

AUGUST 1889.

# The Theological Monthly

---

JUSTIN MARTYR.<sup>1</sup>

WE in this country are comparatively ignorant of American theology. Many are thoroughly acquainted with the movements of religious thought and the development of theology in Germany; they are learned in all the speculations of the Tübingen school and the later theories of Harnack, Wellhausen, Schürer, and Holtzmann, but know little or nothing of the writings of theologians on the other side of the Atlantic who speak their own language. And yet theology has neither been stagnant nor unproductive in America. In recent years it has made vast progress, and many of its divines occupy a high place in the theological world. The old dogmatic theology of Edwards and Hodge has given place to one more thoroughly scientific. Professor Warfield, of Princeton Theological Seminary, the successor of Dr. Hodge, is one of the most accomplished theologians of the present day, and by his learning and critical spirit will soon establish for himself an illustrious name. Dr. Schaff, although by birth a Swiss, has for many years been a naturalised citizen of America, and is universally esteemed as worthy of a position along with the most illustrious German and English theologians. And Dr. Casper Gregory has by his critical researches earned for himself in Germany, as well as in America, the name of a most accomplished scholar and Biblical critic. Lectureships

<sup>1</sup> *The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity*: Lectures delivered on the L. P. Stone foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary in March, 1888, by George T. Purves, D.D., Pastor of the first Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh.

have also been established in America similar to the Bampton and Hulsean in England, and the Baird and Croal in Scotland, which have been conducive to the promotion of theological learning.

Dr. Purves is to us unknown by name or fame ; probably this arises from our avowed ignorance of American theology. All that we know of him is that he is the pastor of a Presbyterian church in Pittsburgh. He was the lecturer of the Stone foundation for the year 1888, and these lectures were delivered in Princeton. After a careful perusal and investigation of his work, we feel bound to speak of it in high terms of commendation. It exhibits great learning and research, an impartial and candid spirit pervades it, and the style is remarkably clear and attractive. The interest in the subject is awakened at the commencement, and is kept up to the close of the work.

The subject selected by Dr. Purves is highly important, and has not as yet been so thoroughly examined as it merits. The writings of Justin Martyr impart to us information concerning the state of the Christian Church in the middle of the second century. Now this, apart from the Apostolic, is the most important age of the Church. It is in this age that we can find the solution of many important questions, as, for example, the relations of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, the nature of the organisation of the Apostolic Church, the influence of philosophy upon the Christian doctrines, and especially the origin of the books of the New Testament. From the time of the Apostles to the middle of the second century there is a comparative paucity of Christian writings which have come down to us: the short Epistles of Clemens Romanus and Polycarp, some doubtful Epistles of Ignatius, the more than doubtful Epistle of Barnabas, the so-called Shepherd of Hermas, and the lately-discovered Teaching of the Apostles comprise nearly all that has reached our times. We know from other resources that there was no lack of writers both among the orthodox Christians and the early Gnostics, but their works have perished. And thus it happens that for information regarding the early post-Apostolic

Church we must refer almost entirely to the writings of Justin Martyr. We do not think that Dr. Purves could have chosen a more important topic in Church history than that which he has chosen—the testimony of Justin Martyr to early Christianity.

Justin Martyr was born about A.D. 80, thus before the death of the Apostle John, and therefore before the close of the Apostolic age. He was a native of Samaria, but was not a Samaritan, but a Gentile by birth—probably a son of one of those colonists who were settled in Samaria after the Jewish war. He addicted himself to the study of philosophy, and was, as he tells us, a seeker after God in the philosophies of the different schools. Like all religious and inquiring minds in those days, he was powerfully attracted by the philosophy of Plato. He gives us an account of his conversion, and relates how that in Christianity only he found the true philosophy. After he became a Christian he did not cease to be a philosopher; he still wore the philosophic garb, and went about the cities of the Roman Empire as a lecturer. It does not appear that he ever became a presbyter, or, to use the language of our own times, a minister. He chiefly resided in Rome, and undertook, as an apologist, the defence of the Christians against their heathen oppressors. According to Eusebius and the most trustworthy authorities, he suffered martyrdom in the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

Justin, as it appears, was a voluminous author. Eusebius informs us that he wrote a work against Marcion, who was then alive, and a work against all the heresies that have arisen. He states that "after having contended with great success against the Greeks, he addressed also other works, containing a defence of our faith, to the Emperor Antoninus, surnamed the Pious, and to the Senate of Rome." Of these numerous works only three have come down to us, whose authenticity is in general uncontested—the two Apologies and the Dialogue. The two Apologies were addressed to Antoninus Pius, and were written to that philosophic and mild emperor with a design to show that Christianity ought to be protected because it was a system of philosophy, and

therefore equally entitled to the imperial favour as the systems of Aristotle and Plato. The date of these Apologies was probably A.D. 147. The dialogue was with Trypho the Jew, and its design was to demonstrate to the Jews that Christianity was predicted by their prophets; in short, it is a defence of the Messiahship of Jesus. It is a question whether such a dialogue actually occurred, or whether the form was merely adopted by Justin to promulgate his opinions. Dr. Purves, in a note, tells us that of these writings of Justin there exist only two complete manuscripts, the Codex Regius Parisinus, written in 1364, and the Codex Claromontanus, now in England, written in 1541. What a striking difference here between the few and recent manuscripts of Justin's writings and the numerous and ancient manuscripts of the New Testament!

Dr. Purves, having in the first lecture considered the importance of Justin Martyr's testimony in general, on account of its recent date and its necessary bearing upon modern questions, proceeds in the second lecture to consider Justin's testimony to the social and civil relations of Christianity. He observes that we have here undoubted proofs of the extensive diffusion of Christianity in early times. The Gospel spread with amazing rapidity throughout the provinces of the Roman Empire, and far beyond its limits. The converts were not limited to any particular class or nation. Whilst the Jews in general rejected Jesus as their Messiah, the Gentiles believed on Him. "In all places throughout the world," observes Justin, "there is not one single race of men, whether barbarians or Greeks, or whatever they may be called, nomads, or wanderers, or herdsmen living in tents, among whom prayers and giving of thanks are not made to the Father and Maker of the universe through the name of the crucified Jesus." Of course, the language here is hyperbolic; but still it testifies to the vast diffusion of Christianity, and has its counterpart in the words of St. Paul, wherein he speaks of the faith of his converts as "spoken of throughout the whole world." Dr. Purves takes the moderate view that, during these early ages, Christianity was not much exposed to

persecution from the Roman Government. Christians suffered chiefly, as they did in the days of St. Paul, from the violence of the multitude, and, as then, they were rather protected than persecuted by the civil authority. The persecutions under Nero and Domitian were rather outbursts of imperial fury, occasioned by particular circumstances, than systematic proceedings of the government against Christianity. He admits that Christianity was, like all other unauthorised societies, illegal, and that Christians might be proceeded against, as indeed is evident from the celebrated letter of Trajan to Pliny; but that until the reign of Marcus Aurelius this was seldom done. "The evidence," he observes, "goes to show that neither Trajan, Hadrian, nor Antoninus took any active part in the persecution of Christians, but sought rather to restrain all violent outbreaks. This had not been the case in the previous period. The two Roman persecutions of the first century, of which we have any clear account, were directed by Nero and Domitian themselves. But with the accession of Trajan, and, indeed, of Nerva before him, a new class of princes occupied the throne of the Cæsars, princes who were neither jealous nor tyrannical, nor serious enough to persecute religion as such, and who were too just to countenance popular violence." And a little further on he remarks: "that under these emperors the actual sufferings of the Christians were, after all, not very severe." He states that only one known martyrdom can be confidently ascribed to the reign of Hadrian, and, besides the Bithynian sufferers of whom Pliny informs us, we know only of two in the reign of Trajan. All the great persecutions arose afterwards. This is certainly a different and more favourable view of these early Roman emperors, with reference to their relation to Christianity, than is generally taken. If correct, it is certainly very remarkable that the Roman persecutions should break out afresh in the reign of an emperor who, from all that we know of him in history and in his writings, approached nearest in disposition to Christianity—Marcus Aurelius.

The third lecture treats of Justin's testimony to the relation of Gentile and Jewish Christianity. Here Dr.

Purves shows most conclusively that the celebrated theory of the Tübingen school, that there was originally two antagonistic phases of Christianity—a Jewish and a Gentile; and that Catholic Christianity arose from a reconciliation of these two, each giving up certain points of opposition, finds no countenance in the writings of Justin. There is no allusion to such a collision of opinions in the Christian Church or to such a compromise. Justin decidedly repudiates what has been regarded as Jewish Christianity; he regards those Jewish Christians who still held to Jewish customs and ordinances as weak. His position was that of St. Paul, that such Jewish Christians are to be tolerated, but that they never represented the faith of the Church. "If some," he says, "through weak-mindedness, wish to observe such institutions as were given by Moses, from which they expect some virtue, but which we believe were appointed on account of the hardness of the peoples' hearts, along with their hope in Christ and the eternal and natural acts of righteousness and piety, yet chose to live with the Christians and the faithful, not inducing them either to be circumcised like themselves, or to keep the Sabbath or to observe any such ordinances, then I hold that we ought to join ourselves to such, and associate with them in all things as kinsmen and brethren." Here there is no compromise, but a spirit of forbearance and toleration toward the weak. Indeed the theory of Baur in its extreme form has now been abandoned, being incapable of being maintained after such direct declarations of Justin. The only early productions which can be brought forward in support of it are the Clementines, but these are now universally regarded not as the expressions of the Christian faith, but as Ebionitic aberrations. What savours of legalism in the writings of Justin has now been proved to be not of Jewish, but of Gentile origin. So far from having adopted the views of the Judaizing Christians, Justin was as much opposed to them as the Apostle Paul himself.

The fourth lecture treats of Justin's testimony to the influence of philosophy on early Christianity. On this point Dr. Purves has some very important and instructive remarks

on the state of heathen philosophy in the age of Justin. Here, also, he takes a more favourable view than is generally taken. There were then many "seekers after God," many earnest-minded philosophers who sincerely sought the light, though they did not, like Justin, attain to it. Philosophy was then at once eclectic and religious: it selected what it judged best in the different systems with a desire to obtain the correct knowledge of God. "Humanity," he observes, "had at least discovered that its need was God, and had learned to distrust its ability to find Him. If in Seneca and Epictetus, in Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre, we read sentiments which seem almost Christian, we are to infer that the dawn of a better day was drawing near, and these exceptional spirits were like high mountain peaks which catch the first glow from the rising sun." Justin Martyr was himself a philosopher before he became a Christian; and, as we have already remarked, did not throw off the mantle of philosophy after his conversion. He was the first who, whether for good or evil, united philosophy with theology, which union in the second century was followed up by Clement, Origen, and the other Alexandrian divines. Justin Martyr's philosophical system was founded on a belief of the incarnation of the Logos. This idea doubtless had its origin from the prologue of St. John's Gospel; but his conception of the Logos approximates more to the idea of Philo than of St. John. According to Justin the Logos is used in the sense of the Reason. He was in the world during all time. It was the Logos who inspired the prophets, and who actuated all the philosophers and seekers after God among the heathen. He was the source of all the holy aspirations and profound thoughts of men in every age and country. And at length, in the course of time, he became incarnate in Jesus Christ. Dr. Purves thus represents the views of Justin: "To Justin the grand fact of Christianity was the incarnation of the divine Logos. In a real incarnation he most positively believed. The Logos who had previously appeared to the patriarchs and spoken through the prophets, and been partially known to all mankind, had voluntarily and according to the will of the Father become incarnate in the Virgin Mary. The

whole Logos had thus revealed Himself. The full manifestation of the truth, therefore, had at last been made." Of course, in the idea of the incarnation of the Logos, Justin differs diametrically from Philo.

The fifth lecture is perhaps to the Biblical critic the most important in the book; in it Dr. Purves considers the testimony of Justin to the canon of the New Testament. This is a point on which there has been much discussion in modern times. Dr. Purves considers "the memoirs of the Apostles" called also "the Gospels" to be undoubtedly the synoptical Gospels as we now possess them. But the most important point is the testimony of Justin to the fourth Gospel. Here the opinions of even adverse critics have now undergone an important change. Hilgenfeld, the greatest living representative of the Tübingen school, now admits that Justin makes use of it. There are numerous undesigned coincidences, allusions, and references which cannot be otherwise explained. And especially there is what must be considered as a direct quotation: "Christ," observes Justin, "has said, Except ye be born again ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God; but that it is impossible that those who are once born should enter a second time into their mother's womb and be born, is clear to every one." "The positive reasons," as Dr. Ezra Abbot well remarks, "for believing that Justin derived his quotation from the fourth Gospel are (1) the fact that in no other report of the teaching of Christ, except that of John, do we find this figure of the new birth; (2) the insistence in both Justin and John on the necessity of the new birth to an entrance into the kingdom of heaven; (3) its mention in both in connection with baptism; (4) and last and most important of all, the fact that Justin's remark on the impossibility of a second natural birth is such a platitude in the form in which he presents it that we cannot regard it as original." That Justin recognises the fourth Gospel and quotes from it as containing the words of Christ is a strong argument in favour of its genuineness. The doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos also could only be suggested to Justin by the perusal of the prologue of St. John's Gospel.

It is true that Justin does not mention John by name as the author of the fourth Gospel. But there is nothing singular in this, as Justin, with the sole exception of the Apocalypse, does not mention the name of any writer of the New Testament. His appeals are indirect rather than direct. And the reason of this is because his writings were apologetic: they were addressed not to Christians but to unbelievers; and therefore he could not appeal to authors whose authority was not recognised. He speaks generally of the memoirs of the Apostles; but to state the different writers of these memoirs would be productive of no good effect. Neither Jew nor Pagan, neither Trypho nor Antoninus, would have been moved by the citation of Apostolic teaching.

The sixth and last lecture is the testimony of Justin to the organization and belief of the post-Apostolic Church. The early ecclesiastical constitution of the Church has in recent times occasioned much dispute; the writings of Hatch in England, and Harnack in Germany, have been keenly criticised. On this point it must be confessed that the writings of Justin do not cast much light. He mentions the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but is silent on the ecclesiastical office-bearers of the Church. In one passage he seems to intimate that in every Church there was a permanent president. What was collected in the Church was to be deposited with the president for the relief of the needy. Neither the name bishop nor presbyter occurs. Now this agrees with what we consider was the gradual growth of the Church's organization. In the Apostolic age, bishops and presbyters were synonymous terms; but by degrees one became a permanent president. According to the Epistles of Ignatius, these presidents of local Churches were called bishops; but in the Western Churches this title was not given until a later age: there is no allusion to it in the Epistles of Clement and Polycarp, or even in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans. Episcopacy was of gradual growth, and was not at the same time adopted by the whole Christian Church; it was first adopted by the Oriental before it was used by the Western churches.

In the writings of Justin Martyr we have a tolerably full statement of the doctrines then embraced by the Church in general, and they are to all intents and purposes the same as are now adopted by the Reformed Churches. Special prominence is given to the incarnation and divinity of Christ. The early Church so far from being unitarian in their views, and regarding Jesus Christ as a mere man, as Priestley formerly attempted to prove, held the doctrine of Christ's divinity as the very centre of their faith, the essence of their religion. As Dean Mansel remarks, the earliest heretics found it easier to deny the humanity than the divinity of Christ, and they thus testify the universal belief of the Christians in the latter. To Justin Martyr, Christianity was the religion of the incarnate Logos, the Word made flesh.

The peculiar views of Justin are certainly somewhat modified by his philosophy, and there is a certain legalism about them, apparently at variance with the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. Although he would not be considered in any sense a Calvinist, if we may use such an expression, yet he would be regarded by all liberal Christians as orthodox. On one point only did he differ from the generality of Christians, but even this would be considered by many pious persons as a recommendation, he was a strong millenarian, a firm believer in the personal reign of Christ in Jerusalem for a thousand years, but this personal reign he supposed would follow and not precede the resurrection.

