

APRIL 1890

The Theological Monthly

THE STORY OF AN ANCIENT BATTLE- FIELD.

TEN or twelve miles south of Jerusalem, and five or six from Bethlehem, on a ridge of the Judæan hills 2,788 feet above the sea, the present-day traveller is arrested by a group of interesting ruins, an extent of "four or five acres," covered with "the foundations of houses built of squared stones, some of which are bevelled," the centre of the space being occupied by the broken columns of a Byzantine church, with "a large baptismal font well wrought in hard limestone." These ruins, which, it is agreed, date from the beginning of the twelfth century A.D., when the district was over-run and devastated by a party of Turks from the east of the Jordan, mark the site of what was formerly a thriving and populous town; while the name *Tekua*, still attaching to them, leaves it barely open to challenge that here, or somewhere in the vicinity, stood the old Canaanitish city of Theko, or Tekoa, which, according to the LXX., was at the conquest assigned to Judah, and in which, according to the chronicler, Asshur, the son of Hezron (by his third wife) and half-brother of Caleb, became the first governor, as Caleb did of Ephratah or Bethlehem. In later times it was the home of that wise woman whom Joab employed to intercede with David for Absalom, though Thomson avers that amongst its present-day inhabitants such a crafty female would be looked for in vain. When, in the hands of Solomon's feeble successor, the kingdom came to be divided, Tekoa, on account of its strategic

importance, which a thousand years later escaped not the notice of Titus¹ in conducting the siege of Jerusalem, was selected as a garrison city—in fact, “as the permanent advanced post toward the pass of En-gedi.” In the beginning of the eighth century B.C. it gave birth to the prophet Amos, whose early years were spent in tending cattle and gathering sycamore fruit, but who in later life predicted the downfall of Samaria and the northern kingdom. After the exile, its inhabitants bore an honourable part in repairing the wall of Jerusalem, though its nobles incurred the reproach that “they put not their necks to the work of their Lord.” Close by, in the wilderness of Tekoa, extending from the city eastward towards the pass of En-gedi, was the scene of that celebrated victory—a victory without a blow—which in the beginning of the ninth century B.C. Jehoshaphat obtained over the allied forces of the Moabites, Ammonites, and Seirites.

1. According to *the chronicler's account*, Jehoshaphat had not long returned from his foolhardy and wholly unjustifiable campaign at Ramoth-gilead—out of which, moreover, he had escaped only with the skin of his teeth—and had barely completed certain wise and prudent religious and political reforms in his own kingdom, when he was startled from his ease by an alarming rumour. The safety of his empire, which had hitherto been undisturbed by foreign invasion, and which, in consequence of recent improvements, not to speak of the garrisons he had earlier strengthened, seemed secure beyond the possibility of overthrow, was at last threatened by a formidable foe. A vast multitude of Moabites, Ammonites, and Seirites—whose territories stretched, on the east of Jordan and the Dead Sea, from the Jabbok or the Arnon on the north, to Mount Seir, in the neighbourhood of Petra, on the south—had either crossed the lake on floats,² or, what was more probable, had rounded its southern extremity, and were encamped among the woods at Hazezon-tamar, or “The Felling of the Palm-trees,” in the vicinity of En-gedi, or “The

¹ Josephus, *Life*, 75.

² Josephus, *Antiquities*, ix. 1, 2.

Spring of the Kid," situated on the west coast of the Dead Sea, about the middle and directly opposite the mountains of Moab. Conder thinks the first of these names may be preserved in that of the tract called Hasâsah ("pebbles"), near 'Ain Jidy, which all authorities accept as the modern representative of the second. "The leafy thicket of 'Ain Jidy," writes Tristram, "at the foot of the sheer and towering cliffs of the barren mountain, presents a strange contrast to the desolation which surrounds it. The mighty cliffs that overhang it, with the awful chasms and sombre gorges that divide them, also lend an indescribable grandeur to the scene." Yet it is obvious, both from the name Hazezon-tamar and from the statement of Josephus, that "in that place grows the best kind of palm-trees and the opobalsamum," that in earlier times the locality was not entirely destitute of vegetation, and that the invaders, who had swarmed over from Syria beyond the sea, had selected the spot for their rendezvous because of the leafy shelter it afforded, and the chance it gave them of stealing upon their victims unawares. Their movements, however, were detected in time to put Jehoshaphat upon his guard. The critical nature of the situation at once forced itself on his attention. Not only was this the first occasion on which war with its bloody steps had invaded his kingdom (hitherto Judah's campaigns had been carried on beyond the limits of her own territory, as at Ramoth-gilead), but Hanani's son, Jehu, Jehoshaphat must have remembered, had denounced upon him wrath for helping the worthless Ahab; and this huge multitude from beyond the sea—what if its coming were the first mutterings of the wrath-storm which had been predicted? Jehoshaphat had good cause to tremble when his thoughts turned southward to En-gedi.

