

THE

# Knox College Monthly

—AND—

PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. XI.

JANUARY, 1890.

No. 3.

---

## THE PHILOSOPHIC STANDPOINT OF THE DAY.

WHILE we may say truly that the philosophic problem is as old as the dawn of speculative thought, and cannot be changed, philosophic thought has its history. Philosophy itself is a progress requiring us to determine where we are philosophically in the times on which our lot has been cast. History has its own philosophy, and there is a philosophy in the history of philosophy itself. No pulling down or rebuilding of theories is fruitless. These processes are like the change in buildings constantly taking place in a great city. These are not simply for the sake of change,—certainly not for the sake of giving work to those who depend on such employment. As such changes mark progress in the city, so it is with the building and reconstruction of theories in the history of speculative thought. Changes of form are constantly appearing, but it is the inner and often hidden advance of thought which is of chief interest at every point, as it is the great reality involved.

For the study of this progress we need to ascertain the standpoint of the day, to find the position whence we can command a view of the contending forces at work. We shall thus be able very readily to determine the form of the philosophic problem with which our age is dealing. The changing phase of the

problem is the result on the one hand of the greatness and complexity of the problem itself, and, on the other, of the unceasing progress of intelligence as the ages roll on. Students of philosophy must interpret this progress. We must recognize the historic value and living force of the theories which have arrested the attention of thinkers, and have guided their labors. The book-shelves may tell the historian what has been attempted and propounded; but we must do individually what no books can do for us, mark the currents of which books are only an index, finding where we are, settling how we ought to steer, and how far we may be able to render any true service to the philosophy of our day. The central interest here is the *practical* interest,—the fact that philosophic thought goes towards the shaping of our views of life, the formation of purpose, and the direction of effort. Whatever our study, it must be a living interest; even when directed on dead languages the dead must live again, and the thought, feeling and aspirations of ages long by must have a value for present day experience. It is, therefore, a circumstance which lends high value to philosophic discipline, that while it demands toil in the midst of what many may regard as remote abstractions, it really penetrates to the heart of human life, and never parts from the profound interests of humanity. In seeking the standpoint whence we may perceive the form of the philosophic problem, we desire better to understand the advance and the destiny of our race.

It thus becomes clear how the philosophic standpoint is higher than the scientific, and affords a higher range of vision. Science is divided amongst the sciences as philosophy is not divided among the philosophies. The sciences are separate and sectional; the philosophies are not. In proportion as a science becomes separated and works persistently in its own department, it rises in value; in proportion as philosophy becomes restricted in its range of area, it becomes one-sided and poor. Science sub-divides the material universe; philosophy seeks to unite, or at least encompass within the range of human view, the material and spiritual alike. For philosophic study we must climb higher, look more widely, and look longer. We may truly speak of the logic of the sciences, and must indeed have some reasonable conception of their unity; but, in admitting this, we

are only the more clearly leading forward to the conclusion that philosophy, which concerns itself with existence as a whole, must comprehend this unity, making account of the whole, and must see how complex is the vast question which intelligence raises when it makes enquiry as to Being itself. We are venturing to look on a problem which is all-inclusive; and is necessarily of profoundest concern to us, for it deals inevitably and conspicuously with human life, with its possibilities and its destiny. However deeply interesting any one of the sciences may appear,—and each of them should supply material of untiring attraction—the whole company of scientific men are concerned in questions of philosophy, for these are questions for humanity. If, then, we urge that the standpoint of philosophy is a lofty one, surmounting every scientific position that can be occupied, all scientific men are welcome to a share in criticism of philosophy, if not to a part in its constructive work, for all are deeply concerned, and the popular mind, which cannot deal with technicalities, must wait for some measure of agreement before there can be a general experience of the power of philosophic theory. These considerations lend additional value to a true appreciation of the form which the philosophic problem assumes in our day.

The philosophic standpoint is found when we reach a position whence we can see clearly where all lines of knowledge converge, and where the thought-forces cross each other. Philosophy at the earliest period in its history began with the Cosmic problem, and it is occupied with it still, but in a very different form, because of the vast increase of scientific knowledge. The standpoint of to-day is on the most advanced line of human knowledge, where we see the force of the current in favor of Evolution coming from every scientific department, and the cross-current flowing through the fields of mental philosophy; where we witness the meeting of the waters, and the deflection of the current as soon as the increased volume is brought full into view.

Here there is a large amount of force which may be regarded as a fixed force for all time, which will continue to affect philosophic thought in coming ages, as now. The advance of knowledge is secured for all time; the unknown in the area of science is to be ascertained and disclosed by work along the same lines as those which have already been successfully followed, and so far we are assured that what change has been effected

in the form of the philosophic problem will be retained, for there is no risk of reversal. This does not imply any dogmatic assurance as to what can and what cannot be accomplished by science. She is mistress of her own territory and of her own prospects; and the race as a whole will give a ready welcome to all discoveries of the future, as welcome has been given in the past. There is yet, for all departments, a very wide region of the unknown to be explored; and we may fairly regard this as hid treasure which will flow into the currency for use of later generations.

The vast accumulation of knowledge within this century gives form to the problem of existence. Does this growing knowledge solve the problem, or even tend to solve it? Here is the point at which the cross-currents of thought strike most violently against each other. The situation obviously wears quite a different appearance as viewed from the scientific standpoint and from the philosophic. Probably the difference may be largely, if not altogether, accounted for by the mere difference of standpoint. Even though the object contemplated be the same, if one observer occupies a position lower than the other, the mere difference of situation accounts for the difference of appearance. But the exact difference should be readily acknowledged by both, if they only consent to a change of positions. Let each take the other's place, and each should become aware of the difference of view, and at the same time both should have a fuller knowledge of the problem of existence. This is one of the grand wants of the day, that scientific men should take the philosophic standpoint, and philosophic thinkers the scientific. The interchange may not be easy, but nothing worth struggling for can be easily had. The difficulty of the task is connected with the contrast in the training and experience of the two orders of specialists. The trained observer and interpreter of the phenomena of nature is to a certain extent being unfitted for the work of the speculative thinker; and the speculative thinker is in like manner being unfitted for the work of observational science. But we must do the best we can under these admissions; and we must specially call to mind that the scientific observer has deep personal concern in the course of philosophic thought, as it is occupied with the interpretation of human life itself, its con-

ditions, intellectual and practical, its possibilities and probabilities. Granting all that science can demand, it is obvious that the problem of existence is much wider than the area of knowledge which science includes. The need for a resolute attempt of the scientific men of the day to occupy the philosophic standpoint is certainly urgent. Only on this condition can they bear their full part in the responsibility of the age. Deliberately to decline looking at the wider question, is to fall out of the line of march when high ends demand our united efforts. Talking of agnosticism while sitting by the wayside, is only the smoke of a soothing pipe which will soon burn out. Any wider and larger converse must be more instructed, and must have some firm grasp of the mysteries of life, which have at least this characteristic, that they do not dissolve in smoke.

Our age is profoundly interested in the philosophy of being; the whole body of scientific men are conscious of the fact. Hence the frequency with which scientists are seen to adventure on the field of metaphysics, where they deserve to have a most hearty welcome. But if such ventures are to render real service, the philosophic standpoint must be identified and resolutely occupied. Without this, well meant suggestions will fail to render any common service. For example, it has been suggested that towards a unification of knowledge it is desirable that the phenomena of mind be expressed in materialistic terminology. But the question is, Can the thing be done? Can you express thought in terms of extension, and deal with it as having length, breadth and thickness? Can you express consciousness in terms of material energy? Is the thing not clearly impossible, and is not the suggestion itself so much an external affair as to indicate that the inner nature of the perplexity of being is not fully comprehended? There is a dualism in existence which cannot be overlooked, whatever terms we employ; our thoughts must deal with reality, and our words must follow our knowledge. The problem is too vast to be brought within range from the standpoint of materialism.

In making account of the lower and the higher views of things, we find the explanation of the cross-currents of thought in our day. A current flows along scientific channels as if the explanation of existence could be found in external phenomena.

An opposing current flows from the higher elevation, discrediting the possibility, and holding on its course in search of the explanation of things behind the appearances contemplated and classified by observational science. The whole conflict of thought in our day is accounted for by these cross-currents. Whatever increased detail in differentiation we may find is consequent on diverse elements commingling in these currents. The one grand conflict is the struggle between an observationalism which seeks the explanation of existence in the facts of existence themselves, and a deeper rational demand which seeks the explanation of Nature beyond itself.

Here is the historic explanation of the rise and influence of agnosticism. It is an attempt to claim that science is all, and that philosophy is nothing distinct; that there is and can be but one line of enquiry in our search for the explanation of things, namely, along the track of observation; that a deeper rational procedure, seeking an explanation of existence behind appearances, is incompetent, and that its votaries are to be recalled. But the times, favorable in one way, are really unfavorable to agnosticism. The force of the cross-current is too strong to be stemmed. Herbert Spencer may be called as a witness whose testimony will be accepted as impartial, and he reads so differently the course of rational progress, that he deliberately offers "a harmony of Science and Religion," and writes in terms so explicit as these:—"The consciousness of an Inscrutable Power manifested to us through all phenomena has been growing ever clearer." (*First Principles*, p. 108.) Science is powerful in its own field, powerless beyond; whensoever it proclaims an agnostic bondage, it falls out of the line of march, weighted and wearied by manacles of its own forging. It cannot place clearly before human view its declaration as to the limits of intelligence, and find credence for its representation. This is admirably put in a passage in the preface to Martineau's *Study of Religion*. To make good the agnostic case, "you must be careful not to look beyond phenomena, as empirical facts; you must abjure the enquiry into causes and the attempt to trace invisible issues; never lift the veil that bounds experience, and you will need nothing and know nothing of a transcendental world." The theory which proposes such restraints cannot be a power in the

world. The most rudimentary distinction between knowledge and thought must be enough to discredit the theory of knowledge which commends faith in ignorance.

The battles of thought are not waged with weapons of negation. Realities of existence are within our range of vision as we occupy the philosophic standpoint ; and from mere contemplation of these, we can see how complex and how grand is the task which intelligence takes upon itself, and in performance of which it finds healthy exercise and increasing delight. The past and the future meet before our eyes ; the visible and invisible must find their relations, and our life, even as thinkers, before we advance to the achievements of practical life in accordance with a lofty ideal, becomes conscious of the grandeur of its position, and the greatness of its possibilities. For we are grappling with the most rational enquiry, how the problems of human life stand related to the problem of existence as a whole.

Passing into the midst of what is positive and truly powerful in modern scientific thought, we are engaged with all the manifestations of the grand law of Evolution. We recognize the popularity of the scheme which rests on this law for the explanation of the universe ; looking along the line of biologic advance from lowest types of life to more complex forms of organism, we recognize the grandeur of the representation supplied, and come to perceive how wonderful is life and how marvellous the action of an environment which has itself no life ; but this view closes in upon us and the prospect of completing our view of existence becomes hopeless. Yet nothing is imperilled but the advance of a theory into a region where its advocates find movement difficult and uncertain. All that it has achieved it retains. If there is wavering and perplexity beyond, it is because thought is greater than organism ; and because interpretation of fibres and nerve cells becomes too poor a thing to be accepted as a philosophy of intelligence, and of the mysteries of an ethical life. It is here that the main conflict is still to be waged. This is the controversy between thought ruled by knowledge of the laws of organism, and thought ruled by the knowledge of thought itself.

One serious disadvantage there is arising from the popularity of Darwinian Evolution, for it has become for the time a form of domination, a type of authority, such as invariably hampers free

thought. The theory has now passed from the hands of the original observer and thinker into the hands of the expounder, who is a dogmatist, and the whole history of philosophy tells how seriously dogmatism impedes progress. The Darwinian of our day will give you a complete history of creation within 300 pages, 8vo.\* You have only to read such a sketch in order to know all about it. And the writer will tell you,—he is quite sure as to this, also,—that there is no such thing as absolute morality. This is one of the discoveries to which Darwinianism has led even shrewd observers; and our author is quite happy over this fancied discovery, thinking that it must be a great relief to humanity to be done with absolute morality, and to know that expediency alone rules human conduct. And a professional critic, standing under the porch of *The Academy*, will tell you that this is an able discussion of the subject. It is true, indeed, that both author and critic show comparatively slight knowledge of the difficulties of the subject they handle, while they succeed in illustrating how little is done to help, and how much to hinder, by a simple dogmatism. Still there is nothing singular in our lot, for it is a trite enough saying that the main hindrance to progress is the absence of thought.