We have thus gone over these lectures of Dr. Purves ; in their perusal we have derived great satisfaction and much information ; and can most heartily recommend them not only to the theological students to whom they are primarily addressed, but to all Christians as affording an insight into the beliefs and customs of the Christian Church in the first half of the second century ; and we have to welcome Dr. Purves as a theologian of great promise, and trust that he will be spared to produce similar works for the edification of the Christian Church. We are glad to think that America can produce such moderate and learned theologians.

PATON J. GLOAG.

## PROPHECY.

THE study of prophecy is usually supposed to mean the study of Divine prediction, whether fulfilled in past history or still unfulfilled. But, interesting as the study is, we are not allowed to approach it at present without meeting a preliminary objection. Is there such a thing as prediction at all? If there be, it is allowed only as a secondary meaning of the word prophecy. And those who allow prophecy in the sense of prediction, often hold that its first meaning must be distinctly relative to the times in which the prophet lived. A double sense, in which prophecy partly accomplished in the days of the prophet may be *fulfilled* long afterwards, is rejected as inaccurate, and destructive to all exact study of the sacred text.

As it is with miracle, so it is held to be with prophecy in its miraculous aspect of prediction. Unfulfilled prophecy, if there be such a thing, is left to rest among the words of "the book that is sealed." The learned do not and cannot, the unlearned may not, attempt to make it plain.

This attitude is hardly wise or safe. There is one event which stands *predicted* in the creed of all Christendom. Every Christian man, woman, or child *must prophesy* whenever the Catholic faith is recited, in whatever terms. Take the Apostles' creed, for example. "I believe in Jesus Christ, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, He descended into hell, the third day He rose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; *from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.*" These last words are either sheer *prediction* or else they are nothing at all. They are no vague statement of an opinion, that death is not the end of all things for all men, but that the naked soul must confess the deeds done in the body, in some all-

exposing world. This is no mere vision of an ancient poet describing the judgment seat of Rhadamanthus as Virgil described it in the scenery of the world of shades—

“Gnosius hæc Rhadamanthus habet durissima regna ;  
Castigatque auditque dolos ; subigitque fateri  
Quæ quis apud superos, furto lætatus, inani  
Distulit in seram commissa piacula mortem.”

Very different is the creed of Christendom. It is not that we shall give account in the other world, but that Christ *shall come again to this*. “This same Jesus” who was born of the Virgin Mary, and dwelt at Nazareth, and came to Jerusalem from Bethany, “lowly and riding upon an ass,” shall come with the clouds of heaven, and every eye shall see Him. And He shall not only judge the living, but shall also raise the dead.

A belief in unfulfilled prophecy, in the sense of *Divine prediction*, is therefore an integral part of the Catholic creed. There is absolutely no other foundation for the familiar statement. For if it be asked, How do you know that the Son of Mary will come again? there is no other answer than this, *It is written in the New Testament that He said so*, and commanded His Apostles so to teach. It was written in the Old Testament that He should do so, and He declared that all things that were written in the prophets concerning the Son of Man should be fulfilled. “Out of thee (Bethlehem) shall He come forth to me,” said the prophet Micah. “I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven,” said the prophet Daniel. The first of these prophecies, that of Micah, was generally acknowledged as a prediction by Jews and Christians alike. The Sanhedrin cited it to Herod in ignorance of its actual fulfilment at that very time (Matt. ii.), and Herod acted on it in the slaughter of the babes at Bethlehem. Until the birth of Jesus it was *prediction* absolute, unfulfilled. The words of Daniel about “His coming with the clouds of heaven” were also then extant—a prediction unfulfilled. They were accepted as prophecy by our Saviour on His oath before

Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64), and His acceptance of them sealed His death sentence on the spot. He staked His life on the truth of them and died. They are accepted as prediction by all Christendom ; used as the ground of comfort in the most trying moments by all saints. "We shall be caught up together with them (whose loss we mourn for a season) in clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." And we "comfort one another with these words" of St. Paul (1 Thess. iv. 18). Yet the sole foundation of this belief is unfulfilled prophecy. It was written in Daniel vii. 13, *and nowhere else* in the Old Testament. It was cited by our Blessed Saviour in Daniel's words, before Caiaphas, on the day that He was condemned to die. It was again repeated by the lips of angels on Ascension day, and written by St. Luke (Acts i. 9-11), and again by St. John in the Apocalypse (chap. i. 7). It is embodied in the creed, and on what authority? On that of Daniel, and our Lord and two angels, and St. Luke, and St. Paul, and St. John—a sevenfold witness. Caiaphas, too, is implicated, and the Sanhedrin. For, on the citation of these words from Daniel, they at once pronounced our Lord guilty of blasphemy. Now this they could hardly have done if the words had been then uttered for the first time. If Old Testament Scripture had not spoken of One who, as Judge of all the earth, should "come in the clouds of heaven," it might have been an imposture to say this, but *blasphemy it could hardly be*. For whose dignity could be injured by it? If one who is merely man claims the known prerogatives of God, that is blasphemy. If he claims that which God has not claimed, he may be an impostor, but he has spoken nothing in disparagement of God. No, it requires the words of Daniel vii. 13 to substantiate the charge of blasphemy, even formally, against Him who stood before Caiaphas and was adjured to speak. It was prediction then, unfulfilled prediction, when He cited it. It is unfulfilled still, however many are committed to it. If it was not true when Daniel alone had given utterance to it, *why should it be true now?* If there is no such thing as prophecy in the sense of prediction, upon what authority do

we rest the confession that "from *thence* (*i.e.*, from heaven) He shall come to judge the quick and the dead?"

In view of this it is hardly safe to ignore the fact that the books of the prophets contain unfulfilled predictions, and to explain the word prophecy as though it were limited to moral or spiritual teaching, and could refer to nothing else. If the New Testament is true, various predictions concerning our Lord's first coming were accomplished with the greatest exactness. In the books which contain these predictions there are many things concerning His kingdom that have received no such exact fulfilment hitherto. Nor are they likely to receive it in the present day. For it appears to be an axiom concerning the Divine promises, that in every several dispensation their fulfilment varies according to the form of Divine government which that particular dispensation maintains. For example, God's promises of help and deliverance to Israel had a perfectly distinct meaning in and after the Babylonish captivity, from that which they had while the kingdom in Jerusalem was still maintained. God delivered Jerusalem from Sennacherib in answer to the faith of Hezekiah and Isaiah. He did not deliver it from Nebuchadnezzar in spite of Jeremiah's intercessions in Jerusalem, and those of Ezekiel and Daniel elsewhere. But He did deliver Ananias, Azarias, and Misael from Nebuchadnezzar's fire.

Again, when our Lord was on earth in the body, the fulfilment of the predictions concerning His Person was literal. Since His ascension the Holy Spirit has taken His place as Present Head of the Church on earth. During this government all fulfilment of the Divine promises is spiritual, that is to say, suited to the operations of the Holy Ghost in and among men. But if the prediction of Christ's second coming is ever literally fulfilled, there seems reason to expect an equally literal fulfilment of other predictions concerning the attendant circumstances of that event. With such predictions the writings of the prophets abound. Upon the whole, then, while we allow that for us, during the present dispensation, the fulfilment of prophecy is mostly spiritual, and confined to the region of the invisible working

of the Holy Ghost, it is quite impossible to deny that prophecy does contain prediction. The old prophets were not simply preachers of moral and spiritual truths.

There is an old-fashioned distinction between two things that are very commonly confused together, which it seems desirable to revive in the present day. I mean the distinction between Inspiration and Revelation; the *inspiration of a man* by the Holy Ghost, and *the delivery* to that man *of a message* or revelation from God. The two things are not identical. A message is one thing; the capacity to deliver a message is another. It cannot be too distinctly stated and remembered that inspiration is not a message in itself.

In the Old Testament this is never overlooked. Saul and others may be among the prophets, but "who is their father?" The inspiration may be that of "a lying spirit." "Beloved, believe not every spirit," says St. John (1 John iv. 1). "Many false prophets are gone out into the world."

In the sense in which Moses, and Samuel, and Isaiah, and the rest of the goodly fellowship were prophets, there is no prophecy without a direct revelation from God. *Prophecy*, in a word, is *revelation*, not mediate, but immediate; the Word of God in the mouth of the prophet, however received, however apprehended, but still the very Word of God. "At sundry times and in divers manners *God spake* in time past unto the fathers by the prophets." The various methods of revelation were well described to the leaders of the Exodus, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam. "Hear now my words. If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make Myself known unto him in a vision, and will *speak unto him* in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all Mine house. With him *will I speak mouth to mouth*, even apparently and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold" (Num. xii. 6-8). In a dream or vision, then, or else face to face, God revealed Himself to the prophets. And without this revelation there is no prophet in the proper sense of the word. As there is no messenger without a message, none sent without a sender, so is there no prophet without a revelation from God. The whole succession from Moses to our

Saviour is described in these words, "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, *and will put My words in his mouth*, and he shall speak unto them all that I command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto My words which he shall speak in My name, I will require it of him. But the prophet which shall presume to speak a word in My name, *which I have not commanded him to speak . . . .* even that prophet shall die" (Deut. xviii. 18-20). It is impossible to mistake the meaning. It is not inspiration simply that constitutes a prophet. He must not speak anything *which God has not commanded him*. It will not suffice to say, I am an inspired man, and therefore I am free to speak, and you are bound to listen. Even a prophet may not speak anything except what the Lord puts in his mouth. That this is the true interpretation of the passage appears by the question immediately suggested, "How shall we know the word *which the Lord hath not spoken?*" (ver. 21). The fact that the prophet has spoken is clearly insufficient. "When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but *the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously*; thou shalt not be afraid of him."

"The Lord hath spoken" and "The prophet hath spoken" are not therefore identical propositions. In other words, *revelation* and *inspiration* are two totally distinct things.

I make no apology for dwelling upon this distinction at present, because it seems to me almost obliterated in modern theology. Inspiration is so pressed upon our notice, that we lose sight of the truth that there ever was such a thing as revelation at all. Take a recent example. "One of ourselves even *a prophet of our own*," in an expository paper on "the Prophets" in the *Homiletic Magazine* for March, not only combats the belief that "prediction" was essential to the prophet's work, but actually omits all mention of revelation in the stricter sense, the sense in which Bishop Pearson used the word ("Pearson on the Creed," Art I., I believe).

The very word Revelation only occurs twice in the paper I refer to, and once it is used by way of denial. God's "secret counsel" is not a revelation of times, and seasons, and events! "The prophets were chosen vessels of spiritual revelation"; but unless I have entirely misunderstood the writer, in no higher sense than he himself may be so now. Yet a revelation from God is no subordinate element of prophecy. It is the very essence of the thing. By revelation I mean, as every reader of Pearson is aware, an actual Divine message, a "Divine patefaction," which God has given to the prophet directly; a message which it is the prophet's part to deliver faithfully to those to whom he is sent. How this message is delivered to the prophet is immaterial. It may be in a vision, or a dream; or by word of mouth, as to Moses. The prophet may be in a trance when he receives it, or he may be in a natural state. The message delivered to the prophet is *the revelation*. The faculty by which the prophet is enabled to receive it and to deliver it, or both, is called *inspiration*. But the Divine afflatus is not identical with the words that the inspiration enables the prophet to transmit. An illustration may help us here. There is no telegram without an electric current. But an electric current is not in itself a telegram. The current might pass over the wires all day long, without a message being sent or received. The telegraphist does not make use of his electricity except when he has a message to convey. But the electricity is not the message, and all the electricity in the world will not make the message. So inspiration is not revelation. All the inspiration in the world will not of itself form a message from God.

The delivery of a Divine message, a revelation directly received from God, is the one indispensable characteristic of a true prophet. It is not written in that passage where God appoints the prophets, from Moses down to our Lord, that He will put His spirit upon them, but "I will raise them up a prophet . . . and I will *put My words in his mouth*" (Deut. xviii. 18). Just so "the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth" (Num. xxiii. 5). Only the word that I shall speak

unto thee, that thou shalt speak (xxii. 35). If inspiration had been give to Balaam, leaving him free to shape his own message, who doubts that Balak would have been pleased? What would have been easier than to present the matter in such a way that, while extolling the blessedness of Israel, the dignity of Moab should be preserved? In fact, Moab was at this time in no danger from Israel. Balak's fears were based upon a misconception, so far as his own people were concerned. Midian was indeed in peril (see Num. xxxi., and comp. Joshua xiii. 21), and Midian was allied with Moab. But the Moabites were under special protection (see Deut. ii. 9). If Balaam therefore had been able "by virtue of his more general insight and inspiration," to "predict events which were yet unobserved by the eyes of the multitude," surely he might have told Balak, that while Midian was in imminent peril, Moab for the present was secure. In fact, he did the exact opposite. "What *this people* shall do to *thy people* in the latter days," he told Balak (Num. xxiv. 14). Of what should befall Midian within the year he said nothing whatever. Why not? No reason can be given, except that which is clear on the face of the whole narrative, and is said *fourteen times* in the course of three chapters, that the words of Balaam's prophecy were not his own. "Have I any power at all to say anything? The word that God putteth in my mouth, that shall I speak" (Num. xxii., xxiii., xxiv.).

The story of Balaam affords an excellent illustration of the difference between revelation and inspiration. The inspiration of Balaam is described thus: "The Spirit of God came upon him." He then speaks of himself as "the man whose eye was closed" (R.V.) *i.e.*, closed to earthly things. He "saw the vision of the Almighty,—falling down, and having His eyes open." This is a form of inspiration. The revelation consists in the simple fact that while in this state, or when he "met" the Lord in a natural state, he "heard the words of God," or "the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth," and bade him *say thus*. In short, the revelation was the Divine message, the inspiration was the current which enabled the prophet to convey it.

And here we may note a most important difference, which Archdeacon Farrar's paper seems to obliterate, between the prophets and the Church. The prophets were recipients of an immediate revelation—a direct message from God. *The Church has never received an immediate revelation.* Consequently the inspiration of the prophets is entirely different from the inspiration of the Church. Her work is to be a witness and a keeper of holy writ, the *written revelation*. The work of the prophets was to deliver, and sometimes to write, the revelation itself. Beside the written revelation, the Church has but one deposit, the Faith once delivered to the Saints. The form of this faith is, of necessity, her own. It is her confession of the Truth taught her; her answer to her Master's questions on His own teaching. "Have ye understood all these things?" "Yea, Lord." Then "Whom say ye that I am?" "The Christ of God." If human teachers require their disciples to answer questions as to what has been taught—and how else is it possible to ascertain that any teaching has been apprehended?—must not the Divine Teacher also demand of His disciples a confession of their faith? This the Church must make, and can delegate the task to no one. Of this and of God's written Word she is the witness and keeper. But the prophets had a far higher task. It was theirs to receive the very words of revelation ("at sundry times and in divers manners"), and to deliver them to the Church—a deposit for all ages. For this purpose inspiration was given them. But their inspiration holds the second place, not the first. The fact that a man is inspired does not of itself constitute a Divine message. He can make no revelation, if he have "no commandment of the Lord."

Every reader who has followed me thus far will, I feel sure, have perceived that we are confronted by a general denial of revelation in the present day. It may not always be intended, but there it is. And the paper I have already referred to is an example. I can find nothing said of the prophets in that paper, which the writer's admirers might not say of the writer himself. "The moral interpretation of God's method of exalting and punishing men and nations;" to

“deal with sweeping generalisations” (this is eminently characteristic) “and inevitable laws;” “denunciations,” not “absolute,” but “conditional;” not “exceptionless, but partial;” not “supernaturally predictive, but as the illustration of eternal principles which God had specially brought home to them;” surely all this is within the reach of the Church in general—the duty of the preachers of to-day. To be “preachers of righteousness, statesmen, and patriots, enlightened to teach an ever-apostatising nation, messengers of Jehovah” (Hag. i. 13) [but this is equally descriptive of the priest, Mal. ii. 7], “men of God” [but so was Timothy, 1 Tim. vi. 11]; “men of the Spirit” [but “if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His,” Rom. viii. 9]. This is said to be the work of the prophets, but surely it is the duty of many who are not inspired.

