received through His own immediate personal intercourse, He enjoined it upon them that they should await the promise of the Father, tarrying in Jerusalem until they should be endued with power from on high. His estimate of the nature and extent of the endowment they needed may be gathered from what took place on the day of Pentecost. Surely the gift of tongues was an endowment extending to language and determining it. Those on whom it was bestowed spake with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. There can be no doubt that the agency of the inspiring Spirit extended to the language employed by Peter and the other speakers on that memorable occasion. To enable one to speak in a tongue previously unknown is to furnish him with a vocabulary, and with skill to use it, discriminating, among shades of meanings, the one

best suited to give accurate expression to the thought as it struggles onward towards the birth, for it is never matured thought until it is expressed in words.

Whether, then, we consider the task, or the men employed to execute it, or the training they underwent, or the estimate of their qualifications expressed by their Master, or the provision He made for their full equipment, we must conclude that, apart from a supernatural agency, such as the verbal theory of inspiration implies, the task had never been executed at all, or else had been executed in a manner so imperfect as to preclude the acceptance of the record as an authoritative rule of faith and practice.

Passing from these unquestionable facts, let us hear what views the writers of the New Testament entertained regarding their relation to the inspiring Spirit, and His actuating energy as He moved them onward in their work.

On this subject the Apostle Paul bears remarkable and most decisive testimony in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (chap. ii.). He is meeting charges preferred against himself as a preacher. There were some in the Church at Corinth who thought him deficient in philosophical acquirements, and looked upon his addresses as lacking rhetorical finish. His reply to the former charge is, that the subjects he was commissioned to proclaim were such as the heart of man had never conceived; subjects, therefore, which transcended human philosophy, and which he and others, his fellow-servants, had received by revelation. They were subjects which none could reveal save the Spirit of God, who knows the mind of God even as the spirit of man knows the things of a man.

With regard to the other charge, he informs his critics that he was not left at liberty respecting the language in which he was to clothe these heaven-revealed truths, as he set them forth before the minds of others. These things he and his commissioned brethren spake not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but in the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, or combining spiritual things with spiritual words—that is, words

given by the Spirit. The claim here advanced by the Apostle is a claim not only for himself, but for his official brethren also, who were chosen instruments, as he was, to make known to men the will of God. Of both he affirms that the words in which they gave utterance to the truths revealed to them were not words which man's wisdom teacheth, but words taught them by the Holy Ghost. In both instances the resultant record was divinely determined in its *form* as well as in its *matter*, in its *language* as well as in its *thought*.

The absolute necessity of such action on the part of the inspiring Spirit is further manifest from what the Apostle states regarding the utter inability of the natural man to receive or know these truths, even when they are uttered or recorded. By the natural man he means, as the context shows, the man who is not taught of the Holy Ghost, for he contrasts him with the spiritual man who searcheth (*ἀνακρίνει*), examines closely, sifts all things, even the deep things of God. Now if man in his natural state, left to the exercise of his own unaided native powers, which are so dominated and paralysed by a heart that is enmity against God that the things of the Spirit are foolishness unto him, and that he can neither receive or know them, surely there is no need of formal argument to demonstrate his utter unfitness to apprehend, or utter, or record infallibly the mysteries of redemption, or those historical incidents in connection with which these mysteries have been revealed. His unfitness to act in relation to the history of redemption is just as patent as his unfitness to act in relation to its doctrinal truths. How could one out of sympathy with such truths, and who regarded them as foolishness, and whose apprehending power was beclouded by sin, make selections out of the historical incidents that have transpired in the history of our race, incidents which were divinely ordered so as to form an appropriate setting for each fresh communication as the tide of revelation rolled on from its native source in the unsearchable wisdom of God? In presence of such a problem the Newer Criticism may well feel perplexed, for its position implies the capacity of an un-inspired agent to write the history and expound the doctrines

of redemption, presenting both in a form that shall serve to instruct the Church of God throughout her militant career, and fit her for making known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God.

The fact is, there underlies this whole question, as between the Newer Criticism and the immemorial doctrine of the Church, the whole subject of man's estate as a fallen moral agent, and the agency of the Spirit in his recovery. No one holding with the men of the Reformation, whether Lutheran or Reformed, that, by reason of the Fall, man is "indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all spiritual good," could hold with the men of this new critical school, that the sacred writers needed no gifts, or graces, or qualifications, save their own native intellectual endowments and the virtues of honesty and fidelity.

Of course these critics—at least those of them who have been trained in evangelical Churches—admit the necessity of the gracious influences of the Spirit to fit a man to hold communion with God, and through such communion to become acquainted with His will. This partial recognition of an indirect agency of the Spirit in the production of the sacred Scriptures carries, on the face of it, a confession of the inadequacy of the agency it recognises which justifies its instant rejection. We are informed that those good men who, through their communion with God drunk into His Spirit and learned His will, had, from time to time, as their own subsequent experience suggested, to eliminate from their conceptions of the Divine character and will many ideas which they had previously cherished as unquestionable truths. The question thus raised is certainly a very grave one. It is no less than this: What guarantee have we that those who erred in the original apprehension did not err in the subsequent elimination? And there is another question inseparable from this which necessarily forces itself upon us for settlement, viz., Have we any reliable guarantee that there were, at any stage in the history of revelation, men who, by virtue of their attainments in godliness, so accurately interpreted and gauged the mind of God

that their interpretations could be relied on as a sure, infallible rule of faith and practice? This novel theory of repeated rectifications as experience created the suspicion of misapprehension and misinterpretation, must, if accepted and acted on, lead its advocates to challenge the doctrinal deliverances of the best of men when they happen to be in conflict with their own interpretations of their own religious consciousness. If inspiration rests on godliness, why should one godly man defer to another? The assumption underlying this theory is that the degree of the inspiration varied according to the attainment of the writer in personal conformity to the image of God. The more holy the inspired agent, the more reliable his interpretations of the Divine will. The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable that as none of the sacred writers were perfectly holy, none of their writings can be accepted as absolutely infallible, notwithstanding the testimony of our Saviour to the absolute infallibility of the entire Old Testament record! The Church of God will not long remain in a strait between these views. Accepting the verdict of her Lord, she will spurn from her with holy aversion the faith-subverting theories of the Newer Criticism.

In so short an article there is not room to establish the claims of the other New Testament writers. What is true of Paul in regard to inspiration is true of all the other Apostolic penmen. They were all present on the day of Pentecost, and were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and spake the Word as the Spirit gave them utterance. It was not for the delivery of mere transient Gospel addresses they were supernaturally endowed. It was certainly more important to write an infallible Gospel or Epistle than to preach an infallible sermon. The latter would soon pass away, or abide, perhaps very imperfectly, as a tradition among their auditors and their descendants. The former were to serve as sources of saving knowledge to the Church throughout her militant career.

The only writers in regard to whose inspiration a question can be raised are Mark and Luke. Suffice it to say, however, I. That they were of prophetic rank, not only companions of Apostles, but (*συνεργοί*) fellow-workers with them in the

Gospel; II. That during the period within which they exercised their ministry, and even till the completion of the Canon, supernatural gifts of the Spirit, as a provisional arrangement for the edification of the body of Christ in the absence of the Written Word, were very extensively bestowed upon individual members of the Churches; III. "The character of the facts selected for record, the character of the doctrines represented as coming from Christ, and the unquestionable harmony of both facts and doctrine with the historical facts and doctrinal statements recorded by the other New Testament writers, satisfy all the demands and fulfil all the conditions of the most rigid rules of internal evidence" (See the writer's book on *The Rule of Faith and the Doctrine of Inspiration*. Hodder and Stoughton).