Leaving such superficial thought out of account, when we come to close quarters, we readily find where the forces of the day are encountering each other in true conflict. It is the familiar struggle between a materialistic and a spiritualistic interpretation of the universe. It is the conflict between the line of thought which seeks through organism to account for humanity, and the opposing line which seeks through thought to account for the universe. Evolution is advancing with the freshness of spirit coming from newly made discovery, and with large expectation of further triumph, inclined to make jest of what is judged an antiquated "transcendentalism." This same transcendentalism just because it is not a thing of recent growth, but has sprung from the necessities belonging to completion of a theory of knowledge, is not seriously moved by the advance of a force which leans upon organism. It has already fought its battles with empiricism in other forms, and is not alarmed by any new advance on the same lines.

---

\* *Story of Creation: A Plain Account of Evolution.* By Edward Clodd.



The chief interest of the day centres on the fortunes of Evolution. There is nowhere a disposition to make light of its progress; the question is,—how can it deal with the grand problems of human life and destiny? It has much to do before it can claim to have surmounted its difficulties; what lies behind as fairly accomplished is comparatively easy in contrast with a theory of human knowledge and practice. It has not yet found, and does not seem near the discovery, a reliable theory of intelligence, much less of moral life. Its grand difficulties are to be met, now that it has escaped from the entanglements which suspicion and traditionalism occasion. The passage from laws of organism to laws of knowledge is not an easy one. The most competent scientific observers who have given concentrated attention to the subject have openly avowed their perplexity (Tyndall, for example), and have admitted that they cannot bridge the chasm which severs organism from consciousness. This is the most noticeable thing now under attention. The only course open to the Evolutionist is to make larger demands on organism. And in what perplexity is the scientist when he proceeds on these lines, unable to move a step save on authority of observed facts. We are in possession of a trustworthy physiology; we know something of the work which can be done by that marvellous structure we name brain; and we are aware that it keeps in its secrets a multitude of unanswered questions. But the puzzle for the Evolutionist is this, that while we know much as to what nerve and brain actually accomplish, and are fully warranted to reason from analogies, we also know what facts are included in thought and purpose and progressive intelligent life, and that these cannot be explained by brain action. Here the scientist has no science; he may have expectations, but in cherishing these he is trusting to a hidden *magic* of brain cells, which cannot well be credited as among scientific *data*. The Evolutionist has here his most difficult task. The eyes of observers necessarily turn on this part of the field, and it is required of all who would contribute to advance that they conform to the scientific requirements which they have themselves accepted.

*University of Edinburgh.*

HENRY CALDERWOOD.

## ANTICHRIST.

### A BIBLICAL STUDY.

THE earnest desire of men to know what the future contains not only as regards their personal destiny, but as regards the Church of God and the human race upon the earth, is not, as is sometimes represented, merely an idle and unprofitable curiosity. On the contrary, it is a desire most rational and worthy of man as a moral creature. Indeed, our action in the present is constantly and necessarily determined by what, rightly or wrongly, we believe as to the future, and the bearing of our action on that future. And God has in fact Himself graciously recognized at once our need and our ignorance by giving us in His Word certain very clear and momentous revelations concerning the future both of the individual and of the world in which we live. And while it ill befits us to seek to be wise above what is written, it not only is not wrong, but is our solemn duty to seek to know whatever God has revealed touching either our personal hereafter, or the future course of human history. To be indifferent here, as too many are, to refuse for whatsoever reason, to hear and attend to what God has seen fit to reveal as to that future, is the part, not of superior wisdom, as some seem to imagine, but of a folly which cannot fail to have disastrous issues.

Among the most distinct and prominent revelations of God's Word regarding the history of the Christian dispensation, is that concerning the coming of Antichrist. Both the word and the revelation it contains are among the most distinct of Holy Scripture. The idea of the coming of Antichrist is not to be classed with inferences which, sometimes, good but mistaken men have drawn from obscure, symbolical predictions of Scripture. On the contrary, the coming of Antichrist is as formally and plainly declared as the doctrine of the atonement, or any other of the fundamental doctrines of Scripture. The Apostle John affirms it in so many words, and as a familiar element of primitive apostolic teaching; "Ye have heard," he says, "that Anti-

christ shall come." Without intending an exhaustive presentation of everything in the Scriptures which might bear on this subject, which were forbidden by the limits proper to this essay, it is proposed to indicate some of the more conspicuous elements of their teaching on the subject.

The prefix "anti," in composition, very commonly means "opposite," "against." The usage is very familiar, even in English. "Anti-slavery" means one who is opposed to slavery; "anti-monopoly," opposed to monopoly; "anti-monarchical," opposed to monarchy. So also "Antichrist" means, etymologically, "one who is opposed to Christ," "an adversary or antagonist of Christ." If we had regard merely to the etymology of the word, we might therefore say that every unconverted person who has heard of Christ and has rejected him, is therefore an "antichrist." But the word from the beginning had a sense more precise and specific. It was from the first understood to denote a person, or power, who should be in some peculiar and prominent sense, as John phrases it in verse 22 of the chapter cited, "*the* Antichrist," that is, one who should in the fullest and most emphatic sense realize the idea of antagonism to Christ. John's use of the definite article with this word here and elsewhere, neglected in the version of King James, but preserved in the revised version, is by no means to be overlooked. The word is peculiar to John; but it is to be noted that he does not represent himself as giving forth some new revelation in this matter. On the contrary, he speaks of this as a part of Christian teaching with which those to whom he wrote his epistles, were already familiar. "Ye have heard," he says, "that Antichrist cometh." And so, in fact, we find the prediction of such a power as to be expected toward the close of this dispensation, in several other places in the Word of God. Especially full and clear is the language of Paul in 2 Thess. ii., wherein he tells the Thessalonians of a like dreadful power to be expected before the manifestation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, to take vengeance on his adversaries. For we read that the day of the Lord "will not come except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself

forth as God." And again, verse 7, he proceeds: "The mystery of lawlessness doth already work; only there is one that restraineth now until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of His mouth, and bring to naught by the manifestation of His coming."

Such, then, is the teaching of the Word of God. Does the Church ask what she is to look for in her future history before the appearing of her Lord? "Antichrist shall come," answers the Apostle John. "The man of sin, the lawless one, shall be revealed," answers Paul, "whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of His mouth and bring to naught with the manifestation of His coming." Surely if this indeed be true it is of consequence that the Church know it beforehand. No better preparation for the manifestation and successful activity of such a power of evil could well be imagined than that the Church should be taken unawares and unwarned, beguiled perchance by sunny visions and cheering songs full of the progress of the age and the glory of humanity and all that, so as not to know what was coming, till she should find herself already caught in the snare of the great flatterer. No; if it be true that Antichrist shall come, it is plainly of immense consequence that we know it beforehand, lest we fall victims to that "all deceit of unrighteousness" which Paul tells us the man of sin shall exercise toward "them that are perishing."

Little enough, however, do we hear of this warning in these latter days. It was different in the time of the apostles. Paul thought the matter of so great moment that, although before he wrote this second epistle to the Thessalonians, he had been with them only three weeks, and the Thessalonian Church was only three weeks old when he left them, yet in that three weeks, along with the very elements of the Gospel of Christ, he had warned them of the coming revelation of the man of sin, as one of the very first things that they as Christians needed to know. For he says in the epistle, "Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" Here is one of the many weighty contrasts between much of the preaching and teaching of the present day and that of the apostles. While we are always hearing of the coming of a glorious millenium as the great thing

to be expected before the appearing of the Lord, and little or nothing of the appearing of an Antichrist before the kingdom; in the recorded preaching of the apostles and their epistles it is just the reverse; absolutely nothing about a millennium of holiness before the return of the Lord, but once and again of days of searching trial to come upon the Church, of the coming of the man of sin, "the Antichrist" as one of the most conspicuous events which, inspired by the Holy Ghost, they saw in the future before the advent of the Lord. "The man of sin shall be revealed," says Paul; "Antichrist shall come," says John. That, they both agree, is what the Church has to expect before the glorious appearing of the King in his kingdom. Is the warning out of date, that we so rarely hear it now? Is perhaps, the danger then come and gone? Some there have been, good and wise men too, who have thought that Antichrist had already appeared. They have imagined that in the papal power was to be seen the fulfilment of this prediction. The Westminster Divines have even given this affirmation, as is well known, a place in our Confession of Faith, Chap. xxv. 6, which reads: "There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself, in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God." But that which John gives in this epistle as the distinguishing mark of the Antichrist, is not true and never has been true of the papacy. "This is Antichrist," says John, "even he that denieth the Father and the Son." But this the Church of Rome, with all her errors, has never done. On the contrary, she has held as steadfastly to the confession of the Father and the Son as any Church in Protestant Christendom; and, indeed, more faithfully than some who are called Protestants. The papacy may be and is antichristian, but assuredly it is not the Antichrist. It is plain, moreover, that, however often there have been and are now, as the Apostle John himself intimates, "many Antichrists," many individual persons and systems which have denied the Father and the Son, yet, up to the present time, there has certainly not arisen any person or power whose denial has taken such a peculiar and emphatic form and so universally and powerfully affected human history as to entitle that

person or system to be called by way of eminence above all others, "*the Antichrist.*" Whatever be intended by the Antichrist that shall come, we are forced to conclude that his appearing is still in the future. The warning of the apostle is, therefore, not yet out of date. The world is yet to see the rise of a person or a power which shall be in a fulness of meaning never yet realized, the adversary of Christ—the Antichrist. If so, it is then evidently a question of present and living importance. What is involved in this prediction? What, according to the word of prophecy, are to be the distinguishing characteristics of the Antichrist, that shall entitle him to this evil pre-eminence.

In the first place, Holy Scripture teaches that the Antichrist, whether a person or an association of persons, a government or polity in Church or State, will be the adversary of Christ in virtue of holding and carrying out in the most startling and audacious way a certain very definite belief or principle. What that will be the apostle tells us in plain words; "*This is the Antichrist; even he that denieth the Father and the Son.*" His grand characteristic is thus to be the denial of the Father and the Son. The great adversary of the Lord, which the future shall reveal, will thus be, in the first place, not a superstitious power like the papacy, but an atheistic power. He shall deny the Father; that is, he will deny that there is such a being as is revealed in the Holy Scriptures, as God the Father. Yet that alone, mere atheism, will not be all. Mere atheism gives us no sufficient reason to call a man an Antichrist, still less *the* Antichrist. For the word Antichrist itself implies that the one who shall bear it shall have heard of Christ, and knowing him, shall deny Him. He shall be not merely an antitheist, but an Antichrist. For the apostle teaches that it shall be the special mark of the denial of the Father which shall mark the Antichrist, that it shall be based upon and proceed from a previous denial of the Son. This implies, of course, like the very name Antichrist, the Antichrist will be one who knows well of Jesus, and knowing him, denies to His face that He is what He claimed to be, namely, the Son of God. Observe the language: "*This is the Antichrist, even he that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father;*" (1 John ii. 22, 23); and again, "*Every spirit that confesseth not Jesus, is*

not of God; and this is the spirit of the Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it cometh." (*Jb.* iv. 3.) Antichrist shall deny that Jesus is the Son of God, and through denying Him shall come to deny the Father also. And it is not difficult to see how this should be the necessary final issue. For the Word of God expressly teaches not only that Jesus was and is God manifest in the flesh, but also that God the Father is only to be known through Him. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared him." (1 John, i. 18.) Hence the denial of Jesus as the only-begotten of the Father, however for a while after such denial the memory of that revelation once believed in, may preserve a fading conception of the Father in the mind, carries with it by necessary consequence the denial of the Father also. This has been illustrated from time to time all along the Christian centuries; but it will receive its most signal and solemn illustration when the Antichrist shall appear.