“The prophet uttered” the Word of Jehovah, “what Jehovah saith.” And so may we, if we keep to Holy Scripture. Finally “there was a sense in which all the Lord’s people were prophets.” “He called them gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken.” And this is the impression that the whole paper leaves upon the reader’s mind. The fact that the prophets received any revelation at all beyond that teaching of the Spirit of God, which any man of God may have now, is not referred to. They “desired to see the things that we see and have not seen them.”

Whether this is levelling up or levelling down, it is undoubtedly levelling. If Archdeacon Farrar is on a level with the prophets, what does it signify which level it is? In fact, he seems to set himself above them. The Book of Daniel is treated even with contempt. The only prophecy (of Old Testament Scripture) which speaks of our Lord’s coming in the clouds of heaven—the book of “Daniel the prophet,” as He called him—is dismissed with one contemptuous sentence, “that sort of minute and detailed description of future events, of which the Book of Daniel would be a specimen, if Daniel were its author!”

But where is the single atom of *proof* that Daniel was not

the author of that book? I have already stated that the very essence of prophecy, as it belongs to the prophets of the Old Testament, is revelation—a Divine message received direct from God. From Moses downwards this is never absent. Beginning with Deut. xviii., which I have already cited, we find that the prophet's business is to speak that which the Lord hath said. Passing over the somewhat scanty records of prophecy between Moses and Samuel, we find at the call of this great prophet that he received an express message to Eli from the lips of the Lord (1 Sam. iii). Again, the word of the Lord came to Nathan (2 Sam. vii.), bidding him tell David the exact opposite of that which his own prophetic instinct had led him to say; not "Go do all that is in thine heart, for the Lord is with thee," but "Shalt thou build me an house for me to dwell in?" Not what the inspired Nathan thought, but what the Lord revealed, was the prophecy—a prophecy of Christ, too, as is clear from a comparison of the several forms in which it is presented (2 Sam. vii. 12-16; Ps. lxxxix. 19-37 and cxxxii. 11; 1 Chron. xvii. 11-14; Isa. lv. 3; Acts xiii. 34; Heb. i. 5).

In the time of Ahab and Jehoshaphat we have the same contrast between inspiration (of a certain sort) and revelation. Four hundred prophets foretold Ahab's success at Ramoth-Gilead. One man, Micaiah, the son of Imlah, foretold Ahab's death; and spoke under the same kind of limitation as Balaam, "As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith to me, that will I speak" (1 Kings xxii. 14). The attempt of Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, to emphasize the outcome of his own inspiration with a "thus saith the Lord," is well brought out in this story.

Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel lay stress on the same thing. "My heart within me is broken because of the prophets"—"They speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord"—"I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied" (Jer. xxiii. 9, 16, 21)—"Woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit and have seen nothing"—"Ye say, the Lord saith; albeit I have not spoken" (Ezek. xiii. 3, 7).

These passages are familiar. And I venture to ask, What possible explanation of them can be given, except the fact that a true prophet is one who has received an immediate and direct *revelation*; a false prophet is one who speaks by inspiration pretended or real (as in the case of the "lying spirit"), but without a message from God?

And the grand test of revelation is prediction. Without resting this for one moment on any derivation of the word prophet, we may point out that instead of prediction being only "not *excluded* from the sphere of a prophet's work," as Archdeacon Farrar puts it, there is hardly a prophet to be named in Old Testament Scripture who did not *predict*. What else is said in Acts iii. 24? "Yea, and *all the prophets*, from Samuel and them that followed after, as many as have spoken have likewise *told* (A.V. has "foretold") *of these days*," *i.e.*, the days of the Messiah. What is this but *prediction*? What spiritual insight could have detected the coming of the Messiah, unless it had been revealed? What else but prediction was it to speak of Bethlehem as His birthplace, and the Virgin as His mother? Of "the ass, and the colt the foal of an ass" whereon He rode into Jerusalem? Of the thirty pieces of silver given for His price, saying, "I cast them to the potter, in the house of the Lord?" Of His dumbness before His murderers, and of the stripes wherewith we were healed? Of the scattering of His followers, and the piercing of His side? Or of the death of him who betrayed Him, and the transfer of his bishopric to another? Of the bones that were not broken, and the flesh that saw no corruption? Or of His feet standing on the Mount of Olives, when He shall come again? It may well be that the *time* of the fulfilment of prophecy was concealed from the prophets and their hearers alike. But does prediction cease to be prediction because it is not stated *when* it shall be fulfilled? Or because, like Ezekiel's prophecy against Tyre (chap. xxvi.), it combines in one view an earlier attack by Nebuchadnezzar which was partially successful, and a later onset by another enemy in which the new city was destroyed.

Why does Archdeacon Farrar assert so positively that

when Micah prophesied that Zion should be ploughed like a field (Micah iii. 12) "he had meant, and had been universally understood to mean, that the doom would fall *at once*"? There is absolutely not one syllable to show when it was to be. The elders of the land (in Jer. xxvi. 19) make this comment, "Did Hezekiah King of Judah and all Judah put him at all to death? Did he not fear the Lord, and besought the Lord, and the Lord repented him *of the evil which he had pronounced against them?*" What is there to show that *time* formed any element of the prophecy. Here are no "forty days" named, as in the case of Nineveh. Why, then, does Archdeacon Farrar make the fulfilment of all predictions of this kind contingent upon the impenitence of the hearers? The fact that execution of a sentence may be delayed by repentance does not prove that it is ever absolutely recalled. "*Zion was ploughed* like a field, and Jerusalem did become heaps" after all. *Tyre was reduced* to a bare rock, though not by Nebuchadnezzar. It is not said (in Isa. xxxii., as Archdeacon Farrar implies) that "Zion should become a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks," or "that *the vengeance* should come in a year and some days," as any one who refers to the chapter may see.

But it is not only distant prediction that is impugned by this writer. Predictions concerning the immediate present or near future are minimised also. "Elijah," we are told, "uttered no prediction which did not concern the immediate present." What about his letter to Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xxi. 12-15)? When our Lord said to His disciples, "Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, *as it is written of him*" (Mark ix. 13), to what part of Old Testament Scripture does he refer? Who wrote the story of Elijah? Is it in any sense a prediction of John the Baptist?

And are "predictions that concern the immediate present" really less predictions than those which concern the distant future? Which is easier, to say that "In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood even thine," that one living (Ahaziah) shall not rise from the bed

where he is lying, and that another (Jehoram) shall die by a certain disease, or to foretell that some time in the course of centuries a city will be destroyed ?

If it is so easy to predict the near future, will Archdeacon Farrar kindly give us a prediction himself ? Let him say, for example, what event will occupy the largest space in the daily papers on a given day next week. Or let him go down to the City, and predict whether the price of any given security will be higher or lower at the next account. Elisha once predicted the price of wheat and barley the day before. And he was ridiculed. But his price was correct. And what else is this but *prediction* ? What else was it when Ahijah the Shilonite said to the wife of Jeroboam, at Shiloh, " Arise thou, therefore, get thee to thine own house ; and *when thy feet enter into the city, the child shall die !*" And Jeroboam's wife arose and departed and came to Tirzah : and when she came to the threshold of the door, the child died " (1 Kings xiv. 12, 17). What was it but prediction when the man of God from Judah prophesied of Josiah's work against the altar in Bethel, a work not executed until centuries had elapsed, but described beforehand in exact terms ? And what was it but prediction to say, " Because thou hast not obeyed the voice of the Lord, behold *as soon as thou art departed from me, a lion shall slay thee ?*" A prediction accomplished in the space of half an hour.

In short, if Archdeacon Farrar is to make good his " sweeping generalisations " about prediction, he will have to re-write the Old Testament. From the style in which he speaks of it, I can only suppose that he is prepared to do so ; but until he has done it, he may fairly be requested to speak of the narrative as it still stands.

The schools of the prophets have furnished him with materials for contemptuous criticism. " Had prediction been the main note of a prophet, there would have been an absurdity in the notion that they could be *trained* to read the secrets of the future, which God's mercy and providence has shrouded in darkness."

It may be so, but the very first mention of the schools of

the prophets in that passage of history where they occupy the largest space, under Elijah and Elisha, occurs thus: "When the Lord was about taking up Elijah to heaven by a whirlwind, *the sons of the prophets* that were at Bethel *came forth* to Elisha, and those at Jericho came near to him in like manner, *and said, Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?* And he said, I also am aware of it: hold your peace." Might one ask what sort of spiritual insight or sagacity enabled all the sons of the prophets to discover beforehand an event absolutely without parallel in the history of mankind, from the days of Noah to the days of the Son of Man? What else is this but *absolute prediction* of the most supernatural kind?

The "sons of the prophets" might not all become "prophets" in the higher sense; and their ordinary duties might be, and probably were, chiefly clerical, to use a modern simile. But why the fact of their being trained should make all revelation to them and all prediction on their part impossible it is not easy to say. The instance referred to shows that they did sometimes foretell future events. "Elijah," we are told, "belonged to no school of the prophets." But a child of ten years old might discover that at least two schools of the prophets belonged to him. To say that "Nathan, Gad, Abijah (*sic*), Jehu ben Hanani were as independent of them as Amos and the majority of the prophets whose writings are found in our Sacred Canon," is simply asserting what no man can prove. The only foundation for the whole sentence is a verse in Amos (vii. 14), "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son." From which it may be inferred that the case of Amos was an exception rather than the rule. For all we know to the contrary, Nathan and Gad may have been pupils of Samuel. Of Jehu ben Hanani we really know nothing, and if there was a prophet in the Old Testament named Abijah, it is the first time I have seen his name. Perhaps the same authority who told Archdeacon Farrar that Elisha "sent for a minstrel *to calm and control the tumult of his spirit*"—excited by the sight of Jehoram, I suppose—can tell us where the prophet Abijah is to be found.

But I must bring this paper to a close. I feel that I myself need something more than a minstrel to calm the indignation which is excited by seeing the word of prophecy treated thus.

"Instead of approaching the study of the prophets with preconceived theories, . . . usually one-sided and often positively misleading, the wiser and truer way is humbly to study the canon of prophetic writings and to note well their contents." It is well said, Mr. Archdeacon, but ill done. Delitzsch and Kuenen, and Philo, and Ewald, and a few references to the Lexicon and Concordance are not a sufficient substitute for *the study of the Sacred Text*. The passages that support the writer's theory are well chosen I admit. The mass of evidence on the other side is conveniently ignored. A few pretty sentences about "the hope for all Israel," which "becomes a hope for all mankind," will not suffice to repair the faults in this paper. Of what avail is it to tell us that the prophets "saw the body of heaven in his clearness, the vision of the perfect Man, the vision of the perfect God," if all that gives substance and truth to that vision has first been carefully cut away? Visions without revelation are visions and no more. Cut away the solid foundation, and how long will the graceful pillars, the lofty arches, the beautiful tracery remain? What is the use of advising us, on one page, humbly to study the Sacred Canon, of which every other page undermines the basis, while some sentences sweep whole masses of the building quite away. To study the Canon itself, with the most absolute submission, has been my greatest joy. Why is every one who believes it as it stands to be henceforth treated as a fool? However, to be called a fool is no new experience; and if the choice is to lie between the modern "prophets" on the one side, and those who devoutly accept the *predictions* of Holy Scripture on the other, my choice is made. Be it folly and slowness of heart to "believe *all* that the prophets have spoken," I trust that I may live and die a fool.

C. H. WALLER.

## SECESSIONS TO ROME.<sup>1</sup>

THE eternal controversy with Rome, it seems, can never be allowed to sleep. The occasional secession from our communion, now of a clergyman of more or less weight and authority, now of a layman of more or less education and position, now of a lady of pious and charitable disposition, warns us that we must still keep our controversial weapons ready for use. But in controversy, as in war, the weapons now employed are of a different character to what they once were. First of all, in consequence of the immense amount of labour and study of the most various kinds required of our clergy in the present day, they are, it must be confessed, much worse equipped than they once were for polemics. They may easily be worsted in a controversy with a Roman disputant whose whole time has been given to the assertion of the claims of his Church in the most effective manner. Then again, the age is impatient of what it regards as purely ecclesiastical questions, and especially impatient of the array of learning with which it was the fashion of old to discuss them. There is also a very healthy impatience of violent language. The invectives with which disputants in past times were wont to season their controversy would in our day do more harm than good to the side on which they were used. Above all, the vast changes which are passing over theological opinion in England have caused the controversialist of the earlier part of the century, of whom, perhaps, Dr. Cumming may be taken as a type, to be entirely out of date. The services which Dr. Littledale, in his *Plain Reasons*, and his *Words for Truth*, has rendered to our Church by re-stating the argument against Rome, in a manner suited to modern requirements, are known to all. Yet the old fictions seem nevertheless to have attractions for some minds, and are polished up anew

---

<sup>1</sup> *Authority; or, A Plain Reason for joining the Church of Rome.* By Luke Rivington, M.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1888.

and hurled at us once more, with more volubility than force, by Father Rivington. The fact that his book has reached a third edition must be our excuse for venturing once more on the ground already so well trodden. There is an additional reason for our doing so, in that, partly from the causes already assigned, partly from the Romeward (we do not mean necessarily *Romish* by this expression) tendencies of modern theology, partly from the increasing liberality of men's minds, there is a very great change in the way Romanism is regarded by the English public at large. This, though matter of congratulation on the whole, is a state of things which has its evils. It is difficult to make Englishmen in the present day understand either the gross perversions of history and fact upon which the Roman claims rest, or the deplorable consequences of their acceptance on the political and religious life of nations. We have not, it is true, to lament any longer the very serious losses we experienced between 1845 and 1855, and what losses we have to confess are more than compensated by our gains. Still, there is an occasional leakage from our communion to Rome, especially among persons of refinement and property, which would not occur if our clergy and laity were better acquainted with ecclesiastical history, and more alive to the ingenuity with which a case for the Roman claims is made out from detached and equivocal sayings of the Fathers, although entirely opposed to the whole spirit of the ancient Church.

One remarkable but reassuring fact must, however, be borne in mind. As Lord Brayne, himself a pervert, has sorrowfully confessed, the hopes once entertained by Roman Catholics of the conversion of England can now no longer be entertained. It was observed in the height of the Roman reaction of 1850 how few members of their congregations were wont to follow the clerical seceders into the Roman camp. If this could with truth be said then, it is still more emphatically the case now. Mr. Luke Rivington, though not a profound divine, was nevertheless a very popular and effective preacher, and a member of a religious order which has attracted much attention in the English Church. Yet we

do not hear of Mr. Rivington's example being followed by any of those over whom he had been exerting an influence. Last winter he was preaching Sunday after Sunday to a large and fashionable congregation in the Riviera. The feeling of that congregation, when the news of his secession was announced, was one of stupefied astonishment and bewilderment. Instead of manifesting any disposition to follow him, his former admirers betook themselves to inventing all kinds of reasons and excuses for his sudden change of front, some of them by no means complimentary to himself. We need not fear, therefore, that his example will be largely followed. All we have to fear is that sometimes it may be adduced with decisive effect on the minds of those who, from one cause or another, are wavering in their attachment to the Church of England.