But the crowning, the absolutely conclusive argument, is furnished in the fact that the Holy Ghost was given to our Saviour, as the God-man, to qualify Him for the execution of the functions of His mediatorial office. That the unction of the Spirit had reference to His exercise of the prophetic as well as to the priestly or the regal function is placed beyond all doubt by express Scripture testimony. In the synagogue at Nazareth our Lord informed His auditors that it was to Him the prophet Isaiah referred (chap. lxi.) when he said, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me: because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek," &c. The extent and specific character of this anointing, as well as the fact of it, is clearly stated in the Scriptures. In the normal prophecy (Deut. xviii. 15-19), in which the rise of the great Messianic prophet and His prophetic forerunners is predicted, Moses is informed that God would put His words in his mouth, and that he should speak all that He should command him. If this did not amount to an inspiration extending to the words, it would be difficult to say what would constitute it. The language employed in this forecast of the functions and relations of *the* prophet is peculiarly comprehensive and significant. It embraces both the *influx* and the *efflux* of the communication. The words were to be given Him, and He was to speak (give out) all that God

should command Him. Now, prior to John the Baptist this predicted prophet, in whom this prophecy should find its *complete* fulfilment, had not arisen. The Jews were, in John's day, expecting Him, and asked John whether he was that Prophet, and were informed by him that he was not. After John there certainly arose no other prophet, save Jesus of Nazareth, to whom this prophecy could possibly apply. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that our Saviour recognised its application to Himself in that remarkable passage (John xii. 49, 50), "I have not spoken of Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He gave Me a commandment what I should say (*εἶπω*) and what I should speak (*λαλήσω*). And I know that His commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak (*λαλῶ*) therefore, even as the Father hath said unto Me, so I speak" (*λαλῶ*). Of similar definite and comprehensive import is a passage which occurs in His great intercessory prayer (John xvii. 7, 8). "Now they know that all things whatsoever thou hast given Me are from Thee: for the words which Thou gavest Me I have given unto them; and they received *them*, and knew of a truth that I came out from Thee, and believed that Thou didst send Me." It was not, according to this account of the message wherewith the Saviour was entrusted, an undefined revelation He was commissioned to make. It was definitely determined in its language, and, as thus defined, He communicated it to His disciples.

One other reference must suffice. It is, however, of itself sufficient to indicate the claim already established regarding the inspiration of our Lord. The passage referred to occurs at the close of each of the Seven Letters to the Seven Churches in Asia. The ever-recurring refrain at the close of each message to the Churches is, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches."

The argument from this testimony of our Saviour to the relation which the Spirit sustained to these Seven Letters, does not need any lengthened elaboration. While He is Himself personally present with the beloved disciple (for He had laid His right hand upon him, strengthening him to hear Him), He, nevertheless, does not claim for His words an indepen-

dent, uninspired utterance. Though the language of the Letters comes forth from the lips of the glorified Saviour, He will have His servant John know, and through him will have the Churches of Asia know, and will have the Church in all time know, that, in communicating the will of the Father to men, He acts, and has ever acted, under an inspiration of the Holy Ghost which extends to the language of the utterance or the record. Is there any need of further argument? If the incarnate *Λόγος* needed such unction of the Holy Spirit, will any one venture to say that Peter, or James, or John, or any other organ of revelation, needed no such endowment?

The principle on which the writer has proceeded in this discussion is simply this: That the testimony of the Scriptures to every subject of which they treat must be accepted by all Christians as conclusive. We have no right to make selections among the subjects they discuss, and say we accept their testimony regarding these, but reject their testimony in every other instance. Regarding this as a valid principle, the sole question to be decided, so far as the subject of inspiration is concerned, is simply, What do the Scriptures teach in regard to the agency of the Holy Spirit in their production? Do they teach that their authors wrote as intelligent, honest, veracious men, giving, in such terms as they thought best, their own impressions of what they saw or heard? Or, do they teach that they spake and wrote under an actuating energy of the Divine Spirit which extended to the *form* as well as the *matter*, to the utterance, or record of the ideas communicated to themselves by revelation, as well as to the verities they were commissioned to convey to others? This latter is, beyond all question, their account of their own origin, and he who rejects their testimony on this point can assign no reason for accepting it on any other. In a word, the rejection of the doctrine that the Scriptures are the offspring of an inspiration which determined the sacred writers in the choice of the language they employed, involves, logically, the rejection of the Bible as the Word of God.

ROBERT WATTS.

DEMONIACAL POSSESSION.

WHETHER the demoniacs whom our Saviour, while on earth, and His Apostles cured were truly what the word imports, or were merely sufferers from some form of brain disease, is a question which cannot be satisfactorily settled on any narrow issue ; the investigation must be so widened in its scope as to become an inquiry into the relations subsisting between spirits whose operations are for the present conditioned by the functions of an animal body, and spirits who possess no kind of organism which the grosser senses of such a body are capable of perceiving. The existence of the latter I am, of course, at liberty to assume. It is presupposed in the expectation of a life after death.

Now that, apart from organic connection with flesh and blood, there are spirits whose influence over mortals contributes to determine the course of terrestrial events has been in every nation under heaven, and from the days when the human race was in its infancy, a widely prevalent belief. Incessant efforts are made to root it out ; but no matter how vigorously philosophy, science, and ridicule are employed for this purpose, it still flourishes. Of the numberless superstitions that have disfigured or caricatured it, many have been, and many are being, swept away ; but the belief remains. And, moreover, the fact is patent that it has been not merely spared, but distinctly authorised, by the revelation under which the dark places of the earth are being flooded with celestial light. It cannot be denied that the Christian faith, as held in Apostolic times, was associated with a serious and operative belief in the helpful ministry of angels, and in the reality of active and formidable hostility on the part of invisible powers of darkness. Hence it is by no means easy to escape the impression that cultured thought in these days is in advance of the teaching to be found in the records of that revelation, and at the same time to feel compelled, so far as practical religion is concerned, to

treat that belief as if it were an obsolete superstition, in effect to ignore it altogether. No person who has been reasoned out of it can fail to see that he has advanced far beyond the necessity of virtually eliminating from the Scriptures a passage here or a passage there ; such a one may indeed have stopped somewhere short of Sadducean incredulity, or even of agnosticism, but the contents of the Book which should make men wise unto salvation will have assumed in his eyes a sort of mythical aspect.

But in spiritual matters it is possible that an incredulity which has its source in imagination, and overlooks the restrictions under which that faculty is exercised, may be fathered upon reason. Unless, however, we are to assume that a supramundane mode of existence shuts out all to whom it has been assigned from communication with this inferior world, whatever degree of interest they may feel in it and its inhabitants, whether as friends or as enemies, then, even apart from further considerations, the probability would seem to be that spirits in the higher sphere do in fact at times come into contact, so to speak, with spirits in the lower, acting and being reacted upon, but in processes hidden from the latter, and doubtless also in conformity with laws to which both alike are subject, and whose orderly fulfilment is adapted to bear fitting testimony to a Unifying Mind and a Sovereign Will. Let this probability be once admitted, and, as will easily be seen, no *à priori* objection renders incredible the occurrence even of apparitions from the unseen world, although, of course, the proof that an apparition, properly so called, has been seen must include a satisfactory certificate from significant events. To a duly authenticated case of this kind no suspicion whatever will attach if the alleged phenomenon may be regarded as having no objective ground in the molecular world, further than as an impression, the effect of mental operation, upon one or more of the senses of the person who perceived it—say the nerves of sight and hearing—yet possibly just as distinct and vivid an impression as might have been produced by the sight and voice of a mortal man.

Seeing, however, that cerebral conditions adequate to the

production of such phenomena as these may be, and in some instances doubtless are, the mere effect of physical disease, or may arise from other causes equally devoid of a relevant spiritual significance, it is important to bear in mind that, whenever facts appear to be sufficiently accounted for by the operation of physical law, the assumption of spiritual causation over and above what these laws presuppose is gratuitous. Do we, then, perceive in that malady which in biblical nomenclature is termed Demoniacal Possession any such symptoms as justify the designation it has thence obtained? There are other and serious considerations which likewise claim attention, but which are not easily approached with arguments that ensure conviction so long as this question is found to block the way.

Now, it may be at once conceded that, regarded from a purely medical point of view, the disease admits of being identified with epilepsy, or other known disorders of the brain and nervous system. But in granting this we are not denying the reality of Possession; on the contrary, we are taking the first step towards a scientific account of its possibility, we are assuming it to be a psychic affection of such a nature that it can find no place in a sound, or, at any rate, a normally operative, brain. For what is Possession, considered as a *spiritual* fact? Some approach to it may be observed in the overpowering influence which a strong character occasionally acquires over a comparatively weak one. This, within salutary limits, may be an influence for good; but it is always hurtful and dangerous, and betrays an evil source, when it paralyses the moral sense, and enslaves, instead of liberating, the reason and the will that have come within its power.