To the same effect with John's testimony is that which Paul gives of this evil power, which shall appear out of the darkness of that future toward which the Church and the world is traveling. His words are different, but they imply that same denial of the Son and the Father which John predicts explicitly. He tells us of a power that shall be manifested before the glorious appearing of the Lord in His kingdom, who shall sit in the temple of God, "setting himself forth as God," which he calls indeed, not the *Antichrist*, but *ὁ ἀντιμέθερος*, "the opposer." And this perfectly agrees with what John has told us. For it is plain that when a man, through denying the Son, comes to deny the Father also, he is then a man without God, and, by necessary consequence, makes himself his own God. This must needs be. There is no escaping it. For if there is no Divine will recognized above me, then, plainly since the will of man, my will, is the highest will which is left now to recognize and obey, therefore, if I deny God, I make myself my own god. So shall the Antichrist, denying the Father, therewith "set himself forth as God." And in this we may see anew the special fitness of his name, "the Antichrist;" he shall be the complete opposite of Christ in character as in action. For whereas Christ, although He is God, humbled Himself to become man, the Antichrist

although man, shall exalt himself to be God. He will proudly and blasphemously profess to have attained that which Satan falsely promised to Adam in Eden, when he said, "Ye shall be as gods." And thus the Antichrist, the king over all the children of pride, "shall set himself forth as God."

Paul adds another feature to the picture. He calls him, *ἀνόμος*, "the lawless one." And this, too, he must be who denies the Father and the Son. For then, in the first place, there is left no Lawgiver above man, so that with the denial of the Lawgiver, follows the denial of law itself as of divine authority and sanction; and, in the second place, since the will of God is the original fountain and source of all law and authority among men, the denial of the Father and the law of the Father, carries with it the final denial of all law as of binding force, whether it be of God or of man. And this is the very idea and essence of lawlessness. Antichrist will, in this sense and for this reason, be, above all that have gone before, the lawless one.

Another name used to describe this coming power of evil, is "the man of sin." Antichrist is so called, because that which shall be his chief sin, is the very root and essence of all sin, namely, this repudiation of the law of God as the binding rule for man's life. So John tells us (1 John iii. 4) "sin is *ἀνομία*, lawlessness." Antichrist shall, therefore, as "the lawless one," realize and set forth in a way eminent and to that time without precedent, the idea of sin, even as Christ realized and set forth in a way and measure never equalled, the idea of holiness.

It is further taught that Antichrist shall be in a special and eminent sense, "the liar." For this again we have the words of John; "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the Antichrist." (1 John ii. 22.) He shall be "the liar," in that he is Antichrist, the great adversary and antagonist of Jesus Christ who is the Truth. He shall be "the liar," again, because the denial of the truth in the last days shall be against a clearer light of truth than ever before. It will be denial in the very face, not only of the revelation of the Father in Christ, but of all the added testimony borne to that Gospel of God by centuries of the history of its saving power. Lastly, Antichrist will be "the liar" by way of eminence, because in this denial of the Son and the Father, is logically involved, as the recent



history of unbelieving philosophy is showing more and more clearly, the denial of all truth, even of the very testimony of the human consciousness, and, by necessary sequence, the denial of the very possibility of absolutely knowing anything.

But not only shall Antichrist be with emphasis "the liar," but he shall be also a deceiver of others. For this is another title which John gives him. "This is the deceiver and the Antichrist." (2 John 7.) Whether the Antichrist be, as the primitive Church held, a person, or a body or organization of men, a polity or government in Church or State, one thing is certain, Antichrist will not be alone. He shall deceive others. The principle which he holds, the denial of the Son and the Father, he shall persuade others also to adopt. This feature of his character and career is much emphasised in all the inspired predictions. John, as we have seen, calls him "the deceiver," by way of eminence; Paul tells us that his coming will be with "all deceit of unrighteousness in them that are perishing." (2 Thess. ii. 9-10.) So the Lord Jesus, who does not directly name him, yet plainly has the same evil power of the last days in mind when he tells of false teachers, Antichrist and his deceived minions, who shall "lead astray if possible the very elect." (Mat. xxiv. 24.) And as if by way of indicating the exceeding greatness of the peril from this unparalleled deceivableness of unrighteousness, he adds: "Behold I have told you before!" From this last particular it follows that we are not to imagine that Antichrist will appear to the world or even probably to the great body of professed Christians as really very bad. As Christ seemed to the wise men of the day to be an evil person, a wine-bibber, a blasphemer and a traitor, while he was in fact, all the while, the only one in the world who "knew no sin," so, on the contrary, shall Antichrist seem to be good and his principles and doctrines rational and true, when in very truth, he is all the while "the man of sin" and "son of perdition," teaching the very falsehood of the pit.

Paul adds yet one more feature to this inspired portrait which we must by no means omit. He tells us, (2 Thess. ii. 9) that his coming shall be according to the working of Satan, "with all power and signs and lying wonders." He shall be on that account, as it were, Satan personified. As Jesus worked wonders, as the Man who was full of the Holy Spirit, Antichrist shall

work wonders, as being full of the spirit of the devil. Let us still observe, however, that this does not mean that he shall seem to be the most satanic. Rather in him shall that word of inspiration be fulfilled, "Even Satan is transformed into an angel of light."

It remains to be added, that according to the Scripture, Antichrist, the great deceiver, shall be very successful. At least, if we follow the great body of interpreters, who identify with the Antichrist and the man of sin the Roman type of world-power, in its revived and final form, as symbolized under the wild beast of Revelation xiii. his temporary world-wide success is explicitly predicted. For it is written in so many words: "It was given unto him to make war with the saints and to overcome them; and there was given him authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation. And all that dwell on the earth shall worship him, every one whose name hath not been written in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world." And, thereupon, as if in foresight of the incredulity with which this prediction would at last be received, it is solemnly added, "If any man hath an ear, let him hear!"

Such then is, in outline, the portraiture which the Holy Spirit has given us of the great enemy of the Lord Jesus and of his Church who is yet to appear. Surely these statements of Holy Scripture are exceeding plain and simple; so plain that one would think that only our natural and often invincible reluctance to believe what is not pleasant, what is not flattering to our human pride and in keeping with the boastful spirit of this age, could hinder any from understanding even as they run. Surely no power, no person or organization has yet appeared in the history of the Church who has fully answered to this portrait.

It will be asked, will the Antichrist be a polity or a person? We may not dogmatise here, but it is natural to believe that as the "many antichrists" of whom John speaks in the text were persons, apostate Christians who had gone out from them, so *the* Antichrist shall be a person also. Further, that ideas should be embodied in persons, is according to the whole analogy of history. So it has always been; history is full of illustrations. The papal ideas had been silently working, finding now more,

now less adequate expression in the person of one and another papal dignitary, till at last they found, as it were, their incarnation in Hildebrand. In like manner, the ideas which brought about the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, were working long before, and ever and anon found, as it were, an impersonation and a voice in a more or less adequate way, in men like Savon-rola, Huss and Wickliffe, till at last Luther appeared, whom we often call "the great Reformer;" and in him the Reformation found at last its most complete expression. So it were only in accord with the whole course of history thus far, that the denial of the Father and the Son, which has all along been taking voice and shape in various persons and antichristian philosophies, should at last find a man, who shall receive and take in this idea of the denial of the Father and the Son in all its logical bearings and issues, and have strength of will and character to carry it out and make it for the first time a governing principle in the history of man. Should this be, that man will be "the Antichrist." If we thus judge, it may be further remarked that this understanding of the matter will be also in full accord with the unanimous belief of the Church in the age immediately succeeding the apostles, as well as of a very large and competent number of interpreters of Scripture in our own time. However, the great fact which we have to face, that which chiefly concerns us to insist upon, is not so much the precise form and embodiment which this evil development may take, as the revealed fact that such a development is to be expected before the history of human rebellion shall end; the age-long sin of man, is to be headed up and consummated at last in a "man of sin." Men have often sinned blindly, not knowing against whom they were sinning; they have often sinned while yet they have admitted even in that very act of sin, in some way, that there was a power above them, even God the Father, whom they ought to obey. But we have not yet seen the worst of sin; it will yet assail the throne of the Creator itself. Through and through the world shall yet ring that proud and angry shout of the kings and the rulers of the earth, predicted by the Psalmist, "Let us break asunder the bands of the Lord and of his Christ, and cast off their yoke from us." That these prophetic words in their

fullest reach of meaning, tell of the days of the lawless one, the "man of sin," "the Antichrist," who shall deny the Father and the Son, is not indistinctly suggested, by the sublime reply of God to this angry rage of rebellious men. "Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Sion." "I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me; *Thou art my Son*, this day have I begotten Thee!" This then is the picture: On earth, the Antichrist and those whom he has deceived, denying that Jesus is the Son of God, and proceeding to cast off the yoke of God the Father also; on the throne of the heavens, the sublime counter-assertion first of the Father and then of the Son the declaration of precisely that truth which the Antichrist and his minions are angrily denying, namely, the supremacy of the Father: "Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion," and the divine Sonship of Christ, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee!"

And this leads to one last thought, namely, the predicted end of Antichrist. John does not indeed mention it, but Paul sets it forth with exceeding plainness. He and his will be utterly overthrown and destroyed. This is intimated in the name which Paul gives to him. He calls him "the son of perdition." He shall, as it were, be begotten of perdition, and shall belong to perdition even as a son to a father. Perdition shall have him for its very own. And the apostle goes yet further; for he tells us in plain words how that perdition shall be brought about. He says that when this mystery of lawlessness working already in his time and all along through the ages, against that other mystery of godliness, "which was manifest in the flesh," shall at last reach its consummate expression in the revelation of the man of sin, setting himself forth as God; then the long-suffering of the Lord shall at length be exhausted. "The Lord shall destroy him," he says. How? Not by moral influences and the preaching of the Gospel, not by the work of the converting Spirit, but, "He shall slay him with the breath of His mouth, and bring him to naught by the manifestation of his coming." Whatever ideas we may have been wont to attach to these words as we read them, as they stand in the original there is no ambiguity. They refer, according to the usage of the terms employed, a usage which has

no exception, to the future personal return and manifestation of the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven; even that same revelation of the Lord in flaming fire of which Paul has spoken in the first chapter, when "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with the angels of His power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God \* ; \* \* when he shall come also to be glorified in his saints, and to be marvelled at in all them that believed." That is the stupendous event which shall finish and put an everlasting end to the career of the Antichrist and his audacious denial of the Father and the Son. The denial of the Son shall be met by the personal appearing of the Son to take vengeance on His adversaries. It will be an argument which will put an end forever to all dispute as to who Jesus of Nazareth really was, and silence to eternity all denial both of the Son and of the Father.

These, then, according to the inspired Word, are among the most conspicuous events of that future toward which the world is hastening; first, the appearing of the Antichrist, then his destruction by the personal appearing of the Son of God, whom he shall impiously deny. All this, one hardly needs to say, is perfectly consistent with the no less plain teaching of the Scripture that the Gospel of the kingdom, before the end, must be "preached for a witness among all nations;" it is perfectly consistent with the teaching of the Scripture that this preaching shall also be effectual to the gathering out of a great multitude from all the nations to be "a first fruits from among men to God and the Lamb." But, evidently, this inspired revelation of a mystery of lawlessness, steadily working through the ages till at last it finds full outward expression in an Antichrist, but very ill agrees with the hopes which so many in our day have come to cherish of an age of triumph for the Church on earth before the coming of her Lord. Archbishop Trench has happily expressed, in full accord with the uniform teaching of the primitive Church, the true teaching of the Scripture as to the future of this world before the return of the Lord. Expounding the parable of the wheat and the tares, he says, "We learn that evil is not, as so many dream, gradually to wane and to disappear before good, the world before the Church, but is ever to develop itself more

fully, even as, on the other side, good is to unfold itself more and more mightily also. Thus it will go on, till at last they stand face to face, each in its highest manifestation, in the persons of Christ and of Antichrist. On the one hand, an incarnate God, on the other, the man in whom the fulness of all Satanic power will dwell bodily. Both are to grow, evil and good, till they come to a head, till they are ripe, one for destruction, the other for full salvation."