Mr. Rivington's book is a curious psychological study. Like most other converts, he betrays the truth that he has been led into the Roman Communion, not by weight of argument in favour of the Roman claims, but by dissatisfaction with the Church of England. Thus his whole book displays the attitude of a man who, having made up his mind to join the Church of Rome, exerts all his ingenuity to find *ex post facto* arguments for the change. Inconvenient testimonies against the Roman See are, as usual, ignored, or else disposed of by arguments worthy of a *nisi prius* advocate. We may take as an instance of this the way in which he meets the direct statement of an Œcumenical Council of the Church that the Papal authority, such as it was, rested simply upon the civil importance of Rome as the capital of the Empire. The language is sufficiently express. "The Fathers," we are told, "fitly bestowed precedence on the throne of old Rome, because that was the Imperial city."<sup>1</sup> All Mr. Rivington can say in answer—and it is obviously no answer whatever—is that Leo "simply refused" to agree to the demand that for similar reasons Constantinople, as the second city of the Empire, should be admitted the second place for her patriarch, and we are told how Leo "saved the Church, for *we know not how*

<sup>1</sup> The 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon.

*long* (the italics are Mr. Rivington's), from being submerged by the carnal pride of the Imperial slaves at Constantinople, the Bishops of that unfortunate See."<sup>1</sup> In what way the "carnal pride" of Constantinople in wishing to be second differs from the "carnal pride" of Rome in wishing to be first, Mr. Rivington does not tell us. Indeed it would be rather difficult to give any other reason for the distinction than that Mr. Rivington approves of the one sort of "carnal pride" and disapproves of the other. But we only call attention to this point in order to show how an authoritative historical statement, made officially by the Catholic Church in Council, is met by the advocates of Rome. Another historical fact is met in a similar manner. Mr. Rivington, to his credit, does not attempt to deny that St. Cyprian resisted the overweening assumptions of the See of Rome in his day. He attempts, it is true, to minimise the force of the attitude of the Bishop of Carthage. St. Cyprian, he tells us, was metropolitan. He wrote on one occasion to Stephen, "urging him to secure the deposition of the Bishop of Arles"<sup>2</sup> (Mr. Rivington seems here to think that Arles is in Africa). Stephen, when Cyprian ventured to differ with him, was not speaking *ex cathedra*<sup>3</sup> (how convenient this distinction is, every one knows who has to argue with a Roman disputant). Tillemont says "there *can be no doubt*" that Cyprian "died in unity with" the Church of Rome, "not only through the disposition of his heart, but also through external communion."<sup>4</sup> St. Cyprian was wrong on the point at issue, and Stephen was right, and so on. But when confronted with the definite statements of Firmilian, who speaks plainly on the arrogance of Stephen, and the injustice of his attempts to usurp a power which does not belong to him, all poor Mr. Rivington can do is to call the letter "disgraceful," though it is as temperate and reasonable as can well be imagined. But whether temperate and reasonable or not, it defines exactly what powers were and what were not possessed by the Bishop of Rome at that time. A convert to Romanism ought to be more sure of

<sup>1</sup> *Authority*, p. 53.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, p. 102.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*, p. 104.<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p. 102.

his ground than to have to resort to the expedient, "no case, abuse the plaintiff's attorney," especially when, as in this case, the person abused was the warm and constant friend of one of the most renowned saints and martyrs of the Catholic Church.

The rest of the treatise is pretty much on a level with what has already been noticed. St. Francis de Sales is brought forward, with a great deal of hysterical rhetoric,<sup>1</sup> in favour of the Papal claims, though what authority St. Francis possesses, beyond any other Bishop of the 16th century, is not very clear. Then we hear of the number of saints the Church of Rome produced "*at the era of the English Reformation*"<sup>2</sup> (the italics are Mr. Rivington's), as if the Reformed Churches had produced none at that period. The argument, so far as it can be called an argument, is an unfortunate one, for it recalls the fact that the number of Roman Catholic saints *since* the Reformation who would be recognised as such outside the Roman Communion is very small indeed, while those who have appeared in the Reformed Churches are simply innumerable. The rest of Mr. Rivington's citations from the Fathers may be divided into two classes, those in which he attempts to throw dust in the eyes of his readers, and those in which he cites rhetorical passages in favour of the Papal authority, entirely ignoring those which distinctly repudiate it.

The attempt to throw dust in the eyes of persons unversed in ecclesiastical history consists in the confounding the primacy of the Pope with his supremacy or infallibility, and in citing passages which prove the one as though they unmistakably asserted the other. Thus the well-known passage in Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History*, though it is not cited by Mr. Rivington, is frequently brought forward as a proof of the Roman position. Socrates tells us that a canon (or rule) existed which forbade any steps of importance to be taken without the consent of the Bishop of Rome. To many minds this sounds very formidable. But its true significance is easily seen by applying it to our own Church. There is

<sup>1</sup> P. 2.

<sup>2</sup> P. 37.

unquestionably a rule which is never infringed in our communion that nothing of importance is ever done without the consent of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Yet does anybody contend that the supremacy (to say nothing of infallibility) of the Archbishop of Canterbury is the doctrine of our Church? We may go further. An able writer in the *St. James Gazette*, at the time of the Lambeth Conference, wrote strongly advocating the constitution of a Court of Appeal for the whole Anglican Communion, with the Archbishop of Canterbury at its head. This proposition was not made by a person strongly tinged with ecclesiasticism. Its author was clearly ignorant of ecclesiastical history, or he would have remembered the disastrous results of such a policy in the past. The proposition rested simply on the obvious convenience of the course suggested. And the suggestion throws a flood of light on the way in which, amid the controversies and confusions of early times, men resorted to the Bishops of the principal Churches, and tried to erect them into a Court of Appeal whose sentence should be final. Hence the appeals to the Bishop of Rome, and the efforts made to magnify the importance of his decision by those in whose favour it was given, as well as their eager assertions concerning the honour due to the "See of St. Peter." But hence, also, the equally strenuous denial of the Roman claims on the part of those against whom the decision was given. Not infrequently the very same man who at one time of his life was full of profuse compliments to the occupant of the "Chair of St. Peter," was at another most scornfully impatient of his claims to pre-eminence. But a very good instance of the way in which the unwary reader might be deceived may be found in the passage cited from St. Cyprian to which we have already adverted.<sup>1</sup> The Saint writes — from Carthage, be it remembered—to Stephen of Rome, concern-

<sup>1</sup> It should always be borne in mind that no Roman citations can be trusted without examination. Since the days of the forged decretals, the Roman case has largely rested on forgery. And, as is admitted by the better class of Roman theologians, St. Cyprian has been constantly interpolated in favour of the Roman claims. Yet Roman disputants are not ashamed to quote these interpolations as genuine.

ing the deposition of a Bishop of Arles (in France), in the following words, "Let letters be addressed from thee to the Province, and to the people dwelling at Arles, whereby Marcianus being excommunicated another may be substituted in his room." This is obviously a suggestion from one Bishop to a brother Bishop, with whom he stands on equal terms, giving his advice as to the best way of dealing with a scandal in that brother Bishop's neighbourhood. But let us suppose that the positions had been reversed. Stephen in that case had addressed these words to Cyprian. Let us suppose that we should have been told that this was an example of the Vicar of Christ giving his orders to a subordinate—orders with which that subordinate had no alternative but to comply. Other instances of this way of dealing with citations from the Fathers are as numerous in Mr. Rivington's pages as they are in those of other Roman controversialists. Thus he makes several citations from Cyprian, whose resistance to the Papal authority is so notorious, and whose claim to a co-ordinate authority with the Bishop of Rome is so continuous and clear. "The chair is one that is founded on the rock by the Lord's voice," "One Church is founded by the Lord on Peter, the origin and principle of unity," and so on. But what do these citations prove? There is not a word in them about the *successors* of St. Peter. Nor is there a hint as to what course may lawfully be pursued if Peter or any of his successors require "withstanding to the face because he is to be blamed." Still less is there any indication of the duty incumbent on us when conclusions are drawn from these premises which prove to be destructive of the unity of the Church, and of the rightful liberty of Christian men.

Of the second class of assertions we will select three, and these as specimens of the rest. The first is, in truth, a specimen of both classes in one. For Mr. Rivington cites St. Chrysostom as calling Peter "the first of the Apostles," "the unbroken rock, the immovable foundation, the leader of the Apostolic Choir," &c., without appearing to observe that all this rhetorical language not only proves nothing whatever

concerning St. Peter's successors, but assigns to him no authority whatever over his brethren. And, while admitting that St. Chrysostom also uses strong language about St. Paul, Mr. Rivington takes care to conceal the fact that St. Chrysostom calls St. Paul "the master of the world," and declares that to him "the charge of all the Churches in the world was committed." Had these words been used of St. Peter we should have heard enough, and more than enough, of them. Another argument of this sort is founded on the somewhat inflated language used by the Papal Legate at the Council of Ephesus. When examined, this language, inflated as it is, does but claim the first position for the Bishop of Rome among the Bishops of the Christian Church. Mr. Rivington does not seem to see that if supremacy and infallibility were the inherent prerogative of the Roman Bishop, there were small need for any Council at all, and that even when it had been held, an appeal would necessarily lie thence to the Papal Chair. Is there any instance where a Pope ever claimed the right to review a decision given by a representative synod of the whole Catholic Church? Or is there a tittle of evidence to show that if such a claim had been made, it would have been listened to for a single moment? The plain language of the 28th Canon of Chalcedon, to which reference has already been made, is capable of outweighing any number of vague expressions of the sort we have just been considering.

The last citation is that with which Mr. Rivington somewhat pompously closes his book, the well-known passage in which St. Jerome tells the Pope that he "speaks with the successor of the fisherman," and boasts of being associated in communion with the Chair of St. Peter, the rock on which the Church is built." But he omits to remind us, though Dr. Littledale does not,<sup>1</sup> of St. Jerome's words at a later period, when he was not merely uttering compliments, but contending for principles against the Roman Church, "Si *authoritas quæritur, orbis major est urbe.*"<sup>2</sup>

It is of course impossible to follow Mr. Rivington through

<sup>1</sup> *Words for Truth*, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> *Ad Evagrium*.

all his citations and arguments. It is sufficient to show that they are throughout vitiated by the same mistake. They are brought forward to prove one point, and they prove another. It is as though the fact that Hengist and Horsa, the first Saxon invaders who landed in this island, were held to give their descendants a right to the sovereignty of the whole of it, or as though the existence of a Bretwalda in the days of the Heptarchy were cited to prove that Æthelbert or Eadwine had absolute power over the lives and persons of every one within the four seas. We turn to Mr. Rivington's Scriptural argument. It need not detain us long. His laboured endeavours to prove that St. Peter presided over the Council at Jerusalem in A.D. 52 may be dismissed with a smile. But his extraordinary language about St. Peter's confession may claim a little more attention. He tells us,<sup>1</sup> on the authority of St. Francis de Sales, that there was no "likelihood" that our Lord would have made such a "grand preface, in order to say no more than 'Thou art Peter,' and then suddenly to have changed his subject and gone on to something else." Is then the declaration of St. Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," really of so small moment? Is such a declaration altogether unworthy to be the rock on which the Catholic Church is founded? Are we to suppose that the truth which "flesh and blood had not revealed" to the Apostle whom Christ so emphatically declared to be "blessed," related, not to the eternal principle which affects every individual member of the Church, but to a simple point of external government, and one which, if the witness of history be trusted, has not been invariably productive of the highest blessings to those who have lived under it? At least, if an Apostle of the Lord Himself is to be trusted, the confession of Christ is a matter of some moment. He tells us that "every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God," that "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him and he in God," and that "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God."<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the authority of St. John, as

<sup>1</sup> P. 19.

<sup>2</sup> 1 John iv. 2, 15; v. 1.

one present when St. Peter's memorable declaration was made, may be thought by some minds to be of as much value as that of St. Francis de Sales on the question, how much importance is to be affected to the confession of Christ.

One remarkable omission there is in Mr. Luke Rivington's volume which is altogether unaccountable on the hypothesis that he has been led by reason in the course he has taken. He scarcely even mentions the Greek Church. He is exquisitely rhetorical about the "mass of rock on one of our English coasts," which has been "there for centuries past, and there it is to-day." "The big (!) waves break upon its sides, the monsters of the deep thrust themselves in vain against it." Of the baleful effects of this "rock" upon the ship of the Church he appears to have no notion. Yet as he very justly says "vessels have been known to go to pieces on it." For it is strewn with the wrecks of innumerable lives. Has Mr. Rivington never read history? Does he not know that eighty to a hundred millions of Christians—and their number and influence is continually increasing—were severed from communion with the West by the Roman assertion of supremacy, and by that alone?<sup>1</sup> Does he remember how in the 15th century the Pope made the surrender of conscientious convictions by Eastern Christians the price of his assistance against the Turks, and that when that surrender was not made the assistance was refused? Has he not read how, in consequence of that refusal, millions of our fellow-Christians have groaned for centuries under a cruel and degrading tyranny? Is he aware that in consequence of this disgraceful abandonment of his brethren in their need, the Turkish hosts have more than once thundered at the gates of Vienna, and that the bones of thousands upon thousands of Western Christians have whitened the plains of Hungary in defence of Christian homes against the Mohammedan invader? And is he ignorant of the fact that our downtrodden Eastern brethren, after having endured God's chastisement for His own good time, are now beginning to recover themselves, and

<sup>1</sup> It was the arrogant claims of the Papacy, not the difference between the two Churches on the Double Procession, which precipitated the schism.

with the mighty Empire of Russia at their head, are preparing to play once more a conspicuous part in the history of the future? Or can he fail to see that a similar chastisement, though perhaps not so severe, is in store for the nations who are apparently "going to pieces" on the "rock" which Mr. Rivington has described? Which of the European powers can be described as in a state of decay at the present moment? Are they not those in which the Jesuits, the chief supporters of the Pope, have worked their will for centuries—Spain, France, Austria? To what is the present commanding position of the only progressive Roman Catholic nation in Europe, Italy, owing, but to the fact that it has destroyed the temporal power of the Pope? Let him look at Roman Catholic colonisation, and compare it with that of nations which have renounced the Papacy. The history of the first is a history of confusion and collapse; the history of the second is bound up with the future welfare of the globe.

But if Mr. Rivington's arguments are so feeble and one-sided, if he is compelled to ignore the plainest facts, and to rest his case upon the most unsubstantial foundations, why, it may be asked, has he seceded at all? One answer to this question will be found to underlie his pages. Like many others, he has been led by the desire for more certainty. We believe, and have reasons for the belief, though we have not now space to give them, that he will be disappointed in the hope he has entertained. There is at least as much practical certainty to be obtained on our side the border as on the other, the Roman claim to be infallible on matters of faith and morals notwithstanding. But the chief cause of Mr. Rivington's secession is to be found in the fact that he has discovered the theological basis of the party in the Church to which he has attached himself to be hollow and unsound. He quotes an unpublished letter written by Dr. Pusey in 1870, complaining of the extravagances of the later Tractarians. And he very justly adds,<sup>1</sup> "There has been a steady descent *in this matter of obedience to authority* ever since the day of

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 9.

the Gorham Judgment.”<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rivington is perfectly right here. The only mistake he makes is the notion he has allowed himself to entertain that the true remedy for the evil is secession to Rome. But of the existence of the evil itself there can be no question. The early Tractarians, whatever their mistakes may have been, insisted continually on the duty of obedience. The later Tractarians or “Ritualists,” as they are now called, have unfortunately acted far too much upon the opposite principle. They carry out what they conceive to be reforms, not only without the advice, but against the wishes of their ecclesiastical superiors. They pick and choose out of mediæval usages those which please them, and dignify such usages by the name of “Catholic customs.” And they place these local and temporary pre-Reformation observances on a level, or almost on a level, as regards obligation, with the Catholic creeds. Professing to hold “Protestantism” in detestation, they rival the most advanced “Protestant” in their exercise of the right of private judgment. These accusations are not merely ours. They are those of Dr. Pusey himself.<sup>2</sup> It is not wonderful that now and then this system breaks down in operation, and that men, convicted in their inmost hearts of inconsistency, should abandon the advanced “Ritualistic” standpoint for something less self-contradictory. An instance of this exercise of private judgment may be found in Mr. Rivington’s pages. He speaks of a certain doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice as a part of “the Catholic faith as held by saints and martyrs since the Day of Pentecost.” When and where has this doctrine been defined? A local synod of the Roman Church in 1216, it is true, decreed the doctrine of Transubstantiation. But that decision has not been universally received. The Church of England has rejected it, and has substituted another definition. Decision of the Church Catholic on the subject there is none. And yet people continue to talk of the “Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist” as binding on the consciences of the faithful, when what they

<sup>1</sup> The italics are Mr. Rivington’s.