That spiritual influence is similarly exercised in the invisible world is probable, not only on independent grounds, but further, as throwing light upon the fact assumed in the Scriptures, that in the realm of confusion and lawlessness, no less than in the kingdom of Heaven, there are "principalities and powers" (Eph. vi. 12); in other words, degrees of rank and power. And it cannot be doubted that overbearing

characters in that world, like similar characters in this, enjoy the exercise of power for its own sake, and that proud and malignant spirits are ready to seize any opportunity that may present itself of playing the tyrant. On the supposition that the will of mortal man, in so far as it has not been adequately fortified from above, is liable to give way under the pressure their wills can bring to bear upon it, there would seem to be sufficient ground for assuming that they exert themselves to reduce to this kind of servile subjection those spirits who are still in the flesh.

But to the complete success of the efforts they are thus making, even in the case of spirits whom they have succeeded in assimilating to themselves, there is ordinarily an obvious hindrance. This is to be found in the regulative habits of a sound brain that has attained its development under such conditions as human and social life presuppose, habits of thought and habits of feeling that render the possessor, so long as they prevail, insusceptible of the extravagantly lawless or wildly diabolical impulses communicated by the fiercer spirits in the Destroyer's kingdom.

It will thus appear that destructive spiritual influence, when it amounts to what may be called Possession, must necessarily imply in the recipient some degree of *cerebral* derangement, and so far bring the case within the scope of medical diagnosis. Some of the phenomena of hypnotism make it evident that an abnormal condition of the brain may open the way to an overpowering influence of spirit over spirit. In the hypnotic trance the mind of the patient, no longer protected by those aids to critical operation which the brain had previously supplied, passively acquiesces in the suggestions it receives from the operator; and thereby the will of the latter dominates over that of the former. On the supposition that it is possible for a spirit who operates by means of no physical organism to influence in some measure the workings of a mortal's brain, and thus to be instrumental in suggesting thoughts that would not otherwise occur, it is surely quite conceivable that, in cases in which the absence of a sufficing spiritual antipathy precludes effectual

resistance, suitable cerebral conditions may admit of a similar subjugation of the will.

If, indeed, misanthropical fierceness were the only symptom from which it could seemingly be inferred that Possession had taken place, the inference might be with good reason disallowed ; such a symptom might easily be accounted for without assuming the presence of a demon. But the symptoms apparent in the demoniacs of the New Testament include, generally speaking, a manifestation of intelligence which, in certain remarkable respects, raised their disordered intellects above the level of the sound minds of their generation, yet which, seeing that it characterised them as a class, cannot be set down to natural gifts, or education, or spiritual docility. How is it that, wherever our Saviour encountered demoniacs, they at once knew Him, recognised Him to be the Christ and the Son of God, and thus showed themselves to be far in advance of nearly all their sane contemporaries in this rare kind of knowledge? The Evangelists had no temptation to draw upon their fancy in support of the theory of Demoniactal Possession ; the possibility of its being called in question is not likely to have entered their minds. Accordingly, as might have been expected, they tell their story in few and simple words ; to all appearance they record notorious facts, and in the accounts they give of the demoniacs and their cries, are evidently as far from romancing as when they relate that Peter uttered a memorable confession and was assured that he owed not to flesh and blood his superior knowledge. There is no room for reasonable doubt as to the *phenomena* which gave rise to the saying "The demons believe, and shudder" (James ii. 19). It proclaims itself indisputably to be the testimony of eye-witnesses. Similarly significant is the account of that humiliating failure which the sons of Sceva experienced in their attempt at exorcism (Acts xix. 13-16). In short, various phenomena, which it is impossible to explain away, point to one conclusion ; they all presuppose physiological conditions, but not in these do they find an adequate interpretation.

Demon, whatever be the true derivation of the word,

signified in its original use a being superior in power and intelligence to mortal man ; but the title included, and became at length a distinctive appellation of, those departed spirits who were imagined to have been received into the celestial hierarchy, and to have acquired superhuman powers. But seeing that, under this notion, the Gentiles in their idolatrous worship "sacrificed to demons, and not to God" (1 Cor. x. 20), these deified inhabitants of the invisible world were, not unnaturally, conceived by the Jews to be the spirits of wicked men, (Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, b. vi., ch. vii., § 3), and to be fulfilling the behests of the great adversary of God and man. Their opinion, as it seemed to them, was fully borne out by the phenomena of Possession. It should be observed, however, that by no means every variety of the morbid state of mind which was thus accounted for exhibited fiendish hatred or terror of the Redeemer and His kingdom. There is no evidence of the presence of a diabolical spirit, but rather the contrary, in the remarkable case recorded in the sixteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. A girl under the influence of a spirit of Python volunteered the confession that Paul and his companions were servants of the most high God, and were announcing the way of salvation. A spirit altogether like-minded with the Destroyer and the Father of Lies would, we may presume, have done his work after a different fashion. Nevertheless, the symptoms observable in this case assimilated it, as we perceive, in one particular of no little significance to those in which the evidence of Possession was as startling as it was appalling ; the language uttered by the girl, of which, probably, the sentence that has been preserved does but indicate the drift, was such as, under the circumstances, her natural faculties and her antecedents failed to account for. Anyhow, St. Paul, as the narrative forbids us to doubt, saw in her the medium of an intelligence comparatively enlightened, yet unsanctified, a vehicle for the utterance of words that were not her very own, but could not be ascribed to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. She had become the property of persons who reasonably calculated that the marvellous gift she appeared to possess would prove to them a source of con-

siderable pecuniary gain, and their expectation had been fully justified by the event ; but, whatever ground there may be for assuming that, when in the state of ecstasy, she created astonishment by her utterances, it by no means follows that they were uniformly sensible and coherent, or that, in yielding to the demand for specific and helpful predictions, she could satisfy curiosity with more than clever guesses. Subjects of a kind of supersensuous inspiration that suffices to stimulate and exalt even to an extraordinary degree the cerebral faculties, are not of necessity in possession of true prophetic gifts, even although at times they may show more than average discernment of characters and purposes, and their spiritual significance. In allowing the case of the Pythoness of Philippi to have been one of real Possession, and in ascribing to it at the same time a typical character, we are not binding ourselves to answer any of the charges that have been brought against the ancient heathen oracles, and to explain away any of the facts which exposed their pretensions and eventually rendered them dumb.

A full investigation of our Saviour's doctrine in respect to Possession necessitates due notice of the *remedy* He has prescribed. "This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer" (Mark ix. 29). If any other remedy can be suggested, let it be named, and its assumed efficacy be submitted to inquiry. If we suppose an evil spirit to have succeeded in effecting an entrance into the spirit of a mortal, and to be there exercising an influence incompatible with sanity, then, unless he were capable of yielding to reasoning or entreaty, nothing may be hoped for from direct efforts on the part of those persons who would liberate the spirit he has possessed. He cannot be dislodged by medical treatment, he is securely out of reach of all the remedies that physicians have it in their power to apply ; and as to ceremonial observances, it may seem superfluous to deny that they can be of any avail. But as in the realms of nature, so in the kingdom of grace, the Almighty has ordained that the forces which are to accomplish His purposes shall take effect along lines of least resistance ; and in the latter these are the lines which His

Spirit has traced in directing the prayer of faith. The only strength available in this matter is that God-given energy of longing and supplicating hope which presupposes trustful submission to His will. To the unconditioned exercise of a subordinate will, however resolute and stubborn, nothing is ever granted in any department of activity. Our Saviour, it is true, by the mere expression of His will cast out demons, and no more than this was requisite for the manifestation of any of the signs which He wrought ; but His will coincided with that which He had come into the world to fulfil : His uttered intention was the revelation of a purpose which it was essentially His nature to honour with an ideally filial regard, He and His Father being One. For not merely did He, as on the eve of making choice of His Apostles, pour out His soul on occasions, during hours of solitude, and in special concentration of heavenward thoughts ; the whole business of His life was a work of unceasing prayer.

But the control He thus exercised over the power of darkness is illustrated by an incident which claims particular attention, inasmuch as the mythical aspect in which it presents itself to many readers brings, in their judgment, discredit upon the entire Gospel history. To the evil spirits whom He had commanded to come forth from the Gadarene demoniacs, and who were in expectation of being expelled from the country and consigned to the abyss, He gave, at their entreaty, permission to enter into a herd of swine ; and the consequence was that the animals, driven by a maniacal impulse, rushed down a steep place into the lake, and were drowned. Such is, in substance, the story as told by the first three Evangelists. Are we, then, bound in reason to regard as improbable either the request they ascribe to the demons, or the fact that it was granted ? Now, in respect to the former, it must not be overlooked that the utterances of a person who is possessed are determined not only by the will which has subjugated him, but also, in a measure, by modes of thought and feeling which he owes to his life in the flesh, that the sound, so to speak, is conditioned partly by the nature of the instrument through which it is produced.