Let us learn one practical lesson from this teaching of Scripture. If it be really true that the Lord has foreseen and predicted all this, then we have no cause to be terrified and discouraged at the ever-increasing antagonism of unbelief to the truth of God of which we in these days, with no little reason, are hearing so much, as if some strange and unexpected thing were coming to pass. Unexpected it may be to many, but not unexpected to others. There are many in the Church who from the Word of God have been led to anticipate even such an intensification of the conflict as we are seeing. The Lord has told us before. Antichrist must needs come, as it is written of him; he must needs come and be destroyed before the Christ, whom he would supplant, can set up His glorious throne. But all this, even all his deceit and evil working, which must needs be mysteriously permitted in the divine counsels, is yet comprehended in the eternal counsel of the Father for the redemption of this sin-cursed world. We are not, then, to be alarmed if, as the bark of the Church sails on, she should come, not yet into peaceful, sunlit seas, as so many dream but rather into tracts of storm and desolating tempest. These same stormy regions into which the Church is, perhaps, even now about entering, are all down on our chart. Right through such tempestuous seas lies the way to the Church's peaceful harbor in the New Jerusalem. When the night shall be at the darkest, and when an unseen power, even the prince of the power of the air shall, with lightnings and devastating storm-wind, threaten the frail bark of the Church with utter destruction, when the little band of the Lord's disciples shall be laboring all in vain to bring her safely to land, then, as of old, shall a form of resplendent light appear in the darkness, and the voice of the Lord shall be heard on the waters, and He, the Son of Man, shall

appear! And then that shall become true again which was written of that tiny bark upon the Sea of Galilee, "Immediately they shall beat the land whither they went." Blessed storms which blow toward the haven! Helpless might of evil which cannot accomplish aught against the mighty Son of God, or hurt one hair of all the chosen company of sons which He, the great Captain of Salvation, has determined to bring to glory.

*Toronto.*

S. H. KELLOGG.

### CROSSING THE BAR.

LAST POEM IN TENNYSON'S NEW BOOK.

Sunset and evening star,  
 And one clear call for me!  
 And may there be no moaning of the bar,  
 When I put out to sea!

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,  
 Too full for sound and foam,  
 When that which drew from out the boundless deep  
 Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,  
 And after that the dark!  
 And may there be no sadness of farewell  
 When I embark!

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place  
 The flood may bear me far,  
 I hope to see my Pilot face to face  
 When I have crost the bar.

## CULTURE AND RELIGION.\*

A SUBJECT so extensive as this one cannot be treated exhaustively, or otherwise than in the briefest outline, within the limits allowed for this address.\* I shall, therefore, endeavor to view both Culture and Religion in their broadest sense, and to show that a relation does exist between them, not antagonistic, as the extreme culturist or the narrow-minded religionist would have it, but, in so far as different, co-operative, both combining to promote one great end, viz., the full realization of all the capacities of the human soul.

We must, first of all, define our terms and ascertain the sphere peculiar to each.

Culture, this favorite word of modern civilization, according to some, means nothing more than a thin veneer of refinement, which lies in acquaintance with the forms of polite society, and in the possession of a few choice phrases, an easy command over conversational trifles, a graceful bearing and a fashionable dress. Sometimes it means a passion for æstheticism, a knowledge of art and beauty, and a longing to make them the chief idols of human worship. At other times it refers largely to the education of the scientific faculty, the obedience of law, the subjection of the lower impulses of the nature to the sway of reason.

These definitions are defective, because they throw the emphasis chiefly upon one particular aspect of human life. Every one of them contains some truth, but only a part of the truth; and every one of them gives evidence of an imperfect generalization. They are, at best, but mutilated statues of true culture, one wanting a hand, another a foot; but even these fragments help us to understand what true culture is. What the Greeks naturally expressed by *καλλιαια*, the Romans by their *humanitas*, we less happily try to express by the more artificial word culture.

Used in its broadest sense, it means the educating or leading

---

\* Inaugural Address read before the 65th public meeting of the Literary and Metaphysical Society of Knox College.



forth of all that is in a man, the training of all the energies and capacities of his being to their highest pitch, and directing them to their true ends, for no definition can be considered adequate, which ignores the cultivation of a single faculty.

Varied are the means employed to attain this end, but the most powerful instrument of culture is to bring the young and impressible mind in contact with what is best and noblest in the thoughts of other men, so that, being to a certain extent assimilated, it may guide conduct, and thus help to mould and build up character. It must not be understood, however, that culture is the product of mere study. Learning may be had from books, but not culture. The person who is a mere book-worm can never be considered cultured. To become so, he must at times shut his books, leave his quiet room, and mingle with his fellow-men, and in associating with those whose minds and characters are fitted to elevate, instruct and sweeten his own, his learning becomes vivified, and the knowledge which hitherto was dormant begins to show signs of life. In an interchange of thoughts with his fellows, in learning their habits and their ways, in discussion with them, sympathies are aroused, faculties stirred to life which otherwise would have remained dead. Culture thus becomes a more living process than the knowledge of what is best and noblest in the thoughts of men could possibly be.

Another thing necessary to culture is the discipline which must be carried on by each man in himself, the learning of self-control, the acquiring the power to use one's own powers, for the attainment of which there is nothing better than an extensive course of study, such as a collegiate course, in which what is finest and noblest in the thoughts of men is reduced to the shape best fitted to be received and assimilated, and being generally applied to the mind when most plastic, the impression is most permanent. But to enumerate all the helps to culture would be an endless task, for the process begins with our earliest years and continues to the last. The man who is under the transforming influence of this process to such an extent as to become matured in every part, so as to be able to fulfill the purpose of his creation, can alone be considered truly cultured.

One will hardly fail to notice how the advocates of education, of the lowest as well as of the highest form, have always urged

its claims for its moral results. "Banish ignorance," say the advocates of a primary education, "and you put an end to vice and crime;" and though we doubt the necessity of the alleged sequence, yet we accept their testimony as to the moral aim which all education should imply.

The culturists—and by those we do not mean the admirers of culture, but those who regard intellectual and æsthetic attainments as the highest good—insist that they do not value culture for the information it implies, or for its utilitarian results, but for its effect in elevating the whole man. They tell us that character is not developed by rules or precepts, but by an ideal which one sets before him, and strives to realize. Of the Indian in his wigwam, as well as of the prince in his palace, this is true. And the culturist would say that it is the aim of culture to furnish men with grand and noble ideals, instead of allowing them to remain contented with those of a meaner and shallower sort. Most especially would they urge its claim upon the young, for by furnishing them with a lofty ideal it would open up to them avenues which would give them a glimpse of the true and the beautiful. Nor do they stop here, but say further, that it would also help men on to the realization of this ideal. We would not gainsay or deny either of these positions taken by culturists. But if the intellectual and æsthetic elements in man's nature alone contribute to the formation of his ideal, then such an ideal can never lead him up to that which it is possible for him to become.

But, says one, have we not always been taught to regard religion as furnishing the ideal which should act as the guiding star in a man's life and conduct, and now apparently a rival power appears upon the scene to furnish another. Are we to regard these two powers as in opposition, or what really can be the relation between them? Evidently they agree in having an ideal. But if, as already admitted, culture has an ideal, so has religion; for what can be more an ideal than that which it sets forth, "Be ye perfect as your Father in Heaven is perfect." But if culture's ideal be intellectual attainment, sensuousness or a passion for æstheticism, then it is clear that any one of these ideals may bring it into collision with religion. If, on the other hand, culture has for its ideal the full realization of all the capacities of the soul, which we believe to be its true and absolute

ideal, then must the opposition between it and religion vanish, for culture thus viewed will embrace the cultivation of intellect, emotion and will, *i.e.*, of every faculty necessary to the development of the purest and highest phase of religion. And so, culture viewed in this light, embraces religion and ends in it.

And now starting from the standpoint of religion, it is by no means an easy task to give a correct definition or an accurate description of it. The reason is that religion is so widespread and so diversified in its nature. It has spread over the whole earth, and it has appeared in an almost countless variety of forms. A certain sense of an unseen power, or powers, presiding over his destiny is manifested by man in the lowest stage of barbarism, as well as in the highest state of civilization. But the rude savage and the cultured thinker have very different conceptions of the powers they worship. The phases of religion are as varied as are the aspects of human life. It extends over all countries and peoples, but in no two countries, and in the case of no two individuals can it be said to be exactly the same. And hence it becomes no easy task to find a definition sufficiently extensive to comprehend and suit the various forms assumed by the religious life. Some evade the difficulty by making it identical with one of its phases, as, for example, Christianity; but it is clear that the varied religions of earth cannot be grouped under the Christian religion.

A definition of religion must completely circumscribe it. It is not sufficient that the definition be applicable to one phase of religion, or to a goodly number out of the vast host of religions. It must give what is characteristic of them all. Accordingly it cannot be very comprehensive, for it cannot tell much about any of them, nor will its significance be very rich or definite. Perhaps if we say that "religion is man's belief in a being or beings mightier than himself, and inaccessible to the senses, but not indifferent to his thoughts and actions, with the feelings and practices which flow from such belief;" we have a definition of the kind required. Anything more definite than this might perchance give prominence to some special phase of religion, rather than to religion itself.

Religion, then, is man's communion with what he believes to be a god, or gods; his sense of relationship to, and dependence

on a higher and mysterious agency, with all the thoughts and emotions that proceed from it. His communion may be dark and drear, finding its expression in profane rites and human sacrifices; or in spirit and in truth manifesting itself in actions and in conduct which elevate and ennoble life. The object of his worship may be some personified power of nature or He in whom all righteousness, truth and holiness have their source. But whatever phase of religion we view, it involves a belief in a god or object of worship, and actions and thoughts corresponding to that belief. It is always a consciousness of relationship to a worshipped being. And as we view the varied phases of religion, it will be noted that this religious consciousness, which is the frame and condition of spiritual life necessary to religion, is not the product of any one particular faculty, but is a joint contribution of intellect, emotion and will, and that, however this may be denied, it will be found that those who maintain the claim of one of these faculties as the exclusive seat of religion, in reality admit the influence of the other two. They may say that the work of the one is more prominent than that of the others, but will have to acknowledge that a religion which is entirely emotional or purely volitional or chillingly intellectual is unthinkable, and that that religion alone is thinkable in the fashioning of which every one of these faculties play their part.

Religion thus viewed embraces the whole mind and the whole man, and being thus rooted in the entire nature, its growth and perfecting can only be carried on by the gradual development of all the faculties of that nature. Its seat is the centre, its sway extends to the outermost bounds. At its lowest ebb it has in it something alike of intellect, emotion and will. In its brightest phase it includes the highest exercise of reason, the purest and deepest emotions, the firmest and noblest volitions.

Religion, thus demanding the exercise of all our faculties, can have for its ideal nothing less than the full development of all the capacities of the soul, and hence is coterminous with culture. And so culture and religion, when viewed absolutely, are not in opposition, but have the same ideal and combine for the same end. They are but the same process viewed from different standpoints. Starting from the manward side and proceeding honestly with the cultivation of the intellectual and spiritual faculties, you land

in religion. Starting from the Godward side of human nature, a full development of the religious faculties implies and demands the culture of the intellectual. Considered absolutely, then, culture culminates in religion, and religion expands into culture.

Now, if we will not accept this account of culture and religion, must we not admit that the value of religion on the one hand, and of culture on the other, cannot be deemed relative to one common good? The intellectual element in man's nature may have one good in view, while the religious may have another, and each having a different end will cause those elements in his nature to be running parallel or to be brought into collision. And it may be said with truth, that history almost invariably, has revealed to us these powers working in opposition. But it may be noticed that this opposition has not been due to anything inherent in culture or in religion, but to the fact that few men have looked at them from more than one point of view, and none, perhaps, have taken a universal or absolute view of either. And so, it has come to pass, that these two powers, starting from different standpoints, have each continued to work on under the impulse of the leading idea which gave it birth, without taking any notice of the idea that animated the other. Culture has thus been made to busy itself with the means necessary to the complete development of the intellectual faculties. The intellectual side of the nature has been developed, while the religious side has been ignored. And, whether this has happened in the case of a nation, such as the Greeks, where, if among any nation on earth, intellectual culture had reached its heights, where history, poetry, oratory and philosophy had not only their birth, but had attained a certain maturity before they were scattered forth among the nations of earth; or whether it has happened in the case of an individual, like Augustine, who, with all his intellectual attainments led but the lowliest possible life until the religious element in his nature was quickened; we find a dearth in the history of the one and a barrenness in the character of the other which no amount of intellectual development can eviscerate. And, if there be a sad sight on earth, it is where we find a man fully developed intellectually, but dead to everything devout and reverent.