<sup>2</sup> *Authority*, pp. 11, 12.

mean is a private opinion of their own. This mode of using the word "Catholic" is nothing more nor less than Protestantism disguised. It is an assertion of the principle of private judgment which derives its danger from its disguise. No wonder Dr. Pusey and other leaders have expressed their solicitude concerning the future of a movement which thus confounds private opinion with the Catholic faith. We can hope for nothing better than occasional losses until English Churchmen have learned to distinguish between points which have been decided by the Church and those which have not. The only authoritative formula known to the Catholic Church is the Nicene Creed. This formula no English Churchmen disputes. On the points which the Church Catholic has decided there is therefore no difference within our pale. But we shall never have peace among ourselves until men have learned to reserve their judgment on those which as yet have been left open. Mr. Rivington is one of those who have never grasped the distinction. It is no wonder that he leaves a Church which abides by a principle he has never clearly understood.

The Church of England will survive Mr. Rivington's secession. If the forces are still feebly operating among us which drove so many into the Church of Rome forty years back, there are also forces operating most powerfully within the Church of Rome, as Mr. Rivington will find, to drive men out of her. The secession to the American Church of so eminent an ecclesiastic as Monsignor Bouland is an event of more significance than the perversion of Mr. Luke Rivington. So is the declaration of Mr. Addis, so lately entrusted by the authorities of his Church with the compilation of an important theological work, that he can no longer remain within her pale. We may be sure that the more thoroughly Catholic principles, properly so called, are understood, the fewer secessions like Mr. Rivington's will take place, and the feebler the Roman schism in England will become. Already the Roman reaction has spent its force. The time for the signal triumph of Anglican principles is near at hand.

J. J. LIAS.

## GLEANINGS AFTER HARVEST.

STRAY PAPERS. No. I.

### "FEELING KINDLY UNTO ALL THE EARTH."

THIS mood of which "the idle singer of an empty day" tells us, is one not unfamiliar to almost every child of Eve. The milk of human kindness is not often wholly dried up in any human heart. It was said of the ferocious Danton that he did "*sometimes* spare." And most souls, "albeit unused to the melting mood," do sometimes relax. Such moods are watched for, by the small folk, in the usually grave Father; in the stern Pædagog: small folk who have "learned to trace the day's forebodings in the morning face."

In such mood the seamed brow relaxes, the set lips soften, the abstracted gaze comes back to things that are close at hand; a kindness flows about the heart, a loosening of the winter-bound sap; hopes are remembered that died long ago; the chilled heart recalls the glow of old familiar faith, and the languid pulse of love begins to beat again. So on the first mild day the dormouse stirs, and, conscious of a genial change, peers with quick dark eye out of its nest-ball, seen now well in the bare hedge, to which no longer

"Clings

A flaky weight of Winter's purest snows."

And the tassels of the nut and the twy-wing of the honey-suckle give it welcome; and a dark violet nestles, half hid in its leaves, at the hedge-foot, where huddle last year's forest-spoils.

Yes, spring airs do come to winter hearts sometimes. Harbingers they are of the coming year, that shall consume the vestiges of old decay, and bring amaranthine flowers out of the *débris* of fallen and withered leaves, and laughing harvests out of the mists of depression, and the days drenched with tears.

Now these kindly moods at first thought seem proper to springtide. When the sap of life is giving "blind motions" of pleasure to the ancient tree and to the sapling, when the dance of the flowers is beginning, set following set throughout the year, and the first note is given of the Orchestra of the woods, it seems natural for old and for young, also, to sympathise with the stir and the warmth of nature. For a young man's fancy to turn lightly whither the loves of the birds and the loves of the flowers direct him; and for even the old to push forth blossom-buds out of the one quick branch left to the maimed, dying stump of what was once the vigorous tree. When life is beginning around us, and everything around seems optimist,

"Labour—not labour in vain, but a training for grander results;  
Sorrow made sweet by its end, and forgiveness made holy with tears;  
Death, but a farewell; a sleep: an absence to make the heart fond;  
Love—not a passion of youth, to wither and vanish with age,  
But the first warm pulse of the joy of the mightier heart-beat to come."

At such a season it seems natural for us also to

"Feeling kindly unto all the world,  
Grudge every moment as it passes by."

And for the aged, the weary, the dull at heart—with early spring airs there comes, or seems, for a fast-fading moment, to come

"A halt in life: a little while  
In which to be but a beholder,  
And think not of the coming mile,  
And feel not 'I am growing older!'  
—A stern old man, with wrinkled brow,  
Urging us on with beckoning finger,  
Time seems no longer—rather, now,  
A sweetheart, who would make us linger.  
Old times are with us, long ago;  
Upon the land familiar shadows;  
We walk again the haunts we know,  
The pleasant pathways thro' the meadows;  
And as we turn and look ahead  
To see which way our paths are tending,  
And mark some spot we wish to tread  
In that long way which has no ending,  
Old thoughts still light us on our way,  
Old love and laughter, hope and sorrow."

But the glory dies down soon to common day, and a deeper sadness ushers in the morrow. Yes, for the overworn with life, the weary of the world, the dried-hearted and passed-by, the Spring is no longer a congenial season.

The "melancholy days;" the stripping branches, the yellowing hedge-rows, the moist park-side palings, on which now the recruited lichen stands out fresh and strong; the time of the wren's hide and seek and of the robin's trill; of the autumn violet, so unlike to that of Spring; of "the primrose of the later year," rare, and, when found, drenched and drilled with insect ravage;—this season is that which calls forth, in the heart that is sad or growing old, the pensive, kindlier feeling. The year has then given up life's hopes, energies, excitements; she acquiesces now in failing powers; the effort, the struggle, the painful flush is over;—the gradually-beaten-back stand against inevitable decay. There is now no need to keep up appearances. The summer flowers, the autumn fruits are gone; the leaves are going—let them go! The fields, where harvests laughed, are bare; the very stubble that poorly recalled them to mind is buried under the long rough ridges of wet red clay, that rose, wave-like, under the steadfast advance of the keen-edged plough, and, falling over, wave-like, overwhelmed the forlorn relics of the wheat, together with scattering of pimpernel, and small, white wild heartsease, and scented feverfew, and shrunk, scant scarlet poppies, here and there. Let all go, and be forgotten, and be buried; let the dead past bury its dead—the year has done now with the mass of decay that was once a shimmer of beauty, and with the failures that once were hopes, and with the successes that are all now part of the receding past. The year looks on all the works that its hands had wrought, and on the labour that it had laboured to do, as that which, adequate or imperfect, successful or abortive, can no longer concern it, and can no longer thrill the heart with exultation of triumph, or pain it with the pang of dull regret. At the time of the "crescent promise" of her youth, all regarded her with interest; her own spirit was full of hopes as she rose and rose in the sky.

“Rounder, thro’ the cypresses and rounder ;  
Perfect, till the nightingales applauded.”

Now it is as the waning moon with her, and all are turning from her in expectation of the Coming year’s promise.

“Now, a piece of her old self, impoverished,  
Hard to greet, she traverses the house-roofs,  
Hurries with unhandsome thrift of silver,  
Goes dispiritedly, glad to finish.”

All are looking forward now—shall she not also turn from the past, and look forward? From decay to life, to life which is felt in every twig—a new vigorous bud pushing aside the old, overworn yellow leaf. To life which is, as it were, casting up its works, completing its advances, for that great spring-rush upon the fortress of death. So the year looks on; and now and then, in her onlooking and in her dreamy severance from that over-and-done-with Past, a kind, lovely day breaks the dome of the mist, and a gleam upon the hill above it gives a glow to the hillside, and there is enough strength of sunlight to cast a faint shadow on the slope from the dark Scotch firs and the stripped larches that stud it here and there. And not only does the robin spill his notes of melancholy cheer; a thrush sings out from the spread sea-weed of a tree picked out against the pale blue. And there is a daisy or two, and an early Christmas rose, and a late China rose or safrano. And a tender, sensitive, kindly gladness—or the ghost of gladness rather, speaking with the thin voice of the shade of Achilles in the Elysian fields—a weird gladness comes upon the mind of the disillusioned year.

Even thus, building up allegorical thoughts—weaving, as warp and woof, nature’s parables and man’s melancholy story—have we arrived at the justification of our theory, that this mood of “feeling kindly unto all the world” belongs rather to the Autumn than to the Spring.

For the winning this gentleness of heart, this wistful unbending to all things around, we give the palm to sadness, if it does not embitter. There is a yearning kindness in sorrow. Take the case of a misunderstanding between near

and dear ones. That wretched scene<sup>1</sup> of Orchardson's—the first breach between husband and wife—a painting that, howsoever beautifully done, I would not hang on my walls to make me miserable were I paid to hang it there. The man, after that evil hour, would feel grateful, in his bitter, lonely disillusion—grateful to his old dog that wagged his tail as in old times to greet him ; grateful to the cat that came and purred, and rubbed its lithe, soft body against his leg. As he struck out through the lanes, how kindly would be his mood—the old cottager that “hoped his honour was well,” the very child that with a confiding smile dropped a curtsy to him, would receive ready, yearning response from him in his *aching*, craving mood.

And the woman, who had dropped the wife for the vixen, and had sailed off, glorying in the last word, finishing in the higher octave, and triumphant over her astonished and chagrined bridegroom—she would be tenderer to her maiden, even if, in brushing, she pulled, her hair ; she would feel a woman-wistfulness, under the unbecoming man-hardening, that she thought so fine and so self-assertive.

So, also, with the Father, whose son, whose daughter, has broken through the sweet old feudal relationship ; and the hitherto unquestioned word has been disputed, and the hitherto of-course infallibility denied ; and a great hollowness of soul and a great dreariness of heart comes upon the disenthroned or disputed-throned monarch—a great tenderness of heart comes, also, with the desolation of feeling. And the blind, vine-tendril yearning after *any* responsive sympathy.

So, also, with friends ;—Sir Leoline and Lord Roland de Vaux of Tryermaine—

“ Alas, they had been friends in youth,  
But whispering tongues can poison truth ;  
And constancy lives in realms above ;  
And life is thorny, and youth is vain ;  
And to be wrath with one we love,  
Doth work like madness in the brain.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Royal Academy, 1887.

And when

“ Each spake words of high disdain,  
And insult to his heart's best brother ”—

with what tender desolation of heart did each meet his kind afterwards.

The mood of “ feeling kindly unto all the world ” belongs most, let us agree, to the hour of sorrow, of hurt feelings, of desolation of the spirit.

And so it is, to cap all that has been said, that a sad heart throws us, shipwrecked from imperfect human sympathies, upon the shore of the perfect sympathy of the love of God. A sad heart draws us nearer to God; gives us the more *Christ-like* feeling—the tenderness of the *Man of Sorrows*.

“ *Feeling kindly unto all the world*,” this is a mood that comes upon the sorrowful, whose weary hearts, tempest-tossed, cling to the Rock of Ages.

And so it should be that, in the wreck and the overthrow of life's hopes and ventures, in the disillusioning which youth disbelieves and age experiences, in the repelling of sympathy, and the forcing upon the reluctant heart the fact of the utter loneliness of the human soul, save for the communion and fellowship of it with its perfectly understanding Maker—in all this, which is indeed the discipline of life, it is not intended that bitterness should canker the ageing tree, but rather that ivy of kindness should clothe it.

The sadness of our own hearts should not harden us, but make us tender, and should help us in “ feeling kindly unto all the world.”

The sad retrospect of waning life ought to be a process softening, not a process resulting in surliness and unkindliness towards mankind.

“ The still, sad music of humanity ”

should find answer meet in the heart that sadness, disappointment, disillusion, the sense of this life's inadequacy, the gathering incapacities of age, has weaned from this melancholy world.

How sad-hearted in such a world, so treated, the Brother of mankind, the Incarnate God, must have been—was—  
And, yet—how kind !

J. R. VERNON.

REVIEW OF "ESSAYS IN BIBLICAL  
GREEK, BY EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., READER IN  
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, OXFORD."

WHEN examining in a recent number of this *Monthly* Dr. Hayman's free translation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, I had occasion to indicate and to account for some points of difference between the Greek of the New Testament and that of the classical authors; and it affords a certain degree of pleasure to be able now to call attention to a new work by Dr. Hatch in which he too protests against "the assumption which has been persistently made that the language of the New Testament is identical with the language which was spoken in Athens in the days of Pericles or Plato, and which has left us the great monuments of Greek classical literature. . . . The degree of a man's knowledge of the latter is commonly taken as the degree of his right to pronounce upon the former; and almost any average scholar who can construe Thucydides is supposed to be thereby qualified to criticise a translation of the Gospels." The points of difference above alluded to were grammatical: those with which Dr. Hatch deals are lexical. It is in fact most reasonable to expect that in both grammar and vocabulary every language should change in process of time.

This will be found to be the case even where the language is indigenous to the country in which it is spoken. In Iceland for instance, where the same race has lived for now more than 1,000 years, the tradition of spoken language and (for nine centuries) the stream of national literature both alike unbroken by either the peaceful immigration or the hostile invasion and settlement of men of alien tongue, nevertheless changes have taken place. There are proofs of changes in the pronunciation, the inflexions, and the vocabulary.

Yet Iceland presents a singular exception to the rule almost all countries under heaven having suffered from the inroads of enemies or from actual conquest—in some cases conquest by several nations in turn. Thus Greece has been subjugated by the Romans, the Goths, the Turks; and it is interesting to observe the effect—namely, by comparing the Greek of the present day with that spoken by the contemporaries of Homer or Pindar or Aristotle or Dion Cassius. Besides countless euphonic changes and other alterations in pronunciation, we find tenses of verbs disused (the future and the perfect, except the unreduplicated perfect participle passive), one case lost (the dative), the government of prepositions such as would have puzzled and horrified Isocrates or Lucian, innumerable old words obsolete and forgotten, and new ones—especially Turkish—introduced, or old words employed in strangely new senses (as ἡ Βρεττανικὴ Μεγαλειότης for Her Britannic Majesty), new compounds formed to convey modern ideas (as ἀτμοταχύπλοιον, a steamer), and so on. And some of these changes must have begun at an early period. We may hope indeed that some day Greece even in these later times will furnish her just contingent to the ranks of the noble army of scholarly theologians, and then fresh light can hardly fail to be thrown on the language of the New Testament.

But when we compare the classical Greek of the fourth or fifth century B.C. with the Greek of Palestine in the first century of our era, we have not only lapse of time to take into account. Both time and place differ, and there is the important fact that in Palestine Greek—whether the dominant speech or not—was an imported language. The Aramaic, which was the vernacular of the people, bore scarcely any resemblance to Greek either in vocabulary or in grammar or in mode of expression.

Classical Greek is full of allusions to the Senate, to the Popular Assembly and the mode of proceeding there, to the Magistrates and Law Courts and the Scrutiny which at the close of their term of office all these officials (Dicasts alone excepted) had to undergo, to the Public Revenue and the

sources whence it was derived: the Jews in Palestine had no such constitution nor magistrates nor finance. Greek Classics continually refer to the Games, the Theatre, the Gymnasia, to all of which St. Paul frequently alludes when writing to Greeks or to Jews familiar with Grecian customs; but public games and theatres (except at Cæsarea) and gymnastic training were all alike unknown in Palestine. The Athenians were a maritime people, and their writers both of prose and verse are always mindful of the sea and ships and sailors: the Jews of Palestine had no ships or sailors, except fishing-boats and fishermen on one small fresh-water lake in Galilee. In Greece there were gods many and temples many: in Palestine one God alone was recognised and worshipped. In Greece, sanctioned by religious rites (so called) in honour of Bacchus and Aphrodite, was an abounding profligacy that cannot be described, and which has left a black and abiding stain on the Hellenic literature: from these kinds of immorality the Jewish national character was removed almost *toto calo*. And all these differences of habits and customs affected the language.