Accordingly, the request may be conceived to express, on the part of the demoniacs, a fear lest they should be forced to quit their haunts and be plunged into some unfathomable experience of misery, and at the same time, perhaps, a delirious hope that, if they could not be left undisturbed by Him who was now the object of their dread, their existence might become merged in that of the animals which were feeding peacefully on the mountain side. As to the occurrence which is related to have immediately followed the liberation of their minds, who will assert that it is precluded by any known law of nature? Certainly, if occult spiritual influences may be instrumental in modifying the thoughts of human beings in the flesh, it is conceivable that, under suitable conditions, they may operate similarly upon minds in the brute creation, and may affect them with abnormal experiences of terror. Were it necessary in this case to suppose any intermediate physical agency, the brief narrative, so far as I can see, leaves room for the conjecture that the unearthly, malignant influence in quitting the demoniacs may have found entrance into the herd of swine through cries proceeding from the men, or acts done by them, in some terrific paroxysm of fury just before their restoration to soundness of mind. In assuming, however, the possession to have been somehow effected, and to have wrought the destruction of the animals, we may read in the fact a profoundly valuable lesson; for it opens up to our mental view abysmal possibilities of brutish degradation, loathsome depths into which intellects, noble though they once have been, impotently sink their exalted powers if they engage in a struggle with Almighty God.

Whether Demoniactal Possession is to be recognised as having in these days a place among abnormal mental conditions, is a question which must needs remain in abeyance unless it can be decided by an investigation of cases. The considerations I have adduced clearly favour the presumption that this form of mental derangement does sometimes occur; and I am not aware of any *à priori* arguments which cautious reasoners could accept as conclusive proof that it does not. But the reader who has followed me thus far will

easily perceive that I have left him at a long distance from a reasonable expectation of obtaining from the products of such cerebral operations as Possession presupposes definite and reliable information respecting the world of spirits, and farther still from a reasonable presumption that it is possible to establish telegraphic communication between that world and this. One thing is certain; the notion that the attendance of spirits may be procured at *séances*, and that they are not only desirous of satisfying the curiosity of mortals, but have the power to do so by causing sounds to proceed from articles of furniture, by using pens or pencils, and by availing themselves of the photographer's art for the representation of their personal appearance, cannot but have the effect of providing occupation for charlatans skilled in legerdemain. But if there be mediums who are neither impostors themselves, nor simply hypnotised tools in the hands of impostors, they belong to a class whose officious and compromising witness to the Truth, as the case of the Pythoness at Philippi compels us to maintain, the Apostles unhesitatingly refused, and whose release from an unwholesome spiritual influence they regarded as a signal testimony to the power of that saving Name which it was their vocation and their privilege to proclaim to the world. To the hope of a life to come any facts which appear to confirm it must assuredly be welcome; but it is no cause for wonder if the spirit of a thoughtful, sober-minded Christian faith has not accepted the marvels of so-called spiritualism¹ as an intimation from on high that it will be henceforth a work of supererogation and a slighting of evidence graciously vouchsafed to anxious mortals, to continue to aspire to the blessedness which has been promised to those who have not seen and yet believed.

H. J. CLARKE.

¹ I would not be understood to assert that I have accounted for all the seemingly strange phenomena to which attention is invited in the interests of psychological investigation, and that whatever psychic affections or faculties it is possible to render apparent are limited to those which the accepted authorities in the scientific world have agreed to recognise.

DAVID'S GOLDEN PSALM.

IN spite of all critical objections that have been raised against the popular heading, or superscription, of the 16th Psalm, it will probably be known to all ages as "The Golden Psalm of David."

It is only at certain early stages of a globe's formation, when its "elements melt with fervent heat," that diamonds can be produced. And it was only in the Davidic era, and at a certain fiery-trying crisis of the great Hebrew's career, when his soul had reached the requisite white heat of holy enthusiasm, that this "jewel psalm," as it is sometimes called, could have been composed. If we have to abandon the theory that מכתם is derived from a root signifying "gold," we must still cling to the judgment of the past that the thoughts expressed in these verses are "more precious than rubies."

Comparing it with the cluster of other psalms bearing the same title (56-60), it would seem to have been written when its author was a fugitive and in daily peril of his life. This lends some countenance to the supposition that this title comes from a word signifying to "hide" or "conceal." The "Hiding Psalms of David" would be a designation borne out by strong internal evidence.

The absence of any reference to the kingship, to Mount Zion, or the Tabernacle, so rarely omitted in David's later compositions, would place its date at a period prior to his coronation, and before the ever-memorable capture of the famous stronghold. And if I am right in the conjecture that the concluding verses were inspired by the hope born of the fact of Samuel's secret "anointing,"—of which, further on—we must place it subsequent to that event. There are fair grounds for believing, therefore, that it was written in exile, when David fled from the face of Saul. As to the style of the poem, that must be left to Hebrew experts.

"*Guard me, O God, for I trust in Thee,*" is the noble keynote of this exquisite piece of heart-music. It brings David

at once into touch with the anthem of the Christian ages, and lifts him into harmony with the worship of the redeemed. How thrilling to us to hear, in those far off times, this earnest human spirit uttering his cry of the night, and expressing thus fearlessly his trust in his Father and ours. It is the touch of the new nature that brings David into the kindredship of saints. Notice his appeal is to לַיהוָה , and not to לְאִישׁ , because it is God he confides in, and not man.

"I have said unto Jehovah Thou art my Lord; I have no good (to look forward to) but in Thee."

It is hard to forgive our Revisionists for the grave error of suppressing the name of David's Covenant God. The word "Lord" bears the same relation to "Jehovah" that the word "Queen" does to "Victoria." An inexcusable superstition of the Hebrews, combined with a keen jealousy of the Gentiles, led them to substitute the Title for the Name. In this our Translators, and more unpardonably our Revisionists, have been foolish enough to imitate them; and thus the Name that was to be "known in all the earth" has all but disappeared from the English Bible! It has been thought advisable, they tell us in their preface, to represent Jehovah by the word "substituted by Jewish custom for the ineffable Name." To their great honour the American Revisionists have restored the word wherever it occurs in the text. But let us try to rise to the sublimity of David's covenant. It was a solemn, sacred, complete surrender of himself, and all he had and hoped for, to the Covenant God of Israel. Jehovah was henceforth to be the absolute Master of his life. He pledges himself to await His time, to obey His orders, and live for His glory. If He will give him the crown and kingdom, he will accept it, but will lift no hand to grasp it; he will wait the unfolding of the Divine purpose, and walk only "in the light of the Lord." This is heroic faith, not only for David's time, but for all ages. בְּיָד is not "goodness," but "benefit," or "good fortune," and corresponds to לְיָד in verse v. *Κύριός μου εἶ σὺ, ὅτι τῶν ἀγαθῶν μου οὐ χρείαν ἔχεις (LXX).*

I have said, *"As to the holy ones that are in the land, these are also its great ones, in whom is all my delight."*

Having chosen Jehovah for his Lord, and entered into solemn covenant with Him, David now makes choice of his people as his future friends and companions. It is the good that are truly great; they are heaven's nobility. When he comes to the throne Jehovah shall be King over him, and His saints, however humble, shall be princes of the kingdom. With his own elevation from shepherd rank to kingship a new era would begin, and holiness would be the chief title to advancement. The Cromwellian theory was forestalled. Alas, for young enthusiasm! Old warriors had to be recompensed. "The sons of Zeruah were too strong for him." Class prejudices had to be satisfied. "The good" were forgotten. "The old Adam was too strong" for the young monarch.

אֲדִיר denotes "bigness," not moral "excellence." The A.V. is too prematurely theological for David's time, and the R.V. lacks continuity.

"Many are their troubles that hurry after another (Lord, Saul, e.g.). I will not anoint myself with their anointings of blood, and will not take their titles upon my lips."

The transition of thought from himself and his associates in exile, to the condition of his rival and his followers in power, is easy and natural. His theory of Divine government had led him and his army into great straits; but neither were his enemies, who held a different theory, free from troubles. They were driven, in maintaining their titles by their own hands, to war and murder. The rejected king was subject to fits of frenzy. נִסַּךְ is here mentally contrasted with מִשֶּׁחָ, the mere pouring on of the oil with the sacred anointing (2 Sam. xiv. 2; 1 Sam. ix. 16; xvi. 12). Moreover, Saul's daily anointing was with "blood," and now that Jehovah had rejected him his title was of human right. David shrinks from such a baptism, from the thought of winning the crown, or holding it by such means, and would not take such titles into his lips. Great as his difficulties and hardships are, they are less than the sorrows of those "who followed another lord."