So, too, the same truth holds of religion. For, by viewing it

from one standpoint, or by regarding it as the production of any one faculty, it has been bereft of everything that is purely life-giving. Starting from the view of God's existence in the consciousness it has been entirely absorbed with the results that flow from this relationship, the sense of dependence, the duty of obedience and self-surrender, and, in turn, the emotional, or the volitional, or the intellectual, has been regarded as the only essential element in it. And in its absorption, with its sphere thus limited, it has looked for light to conscience, to the help furnished by nature and history, and to the light that comes from heaven itself, but, being self-enwrapped, it has become dead to everything beyond its own little bounds, and, thus narrowed, minds loving freedom and truth have been turned away from this caricature of true religion. For, when religion does not satisfy the reason, waken up the emotions, call to action the will, it loses its beauty and power, and having a name to live, is dead.

The religious history of the Jewish nation gives us an exemplification of some such a change as this. We first behold the souls of the aged patriarchs waxing warm in a clear consciousness of their communion with God, and their religion being spiritual, elevated and uplifted the whole man. But as time moves on it changes. The marks of human hands upon it are evident, and in the transformation which it undergoes, the intellectual element becomes predominant, and instead of acquiring a grace and beauty, which it had not hitherto possessed, it is emptied of everything that is purely spiritual, and becomes a thing of forms and ceremonies. This having happened often in its history, we need hardly wonder that some of the bitterest attacks made upon religion by thoughtful men have been directed, not so much against its broad principles as against the meagre views and the formality and hollowness of the lives of its professed exponents.

"It is a phenomenon," says Christlieb, "that meets us in the earliest history of the Christian Church, that the outbreak of heresies goes hand in hand with the loss of spiritual life in the Church at large, that the rise of doubts has often coincided with the prevalence of fruitless controversies, and that open opposition to or separation from the Church Universal has been the consequence of abuses and neglects in practice, or of one-sidedness and exaggeration in dogmatic teaching." This testimony is too true,

and it is not a matter of surprise that many were repelled from the Church and the Christianity she professed, by the blinded bigotry which saw no truth beyond her own narrow circle of belief, or by the cruel persecutions which hunted those who would not subscribe to her tenets. And so, many a soul yearning for light and spiritual communion unknown within her pale, preferred almost anything to her cold formalism and dogmatic assumption.

The life of Charles Darwin furnishes us with a good example of a case where the æsthetic and religious elements in a man's nature have been sacrificed for the sake of the intellectual. In early life he seemed to have had a marked taste for the fine arts, and it is almost pathetic to read his own account of the way in which he fell out of correspondence with poetry and painting. Up to thirty he delighted in both. Gradually they ceased to interest him, and finally they became distasteful. "I cannot endure" says he, "to read a line of poetry. I have tried lately to read Shakespeare and found it so intolerably dull that it nauseated me. I have almost lost my taste for pictures or music. My mind seems to have become a kind of machine for grinding general laws out of large collections of facts, but why this should have caused the atrophy of that part of the brain alone on which the higher tastes depend, I cannot conceive. If I had to live my life again I would have made a rule to read some poetry and listen to some music at least once a week; for perhaps the parts of my brain now atrophied would have been kept active through use." "It is an accursed evil to a man" he writes to Hooker, "to become so absorbed in any subject as I am in mine." His religious history is no less interesting. In early life he seems to have been more or less susceptible to the genial influence of religion, intending at one time to enter the Church. His view of the ministry he incidentally gives as follows: "To a person fit to take the office, the life of a clergyman is a type of all that is respectable and happy." For many years of his life he had not thought much about the existence of a personal God. He had taken Paley's premises "on trust." His idea of entering the ministry "died a natural death." That idea given up, his religion, based on "Paley's argument and Pearson on the creed," gradually gave way. With the abandonment of special creation

Paley's argument disappeared. The Old Testament from which Pearson started seemed "no more to be trusted than the Sacred books of the Hindoos." "Disbelief crept over me at a very slow rate, but was at last complete. The rate was so slow that I felt no distress." Thus his religion dies a natural death. And from his own confession we learn that by an undue attachment to one subject, he became atrophied as far as the fine arts were concerned; and we trust we are neither uncharitable nor unkind when we sum up his religious history in the words "the atrophy of faith."

But among all the causes of estrangement between culture and religion we must not forget the one which has, perchance, been most pernicious of all: the alienation of the human heart from the highest forms of truth. However repulsive this truth may be, we shall have to admit that sin works disunion in the heart of man, which, while unrenewed, furnishes but poor soil for the growth and development of that which is pure and noble. Religion must have its root in something higher than this.

That root a richer soil doth know  
 Than our poor hearts could e'er supply,  
 That stream is from a source more high;  
 From God it came, to God returns,  
 Not nourished from our scanty urns,  
 But fed from his unfailing river,  
 Which runs and will run on for ever.

Those who are to break the bread of life to perishing men, whose calling should impel them ever on towards the highest attainments, intellectually, whose culture should be of the most liberal kind, should not forget that their training in schools and colleges, marks but the beginning of this life-process, and that, if true to their work, their culture will be broadening with years. They should be mindful of this fact, that the highest attainments reached by mere intellect, will avail but little to give a full, rounded manhood, unless transformed into spiritual graces; and that, if they are to become strong in their work, they must bring their intellectual as well as all other gifts to the foot of the Cross. They need not fear that the truths which philosophy and science will yet bring to light will augur any ill to true religion. For, in



so far as they are truths, God wishes them to be known and to be incorporated in our thoughts of Him and His ways. And never should they forget that life is full and rich and abundant only when they drink deeply, not of culture's springs alone, but of these fountains of living water of which if a man drink he shall never thirst.

JOHN CRAWFORD.

*Knox College, Toronto.*

### THE NIGHT AND THE MORNING.

To dream a troubled dream, and then awoken  
 To the soft gladness of a summer sky ;  
 To dream ourselves alone, unloved, forsaken,  
 And then to wake 'mid smiles, and love, and joy ;

To look at evening on the storm's rude motion,  
 The cloudy tumult of the fretted deep ;  
 And then at day-burst upon that same ocean,  
 Soothed to the stillness of its stillest sleep—

So runs our course—so tells the Church her story,  
 So to the end shall it be ever told ;  
 Brief shame on earth, but after shame the glory,  
 That wanes not, dims not, never waxes old.

Lord Jesus, come, and end this troubled dreaming !  
 Dark shadows vanish, rosy twilight break !  
 Morn of the true and real, burst forth, calm-beaming,  
 Day of the beautiful, arise, awake !

—BONAR.

## BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

NOT the Church of England only, but Protestant Christendom, has suffered grievous loss in the death of Bishop Lightfoot, following, as it does, so closely upon the death of the Oxford scholar, Hatch, whose work lay, to a great extent, along the same lines of philological and historical research in relation to the sacred Scriptures and the early Church.

Joseph Barber Lightfoot, a younger son of Mr. John Jackson Lightfoot, an accountant, was born at Liverpool, April 13, 1828. On his mother's side he claimed kinship with the pastor immortalized by Wordsworth in "The Excursion"—"The Wonderful" Walker of Seathwaite, and with the artist Joseph Barber, after whom he was named. He received his early education in the Liverpool Grammar School, then under the famous Dr. Prince Lee, afterwards Bishop of Manchester. Thence he proceeded to Trinity College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1851, being wrangler, senior classic and senior medallist of his year. It is said by one who knew him in his college days that the great characteristic of his work was thoroughness. He was elected fellow of his College in 1852, ordained deacon in 1854, priest in 1858. In 1857 he was appointed a tutor in his College; in 1861 he was made Hulsean Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and in 1875 he was transferred to the Lady Margaret Professorship of Divinity, which he retained until 1879, when he was consecrated Bishop of Durham. From 1862 to 1879 he was Examining Chaplain to Dr. Tait, first in the See of London, and when Tait became Archbishop, in the See of Canterbury. This association in office was the outcome of a life-long friendship between these two great men, who bore so marked a resemblance to each other in their large-heartedness and breadth of thought, their gifts of statesmanship and their abhorrence of sacerdotalism and formalism. Lightfoot proceeded to the degree of D.D. in his own University in 1864; he received the degree a second time from the University of Durham in 1879, when, at the same time, he was honored with a D.C.L. from Oxford, and an LL.D. from Glasgow.

In 1887 he received, for the third time, the degree of D.D. given to him by the University of Edinburgh at the celebration of its ter-centenary, when his acceptance of this highest acknowledgment of theological scholarship from the chief Divinity School of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, was a significant indication of his theological position and his genuine catholicity.

The honors, which these universities conferred upon Dr. Lightfoot, were the expression of the love and reverence entertained for him throughout the Christian Church, and the appropriate acknowledgment of the indebtedness of Christian scholars and teachers to this great Master of Exegesis. His literary work was carried on in the two related spheres in which, it seems to me, it is possible for a Christian scholar to render the most signal service to the Church of Christ, to mould most effectively its thought, and to influence most powerfully its future progress towards the realization of its unity in Christ. The greatest boon which scholarship can confer upon the Church is the help it can give towards the right understanding of the Sacred Scriptures, especially of the New Testament; and only second to this is the investigation into the historical *origines* of Christianity. In both of these departments, Bishop Lightfoot has done work that will live. His earliest contributions to the critical study of the New Testament began to appear in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* shortly after his graduation, and became, in subsequent years, one of the most noteworthy features in that periodical. The substance of these articles was afterwards incorporated in his larger works. Lightfoot projected a complete critical edition of St. Paul's Epistles. His high ideal of such a work can be gathered from his searching review of the commentaries of Jowett and of Stanley, which was published in the *Journal of Philology* in 1856, and which, with Lightfoot's subsequent articles, caused New Testament scholars to await, with great interest, the publication of the critic's promised work. The first instalment of Lightfoot's *magnum opus* appeared in 1865—his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, which has since reached its eighth edition. It contains, beside the critical edition of the Greek text, notes, translations, introduction and dissertations, and among the latter, that on St. Paul and the Three, discussing St. Paul's attitude towards Judaism

and Judaic Christianity, is of peculiar value. In 1868 the commentary on the Philippians was published upon the same plan as the preceding. It was enriched by an exhaustive dissertation on St. Paul and Seneca elucidating the relations of Christianity to heathen philosophy, and by the well-known essay on the Christian ministry. The commentary on the Colossians did not appear until 1875. It contains three elaborate dissertations on Essenism and its relation to Christianity. The introduction is distinguished by the very clear elucidation of the Colossian heresy and its relations to the later Gnosticism. This great contribution to the study of the New Testament was interrupted by Lightfoot's elevation to the responsibilities of the episcopate, an elevation, which, however honorable to its promoters and to him, who, for ten years, so faithfully, and with such ability and wisdom, administered the great Diocese of Durham, we cannot but regard as a calamity in view of the splendid possibilities of scholarly service which Lightfoot alone could have rendered to the Christian Church. Other men could have been found to discharge the duties of the Bishopric of Durham. None but Lightfoot could have completed the unique series of commentaries which will remain *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ* to the Church of Christ. It is known that other volumes of the series were under preparation, some of them nearly completed, and it is to be hoped in a condition to be published. We may probably have given to us those on Ephesians, Thessalonians and the Pastoral Epistles; more we do not venture to expect.

In addition to Lightfoot's valuable contributions to Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, his chief work in this department of study was connected with the Revised Version of the New Testament. In 1871, shortly after the revisers had begun their work, he put forth his plea for "A fresh Revision of the English New Testament," in which he developed and illustrated the principles which chiefly controlled and guided the revision, in which work, as is so well known, he took a foremost place.