On the other hand, in opposition to that which is peculiarly Greek, many a metaphorical term in the Hellenistic language of the New Testament needs to be explained by reference to the conditions of Syrian life.

"For example, whereas in Athens and Rome the bustling activity of the streets gave rise to the conception of life as a quick movement to and fro, ἀναστρέφεισθαι, ἀναστροφή, *versari, conversatio*, the constant intercourse on foot between village and village, and the difficulties of travel on the stony tracks over the hills, gave rise in Syria to a group of metaphors in which life is conceived as a journey, and the difficulties of life as the common obstacles of a Syrian traveller. The conduct of life is the manner of walking, or the walking along a particular road, e.g. ἐπορεύθησαν ὑψηλῶ τραχήλῳ, ἐπορεύθη ἐν ὁδῷ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. A change in conduct is the turning of the direction of travel, ἐπιστρέφεισθαι. The hindrances to right conduct are the stones over which a traveller might stumble, or the traps or tanks into which he might fall in the darkness, σκάνδαλα, προσκόμματα, παγίδες, βόθυνοι. The troubles

of life are the burdens which the peasants carried on their backs, φορτία."

I would gladly quote a whole page more in which Dr. Hatch refers to agricultural processes, to household operations, to money-lending, and to "the capricious favouritism of Oriental potentates," but must refer readers to the volume itself. It should not however be forgotten that the representation of a man's moral conduct under the metaphor of *walking* is not unknown in the classics. See for instance Soph. Œd. Tyr. 883—

εἰ δέ τις ὑπέροπτα χερσὶν ἢ λόγῳ πορεύεται  
δίκας ἀφόβητος κτλ.

And is Dr. Hatch quite right in his explanation of ἐπιστρέφειν and ἐπιστρέφεισθαι? Surely this term indicates much more than a mere change of direction. It is what in military drill is known as "right-about-turn," and then—subsequent motion being usually implied—marching straight back again in the exactly opposite course to that in which the man was previously going. It is what the French call "retourner sur ses pas." In the Iliad when we read how Diomedes among the Thracian followers of Rhesus (Il. 10, 483), and at a later time Achilles among the Trojans (Il. 21, 20), κτείνει (or τύπτει) ἐπιστροφάδην, interpreted by Heyne "dextrorsum sinistrorsum cædendo," and by Cordery "'gan slaughter right and left," there can be no doubt that this is the true sense: the hero smote down one on the right, then faced sharply round to cut down one on the left, and so on, each time *turning his back* full on the enemy just slain. And when any man "repents and *is converted*" (Acts iii. 19), "*turns* unto the Lord" (Acts ix. 35), and "*returns* to the Shepherd and Overseer of our souls" (1 Pet. ii. 25), this verb—for it is the same in each of these passages—signifies a *total* change in the direction and purpose of his life. Even when the action is the same as before, the motive is not merely in part, but wholly, different, or even reversed: whether he eats or drinks or whatever he

does, he does it with a view mainly not to present benefit but to eternal gain, not to his own personal gratification or aggrandisement, forgetting or disregarding God, but to the glory of God (I Cor. x. 31) as the one great aim of his renewed life.

Inasmuch then as the Palestinian Jews when they used the Greek tongue "were not only foreigners talking a language which was not their own, as an Englishman talks French: they were also men of one race speaking the language of another, as a Hindoo Mussulman talks English"; the natural result, but one too frequently overlooked, is that "in a not inconsiderable number of cases the meaning of New Testament words has to be ascertained afresh." This task of discussing a certain number of Biblical words Dr. Hatch has endeavoured to accomplish. To what sources however should the investigator look for the facts on which his induction is to be based?

1. First to the Septuagint, mindful "that it is more cognate in character to the New Testament than any other book, that much of it is proximate in time, and that it is of sufficient extent to afford a fair basis of comparison." It contains many new words apparently invented by the LXX. as expressive of specially Jewish ideas or usages, and all re-appearing in the New Testament, (*ἀναθεματίζειν*, *ἀποδεκατοῦν*, *ἐφημερία*, *πατριάρχης*, *περιτομή*—though of course Dr. Hatch is aware that the verb *περιτάμνεσθαι* is used by Herodotus, and therefore the noun *περιτομή* is likely to have been within the range of that author's vocabulary, notwithstanding his not having employed it in his narrative—*προσήλυτος*, *ῥαντισμός*, &c.), some of them being new compounds legitimately formed from existing elements (*ἀκρογωνιαίος*, *εὐδοκία*, *κατοικητήριον*, *σκληροτράχηλος*, and many besides). The LXX. moreover is an invaluable key to the meaning, not only of new words as we find them afterwards adopted into the New Testament vocabulary, but of more familiar words also in their Hellenistic use. For "the fact of their constant occurrence in the Septuagint in the same connexion [as in the N. T.] and with predicates of a

particular kind afford[s] a strong presumption that their connotation was not the same as it had been in classical Greek."

2. Then again the Apocryphal books not only are singularly valuable for the syntax of the New Testament (with which however our author does not deal), but they supply the earliest instances of some New Testament words (*ἐκτένεια, ἐξισχύειν, σκανδαλίξειν, φυλακίξειν, χαριτοῦν, &c.*).

3. We have also fragments of other Greek translations of the Hebrew Scriptures—those of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and two others—these too supplying their quota of new words to Biblical Greek (*ἀποκαραδοκία, θεομάχος, σπλαγχνίσεσθαι, &c.*). And the value both of these versions and of the LXX. is immensely enhanced by the fact that they *are* translations, and that too of books the originals of which are in our hands. Thus in order to determine the exact significance of every word used in the New Testament, a few *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* excepted, we can avail ourselves not only of classical writings both in verse and prose, but also of a large body of Hellenistic literature belonging to the same nation as the Evangelists and the Apostles belonged to, and dealing with the same class of subjects as they handled, and of the Hebrew and Chaldee originals from which most of these books have been translated.

4. Other Post-Classical writers, partly Hellenistic—Philo, Josephus, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, &c., and the early Greek Fathers—may also all be laid under contribution.

Now it is interesting to note by way of momentary digression (especially after having so recently pointed out, without having seen Dr. Hatch's book, how variously Dr. Hayman has rendered certain words) the liberty which the LXX. assumed in their Version in respect of variety of terms employed. It will suffice to give two examples from Dr. Hatch. The Hebrew  $\text{יָדָה}$  is rendered in the Septuagint in no fewer than 33 different ways; while on the other hand *ὑπόστασις* is used in that Version 18 times in all in the canonical Books, and in those 18 it represents 15 different Hebrew words.

It is time however to mention, though there will be no room to discuss, some of the results at which this investigation has arrived. The following are some of the most important:—

*ἀγγαρεύειν* is not merely "to compel to go," but "to compel to carry baggage."

*ἀναγινώσκειν* is not merely "to read," but "to read and comment upon." Such an exercise in the time of Epictetus was required of students, while the professor in turn undertook the *ἐπαναγινώσκειν*—to remark on the reading and explanation of the students.

*ἀρετή* in the LXX, twice answers to the Hebrew *דָּבָר*, "glory," four times to *תְּהִלָּה*, "praise"; once in the Apocrypha (Esth. iv. 17, in an apocryphal addition) it signifies "praise," four times it bears its ordinary meaning. The bearing of this on 1 Pet. ii. 9 and other passages is obvious: whether the inference suggested is sound is another question.

*δευσιδαίμονες* (Acts xvii. 22) is "rather inclined to superstition," which is also the view taken by the Revisers.

*διαθήκη* "occurs nearly 280 times in the LXX. proper, *i.e.* in the parts which have a Hebrew original, and in all but four passages it is the translation of *בְּרִית*, 'covenant'; and in none of those four is it "will" or "testament." In the Apocrypha it is always "covenant." In the Hexapla it is sometimes changed into *συνθήκη*, which again is nothing but "covenant," and is the more usual Greek word in that sense. Philo too uses the word for "covenant." Dr. Hatch concludes:—

"There can be little doubt that the word must be invariably taken in this sense of 'covenant' in the N. T., and especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the LXX. as the Epistle to the Hebrews. The attempt to give it in certain passages its classical meaning of 'testament' is not only at variance with its use in Hellenistic Greek, but probably also the survival of a mistake: in ignorance of the philology of later and vulgar Latin, it was formerly supposed that 'testamentum,' by which the word [*διαθήκη*] is rendered in the early Latin versions as well as in the Vulgate [of

the N. T., in all the 33 passages where the word occurs] meant 'testament' or 'will,' whereas in fact it meant also, if not exclusively, 'covenant.'"

Scholefield, like many others, arrived at the same conclusion from totally different premises. When discussing the difficult passage (Heb. ix. 15-17) he insists on *διαθήκη* as there bearing no other sense than "covenant," and *ὁ διαθέμενος* as having its meaning fixed by the *μεσίτης* and *θανάτου* of v. 15 as "mediating sacrifice."<sup>1</sup> But while he writes, "we are cautioned not to turn to Thucydides and Xenophon in order to understand the Greek of the New Testament"—I have searched in vain to find by whom among the critics of that day the caution was given,—nevertheless Scholefield, arguing solely from the context "as in the case of words or phrases which are *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*," does not even allude to those sources of lexical information on which Dr. Hatch relies.

"The meanings of the two words *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἐλεημοσύνη* had interpenetrated each other." If this has really been demonstrated, and the evidence adduced seems very weighty, this conclusively proves that *δικαιοσύνη* in Matt. vi. 1—for that is the reading accepted by Griesbach and all modern editors from Lachmann to Westcott and Hort, as it was also given in Stephens's margin and in the margin of A. V.—already conveyed, though in a less usual form, the same sense as the *ἐλεημοσύνη* of other codices. In harmony with this view Dr. Hatch would render *δίκαιος ὢν* in Matt. i. 19 "being a kindly man." *Kind-hearted* however would better express his meaning, *kindly* properly signifying only *natural*, as when we pray God to "preserve to our use the *kindly* fruits of the earth."

*ἔτοιμος* and its derivatives are shown to be used in the

<sup>1</sup> His rendering of the three verses is as follows:—"And for this end he is the mediator of the new covenant, that, *his* death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, they that are called might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. For where a covenant *is*, there must of necessity be brought in the death of the mediating *sacrifice*. For a covenant is valid over dead *sacrifices*; since it is never of any force while the mediating *sacrifice* continues." *Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament*: Cambridge, 1832.

LXX. interchangeably with ἀνορθοῦν, κατορθοῦν, θεμελιῶν, στερεοῦν as the translation of עָמַד, of which the proper sense is *to stand erect*. And "the use of this word in the Septuagint affords an interesting illustration of the manner in which the meaning of the Hebrew acted upon the Greek; for it is clear that it came to have some of the special meanings of the Hebrew, 'to set upright,' 'to establish,' 'to make firm.'" Consistently with this view Dr. Hatch holds ἐτοιμασία in Eph. vi. 15, the solitary place in which it occurs in the N. T., to bear the meaning of *firm foundation* or *firm footing*; and "this view is confirmed by the use of the instrumental ἐν which . . . gives to the passage a strong Hellenistic colouring." In various other places (Matt. xx. 23, xxv. 34, 41, &c.) it is suggested that the nearest English equivalent to the verb ἐτοιμάζω is *to destine*.

μυστήριον. Dr. Hatch contends for the same sense as Dr. Hayman has given this word, "secret counsel." He also adds an important remark (though it is one which every careful reader of the Vulgate must already have made for himself) on the term *sacramentum*, which in early ecclesiastical Latin was used for μυστήριον, namely that the name *sacrament* contains no allusion to the military oath according to Tertullian's misleading explanation. Compare the passage above quoted under διαθήκη.

The οἰκόνομος was sometimes (Luke xii. 42) the *dispensator*, as in Corp. Inscr. Gr. 1247, 1498; but sometimes also the *villicus* or land-steward (Luke xvi. 1). Hence also in Rom. xvi. 23 ὁ οἰκόνομος τῆς πόλεως is probably the administrator of the city lands.

πονηρός, besides its ordinary meaning in Classical Greek, is shown to bear in a few passages (none of which however occur in the LXX. itself) the sense of *niggardly*. Hence we should render in Matt. vi. 22, 23, "If thine eye be liberal (ἀπλοῦς), . . . but if thine eye be grudging (πονηρός)"; and Matt. vii. 11 "may be paraphrased: 'If ye then, whose own nature is rather to keep what you have than to bestow it on others, are still able to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father in heaven, who is always

bestowing and never keeping back, give good things to them that ask Him?' ”

*ὑπόκρισις* has in the authorities appealed to a stronger meaning than that of *false pretence*, and *ὑποκριτής*, Heb. חָזֵן, *impious* or *profane*, signified “more than merely ‘the actor of a false part in life.’ It connoted positive badness.” Hence Matt. xxiv. 51 should be rendered, “he will surely [a misprint for *severely* ?] scourge him, and will appoint his portion with the impious’: it would be mere bathos to render *ὑποκριτῶν* by ‘false pretenders.’ ”

This will suffice as a specimen of the kind of lexilogus that occupies Essay II. (nearly sixty pages) of Dr. Hatch's volume. But Essay III., “On Psychological Terms in Biblical Greek,” *i.e.* in the LXX., with which Philo is compared at considerable length, is no less replete with interest. For instance, just as our author has explained the change of *δικαιοσύνη* into *ἐλεημοσύνη* in Matt. vi. 1, so he shows that *καρδία* and *διάνοια* are to a considerable extent used interchangeably in the early authorities to which he appeals. Cf. Eph. i. 18. (I may therefore have been mistaken in supposing that Dr. Hayman could not possibly have intended “intellect” as a rendering for *καρδία* in that passage.) The closing lines of Essay III. are the following :—

“I believe that two points may be clearly gathered from the facts which have been mentioned,—

(1) That the use of such terms [*καρδία, πνεῦμα, ψυχή, διάνοια*] in the Synoptic Gospels is closely allied to their use in the Septuagint ;

(2) That the use of such terms in St. Paul differs in essential respects from the use of them in Philo, and that consequently the endeavour to interpret Pauline by Philonian psychology falls to the ground.”

The remaining portions of this learned, laborious, and (as every true student of Holy Scripture will consider it) very valuable work, have for their themes “Early Quotations from the Septuagint” (Essay IV.), “Composite Quotations from the Septuagint” (Essay V.), “Origen's Revision of the LXX.

Text of Job" (Essay VI.), and "The Text of Ecclesiasticus" (Essay VII.)