"Jehovah is the portion of mine inheritance, and of my cup."

THOU maintainest my lot. The lines have fallen to me in pleasant places ; yea, a goodly heritage is mine."

One is reminded of the saintly Riccaltoun taking his humble meal on a rough boulder at his cottage door ; " I am resting on the Rock ; feeding on the promises ! "

It was only the Divine presence and favour that made David's places pleasant in the desert, and his cup to run over. But those who seek their inheritance in Jehovah will find all things theirs. " The wilderness and solitary place are made glad for them, and the desert rejoices and blossoms like the rose. "

" I will bless Jehovah, who hath been my counsellor ; my reins likewise admonish me in the night seasons. "

רִבֵּי conveys the idea of " checking " rather than of " instructing. " Like the *dæmon* of Plato, David's inward monitor " warned him rather of what he ought not, than what he ought to do. " When, *e.g.*, he was restrained from killing Saul in the cave, he was wisely and divinely " admonished " ; " Jehovah shall smite him, " he whispered to Abishai ; " either his day shall come to die, or he shall descend into the battle and perish " (1 Sam. xxvi. 10). In all this he kept to the terms of his vow, and obeyed the admonitions of his conscience.

" I have set Jehovah ever before me : because He is at my right hand I shall not be moved. "

Perhaps David was never so near in heart and will to God, never so much the " man according to God's own heart, " as at this season of trial and adversity. He was slowly rising to the full assurance of his faith, and to the " white heat " of holy enthusiasm, that drew from him the imperishable words that follow. In the calm depths of the ocean of peace in his soul, which the storms on the surface could not disturb, to change the metaphor, the Divine Spirit was putting the pearl into the oyster shell, " a thing of beauty and a joy for ever. " Out of the fiery ordeal of David's desert life Jehovah brought this gem of the psalms, as He brings all jewels from the war-ringing elements of nature.

" Deep in unfathomable mines
Of never-failing skill,
He treasures up His bright designs,
And works His sovereign will. "

"Therefore my heart is glad and my glory (*ἡ γλῶσσα μου*, LXX.) rejoiceth; my flesh also shall dwell in confidence. For Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol, *לֹא תַשְׁלִי*; Thou wilt not allow Thy Favoured One to see corruption."

The weight of authority seems to be in favour of *קֹדֶשׁ*. Our Revisionists have adopted the reading, and rendered it "Thy Holy One." In this they follow the LXX., from whom Peter quoted at Pentecost. But what is the necessity for translating the term "holy"? The Apostles no doubt acted wisely in appealing to a version that was then universally accepted; but the rendering of the words *τὸν ὁσίον σου* was not necessary to their argument. Moreover, it could not, strictly speaking, have been applied by David to himself. He regarded himself as highly "favoured," as the recipient of Divine mercy and love; but apart from the necessity of his rhythm, of which we cannot judge, he was free to employ *קֹדֶשׁ*, and did not; he did not feel himself to be "holy."

Was David, then, conscious that he was speaking of Another who was not to see corruption? The question lies at the root of every theory of inspiration. God did not apparently *dictate* the words of the prophets. The truth He impressed upon them in His providence, and by special revelation, was intelligible to their own minds at the time, although its ultimate bearing might lie beyond their vision. There is a sense in which this verse must have been understood by David as a present joy and comfort to himself. The words were fulfilled to him, and in a far higher and deeper sense they found their full realisation in the resurrection of his "Greater Son."

David had been solemnly "anointed" by Samuel as King of Israel. He was *מְשֻׁחַ*. That was a fact which in his darkest hours he could never forget. Jehovah had pledged Himself by the hands of His servant to make him king. The whole psalm breathes this hope. Meanwhile he is threatened by death on every side. The troops of Saul were on his track, and he was liable at any moment to fall into his hand. Yet David is calmly confident that he will not fall. He lies down at night in perfect composure. What is the secret of his confi-

dence? Why this, that Jehovah will not allow His Anointed One to enter Sheol or see the pit, until He has fulfilled His promise and brought him to the kingdom. Like Cæsar on board he believed in destiny. He was immortal till his coronation. Hence the importance of rendering the words "to Sheol," and not א, "in Sheol."

David's faith was justified; he did not see the grave *till his typical Messiahship had been accomplished*. "O the depth of the riches!" Paul would say.

It requires no forcing of the words to see their application to the Anointed Jesus. The same promise had been made to Him, although in an infinitely grander sense, than had been made to David. He was the Messiah; "the heathen were to be His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth His possession." Jehovah would "maintain His lot;" would not "leave Him," עֲוֹב—a happy choice of phraseology for David—"to Sheol, nor suffer the Favoured One to see corruption," until—but here the parallelism breaks down; for by His death He abolished death, and "brought life and immortality to light."

"Thou wilt make known to me the way of the living; fulness of joy is in Thy presence; pleasures are in Thy right hand for ever."

Although David could not see the bridge of events in God's Providence that led from Adullam to Mount Zion, he had faith given him to know that the dark interval would somehow be made possible, and "abundant entrance ministered to him into the kingdom." A cup running over with happiness was kept in reserve for him in Jehovah's right hand: as he was able to write afterwards, "Goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of Jehovah for ever." The unity of the Psalm is complete, and its grand lesson is paraphrased in venerable words—

"O but the counsel of the Lord
Doth stand for ever sure,
And of His heart the purposes
From age to age endure."

R. BALGARNIE.

THE CHOICE OF MOSES ;

OR, THE TURNING-POINT IN A GREAT CAREER.

MOSES, the illustrious founder of the Hebrew nation, celebrated in the annals of his people as emancipator, leader, lawgiver, prophet, whose colossal figure, uprising in the land of the Pharaohs upwards of three thousand years ago, has overshadowed with its greatness all the intervening centuries, and to-day casts the spell of its mighty name upon the most enlightened and enterprising races on the globe. Of such a character it may be interesting to consider the turning-point of his history, which is briefly recorded in the words, "He refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter."

The SIGNIFICANCE of this act is not always rightly estimated. Josephus¹ tells us that the act itself was presaged in a startling deed performed by Moses when a child. Thermuthis having on one occasion exhibited him to her royal parent, that illustrious personage "took him and hugged him, and, on his daughter's account, in a pleasant way put his diadem (the double crown, which etchings from the monuments have made familiar) upon his head ; but Moses threw it down, and in a puerile mood wreathed it round and trod upon it with his feet." Perhaps it is a fable, though singularly enough something like this occurred in the case of Rameses II., who, if then born, must have been a child like Moses. An inscription² on the temple of Abydos, placed there by Rameses II. in honour of his deceased sire, communicates the fact that while yet a boy he (Rameses) was crowned as co-regent with his father, "solemnly inducted as eldest son into the dignity of an heir to the throne, on the chair of the earth god Seb." Lifted into his father's lap, he was exhibited before the public, the regal circlet was placed on his brow, his fond father saying, "I will cause him to be

¹ *Antiq.*, ii. 9, 7. ² Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, vol. ii. p. 39.

crowned as king, for I will behold his excellence while I am yet alive." Possibly in course of time tradition among the Jews may have mixed up Rameses II. and Moses, as among the Greeks it undoubtedly manufactured out of Seti I. and Rameses II. (father and son) one Sesostris ; or, if both incidents were true, and Rameses II. was not born when Moses was presented to Seti I.—which their relative ages show to have been possible—the act of the king in playfully placing on the head of Moses the double diadem may serve to show that even then he had begun to think of one day exalting a son (adopted if not real) to the throne as co-regent with himself. But in any case, whether what Josephus narrates was fact or fiction, history or legend, it substantially expresses what Moses did in declining to be longer known or spoken of as the son of Pharaoh's daughter. A king's adopted son, he effectually put from him all hope and prospect of succeeding to the crown. Renouncing his foster-parent, he went back to his true mother, though a Hebrew slave. From being himself a prince, he sank to the status of a peasant and a serf. His life of pleasure and renown he exchanged for one of hardship and oppression, "choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." His liberty he threw away like a thing of nought, and girt himself about with a bondman's chain ; or at least he was prepared to do so should necessity arise. Of course he had other objects in view than simply to toil in the brickfields of Pharaoh, and at length to sleep in a bondman's grave. He meant, if possible, to accomplish the emancipation of his countrymen ; but should that bright dream vanish into thin air, he would rather share the lot of his down-trodden brethren, rather sweat himself in making bricks without straw beneath an Egyptian sun, and to the music of an overseer's lash, than he would longer enjoy the gilded pleasures of iniquity, or even wear the honours of a semi-royal name. Brave son of Amram ! At a distance of thirty centuries we honour thee, we crown thee king, weaving around thine imperishable name a garland of equally imperishable fame, setting on thine immortal brow a double crown, more lustrous than that which either Rameses or Seti wore, or ever playfully placed upon

thine infant head—the crown of meekness and the crown of pity, the crown of self-sacrifice and the crown of love.