Concurrently with his work on the Pauline Epistles, Bishop Lightfoot projected another of nearly equal magnitude upon the Apostolic Fathers. The volume on the Epistles of Clement of Rome was published in 1869. The discovery, in 1873, by Bryennios, of the now famous Jerusalem Manuscript,

which, among other things, contained the only extant copy of the Didache or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the little book which has created a sensation equal to that excited by Tischendorf's romantic finding of the Sinaitic Manuscript, gave also to scholars the first complete copy of the Epistles of Clement. Dr. Lightfoot accordingly published, in 1877, an Appendix, containing the newly recovered portions of the Epistles of Clement, with elaborate notes. He is known to have been engaged last year in the preparation of a new edition of the entire work. In 1885 the Bishop published the three splendid volumes on Ignatius and Polycarp, an unsurpassed contribution to the solution of the great doctrinal and historical problems bound up with the early Christian literature. The publication of the crude and pretentious work, entitled: "Supernatural Religion," drew forth from Bishop Lightfoot a series of masterly papers, published in the *Contemporary Review* from 1875 to 1877. These have been lately gathered together and re-issued without alteration, the Bishop explaining that he did so reluctantly, and only because the hope he had entertained of completing a work covering the whole history of the New Testament Scriptures during the first two centuries, he had, through failing health, been compelled to abandon. It will be difficult to find another English scholar so amply equipped for this great and much needed work. Lightfoot's contributions to Smith's Dictionaries of Christian Antiquities and Biography, and especially his splendid monograph on Eusebius, fill us with a keener sense of the loss the Church has sustained through his inability to give us a complete critical survey of the basal centuries. But while we mourn the incompleteness of the vast undertakings which this great intellect essayed, we are the more impressed by the priceless value of what he was enabled to accomplish.

Wherein then lies the unique value of Lightfoot's writings? What are their distinguishing characteristics, the elements of their power? Professor Sanday, in a very discriminating analysis, made some three years ago, distinguishes five chief excellencies in Lightfoot's work. In any one of them, taken by itself, others may be found to equal, scarcely to excel him. But Lightfoot's pre-eminence lies in the rare combination of all these qualities—the accuracy and thoroughness of his scholarship;

the breadth of his erudition, covering, and covering so completely and minutely, a vast extent of knowledge with the mastery of a specialist in departments rarely traversed by the same worker; the rigorously scientific method, reaching conclusions by accurate and comprehensive induction of facts from which the merely subjective was carefully excluded; the strong common sense, the clear, well-balanced judgment, thorough and impartial in investigation, cautious and circumspect in decision; the lucidity of a style, clear-cut, and free from obscurity, a plainness and completeness of expression, carried to such an extreme that it lacks the suggestiveness of a more compressed method, and even gives to some readers a false impression of a lack of depth. To these five characteristics, which relate to the style, method and intellectual contents of the work, a sixth might well be added relating to the inner spirit which permeates it—the loyalty to truth, the intense sympathy with the grace of Christ, with the freeness and fullness of salvation, and the profound appreciation of the liberty of the Gospel, the freedom wherewith Christ makes us free.

Great as were the excellencies of this marvellously gifted man, let it not be imagined that he was absolutely without defects; but of these it behooves ordinary men to speak with becoming humility. There is one, however, to which I will venture to refer. His judicial mind, with its excess of caution and moderation, sometimes betrayed him into unnecessary concessions. Of these, not unfrequently, unfair advantage was taken by opponents, who could neither meet his arguments nor appreciate his courtesy, and who sought to draw from any apparent equivocalness of expression, pretext for the very errors which he was endeavoring to expose and confute. A notable illustration of this occurs in connection with the invaluable essay on the Christian Ministry. A few vague sentences towards its close have been perverted by sacerdotalists, to give, if possible, to the very error against which the whole scope and force of the argument had been directed, some semblance of shelter under Lightfoot's great name.

Of the results of Lightfoot's work it would be premature to speak with confidence; but I may say something, necessarily brief, as to the lines of direction in which these results will tell.

Lightfoot has given a permanent impetus to Biblical study in England, and, not only contributed most richly to its stores, but ineffaceably moulded its methods. He was the first to assimilate the vast stores of German erudition and apply them in an English form to the elucidation of the New Testament. Stanley and Jowett, of Oxford, in their commentaries on some of the Pauline Epistles, had indicated this fruitful field, and snatched some of its treasures; but they failed to secure any really valuable or permanent results. Stanley failed from the customary inaccuracy of his facile pen, which, in its very exuberance, said a caustic critic, scattered Greek accents as though from a pepper castor, and was equally careless in grammatical details, and historical references. Jowett failed, not only because of his metaphysical bent, but through his false theories as to the looseness of New Testament grammar, which not only seriously vitiated his own work, but which, if accepted, would involve the criticism and interpretation of the sacred volume in vagueness, arbitrariness and complete uncertainty. Lightfoot has vindicated the true principles of New Testament interpretation, and placed the study upon a sound scientific basis. His commentaries are invaluable, not only for their direct contribution to our knowledge of St. Paul's writings, but even more so for the stimulus and example of their spirit and method. In this field, Lightfoot has not stood alone, but he excels in it by the peculiar combination of qualities which his work exhibits. Bishop Ellicott had preceded him in his works on Galatians and Ephesians, which exhibit a rare accuracy and thoroughness of scholarship, but which are comprised within the narrowest limits of grammatical criticism. Lightfoot adds to the minute accuracy of Ellicott, the historical gifts of Stanley and the thoughtfulness of Jowett, freed from their vicious prepossessions and defects. Westcott has achieved a great work both in textual criticism and in exegesis, but he is essentially a mystic, and, to some extent, a scholastic. His mysticism not unfrequently makes him obscure, while his scholastic tendency leads to an excessive subtlety and over-refinement in definition, and an extreme minuteness of analysis. Lightfoot is marvellously lucid and distinct; his sturdy common sense and well-balanced judgment protect him from the extreme subjectivity, which, not seldom, affects Westcott's conclusions.

Lightfoot's work will long remain the model and the standard for all workers in the department of New Testament Exegesis.

The results of Lightfoot's work in relation to the history of the Canon of the New Testament, and the vindication of historical Christianity against the assaults of rationalism, important as they are, I have not now space to discuss. Suffice it to say that he met and discomfited the skeptical critics upon their own ground and with their own weapons; and subjecting the historical evidences of Christianity to the most searching processes of enquiry, furnished the completest demonstration of their impregnability. There is another and kindred line of enquiry, with which the Bishop's name has been specially connected, to which I am the more desirous to refer because it bears so closely upon the much-debated question of Church unity. Nothing Lightfoot has written has exercised a more fruitful influence than his famous essay upon the Christian ministry. In it he has gathered up the results of many exegetical and historical studies contained in his different works. Among the many causes of disunion and isolation among Christians, none has been more potent for evil than the false views entertained as to the nature of the Christian ministry and its relations to the Church. Sacerdotalism is chiefly responsible for the discord of Christendom. Bishop Lightfoot has traced out the Genesis and development of this anti-Christian error, its source in heathenism, its sanctions in the false conceptions of Judaism, and its insidious growth, until it brought the Church under its sway. He has, with luminous distinctness, set forth the true sacerdotalism of the Gospel, the universal priesthood of believers, and the functions of the ministry as a pastorate and leadership.

The Bishop cut away by the roots, that theory of tactual succession upon which the sacerdotalist bases the claims of one form of external organization to be the sole channel of Divine grace. He has demonstrated that life precedes organization, and that organization itself grows and changes. He has shown us that, in the development of the external organization of the Church, the Divine Builder has worked after the same analogy as in the natural world, that the work has been accomplished gradually and the fabric built up out of materials pre-existing in the social and political life of men. In tracing out this process



much remains to be accomplished. The labors of Sanday, Hatch and Harnack have carried on this investigation upon the same lines. It is true that many points are still undetermined, but more than enough is disclosed to establish the great principles involved, and to show how completely secondary are these matters of external organization, and how comparatively unimportant are the controversies respecting them which have separated communities of Christians in the past. This is no merely negative result. It is a grand attainment to come to know, as Canon Westcott has nobly written, that "the essential bond of union is not external but spiritual"; that "it consists, not in one organization, but in a common principle of life"; that "its expression lies in a personal relation to Christ and not in any outward system." Bishop Lightfoot's investigations and discussions have tended very largely towards the realization of this truth, and so we honor him, and will cherish his memory in grateful remembrance, not merely because of his scholarship, profound as it was; not only because of the helpful and suggestive writings, which will continue to minister edification to the Church; but, above all, because as a minister and interpreter of the revelation of Jesus Christ he was privileged to remove barriers and to disseminate those vital principles, by means of which the scattered forces of a divided Christendom will be reunited "into a confederation, in which organization will be of less account than fellowship with one Spirit and faith in one Lord—into a communion wide as human life and deep as human need—into a Church, which shall outshine even the golden glory of its dawn by the splendor of its eternal noon."

I have necessarily devoted this paper chiefly to the consideration of those literary and theological labors by which Lightfoot is best known to students generally. But inadequate as this brief study is, it would be still more seriously defective without some reference to the practical Christian work and character of the great Bishop. He was an ideal Professor, a most inspiring teacher; no lecturer at Cambridge ever wielded such an influence. The results of his work abide in the men who passed through his hands, and will be more conspicuously manifested in the theological scholarship of the future, and in the work carried on by those who imbibed his spirit, and are following

his methods. When he went to Durham, the same influence was felt in its University, more indirectly, but not less potently. He proved himself to be a most wise and efficient ruler. He lived for the people, and won the affection and reverence of all classes. Like Tait, he was the Bishop of the laity as much as of the clergy, of the Non-Conformists as well as of Churchmen. There is not a department of Christian work into which he did not throw the most intense energy. He laboured strenuously to promote home missions and the work of evangelization, while he was deeply interested in foreign work. He was a total abstainer and a most zealous advocate of temperance. He founded the White Cross Army, and rendered invaluable service as the champion of social purity. He stimulated, by the example of his liberality, the works of benevolence and charity. For, possessed of ample private means, he was able to devote his whole official income to Christian work. He lived in great plainness, ordering his household in simplicity under the superintendence of his sister, for he never married.

He was a man of large heart, lavishly generous, completely unselfish, of genuine catholicity, most disinterested, patient and tolerant, of singular modesty and sweetness of disposition, beloved by all who enjoyed the intimacy of his friendship, revered by all who could appreciate his worth. Great as a scholar, he was still greater as a man. England's Church now mourns one who, without any exaggeration, may rightly be regarded as one of God's best gifts to her in the eventful age in which we live. Such men help us to feel how incomparable must be their Master and ours; and from the highest and best of those whom He inspires and ennobles, we turn in our bereavement to Him, who is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, the ever abiding Teacher of His people.

J. P. SHERATON.

*Wycliffe College, Toronto.*

## II.—RECENT PROGRESS IN THEOLOGY.

### NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND COMMENTARIES.

IN no department of theology has the progress been so apparent and so fruitful as in New Testament studies. It may be said that the past fifty years have done more to promote the understanding of the New Testament than all the other Christian half-centuries put together. During these years very many of the finest minds in Europe have been devoted to the ascertainment of the origin and history, the inter-relation, the actual text, and the true meaning and contents of the books which constitute the New Testament. Some thousands of volumes have been written embodying the results of the life-long investigations of scholars thoroughly equipped for their work, and in the main guided not by a desire to find what suited their own predilections and presuppositions, but the actual facts. The influence of such studies may only slowly be felt by the Christian people, although even already not only in such shapes as the Revised Version, which puts within reach of "him that binds the sheaf, or builds the house, or digs the grave," the meaning of the New Testament writers as it appears to the best scholarship of to-day, but also in the very perceptible clarification of the popular mind from the idea that scripture may be allegorized and spiritualized so as to yield almost any meaning the reader thinks desirable, it is evident that the science of scholars is being transmuted into common sense among the people, and that the Bible is at last to have a chance of being allowed to utter its own meaning, of being understood as its writers understood it. There is also much in the scientific study of the New Testament that will not at all or in a quite imperceptible degree touch the practical Christian. The healthy soul does not wait upon science, but can find nourishment in almost anything, as the healthy body need not be curiously catered for, and can extract nutrition from substances which would scarcely pass the sanitary chemist's analysis. It is easy on this account to depreciate such studies as Textual Criticism, the practical

results of which do indeed bear an almost infinitesimal proportion to the marvellous patience, skill and learning which have been spent upon them. One is sometimes tempted to grudge that eyesight and life itself should be worn out in deciphering MSS. which are not even expected to yield readings that can alter or in the slightest degree modify a single doctrine; one grudges that what Paul thought impossible to his friends in Galatia, that they should pluck out their eyes and give them to him, has been found only too possible to critics like our own Tregelles, whose efforts to find some words of Scripture on a page to all uninitiated eyes a blank, called out from the Munich librarian the compassionate exclamation, *Parce tuis oculis*. But science demands that all possible sources of more perfect knowledge be exhausted, and that whatever can be known shall be known.