In the Essay on Job there are numerous marks of haste which are to be regretted. For instance, in Job xvii. 2 (p. 221), *λίσσομαι κάμων, καὶ τί ποιήσας* [*sic*] is translated, "I am weary with entreating, and what hast thou done?" Surely the augment is not dropped in the LXX. as in Homer so that *ποιήσας* should stand for *εποιήσας*. If we read *ποιήσας* with the usual accent, it will then naturally agree with the *ἐγώ* understood: "And what have I done (to deserve this)?" literally, "and for doing what?"—Again, a few lines lower down Dr. Hatch gives up as hopelessly corrupt the first clause of v. 5. The whole verse runs thus: *τῇ μερίδι ἀναγγελεῖ κακίας, ὀφθαλμοὶ δὲ ἐφ' υἱοῖς ἐτάκησαν*, which Dr. Hatch renders "? Even the eyes of his children *failed*." [The ? and the italics are his.] Doubtless the Greek is strangely crabbed and uncouth, and yet it is not untranslatable. The last word of v. 4 is *αὐτούς*, and obviously it is *their* children that are alluded to, not the children of the subject of *ἀναγγελεῖ*. The ordinary Greek student will not know, but Dr. Hatch is perfectly aware, that in Hebrew one way of conveying the notion of the indefinite pronoun—as in "*on dit*," "*man sagt*," "*uno no puede juzgar*," "*one must admit*"—is to put the verb in the third person singular without any subject expressed. One instance will suffice. In Gen. xlviii. 1 "he said to Joseph" is properly rendered in both A.V. and R.V. "*one said to Joseph*." Luther gives "*ward Joseph gesagt*," and Segond "*l'on vint dire à Joseph*." Now if we suppose, consistently with the leading idea of Dr. Hatch's volume, that this idiom is here, as it is elsewhere (Job xxviii. 3, for example) transferred from the Hebrew to the Greek, the verse can be translated at once, and in perfect harmony with the context. V. 4 finishes, "therefore shalt Thou not exalt them," and v. 5 proceeds, "*One shall tell of malicious acts done to their portion, and their eyes have wasted [= shall waste] away (in tears) over their (slain) children.*"

RICHARD FRANCIS WEYMOUTH, D.Lit. Lond.

## SYNOPSIS OF THE ARGUMENT ON THE "PHARAOH AND DATE OF THE EXODUS."

### EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY.

1. The theory of most Egyptologists that the Hebrew exodus took place in the reign of *Minptah*, son of Ramessu the Great, is mainly based on Manetho's story of the leper uprising and exodus as preserved in Josephus' reply to Apion, the assumption being that the leper exodus and the Hebrew exodus are identical. In Manetho's dynastic lists *Minptah* appears as *Menophath*.

2. But Manetho says distinctly that the king of the leper exodus was named *Amenophis*; and, as he calls the chief adviser of the king by the name of *Amenophis Paapis*, this shows that he was referring to *Amenophis III.*—the fifth predecessor of *Minptah*—in whose reign the chief functionary was, in fact, *Amenophis* son of *Hapi*, that is, *Apis*.

3. The leper exodus, when analysed, turns out to have been a purely Egyptian event, that had no connection whatever with the Hebrew exodus. It relates solely to a religious uprising under *Osarsiph*, who usurped the throne of Egypt for 13 years, reigning under the name *Horus*.

4. Manetho places the Hebrew exodus in the thirteenth year of *Tothmosis III.*, and says distinctly that this king reigned 25 years 4 months after the expulsion of the "captive shepherds who settled in Judæa."

5. The monuments show that dynasty 21 was cotemporaneous with dynasties 20 and 22, and that dynasty 19 succeeded on the death or dethronement of *Horus*. Manetho's figures for the *chronological* part of dynasty 18 to dynasty 22, year 14 (excluding dynasty 21) give 514 years. Biblical chronology places the invasion of *Shishak* (in his fourteenth year) in 924 B.C., therefore Manetho's date of the exodus of the Jews was 1438 B.C.

6. The chronological framework thus restored is confirmed by the following astronomical arguments derived from the Egyptian monuments :—

(1) A new moon on Pachons 21 in the twenty-third (nominal) year of Tothmosis III. indicates 1443 B.C. ;

(2) A manifestation of Sothis on Epiphi 28, in the latitude of Elephantine, in the second year of Tothmosis III. indicates 1450 B.C., which is the second year of his sole reign according to Manetho.

(3) Another Sothis date, on Mesore 12 in the thirty-third year of his sole reign, confirms the two preceding dates, as it can refer only to 1419 B.C. ;

(4) The coronation of Amenophis III. on Epiphi 13 (= a new moon, according to Floigl) agrees with Manetho's date of his accession in 1373 B.C. ;

(5) A panegyry of the waters on the 16th of the month Athyr of his eleventh year probably alludes to a festival at the completion of the rise of the Nile about Oct. 4-14, or about 1369-29 B.C., hence agreeing with Manetho's date, 1363 B.C., for the eleventh year ;

(6) *Menophres*, who reigned in 1322 B.C., according to the astronomer Theon, is the throne name (*Menpehora*) of Ramessu I., who reigns in 1323 B.C., according to Manetho.

(7) *Nem mesu*, a title of Seti I., who was associate king in 1322, B.C., probably refers to the renewal of the Sothic cycle of that year, since it means "new birth," or *renaissance*.

(8) According to Riel, the Ramesseum indicates a rising of Sothis on Thoth 16 in the reign of Ramessu II. This indicates the years 1265-2 B.C., and agrees with the year of the sole reign of Rameses II., according to Manetho, in 1263 B.C.

7. Two monumental facts point to Tothmosis III. as the pharaoh of the exodus: (1) a representation of the *making of bricks by Semitic captives*; and (2) fragments of bricks bearing his stamp, which, on being broken, show that they were made without straw.

## BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY.

1. A comparison between the chronology of the two rival kingdoms of Israel and Judah shows that the reigns in the former kingdom were reckoned according to a system that requires a reduction of one year in every case. Hence the Biblical numbers from Jeroboam I. to the accession of Ahab are *chronologically* as follows:  $21 + 1 + 23 + 1 + 11 = 57$  years.

2. Josaphat of Judah begins to reign in the fourth year of Ahab, and Ahab's son Ahaziah begins to reign in the seventeenth of Josaphat. Ahaziah, after one year's reign, is succeeded by his brother Joram, who reigns 11 years to his assassination by Jehu. Hence from 1 Jeroboam to 1 Jehu are  $(57 + 3 + 16 + 1 + 11)$  88 years. The Assyrian Eponym Canon places the accession of Jehu in 841 B.C., therefore the era of the kingdom of Israel was 929 B.C. As the kings of Judah dated their official years from the *Nisan* following their accession, whereas the kings of Israel appear to have dated them six months earlier from *Tisri*, it follows that the first year of Roboam was 928 B.C., and his fifth, in which Shishak's invasion took place, was 924 B.C.

3. The 40 years assigned to Solomon begin therefore in  $(928 + 40)$  968 B.C., but Scripture indicates an association with his father David for some time, not specified. The Tyrian annals, according to Menander (in Josephus) reckon 145 years from the fourth year of Solomon to the building of Carthage, which, according to the unanimous testimony of Aristotle, Timæus, Dionysius, Halicarnassus, Velleius, Cicero, and Eusebius, must be placed in 814-13 B.C. Therefore the fourth of Solomon was  $(814 + 145)$  959 B.C., and his associated reign with his father David lasted for six years.

4. The year 959 B.C. as the Tyrian date for the fourth of Solomon, is confirmed by another Tyrian reckoning, according to which the fourth of Solomon was the year 240 of the building of Tyre. Justin says the building of Tyre was one year before the fall of Troy. Lydian chronology, Africanus, the list of the "Thallassocratie" of Castor of Rhodes, a

Roman chronicle cited by Syncellus, and the chronographer Eustathius, place the fall of Troy in 1197 B.C. Hence the building of Tyre was 1198 B.C., and the fourth of Solomon (1198 - 239) 959 B.C. as before.

5. The Bible places the exodus from Egypt 479 years before the fourth of Solomon, which the two preceding sections show, was in 959 B.C. Hence the Bible date of the exodus is  $(959 + 479)$  1438 B.C., or the same date as Manetho and the Egyptian monuments.

6. The chronology of the reign of Tothmosis III. shows that the exodus fell on Pachons 1 (of the vague official year) of his thirteenth year in 1438 B.C., on April 15. A restoration of the fixed or civil year of Egypt shows that Abib 14—the Biblical day of the exodus—means Epiphi 14 of the civil year, which fell on Pachons 1 of the vague year *and on April* 15, only in 1438 B.C. As this coincidence could happen only once in the whole period of pharaonic history, the question may be considered as definitely settled.

7. The Bible, in Num. xxxiii. 3, seems to place the exodus on Abib 15 instead of Abib 14, as assumed in the preceding section. This apparent contradiction of the theory is easily explained. The Egyptians began their day with midnight, whereas the Jews began it at sunset. Hence, anything later than about 6 p.m. of Epiphi 14, would be reckoned as Epiphi (or Abib) 15, according to the Jewish custom. As the exodus happened shortly before midnight, and after sunset, it *was* on the 15th of Abib, Jewish reckoning; but on the 14th of Epiphi, Egyptian reckoning, as the Egyptian Epiphi 14 did not expire until 12 m. of April 15, 1438 B.C. If we assume that sunset was about 6 p.m., then the Hebrew Abib 15 and the Egyptian Epiphi 14 were concurrent for about six hours, and during this interval the exodus must be placed.

The argument in Sections 6 and 7 is developed in detail in the article, "The Day of the Hebrew Exodus from Egypt," which endeavours to determine the date of the exodus by a restoration of the fixed year of Egypt compared with the official vague year.

## CURRENT POINTS AT ISSUE.

### MENTAL EVOLUTION.

MR. ROMANES is right when he says in his latest work that the evolution of mind "is perhaps the most interesting problem that has ever been submitted to the human race," and Mr. Stout is equally correct in stating that it is a "most difficult as well as interesting problem, and its difficulty, so far as he has yet dealt with it, has, in his opinion, proved too great to be surmounted even by the courage and ability of Mr. Romanes." This, from a believer in mental evolution, means much, but we do not see how he could have said otherwise. There is a large collection of interesting though unverified anecdotes, but they are in a setting of unsound philosophy, incorrect psychology, and limping logic. Both the *London Quarterly Review* and *Mind* agree in condemning the manner in which his work is done. We are told that "even when the child becomes capable of expressing its ideas by gestures and articulate sounds, it does not on that account rise above the intellectual level of those animals which possess a rudimentary language, because the signs are at outset only signs of receipts, analagous to animal gesture." This is pure imagination, for surely a child, even at so early an age, may have a concept, and the gesture be an expression of that and not of a receipt. Besides, as the friendly Mr. Stout points out, he does not explain the origin of concepts at all, but assumes a full-blown concept to explain the origin of concepts.

We undoubtedly possess a small number of mental faculties similar in kind to those possessed by the lower animals, but this goes a very short way towards proving that the mind of man can be evolved from these brute faculties, or towards showing that our mind does not differ in kind from theirs. The weakest part of Darwin's *Descent of Man*

is the few pages in which he attempts to show how our intellectual faculties have been evolved from the brute by natural selection. He exposes the weakness of his whole position when he says (chap. iv.) "that such evolution is at least possible, ought not to be denied, for we daily see those faculties developing in every infant; and we may trace a perfect gradation from the mind of an utter idiot, lower than that of an animal low in the scale, to the mind of a Newton." Could there be more utter confusion of thought than this? What relation is there between the steady development of man's faculties from youth to age, and the evolution of monkey mind to human? And what has the diseased mind of man to do with the subject in any way? Whatever indications there may be of the possibility of the evolution of man's body, there are none whatever of the evolution of his mind.

#### THE FUTURE OF THEOLOGY.

Prophecies on this subject are numerous and contradictory. The *North American Review* informs us that the surrender of orthodoxy is inevitable; of course in that case the theology of the future will be a mixed, or rather a vanishing, quantity. When every theologian either writes his own bible or does without one, and pumps his theology from the depths of his own fancies, the systems so concocted will be many and various, and theology will become a synonym for a mental kaleidoscope, *minus* the symmetry and beauty of that charming toy. But as the Church has heard this prophecy for many years and orthodoxy is ever waxing stronger, why does the writer imagine the time for this great surrender specially near? Because he considers this "the age of theological fiction." He does not refer to the fictions of Mrs. Ward and other theological ladies, but to the dishonesty of orthodox theologians. They profess to be orthodox because they are afraid of the consequences of honesty. Of course, these hypocrites have made this American their father confessor, and so knows all about them. In proof of his position he quotes a clergyman, who writes that when he says certain things about Christ "we simply

mean to declare our belief in the facts of history, whatever they are." But surely a man who voluntarily exposes his own—any degradation that is not libellous—must be the most honest of men. Seriously, would it not be well for men of the calibre of this North American Reviewer to pause before accusing others of deliberate dishonesty, before making himself the standard of intelligence, and from the standpoint of a soap-bubble predicting the dissolution of the Rock of Ages?

That there is a development in theology none will deny and few regret; but it is development, not revolution. It is organic growth, first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. It is obedience to the injunction of St. Paul, "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection." The future of theology will be a going on towards perfection, "a looking forward to the future without breaking with the past." How healthily and hopefully does Professor Sanday write in the *Contemporary Review* on this subject. He admits change, but he says, "The reconstruction of Old Testament history, which is now taking place, is emphatically a Christian reconstruction. It is a movement within the Church of England. The leading ideas of the prophets are grand, and, I believe, truly permanent ideas, and never were they realised so fully as they are coming to be now." Professor Sanday is a teacher; he comes into direct contact with those who will be the leaders in the future, and therefore his inferences are valuable. How cheering his words, "Of all the hopeful signs that I see about me there is none more hopeful than the spirit in which I find the younger students prepared to work." We have no hesitation in saying that the future of theology, whether as regards breadth of doctrine, brotherhood of believers, or insight into the revelations from God, never was brighter than it is at the present moment.

#### A RATIONAL SUNDAY.

*The Westminster Review* considers that a Sunday is spent rationally when it is spent in picture galleries or museums,

listening to bands, or in social enjoyment. If this opinion were confined to the readers of that particular magazine it might be allowed to pass without further notice ; but we fear it finds favour with many outside that literary circle. If such be a rational Sunday, there are considerable numbers who can pride themselves on being rational at least one day in the week. But is this a rational Sunday? It would be if man had no higher faculties than the æsthetic and the cognitive, and no nobler aim than amusement. But if he has other faculties and other aims greater than these, it is not rational so to use his hours that the less important usurps the time of the more important. It may, therefore, be a rational Sunday for the atheist or the rationalist, but certainly it is not for the Christian, who believes that he has a moral faculty, a very close relationship to God, and a life that will not end with time. That these are very serious beliefs cannot be denied, and it is equally without controversy that they demand at least as earnest consideration as the contents of a museum, however interesting these may be. Christianity will refine even more than nice pictures. We yield to none in our admiration of those things, and would do our very utmost to foster a love for them at the proper time, but Sunday is not the proper time, and for the very simple reason that they steal from us most of the very little time at our disposal for the thoughts of quiet hours. If the fourth Commandment had never been heard of, this would remain equally true, and the pause on the pearl of days be equally a necessity for immortal beings. It may be said that we need not go to any of these places unless it is our wish. That is true, but there are many who are not earnest about themselves, and who will go to amusements if such be offered them, but who would probably have remained at home had there not been any such temptation. It is chiefly in the interest of those who are on borders of Christian thoroughness that we write ; and we say, nothing is rational that mars or hinders the development of the highest reason.

JAMES McCANN.

## CURRENT LITERATURE.

**Psychological Works.** *The Origin of Human Faculty* (1) is a big treatise, in which Dr. Romanes applies the theory of evolution to the origin of the human mind. If, as he assumes, that theory is true with regard to the human body, it would seem to follow as a corollary that it holds good with respect to the human mind. However, there is a considerable section of evolutionists who draw the line here, and hold that the difference between the human mind and the mental capacity, or whatever it may be called, of brute animals is one of kind, and not merely of degree; and Dr. Romanes' work is a sort of special plea to meet the opinions of these objectors. Whether he will have convinced them by his arguments remains to be seen. On the large mass of people who do not accept the doctrine of evolution we imagine this book will have but a very small effect. The arguments are drawn out to prolixity, and reiterated to tediousness; the conclusions are very large, and the data on which they are formed are small and insufficient. The book has an immense quantity of long footnotes, which for the most part had better have been included in the text: as they stand they give the notion that Dr. Romanes had made up his mind first and read up his authorities afterwards. His division of the psychological process into precept, receipt, and concept he claims as new; and it is possibly an advance in the terminology of that somewhat cloudy science. As might be expected, a great proportion of the work is taken up with the question of human speech. Dr. Romanes professes himself to be no deep philologist, yet he proceeds to demonstrate the fallacies of such profound writers as Mr. Max Müller and others, and demolishes their arguments, at any rate to his own complete satisfaction. Other people, however, may have different opinions on the matter. One thing is quite clear, that Dr. Romanes' work is not a popular one. No one, we venture to think, will be attracted to read it by its style, and any who wade through it from love of science will find they have completed a task which is more formidable than profitable.