What now were the PRINCIPLES or motives which led to this stupendous act of self-immolation on the part of Moses? Josephus¹ is obviously at fault in ascribing it to the envy and hatred which his military successes among the Ethiopians had excited against him in the breasts of the Egyptians—king and people; the writer to the Hebrews is nearer the truth when he traces it to the awakening within him of the hitherto slumbering spirit of patriotism, and the deepening in him of an all-controlling spirit of piety.

That patriotism, or love of country, had to do with Moses' espousal of the Hebrew cause is expressly stated by the author of Exodus, and by Stephen in his defence before the Sanhedrim. Nor is this surprising. Next to religion it is doubtful if a stronger or holier impulse can inspire the human bosom. It may even be questioned if patriotism be not included in any right conception of religion. The challenge of Sir Walter Scott may not be able to be answered in the negative—

“Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land?”

—but certainly in every right-feeling bosom there lurks an inextinguishable spark of patriotic fire. And never perhaps was there a people in whom that slumbering spirit broke forth more conspicuously and splendidly than it did in Israel. Few countries so small can boast of a roll of heroes so large—Joshua and Caleb, Gideon and Barak, Samson and Jephthah, David and Elijah, Ezra and Nehemiah, Zerubbabel and the second Joshua, Judas Maccabeus and his associates. Yea, so charged were the people with this hidden fire that it flamed up within the bosoms of their women, transforming for the time being their wives, sisters, and daughters that were made for love and the gentle ministries of home into prophetesses and poets, whose winged words kindled the souls of their husbands and sons, brothers and lovers, into martial ardour; and not infrequently also made of these, generals and com-

¹ *Antiq.* ii. 11, 1.

manders, who led forth the nation's troops to battle and to victory. The names of Miriam and Deborah, Jael and Judith, will at once present themselves as examples. Yet was none of these greater than the son of Amram, who, in order to effect the emancipation of his brethren, renounced his royal station and imperial prospects.

That Israel's condition in the land of Egypt was at this time such as powerfully to appeal to the latent patriotism of a great soul like Moses, the monuments and Scripture unite to declare. However pleasantly life moved along for Jacob's household in Goshen whilst Joseph's friend and patron held the reins of government, matters took a turn for the worse when the new dynasty of Theban Pharaohs climbed into the throne. Then the Israelites began to be looked upon with disfavour, and ultimately, in consequence of their multiplying numbers, with alarm. By the opening of the 4th century of their sojourn they had been completely reduced to a state of servitude. In accordance with a custom of the Pharaohs to employ no Egyptians but only foreign captives in the building of their temples and cities, they were turned out under taskmasters or overseers to work, and their lives rendered bitter to them "with hard bondage, in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field." The king employed them to build two treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. Their oppression deepened as the years sped along. When Moses was born it was at its worst—it was midnight in the land of Goshen. Every male child among the Hebrews was cast into the Nile except such as, like Moses, were rescued by maternal love and ingenuity smiled on by heaven. Eighty years rolled by without a streak of morning light relieving the gloom. Rather, when the first promise of approaching dawn appeared in the return of Moses from Midian, their burdens were increased and their woes multiplied. The tale of bricks heretofore exacted was still demanded, while the straw with which they had been furnished was henceforth to be gathered by themselves; and while the people fainted at their tasks the overseers, whip in hand, lashed them on, saying, "Go to; ye are idle, ye are idle!" But all through those years of enforced service the

cry of their misery was going up to God. Nor is this a mere rhetorical picture the author of Exodus has sketched for the entertainment of his readers. Recent research has demonstrated that the Scripture narrative of Israel's bondage is a page taken from veritable history. The monuments¹ tell us that scarcely was Seti I. seated on the throne than he was summoned to undertake a campaign against the neighbouring tribes, who were pressing in upon the Delta from the East, and that at its close he engaged in the construction or reparation of a great wall for the defence of the eastern frontier. Rawlinson thinks that Pithom and Raamses, the "store cities," were arsenals and magazines erected in connection with this wall; Brugsch regards them as having been "temple cities" dedicated to patron divinities. In any case, these cities have been found. Raamses was in all probability the Zoan-Tanis of Scripture,² which, begun by Seti I., was completed by Rameses II., and made a royal residence under the name of Pi-Ramessu, or "City of Rameses." A letter, dating from the 19th dynasty, and written by a clerk named Panbesa to his superior Amenemapt, supplies a lively description of this ancient capital:—

"I proceeded," says the writer, "to Pa-Ramessu Meiamen.
 I found it flourishing in good things, without a rival,
 Like the foundations of Thebes . . .
 The abode of felicity.
 Its meadows are filled with all good things;
 It is well provisioned daily.
 Its pools are filled with fish, its ponds with fowl;
 Its fields are verdant with grass,
 Its threshing-floors are full of wheat and barley.
 Gladness dwells within it,
 None speaks scorn of it.
 The little ones in it are like the great ones.
 (They say) Come, let us celebrate its heavenly festivals
 And the season feasts."

¹ Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, vol. ii. p. 10; Rawlinson, *Egypt and Babylon*, p. 226.

² Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, vol. ii. p. 100; Ebers, in Riehm, art. "Ramses;" *Records of the Past*, vol. vi. p. 11.

This identification of Rameses, however, has been challenged by Sir J. William Dawson,¹ who locates the sought for "store" or "temple" city further south, at the Western extremity of the Wady Tumilat, at the eastern end of which, in the mounds of Tel-el-Maskhûta, near Tel-el-Kebir, the second city Pithom, Pi-Tum, "or the city of the Setting Sun," the Patoumos of Herodotus, the Heroopolis of the Greeks, and the Hero or Ero of the Romans, was recently found by M. Naville. The discovery of this city indeed has set to rest the whole question of the truth of the Biblical narrative concerning the servitude of Israel in Egypt. Exactly as the sacred writer states, Pithom is ascertained to have been founded by Rameses II., to have been built of bricks, *both with and without straw*, and to have been used as a treasure or store city; while by Brugsch, Sayce, and others, it is believed to have been identical with Succoth, from which the children of Israel took their departure on leaving the house of bondage. The mode in which it was built may also be said to have received confirmation, the monuments² showing that the captives worked in detachments, each presided over by a taskmaster, and compelled to produce so many bricks a day. Nay, in a papyrus roll³ relating to twelve brickmakers occur words that read like an extract from Scripture: "Let there be no relaxation; that they should make their number of bricks daily in the new house, in the same manner, to obey the messages sent by my lord;" while a bas-relief has been recovered which exhibits one of Pharaoh's taskmasters standing over a gang of slaves, whip in hand, and saying, as he lashes them, "To your work, O slaves; ye are idle!" Well, the Bible reports that Moses saw these things, heard the cracking of the slave-driver's whip; perhaps too saw the spouting of the red blood beneath its stroke, heard the groans that escaped from the over-driven people; probably beheld them drop down and die where they stood, unable to contend longer with their hard lot; and being himself a Hebrew, remembering that those spiritless serfs whom

¹ *Egypt and Syria*, pp. 43. ff.

² Wilkinson, *The Ancient Egyptians*, vol. i. pp. 342, 343.

³ *Ibid.* p. 343, note L.

Pharaoh's underlings were goading to death were his own flesh and blood, his heart bled within him, the liquid fire of a patriot's enthusiasm ran through the veins of his great soul, and he determined to strike a blow for their freedom. As it turned out the blow he struck was premature. The smiting of the overseer did not awaken the response among his countrymen he expected. Four centuries of exile, mostly of oppression, had tamed their fierce spirit, and made them ignobly submissive. But in any case, it would have been strange had Moses not been a patriot.