In this very department of Textual Criticism the progress made during the last fifty years is very remarkable. Fifty years ago the Christian public possessed no reliable edition of the Greek Testament. The Textus Receptus was largely haphazard, formed with insufficient material and on no clearly conceived and thoroughly applied principle. It is true that between the formation of the Received Text and our own times, Mill and Bentley, Bengel, Wetstein and Griesbach, had labored to reduce the emendation of the Text to a science, but ample as their scholarship and industry and critical tact were, they really did little more than break ground, and it was reserved for Lachmann, whose larger edition began to appear in 1842, to indicate a better way by throwing aside the Textus Receptus, and going back to the oldest authorities. More recent critics look back to him as virtually the father of their science; one of them, himself the editor of a sounder text, enthusiastically exclaiming—“Let any objections be raised to the plan, let inconsistencies be pointed out in the execution, let corrections of varied kinds be suggested, still the fact will remain, that the first Greek Testament, since the invention of printing, edited wholly on ancient authority, irrespective of modern traditions, is due to Charles Lachmann.” Just within the half-century too are comprised the whole of the stupendous labors of Tischendorf, the first fruits of his critical studies having been published in 1840, and his first edition of the Greek Testament being printed the same year,

and being published in 1841. Time would fail me to tell of the herculean labors of this scholar, of his adventurous journeys in search of ancient MSS., how he smote the dragons that guarded what was of infinitely greater value than the golden apples of the garden of the Hesperides, how he copied day and night, with sleepless eye and eager hand, what he could not carry away, how he issued, year after year, transcripts and facsimiles of MSS. already treasured in European libraries, and how, through all these toils, any one of which would have overtaxed ordinary energy, he held to the great aim which justified them all, the ascertainment of the true text and its justification on MS. authority. In Tischendorf's eighth and last edition of the Greek Testament are garnered the results of these fifty years of research. In it we may not have the absolutely best text, we may not be able to say, "Here is precisely to the letter what evangelists and apostles wrote," but we have so full a register of all the readings of such MSS. as are worth consulting that we have in our own hands the means of judging for ourselves what the true text must be. Born two years before Tischendorf, and dying four months after him, Samuel Prideaux Tregelles was his life-long friend and rival. Doing less than the German scholar in discovering MSS. and publishing transcripts, he did more to establish the true principles of criticism. Being himself a man not only of unrivalled attainments in his own pursuits, but also of "great simplicity of character and deep religious feeling, a devout believer in the plenary inspiration of Scripture and in the doctrines usually denominated evangelical," he was able to remove the prejudice existing in favor of the Received Text, and has wrought a complete revolution in the attitude of the Church towards textual criticism. His Greek Testament, the first part of which was issued in 1857, and the last in 1872, is a monument of self-sacrificing devotedness and unremunerative learning, but probably his *Account of the Printed Text of the Greek Testament*, published in 1854, has been more influential, because in it he established the right of a few ancient MSS. to outweigh a numerical majority of more recent cursives. Advancing still further in the reduction of criticism to a science, by carrying out to its full issues the genealogical classification of MSS., and by establishing the relations of external and internal evidence and

other principles, Drs. Westcott and Hort have placed the keystone, in the arch which has been rising by the labors of former scholars. The alterations of the text in this edition are not so many as they are bold, and indicate a thorough emancipation from traditional readings. It is felt to be a want that the editors do not follow Tischendorf's example, and cite authorities for the whole of the text, but only defend or oppose certain readings by the citation of MSS. The distinctive characteristics of the edition, and that feature which marks progress, is the attempt scientifically to ascertain the character and the relation of known MSS. Parallel with these labors on the New Testament text have run the fruitful studies of Scrivener, Lagarde, Field and Swete; while the magnificent beginning which has been made to Bishop Wordsworth's and Mr. White's edition of the Vulgate, bears the same relation and the same testimony to modern textual criticism as the Forth Bridge does to modern engineering skill.

Having a text as nearly as possible reproducing the autographs of the New Testament writers, we have next to understand what is written. It has lately been said by one who has unquestionably made good his right to speak with authority, "The language of the New Testament has not yet attracted the special attention of any considerable scholar. There is no good lexicon. There is no philological commentary. There is no adequate grammar." This, like much else that comes from the same source, is extreme. Perfection has, no doubt, not yet been attained. But Moulton's *Winer* may claim to be adequate, and Thayer's *Grimm* is very moderately estimated if we content ourselves with saying that it is "a good lexicon." A philological commentary is a desideratum, but the materials for it lie in the collections of Kypke and Carpzov and many other workers who have been contributing here a little and there a little during the last two centuries. Dr. Hatch's remark is however useful as pointing the way to a more profitable expenditure of labor than in the mere multiplication of commentaries which only work up in a new form what is given or implied elsewhere.

Of commentaries on the whole New Testament, or on particular books, one is tempted to say that for the present we have enough. Modern scholarship has been applied, and modern

discoveries have for the most part been already worked up into expositions of the New Testament. If a man cannot ascertain Paul's meaning with aids already existing, it is to be feared no forthcoming light will greatly help him. It is sufficient merely to name the scholars who, during the past generation, have devoted their exceptional gifts and acquirements, to recognize our wealth in this department. The reputation of Germany for thorough investigation and scientific work has been maintained by Lücke, Bleek, Hofmann, Philippi, Holtzmann, Weiss, and many others. Meyer, perhaps, still stands at the head for a well-grounded decisiveness. On each clause he pronounces clearly and firmly, exhibiting at the same time the grounds on which he proceeds, and the opinions from which he wishes his own to be differentiated. His English rivals mostly labor under the disadvantage of being fragmentary. Thus, the late Canon Evans, a more original scholar than Meyer, less dependent on grammars and lexical helps, and trusting more to his own exact reading and extraordinary aptitude for language, has left a commentary only on one book, and it, for many readers, buried in the Speaker's Commentary. The late Dean Alford has the merit of leading the way in the modern style of exposition, and of mingling sound sense with the somewhat wooden preciseness of greater scholars. Bishop Ellicott has carried his grammatical microscope over a large number of the Epistles of Paul, and has settled, beyond appeal, many points which before had been under discussion; presenting his results in a clean-cut and finished form without the waste of a word, which of itself lends to all his work a promise of permanence. From his familiarity with Greek, Dr. Jowett has contributed many suggestions, while his philosophical bent and training, and his knowledge of ancient forms of thought, have enabled him to shed quite fresh light on the writings of Paul. Add to these the names of Stanley, Gifford, Waite, Westcott, Lightfoot, Rendall, Beet and Edwards, and it becomes apparent that, in the present state of scholarship, few gleanings can be left for ordinary workers, and that the student has now sufficient guidance to the meaning of Scripture. Nothing, of course, can prevent men from reading the wrong books, or it may be, even secure that they read any books at all; but the sensible majority, or minority, who sincerely

desire to be instructed can now find reasonable and consistent interpretations.

Having all this library of modern commentaries, one resents being distracted by the appearance of additional works in the same department. It is true, "there is always room at the top;" but new commentaries do not always appear at the top. A new commentary can only do one degree better, with the risk of doing many degrees worse, what has been done before. If a man has ideas he may doubtless let them overflow into a commentary, although it must be owned that is not the place where one goes in search of ideas. Then each new commentary is provocative of more, advancing more foolish opinions that must be exploded, and new mistakes in interpretation that must be exposed. Justifiable however and commendable are commentaries written for special objects, such as the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*, Clark's *Handbooks for Bible classes*, and the more ambitious *Hand-Kommentar* by Holtzmann and his coadjutors, of which the first parts have just appeared. These may give us little that is new, but even the industry that re-arranges and makes more portable scattered information, deserves well of the student. But it seems to me that those who are able to do something more than merely echo and re-arrange, might be better employed than in writing commentaries. Dr. Field, in his *Otium Norvicense*, has shown us how much light may yet be shed on particular words and phrases by the scholar who will patiently read through a period of Greek literature, and who, instead of attempting to say something new or striking on every verse in a book, will confine himself to those few verses on which he really can shed light. This is the work which may most profitably be done at present in this department—most profitably, I mean, for the advancement of New Testament studies, but certainly not most profitably for the unremunerated scholar, who must spend years of silence and hard reading in order to produce at last a few pages of which the crowd will take no heed, but which all scholars will prize as only original work is prized. From Dr. Hatch's *Concordance to the LXX.* much is expected, and whoever can follow the example so perfectly set by Bishop Lightfoot, and give us interesting and adequate introductions to the separate books, will earn the intelligent gratitude of all students of the New Testament.



The gain, then, in interpretation of Scripture during the past fifty years does not consist in the mere multiplication of books, but in the new method, the new ideas, the new resources used by the interpreter. The difference between the past and the present may be measured by the difference between Thomas Scott, who, in my boyhood, was still being issued in expensive editions, and the revised Meyer. Reading to-day Jowett's essay on the interpretation of Scripture, which was, thirty years ago, considered one of the most dangerous of the essays and reviews, or the *Septem contra Christum*, as some one called them, it is difficult to understand how so much disturbance should have been caused by a paper which clearly sets forth principles of interpretation now universally adopted. Jowett's main contention is that Scripture, like other books, "has one meaning which is to be gathered from itself without reference to the adaptations of fathers and divines, and without regard to *a priori* notions about its nature and origin. It is to be interpreted like other books, with attention to the character of its authors, and the prevailing state of civilization and knowledge, with allowance for peculiarities of style and language, and modes of thought and figures of speech." But the disturbance and suspicion aroused by this essay show that at the date of its publication, barely thirty years ago, the Christian people of this country still held the mechanical theory of inspiration, which taught that the writers of Scripture were the mere pens of the Holy Ghost, and which Canon Westcott denounces as "at variance with the whole form and fashion of the Bible, and" as "destructive of all that is holiest in man and highest in religion." It might have been supposed that the absurdity of such a theory would have been sufficiently recognised when the Wittenberg faculty, in 1638, "decreed that to speak of barbarisms and solecisms in the Greek of the New Testament would be blasphemy against the writers of Holy Scripture and against the Holy Ghost." While such a deliberate closing of the eyes to the plainest facts of Scripture, such irreverence and faithlessness under the guise of reverence, such audacious telling of lies for God continued, there was no possibility of a return to the splendid candor of Calvin and Luther, and no possibility of an advance to the sane, full and fruitful interpretation of our own day. Archdeacon Farrar most

truly says: "No conception more subversive of Scriptural authority has ever been devised than the assertion that in the Bible we must accept everything or nothing. That notion, which so irremediably confounds the truth of God with the theological notions of men, has been responsible for crimes and errors innumerable. [The canon which it maintained was indefensible]; its science has been proved to be childish; its ethics are tainted with hatred and intolerance, its history and chronology are obsolete; its harmonistic methods are casuistical to dishonesty; its views about the inspiration of the vowel points, and the perfect accuracy of the text, have been covered with confusion; its whole method of interpretation has been discredited and abandoned." These are strong words; but they are not too strong to denounce a theory of Scripture which has made the Bible an offence to many honest men, which is dishonoring to God, and which has turned enquirers into sceptics by the thousand, a theory which should be branded as heretical in every Christian church. They are not such strong words as Richard Baxter's, "It is the devil's last method to undo by overdoing, and so to destroy the authority of the Apostles by over magnifying." I can very well remember the shock of surprise and anger with which, in the library of this College, I read the late Dean Alford's neat and conclusive disposal of the theory of verbal inspiration; and how, by exhibiting the impossibility of harmonising the synoptical gospels, he demonstrated that literal accuracy was out of the question. These were the beginnings of a better day, in which the interpreter no longer trammelled by an untrue theory, was able to open his eyes to the actual facts of Scripture, to let it speak out its own meaning, and endeavor to understand it in the light of the writer's circumstances and opportunities.