*The Philosophy of Mysticism* (2) is not the philosophy of such mysticism as we associate with the names of Tauler, Ruysbroeke, Eckhard, or even Hegel or Böhme. It is the Mysticism of Science; the philosophy of dreams, mesmerism, hypnotism, clairvoyance, and magnetic sleep, all of which the author includes under the name of somnambulism, a state in which, he tells us, people pass into

a sort of transcendental existence. Baron Du Prel is of opinion that we always dream when asleep, and that the deeper the sleep the more real the dream, though how he arrives at that conclusion is not clear, because it is allowed that people only recollect what may be called "waking dreams." "What we forget is not obliterated as an idea, but remains in the transcendental consciousness; what we remember is not newly produced as an idea, but only emerges in the semi-consciousness." This seems vague, but so is the whole subject. The Baron strongly advocates the monistic doctrine of the soul, and makes use of such terms as the bi-unity of man, and his Janus-aspect. He is not quite contented with the doctrine of evolution or the hypothesis of Darwin; nor is he satisfied with the common opinions about spiritualism and such like. His accounts of the powers and perceptions, the properties and processes of somnambulism are wonderful enough; but they hardly carry conviction, though gathered from what appears to be an extensive literature upon the subject. He seems to say that a physician has only to put a patient into a magnetic sleep, or bring him under the influence of a clairvoyant, and he will be infallibly told what is the matter, and how to proceed towards the cure. This would be a distinct advance in medical science if it be quite accurate and practicable. The author does but touch on the fringe of religion in the consideration of this subject, and perhaps this is well, especially when he tells us, for instance, that it was with evident reference to somnambulism it is said in the Gospel, "And if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them." With regard to miracles we can better agree with his opinion, which is that what is a miracle from the standpoint of one half of the world can belong to law from the standpoint of the universe.

As an addition to the science of psychology this work may be interesting; but from the Christian point of view it is disappointing, although the author claims that in applying ourselves diligently to self-cognition we shall best revive the demand for metaphysics, without which no religion, no philosophy, no true art is thinkable.

*The New Eve* (3), by Mr. Randolph, has been sent to us. It is called a "study in recent evolution;" but the reason for that seems slender enough. Possibly the new phase of evolution is dependent upon such opinions as these which we find here—"the professor of religion is as often as not incapable of argument"—"by flying in the face of all reasonableness, the teachers of religion too often destroy

what they would build"—"while religion too often contents itself with the cup of cold water, science has, with hands overflowing, strewn blessings upon the entire race"—"the missing link of our descent from our supposed fathers, the apes, appears to be hid in the religious vagaries of their progeny"—"the old method of implanting religious fact has become a shocking immorality," &c. This recent study in evolution is no improvement from the religious point of view. Nor is it otherwise from the moral. For it is the history of a woman who is made to be wicked without reason, sentimental without sense, sensual without excuse. The story is not without a certain power, but if Mr. Randolph had exercised his (or her) abilities in writing a work of fiction which the school-girl, to whom this is dedicated, could be recommended to read, he (or she) would have been better employed. The story has a prologue entitled "The Ivory Gate," which is a wonderful piece of writing. We are there told that "the gentle hills were feathered with foliage," "along the sandy marge, wood and water are at perpetual warfare," and finally, "the moon climbs the vault, reaches her zenith, sinks again, and slowly pales into a paling sky." However, we are bound to say the body of the work is in plainer language; but the book is neither attractive as a work of art, nor will it serve any useful purpose that we can see.

*St. Basil the Great on the Holy Spirit* (4) is not out of place here, though of quite another character. We believe that the present issue has been withdrawn from circulation, and another published with additional notes. On some points St. Basil's doctrine cannot be called *evangelical*; and it is just as well that the most important of these points should be guarded. But it is scarcely to be expected that no work should be accounted a Christian classic unless its theology can be pronounced unexceptionable. Mr. Lewis has done his share of the work admirably, barring the oversight that has now been rectified.

(1) *Mental Evolution in Man*. By G. J. Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888. Price 10s. 6d.

(2) *The Philosophy of Mysticism*. By Carl Du Prel, Ph.D. Translated from the German by C. C. Massey. London: George Redway, York Street, Covent Garden. 1889.

(3) *The New Eve*. A Study in Recent Evolution. By Mr. Randolph. Two Vols. London: Spencer Blackett. 1889.

(4) *St. Basil the Great on the Holy Spirit*. Translated with Analysis and Notes by the Rev. George Lewis. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1888.

**Men of the Bible Series.** *Abraham's* (1) life is pleasantly told by Mr. Deane in this useful little volume. He has collected all the information available about "the Father of the Faithful," and has fairly well grappled with the difficulties that hang to the Scriptural account of the patriarch. In considering the sacrifice of Isaac, Mr. Deane notices the opinion of those who hold that this was merely an instance of the child-sacrifice common in those ancient times; he refers to the views of Bishop Horsley and Bishop Warburton, who suppose that it was in this way Abraham was vouchsafed an insight into the doctrine of atonement, and "saw the day of Christ;" nor does he omit the opinions of Kuenen and of the German neologians, who have said that the first-born always was sacrificed among the Israelites until the Passover in Egypt put a stop to the practice; and then Mr. Deane holds to the opinion that it was given and intended by God as a trial of Abraham's faith. The whole life is very readable, and there is a capital summary of this famous man's characteristics, both in his personal capacity and as progenitor of God's chosen people, and of all others who imitate his faith.

*David* (2) is another volume by the same author, who begins by saying that outside Holy Scripture there is no reliable information about the Royal Psalmist. However, he makes the best use of the information contained in the Scriptures, and has wrought them up into a very interesting account. Such books ought to send their readers with a renewed zest to the study of the Bible.

*Daniel* (3) is a very interesting study, in which Mr. Deane sets before us in a concise and readable form the account of the life and times of that prophet. He makes good use of the labours of Professor Sayce and others in the regions of Assyriology, and brings before his readers a large amount of modern knowledge on this ancient subject. Mr. Deane points out that the first six chapters of the book are historical, the last six prophetic, and recognises the same hand in both parts. His explanations of the prophecies are entirely in support of the ordinarily received view. But he expresses his difficulties with regard to the ten kingdoms and the little horn, and does not attempt to put them aside. It is a very good book.

(1) *Abraham*. His Life and Times. By Rev. W. J. Deane, M.A. London: Nisbet & Co. 1888. Price 2s. 6d.

(2) *David*. His Life and Times. By Rev. W. J. Deane, M.A. London: Nisbet & Co. 1888. Price 2s. 6d.

(3) *Daniel*. His Life and Times. By H. Deane, B.D. London: Nisbet & Co. Price 2s. 6d.

An instalment of yet another series, in many respects a very valuable one, lies before us (1). This volume is a capital combination of careful compilation and independent observation. It is very thorough, and is written in an interesting manner. The illustrations are spirited and correct. Far away it is the best handbook of Biblical zoology with which we are acquainted.

The third issue of the "Church History Series" traces the history of the Huguenots in France from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the year 1802 (2). Few people are familiar with this portion of ecclesiastical history, though it is intensely interesting. Mr. Heath tells the story excellently. Perhaps he compresses a little too rigorously, and misses something of the picturesque and exciting. Nevertheless the book is capital reading.

In the *Historical Connexion between the Old and New Testaments* (3) Mr. Skinner gives within a very few pages the information which it would take a good while to extract from Prideaux, and other voluminous writers. A sketch is given of the Jewish community from the close of Nehemiah's administration (about B.C. 430) to the birth of Christ; and any one who reads it will have a fairly good notion of that period of history. The work is one of the Bible Class Primers edited by Professor Salmond, of Aberdeen, and is admirably suited to the end it has in view.

It is amazing what theological vagaries some people will advocate and accept. An enlarged edition of a queer work entitled *The Mystery* (4) has been sent to us. It purports to give "Scripture proofs demolishing criticisms of the first edition," and to be written by one who was "ordained a servant of God, May 9th, 1858." This is some improvement upon the "Theologian, Electrician, and Engineer" of the first edition. It is a curious medley of real Bible reading, acute dialectics, absurd exegesis, and utter want of common sense. "The mystery" of Rome xvi. 25 is, it seems, the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, the faith whereby the Gentiles are saved, Christ's faith that His soul would be rejoined to His body, the covenant of grace a secret transaction between the Father and the Son. Criticism is needless.

*The Hebrew Bible and Science* (5) is a little work in which Mr. Badger describes some of his "diggings" in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; by which he finds that the earth's suspension in space, its rotundity and motions, and other scientific matters are stated in it. It is satisfactory to know that science and revelation can be made to agree, and any well considered attempts in this direction are

always welcome. We can recommend Mr. Badger's little work, and we hope he may be able to continue his explorations in a mine which promises such good results.

We are not surprised that a new edition of Dr. Thomas Hamilton's Prize Essay on the Sabbath has been issued (6). It combines the theoretical and the practical judiciously, and is one of the very best of the more popular tréatises on the subject. A great merit is its succinct and yet lively style. The additional notes and chapters, and also the omissions, perceptibly improve the book.

*Infidelity Refuted by Infidels* (7). It was a very good idea of Dr. Sprecher to put together in a concise way the various opinions of those exponents or opponents of Christianity whom he has no hesitation in calling "infidels." And he does it in a scientific manner which will greatly help the memory. The several chapters deal with the various theories that have been propounded—*e.g.*, the theory of imposture, of self-deception, the rationalistic theory, the mythical, the tendency of legendary theories, and lastly the current infidelity; and in each case the refutation by other "infidels" is appended. We heartily recommend the little work; it is just the sort of thing to place in the hands of young people who have "doubts;" and we have no hesitation in saying that no one can peruse the book without having their eyes greatly opened to the weakness of the attacks which have been made on the stronghold of our faith. Amidst all the din of religious warfare this fact comes out most strongly—that the wondrous life and unapproachable character of Jesus shine out with such lustre that the most bitterly prejudiced are compelled to admit there is in Him a very miracle among men; "and if He be lifted up," even by the unwilling aid of infidels, "he will draw all men unto Him."

(1) *Scripture Natural History. II. The Animals mentioned in the Bible.* By Henry Chichester Hart, B.A., F.L.S. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1888.

(2) *The Reformation in France from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Incorporation of the Reformed Churches into the State.* By Richard Heath. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1888.

(3) *Historical Connexion between the Old and New Testaments.* By the Rev. John Skinner, M.A., Kelso. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Price 6d.

(4) *The Mystery, with Scripture Proofs demolishing Criticisms of the First Edition.* By James Johnstone, ordained a servant of God, May 9th, 1858. Published at the Author's office, Dalhousie Terrace, Edinburgh. 1888.

(5) *The Hebrew Bible and Science.* By Rev. W. Collins Badger, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 1s.

(6) *Our Rest Day: Its Origin, History, and Claims, with Special Reference to Present Day Needs.* By Thomas Hamilton, D.D. Edinburgh: James Gemmell. 1888.

(7) *Infidelity Refuted by Infidels.* Samuel S. Sprecher, D.D. London and New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1888. Price 1s.

**Miscellaneous.** *Colloquies on Preaching* (1) are interesting reading. The author brings all sorts and conditions of men, and of some women too, to give their ideas on one of the most serious subjects of the day. It is often asked why sermons should have such little influence as they seem to have. And it is difficult to give a satisfactory reply, though the probability is that they have more influence than people think. Mr. Twells inclines to the idea that extempore preaching is that which is most influential, and he seems to think that in the future that style alone will be prevalent. We are quite ready to admit that, when well done, an extempore sermon is the most impressive. But "there's the rub." It so seldom is well done, because it requires special gifts and capacities. Anything drearier than an extempore sermon badly prepared and badly delivered can hardly be imagined. An extempore discourse requires really more preparation than a written one; but this preparation must almost of necessity be put off to the latest moment, and it is almost sure to suffer from haste, as it will also from a variety of accidents from which a written sermon is free. The young ladies' colloquy is very amusing, and in the colloquy between the squire and his guest Mr. Twells points out how a most estimable clergyman may be overlooked if to all his other virtues he adds that of modesty, and that between the rector and the vicar shows what a preacher may be really doing even when the results, so far as he can see, are by no means satisfactory.

*Present Day Tracts on Man in Relation to the Bible and Christianity* (2) is a collection into a volume of a series of small treatises on the most important points of religious controversy at the present time. The former special volumes issued by the Religious Tract Society have been found useful and popular, and this volume is a very worthy successor. In it we find such subjects as "The Age and Origin of Man," "The Antiquity of Man," "The Physiology of Man," "The Responsibility of Man," "Man's Moral Nature," "Revelation and Natural Science," "Christ and Creation," treated in a concise and yet by no means in a perfunctory manner. The volume cannot fail to be helpful towards strengthening the faith of all who read it; and we sincerely hope that its readers will be numerous.

(1) *Colloquies on Preaching*. Rev. H. Twells. Longmans & Co. 1889. Price 5s.

(2) *Present Day Tracts*. Vol. iv. Religious Tract Society. Price 2s. 6d.

The first number of the *Periodical Press Index* (3), dated May 15, 1889, is before us, and it seems to us to supply what many must have often felt the want of. In these days, when magazines and periodicals of all sorts are pouring from the press, both at home and abroad, and when much learning and vast stores of information are published in this form rather than in ponderous treatises, it is of very great use to be able to find the locality of articles on various subjects, and this the *Periodical Press Index* enables any one to do with the utmost possible ease. It is called a monthly record of leading subjects in current literature, but the present number embraces a vast range of subjects, from railroads in Columbia to hunters' sires; life insurance, hay fever, ornamental designs for initial letters; Christian ethics, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Mysticism, Nature Worship; and indeed it is difficult to say what cannot be found by its means. The Index is given in two forms—(1) A Subject Index mainly on the lines of Mr. W. E. Sonnenschein's *Best Books*; and (2) A leading Key-word Index, the value of which is enhanced by references to the principal divisions and sub-divisions of the Subject Index. And as it is foreseen that a monthly index would in course of time become irksome of reference, arrangements are made to supplement the monthly parts by an additional yearly volume, on a plan which will obviate reference to each part month by month. Considering the amount of research and the great care required in printing, the price is very moderate.

*The Church and Scepticism* (4) is a pamphlet replying to a paper read at the Pan-Presbyterian Council, July 5, 1888, by Dr. Marcus Dods. The author stoutly and with a good deal of learning maintains the older view of the Inspiration of the Scriptures; and he says that "the unbelief of the modern pulpit has not a little to do with the unbelief of the pew, and the scepticism of the press and the platform with that of the outside world. Not only some scientists, but even some preachers of Christianity and popular writers of the day, live in a murky atmosphere of doubt, and breathe a spirit of unbelief, which like the simoom of the desert poisons all on whom it blows. There are doubts at the very bases of their soul, head-doubts, heart-doubts, doubts at their fingers' ends, and at every pore and portal of their being. . . . They falsely assume that the life can be really right when the head and heart are wrong. They are morally wrong in teaching that a good moral life, without a right head or a right heart, is sufficient. And they are logically absurd in drawing a positive conclusion from the conditional premiss."

(3) *The Periodical Press Index*. Monthly. Price 13s. per annum, post free. London: Trübner & Co.

(4) *The Church and Scepticism*. By the Rev. James Scott, D.D., LL.D. Edinburgh: James Gemmell. 1889.