Yet the writer to the Hebrews ascribes the decisive act of Moses mainly to religion, or to the opening of his soul's eye to the vision of the Unseen: "By faith Moses, when he came of age, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." He cast in his lot with the suffering Hebrews, not so much because these were his kinsmen, as because they were the people of God, and had among them the hope of Israel, which the writer identifies with the hope of Christ, though it must not be supposed either Moses or his countrymen knew Christ by that name. Then he esteemed the reproach of Christ, *i.e.*, whatever sufferings or obloquy he might encounter on account of such a hope, to be greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt. And finally, "he had respect unto the recompense of the reward," *i.e.*, he had an eye to the inheritance above, in comparison with which the sweetest of earth's satisfactions were as nought. These were the three strands of the cord that drew him to the side of the down-trodden Hebrews. And these three principles of action had their roots in faith; that faith which is "the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen," which enables one to discern realities both on earth and in heaven which are hid from sense and reason, and which supplies a solid ground for hopes and expectations which to the ordinary mind appear baseless and visionary. Whether Ewald¹ is correct or not in thinking that the emancipation of the Hebrews was the result of two simultaneous semi-patriotic and semi-religious movements, which, breaking forth in Asia and in Egypt, coalesced when Moses, returning from Egypt, was met by Aaron at Mount

¹ *History of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 36.

Sinai, it is almost certain that, forty years before that meeting of the "noble brothers," Moses stood pretty nearly alone in respect of both his patriotic impulses and religious conceptions. The notion¹ that, "before the return of Moses from Sinai, the Israelites in Egypt had risen up energetically against the dangers which threatened their nationality and their religion, and were in the midst of a movement which the arrival of Moses, as their deliverer, only brought to a climax," does not seem warranted by the facts presented in Scripture; but, even if it were, it would still most accord with these facts to say that, at the time when Moses took the decisive step which really proved the turning-point in his history, and the starting-point of his subsequent unparalleled career, his views and projects, his hopes and aspirations, were shared in by comparatively few besides himself. And this is ever found to be characteristic, more or less, of great men who are called to be leaders of their fellows. The pioneers of all mighty movements, whether in Church or in State, in religion or in politics, for the most part live alone, in advance of their age, in communion with and under the fascination of the lofty ideas by which they have become inspired, and must go forth alone, almost always in the first instance without either the co-operation or the sympathy of those they desire to serve; must go forth alone, prepared to endure obloquy, persecution, death itself, in order to point the way to the Eldorado of the future, and to strike the first blow for its realisation.

The OUTCOME of this stupendous act of self-sacrifice on the part of Moses can only be briefly referred to. Its immediate consequence was precipitous flight from the land of Egypt, followed by forty years' obscurity in Midian. When he smote and buried the overseer, he imagined that his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver Israel, but they did not; and so, alarmed for his safety, he escaped beyond the king's dominions—away around the northern fork of the Red Sea, out into the wilderness of Sinai, in amongst the deep defiles and rocky cliffs of Horeb, where he forgot all about his former dignity as "the son of Pharaoh's

¹ *History of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 39.

daughter," in the peaceful occupation of keeping sheep, and in the sweets of conjugal and domestic felicity with Zipporah, the daughter of Jethro. There he found that training which was needful to equip him for the splendid career for which he was preparing, and of which the first impulses had already begun to stir within his soul—acquired that stability of thought, that maturity of wisdom, that solidity of character, that acquaintance with himself, that knowledge of his own weakness and insufficiency, of his own utter insignificance and non-requisiteness for the accomplishment of the smallest of Heaven's designs, which were indispensable for the carrying forward of his life's work to a successful termination; and then, when God's time had arrived for his promotion, nothing is more remarkable than the incredible rapidity with which greatness rushed upon him. When the forty years of solitude and inactivity in Midian were ended, God sent him back to Egypt—not to Rameses II., the brilliant and warlike prince who had meanwhile died, but to Menepthah II., his thirteenth and eldest surviving son, a man about sixty, who had inherited his father's cruelty and disregard of human life, if not his energy and genius. This feeble sovereign—whom an inscription¹ describes as "a hero who takes no account of hundreds of thousands of enemies on the day of the turmoil of battle," and who records² of himself that in the Libyan war he "slaughtered the people and set fire to them, and netted, as men net birds, the entire country"—was undoubtedly the tyrant who exacted from the suffering Israelites bricks without giving them straw, and from whom Moses demanded the liberation of his countrymen; and when this was obstinately and perseveringly denied, God strengthened him to lead them out in spite of that monarch's reluctance and opposition, to freedom in the Sinaitic desert. To Moses, under God, it was owing that the exodus from Egypt was a brilliant success. It was he who led the van in that memorable midnight march which gave birth to Israel as a nation—who with his shepherd's crook at God's command opened up a pathway for the fugitives through the sea, and closed it again upon the chivalry of Egypt, if not upon Menepthah himself—a doubtful ques-

¹ Brugsch, vol. ii. p. 123.

² *Records of the Past*, vol. iv. p. 47.

tion, upon which there is no room to enter. It was he who cheered on the desert pilgrims when they fainted, reproved them when they murmured, and interceded for them when they sinned. Moses it was who gave them laws and appointed them institutions ; and though he crossed not with them into Canaan, he lent them the inspiration of his mighty name, which became to them a tower of strength for conquering the land ; yea, and all through their history as a people there arose not a prophet like unto Moses, who talked with the Almighty face to face, as a man talketh with his friend. His was the name of most potent influence in Israel, until the Prophet like unto him, but greater than he, arose—the Messiah of Israel and Saviour of the world, of whom he was but a dim earthly shadow. Nor though Christ has come has the lustre of Moses' name declined. Rather, because Christ came to be, and to illustrate all that Moses taught, that lustre increased, and will keep on increasing, being now so inseparably bound up with that of Christ that it may almost be said of him as it is of Christ, "His name shall endure for ever : his name shall be continued as long as the sun ;" yea, when the sun itself shall have grown old and feeble, and shall have disappeared for ever from the firmament of heaven, the name of Moses will be discerned, shining with a brilliance which eternity will not dim ; for it is written, that when the blood-washed host shall have crossed the narrow Jordan of death, and been gathered into their rest and inheritance upon the other side in the heavenly Canaan, they shall sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb.

The lesson of the whole may be stated in the counsel given by Jeremiah to his amanuensis Baruch, "Seeketh thou great things for thyself? Seek them not ;" or in the words of our Lord to His disciples, "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister ; and whosoever will be chief, let him be servant of all." The road to fame and influence among men lies not along the path of ambition, but along that of self-sacrifice and devotion to the good of others. "Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased ; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

THOMAS WHITELAW.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Histories. THE *Second Division of the History of the People of Israel* (1) contains what M. Rénan considers the most important part of the history of Judaism; and the reason for this opinion is thus expressed in the preface—"Jahveh, the national God of the Jews, undergoes therein a complete transformation. From a local and provincial God he becomes, through a kind of return to the old patriarchal Elohim, the Creator of Heaven and Earth. He becomes, above all things, a just God, which national gods, necessarily full of partiality towards their *clientèle*, never are. The introduction of morality into religion becomes an accomplished fact." The treatise bears marks of a learned man, as we should expect; but his learning is used for the purpose of showing how "small and local" Judaism was, and, by inference, Christianity is. The book is written in a lively style, which is in its way attractive; though it is cynical beyond measure, and oftentimes shocking by its irreverence. David is made out to be a very poor creature at the best, no better than Abd-el-Kader; and we have a picture of him drawn from M. Rénan's inner consciousness which is as ridiculous as it is imaginary. Indeed, it never seems to strike M. Rénan that he can possibly be wrong; and he thinks himself justified in sitting on the eminence his conceit has piled up, and sneering at Elijah and Elisha, or at God Himself. One thing we suppose we must thank M. Rénan for, and that is, that he allows us to retain our belief in the sequence of events which the sacred record gives us. But of course we quite expect he will gird at prophetism, or at any thing else which people like to cherish as matters of faith. M. Rénan's notion that one account of the Creation is the product of the northern half of the kingdom of Israel, and the other of the southern part, is simply fanciful; and when he tells us that the Ten Commandments were written by some obscure scribe in a chamber at Jerusalem he asks us to believe a greater miracle than that of Mount Horeb. When one thinks how small and unimportant M. Rénan tries to make out Judaism to be, the wonder is that so great a man

should consider it worth his while to trouble about it at all. M. Rénan's talents are quite misused, for if his object be to get at the truth, he has not gone the way to do it; while, on the other hand, his exertions are liable to undermine the faith of thousands. He says that "an extensive transposition requires to be effected in all the religious ideas we have inherited from the past. It cannot be said that the formula which would satisfy us has yet been found." What would satisfy M. Rénan? Will he ever be able to tell us?