But it is in criticism properly so called that the advance of the last fifty years is most apparent. Since the appearance of Strauss' *Leben Jesu* in 1835, the books of the New Testament have been made the subjects of ceaseless and keen criticism. In the same year appeared the first important critical work by Ferdinand Christian Baur, who is recognized by all schools of critics as opening a new era in the history of their science. Not only does Pflaiderer ascribe to him the merit of having for the first time supplied the solid ground-work upon which the scien-

tific examination of primitive Christianity has been since building; but even so conservative a scholar as Weiss is forward to yield to Baur the credit of bringing the criticism of the New Testament books into fruitful connection with the historical investigation of primitive Christianity. "He it was," he says, "who first made it the problem of criticism to assign to each book of the New Testament its place in the history of the development of primitive Christianity, to determine the relations to which it owes its origin, the object at which it aims, and the views it represents." In order to appreciate Baur's importance this must be kept in mind. His conclusions are, for the most part, wrong. His own disciples have abandoned many of his most important positions. Hilgenfeld defends the genuineness of Philemon, Philippians and 1 Thessalonians, all of which Baur rejected. Volkmar, who even surpassed the audacity of Baur in postdating the books of the New Testament, shatters the Tübingen theory of the gospels by putting Mark first. But while it is true that one might cull from the writings of Baur more discredited theories than from the pages of any other modern critic, he still stands at the head of the science, because he introduced a new method, or if he did not introduce it he yet gained currency for it by the brilliant use he made of it, and the daring conclusions he reached. His method was the now universally adopted method of historical criticism, a criticism which finds a place and a *raison d'être* for each writing in the history of the period to which it belongs, and which posits each in that particular stage of development to which its contents testify. Along with Baur's criticism there necessarily went a theory of the development of the early Church, and although this theory has been proved to be erroneous, his disciples have striven so to modify it as to bring it into harmony with the facts. Baur's method and the commanding ability, learning and insight shown in his works attracted to him many disciples, all of whom, Zeller, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Volkmar, Keim and Pfeiderer, while differing considerably among themselves, yet agree in rejecting more or fewer of the Pauline epistles. These men are probably as well equipped and as acute critics as are likely to appear in any age. They had a theory which compelled them to bring the dates of several of the New Testament

writings as low as possible. They have labored with untiring industry and singular acuteness to prove that their theory is consistent with the facts. And yet, I suppose, that every one who knows anything of the recent history of criticism, would agree that this storm which threatened to blow our New Testament in pieces has spent its force, and that the New Testament remains very much as it was. Has then all this labor been in vain? Has all this attention been spent on the New Testament without result? Has the Augustan age of New Testament criticism passed away and left no solid monuments behind it? Most certainly not. The method of historical criticism remains, a new, more intelligent, and more truly scientific method of looking at the Apostolic writings. They are not now viewed as written in vacuo, and as if their contents might be understood and used apart from the circumstances which gave rise to them; but their slightest indications and allusions must be brought into harmony with the theory of their origin, and every jot and tittle shewn to be congruous with the history of the period which they belong. Besides this, although Baur's critical conclusions and those of his followers have frequently been erroneous, yet they have for the most part, been so plausible and maintained with so much scholarship, that, in order to demonstrate their insufficiency, scholarship as exact and criticism as searching have been required. The consequence is that in recent times the books of the New Testament have been examined with microscopic minuteness and attention to detail; every possible source of light has been again and again ransacked; every possible theory canvassed in the public debating-ground of European criticism, and nothing has been allowed to stand which is not thoroughly well-grounded in ascertained fact. To find any analogy to the ordeal through which the New Testament books have recently passed, one must turn from literature to physical science. No single book or series of books has ever exercised so many powerful minds or elicited so strenuous a criticism. And the gain to the student of the New Testament has been enormous. Never has there been a time when the authenticity of the Pauline epistles was so intelligently held. Not only has modern criticism failed to shake the Church's faith in the genuineness of these epistles, it has rather enabled the Church, as never before, to

apprehend their origin and significance, and to understand why they belong to Paul, and could belong to no one else. The assurance and intelligence with which they are to-day accounted his are in the ratio of the deeper insight into their origin to which the Church has been driven by criticism, in the ratio of the prevailing arguments by which reasons alleged for doubting them have been refuted. They have passed through the fire. We hold them now in no fear of what some unknown critic may adduce. We can give a reason for the confidence that is in us. A shade of doubt may still rest on the pastoral epistles, although, even regarding them, some significant admissions have of late been made by the foremost critics, and by some of the best scholars of Germany they are frankly accepted. And undoubtedly the tendency is at present towards the enlargement rather than the contraction of the writings to be ascribed to Paul. In regard to the synoptic gospels, the advance of knowledge has been remarkable. Fine tact and dogged industry, scholarly imagination and mechanical aids, the patience that can count words and the genius that can survey a wide field of literary history, have all helped towards the solution of what is known as the synoptical problem. This problem, if it has not been entirely solved, has yet been reduced within well-defined limits, and the final solution is not likely to be long delayed. The relation of Mark to the other gospels may be said to be determined, and the manner in which the first gospel has been formed is now fairly well understood. But no enumeration of the nett results gained by the criticism of the gospels could convey an adequate notion of the insight into the aims and methods of composition which the prolonged and careful scrutiny of the gospels has won. It might be too much to say that we can now sit with each evangelist at his desk and read along with him the documents he employed and detect the motives which prompted him to omit this incident and give prominence to that, to leave one saying of Jesus where he found it, and shift another to a different connection. But if this might slightly exaggerate the truth, we can certainly say that the attempt to understand the manner in which the gospels were composed has made us acquainted with many most significant facts regarding their

construction, and has made intelligible much, which, but a few years ago, was misunderstood and a cause of stumbling.

We may enter, then, on our study of the New Testament, assured that the accomplished criticism to which it has been subjected during the past generation has only added to its interest, and subtracted nothing from its power, that the fierce light which has beat upon it has only made it seem a more real and intelligible book, and that when stripped of the fictitious robes of honor which timorous and unworthy men have thrown over it, it stands out in its native majesty, and its real power is recognised. I shall be forgiven by those who labor in other departments of theology if I say that there is no study which so rapidly repays the toil spent upon it, none in which the methods are more scientific, and the results more certain. The New Testament is a mine out of which the gold has not all been brought to the surface, nor all sifted and refined. Much has been quarried and made current, in which the least original scholar may rejoice, and by which he may largely profit. But there remains much to be done, and of a kind which may well attract the energies and resources of the most ambitious mind. For the preacher of Christ this study is indispensable and invaluable. It is in the New Testament he can meet with Christ and learn His mind. It is there he can get rid of all that has overlaid the figure of the Lord, and see Him face to face. It is there he can learn from the lips of Christ Himself the gospel he has to preach; and by living through the same scenes and breathing the same air with Him, come at length to understand His purposes and enter into His Spirit.

MARCUS DONS.

*New College, Edinburgh.*

### Here and Away.

"Oh, that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears!"

If Jeremiah had lived in the year 1890, Anno Domini, and resided in Knox College, he would probably have used a different figure.

For even theologues are not exempt. That which cometh to the fool cometh also to the wise man. They have all redness of eyes. They have all wounds without cause.

It is inspiring to see the heroic efforts of professors and students to stand fast against the inevitable. But Influenza gets the underhold, and the bravest is made to bite the dust.

THIS Department has taken Charles Lamb's cure—twelve handkerchiefs a day. The result is evident—on the handkerchiefs. But—excuse me, I've "La Grippe"—but, after four days meditation, and with a pyramid of books supporting our head and our left hand grasping a new handkerchief, it is with sorrow we write, even weeping.

THE destruction around this office is worse than that of a Western cyclone. The enemy caught one of the University professors, and an article on Robert Browning, intended for this number of the MONTHLY, vanished into thin air. A sketch of the fifty years history of Queen's University, and the semi-centennial celebration was lost in a succession of sneezes. Four articles for the Missionary Department from China, India and Corea, were delayed by the storm at sea, caused, no doubt, by the sneezing on shore. And it was simply madness to expect any book-reviewing or editorial work to be done. Yes—tell it not in Gath—we have come out second best in this contest.

BUT the February number will make up what is lacking in this issue. In it Dr. Daniel Clark, Medical Superintendent of the Toronto Asylum for Insane, will discuss that live question, "Faith Cure." Rev. Dr. Laidlaw offers an admirable paper on the Sabbath Question. First-class "copy" has also been received from Mrs. Margaret Caven Wilson, Central India, J. S. Gale, of Corca, and Messrs. J. Goforth and Donald McGillivray, of Honan, China.

BUT we are heartily sorry about the sketch of Queen's University. The Jubilee celebration was such a splendid success that "writing it up" would have been a pleasure. The students meetings on Tuesday evening, made a Toronto man feel at home; the songs brought back old times. Wednesday was the great day. From far and near the faithful came. At eleven o'clock Divine service was held in Convocation Hall. In the afternoon—but we cannot give particulars—the distinguished guests, and their speeches, the stories they told, the jokes they made and the good wishes they expressed. Have they not been written by the eloquent scribes of the newspaper press?

BUT as we sat there on that gray afternoon, under the spell of the memory-reading orators, a change seemed to come over the scene. The room is small. The crowd not much larger than a good committee. They are Presbyterians and mostly Scotchmen. During an occasional lull in the conversation we hear something about "liberty," "higher education" and "a new university." Some one is making a speech. There at that table sits the secretary, a Mr. Rose. Do you see that young Scotchman at the end of the seat? That is William Reid, a newly-landed preacher. He says nothing but he admires the pluck of these Canadians. Who is that dapper young man who moved a motion? He is a limb of the law, John A. Macdonald. He moved that arrangements be made for the establishment of a university in this town. Then the twilight comes on. The candles flicker, and in the

uncertain light the dim outline of what is called a college is seen. The scenes are shifted rapidly. Students come and go. Professors are installed, lecture, die and are buried. What's that? A stone building? Yes, a real university pile! And there are live professors and hundreds of students! And they are all singing in hideous discord about "Old Queen's"! Why, the motion to found the proposed university was made not an hour ago.

At this point in our reverie there came a tremendous crash. We started up and asked what was the matter. A man wearing a dog-collar and a preacher coat tried to calm us by saying that they were applauding the joke. What joke? Sir John's. Who is Sir John? Then there came some more of what he called applause and we began to rub our eyes and pinch the leg of the man next us to be quite sure about our personal identity. Why, of course! That's Sir John Macdonald. There's Dr. Reid, and old Mr. Rose, and Principal Grant and professors, and governors, and Lord Stanley himself with his new LL D., and ladies everywhere, and the students howling in the gallery, and—Why, of course! This is not Wednesday, Dec. 18th, 1849. That was fifty years ago, and this is Queen's Jubilee. Yes, let's cheer for Queen's, We never saw the place before but—Hip! Hip! Hooray! A tiger—Hooray!!

It took us full two hours to recover from that exertion. But we did pull ourselves together and at eight o'clock looked round on the noble guests, the sturdy yeomanry, the grave professionals and the festive undergrads who seemed grateful for a competent portion of the good things of this life. You may be sure the tables groaned—at first. But the ladies have arrived. Speeches are being made, and "dry toasts" offered. Healths are proposed, from the Queen of England to the queen of every man's fireside. Replies are made and every one wishes Queen's prosperity. Chancellor MacVicar says "you need men as well as money"; Sir John, *sotto voce*, "you can't get men without money." But cold type gives post-prandial pleasantries a chill. You must catch it on the fly. So we leave the speeches to live only in the memory of those who heard them—or to die. They were all good, and many worse are recorded in history. Some of these may make a brief snatch at immortality. But the last strains of "Good Night Ladies" are being sung, and with that pensive melody ringing in our ears, in the "wee sma hours" we make our way in the drizzling rain, through the dark streets to the railway station, mentally noting that, much as we love our *Alma Mater*—and there is nothing like her on the American continent—there are other colleges and universities deserving of a few square yards of space above ground, and resolving if this Department is anywhere in this part of the universe when Queen's celebrates her hundredth anniversary—well, send us an invitation.