In the *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (2) Professor Lichtenberger has furnished a very interesting conspectus of the course of thought in Germany, which has had such a wonderful effect upon the religious aspect of the world during a period which has presented an extraordinary amount of activity in all departments of human energy. He has arranged this subject according to the various schools of thought, beginning with the philosophy of Kant, Fichte, Hegel, and Schelling, and then going on, through the rationalism and supranaturalism of Röhr, Paulus, De Wette, and others, to Schleiermacher and his disciples, such as Neander, Nitzsch, Twesten, and Ullmann. Then follows the New Orthodoxy, represented by such men as Harms, Hengstenberg, Hahn, and Harless; then the Speculative School of Strauss, Daub, Marheineke, &c. A chapter on the Classical Literature of Schiller and Goethe, and another on the Romantic School of Richter, the Schlegels, Novalis, Arndt, Uhland, Ruckert, and Spitta completes the first part. The second part commences with the school of Strauss, of Feuerbach, &c., with the Theistic opposition of Weisse, Hartmann, and Lotze. Then follows an account of the New Biblical Criticism connected with the names of B. Bauer, Baur, and the Tübingen School; then the New Lutheranism under which are ranged such men as Delitzsch, Stahl, Hofmann, Oetinger. After this comes the School of Conciliation, with such names as Tholuck, Martensen, Hagenbach, Beyschlag, Rothe, and Bunsen. Then the New Liberal Schools, and the Neo-Kantian School under which we find Ritschl classed. The Roman Catholic Theology comes in for consideration, and the old Catholics are not omitted. The work partakes greatly of the nature of a biographical dictionary, and here comes in the use of a capital Index of persons. To such men as Schleiermacher, Neander, Bunsen, Strauss, Rothe, and Ritschl greater space is given; but it is very easy to gather the aim and purpose of almost any writer of importance within the limits

assigned. Professor Lichtenberger has done his work well, and his judgment is very fairly given on all occasions. The book is translated and edited by Mr. Hastie, to whom great praise is due; and the whole "get up" of the work is such as might be expected from the eminent firm that publishes it.

PROFESSOR KURTZ' work (3) has long been recognised in Germany as the most useful Church history for students. It is concise, sufficiently full, and readable. The plan of arranging the matter in principal sections, and attaching to them a disproportionate amount of notes, has an awkward look and hinders unity of impression, but it saves space and is convenient for learners. The translation is both accurate and idiomatic. Mr. Macpherson has omitted a number of references to German works, and substituted for some of them references to books accessible to English readers. This is a substantial advantage; but the literature-list so compiled would repay revision.

The Church of Scotland in the Thirteenth Century (4) is an able essay, in which Mr. Lockhart has set forth with clearness the condition of the Mediæval Church in Scotland at a period in which we should hardly look for much religious advancement. Mr. Lockhart shows that this century was an age in which road-making made progress, towns were built, streams were spanned by bridges, and civilisation made itself felt everywhere. He has ranged his information round the name of David de Bernham, Bishop of St. Andrew's, who was undoubtedly not only one of the foremost men of his own age, but he would have been a conspicuous figure in any age. The modes of dedicating Churches, the rise of the Mendicant Orders, the origin of Ecclesiastical Legislation in Scotland, and the account of Mediæval Preaching form very interesting chapters, and the work altogether is a valuable addition to Church history in Great Britain.

(1) *History of the People of Israel*. From the French of E. Rénan. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited, 1889.

(2) *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century*. By F. Lichtenberger. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Price, 14s.

(3) *Church History, by Professor Kurtz. Authorised Translation from Latest Revised Edition*. By the Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A. In three vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1888.

(4) *The Church of Scotland in the Thirteenth Century*. By William Lockhart, A.M. Edinburgh and London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1889.

Books about
Missions.

The Missionary Year Book for 1889 (1) contains historical and statistical accounts of the principal Protestant Missionary Societies of Great Britain, the Continent of Europe and America, and is illustrated with a diagram showing the proportional parts of the population of the world according to the professed religion of the people. To the account of every society is appended a table, setting out the dates of the foundation of missions, their progress and their income. It is altogether an interesting and valuable publication.

The Rev. John Liggins has written a timely and useful book, setting forth the *Great Value and Success of Foreign Missions* (2), which he supports with much undisputed information. It is often alleged that missionaries are unsuccessful, but those who are inclined to be daunted by such expressed opinions will be greatly encouraged by Mr. Liggins' work; and all who take an interest in missionary effort ought to read this book, which tells us a thrilling tale in a simple way. The work has an introduction by Dr. A. T. Pierson.

The Religious Condition of Christendom (3) is an extremely valuable series of papers presented to the Eighth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in Copenhagen in 1884. There are accounts of the religious state of various European countries by men eminently qualified to give them; and there are also many suggestive addresses on such subjects as Christian Life in Relation to Social Conduct, Family Religion, the Power of Prayer, our Lord's Divinity and Atonement, the Lord's Day, &c.; all by men of known name and fame. We can confidently direct attention to all these papers, and especially to that on Religious Indifference, by Professor Christlieb; on Modern Social Problems, by Professor Redford; on the Basis of the Authority of the New Testament Scriptures, by Professor Godet; on Modern Unbelief, by Dr. Sinclair Paterson; to the Harmony of Science and Revelation, by Prebendary Anderson and Dr. E. Conder; with many others. Indeed, the volume teems with interest. It is well edited by Dr. L. B. White, who shows his qualification for the work by a paper on Christian Literature; and the whole "get up" of the work does credit to the Evangelical Alliance, from whose office it proceeds.

(1) *Missionary Year Book*, for 1889. London: Religious Tract Society.

(2) *The Great Value and Success of Foreign Missions*. By Rev. John Liggins. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1889. Price 3s.

(3) *Religious Condition of Christendom*. Edited by the Rev. L. B. White, D.D. London: Office of the Evangelical Alliance, 1885. Price 7s. 6d.

The Henry Irving Edition of Shakespeare (1) is one on which all concerned may be heartily congratulated. It is difficult to see what more is required in an issue of the works of our great poet. Mr. Irving has written a pleasant introductory essay upon Shakespeare as a playwright, which he undoubtedly was, we may say, first of all. Mr. Irving is also joint editor with Mr. F. A. Marshall, upon whose capable shoulders most of the burden, however, seems to have fallen. Each play has an introduction treating of its literary history, its stage history, and concluding with critical remarks which are always learned, judicious, and suitable. The text followed is that of the Folio Edition of 1623, except in a few instances; such parts of the plays as are not really necessary to the story, and which the length of the original makes it desirable to omit, are enclosed in brackets and marked in the margin; and so we have a complete edition of Shakespeare's plays so arranged that it forms an acting edition or one suitable for public recitation and reading; while private students will here find almost all the help they require to a good understanding of the author. The meanings of difficult words are put at the foot of the page, and so the turning over to a glossary, which is often so tiresome, is avoided. Every play is furnished with a sketch map to show its locality; and there are notes written and arranged with great care, which will be found most useful. In order that nothing should be wanting, there are notes even to the tables of *dramatis personæ*; and Mr. Gordon Brown has exercised his art in giving abundant illustrations which are spirited and striking. This edition of Shakespeare is a very complete one, and ought to find an honoured place on the shelves of all who take a pride, and find pleasure and profit (and who does not?), in the works of our great national poet.

In *Fifteen Hundred Facts and Similes* (2) Mr. Tinling has furnished forth a volume similar to many others, and no better or worse than its predecessors. Such books are useful to preachers and other speakers who desire to embellish their addresses with "wise saws and modern instances," and as they speedily become used up—for the more striking a simile or fact is the less often can it be quoted—there will always be room for fresh collections. Some of Mr. Tinling's facts do not seem to us to be very striking, and his similes at times are far-fetched. If they are, as the author claims, new, they are not always novel and not in all cases to the point. The volume is furnished with very full indexes, so that if one seeks in it for any fact or simile he may wish for, he can hardly fail to find it, if it happens to be there.

(1) *The Works of William Shakespeare*. Edited by Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall. London: Blackie & Son, 1888.

(2) *Fifteen Hundred Facts and Similes*. By J. F. B. Tinling, B.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889. Price 6s.