In the sudden and dangerous emergency that had arisen, Jehoshaphat, had he been a prudent general as well as a brilliant sovereign, would have looked well to his defences, to the spears and helmets, habergeons, bows and slings of his warriors; to the strength of the city walls, and to the towers upon the bulwarks. Being only a pious man, he betook himself to prayer. Perhaps he recollected that the last time he had

tried the fortunes of war he had been too late in calling God into council, and had resolved to take occasion by the forelock in this. Three things in particular he determined to do : to set himself to seek Jehovah, to proclaim a fast throughout all Judah, and to hold a national convention in Jerusalem. There was not a moment to lose. From city to city the king's couriers sped, summoning the heads and representatives of the people to the capital, as his father, Asa, had done in a similar emergency, to ask help of the Lord ; and in answer to the king's invitation they came, the princes and chiefs of the fathers' houses, with the principal men out of all the cities of Judah. In the wide quadrangle, or outer court of the temple, which perhaps had been recently repaired and swept, the vast concourse assembled. The good king, then a middle-aged man, and weighted as he had never been before with cares of state, stood forth in the middle of the throng, most likely on the scaffold or platform, beside the brazen altar which Solomon had erected, and there, "without form or premeditation," (?) says Adam Clarke, "offered one of the most sensible, pious, correct, and, as to its composition, one of the most elegant prayers ever uttered under the Old Testament dispensation." It was undoubtedly a noble supplication, of soaring sublimity, yet of lowly humility ; brief but comprehensive ; impassioned and withal calm. Addressing Jehovah in terms so exalted and spiritual as to indicate an ampler and clearer, purer and higher vision than one is accustomed to associate with an Old Testament standpoint, the king spoke of Him as a God at once personal and present, ancestral and faithful, celestial and mundane, universal and local, omnipotent and omnipresent. Reminding Him of the different claims they had on His assistance,—His own covenant mercies in giving them the land from which they were then threatened to be driven ; the expectation they had been led to cherish by the fact that His temple was among them, that He would hear and keep them when they called upon His name ; the ingratitude of the enemy then repaying Israel's former clemency to them as a people by attempting to drive her from the land ; the utter helplessness of Judah to contend with such a horde as was

sweeping down upon her; and the suppliant attitude in which they then stood, with eyes directed upward to heaven—reminding Him of all these, the praying sovereign requested that Jehovah would hear them and defeat their foes.

Scarcely had the echoes of the king's prayer died away within the temple court than the answer came through an unexpected channel. Jahaziel, the son of Zechariah, a Levite of the sons of Asaph, having become conscious of a Divine afflatus, challenged the attention of all Judah, of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and in particular of the king. In Jehovah's name he counselled them to cast aside fear, and march forth boldly on the morrow in search of the enemy. Even then these were on the move, climbing up the mountain pass of Ziz, which led from En-gedi to the tablelands of Judæa, and were purposing to encamp at the end of the valley before the wilderness of Jeruel. (This name has not yet been discovered in Arabic nomenclature, though most likely it marked that part of the flat country extending from the Dead Sea to the neighbourhood of Tekoa, and called El-Husâsah from a wady on its northern side.¹) The moment these were sighted they should set themselves in battle array. It would not be needful to measure swords with the invaders. The battle was Jehovah's, and He would do the fighting. They should simply require to stand still and see the salvation of God. The words sounded like an echo from the distant past of similar notes of encouragement and hope spoken by the illustrious emancipator to their fathers on the Red Sea shore, on that memorable night when, shut in between the mountains and the sea, they heard behind them the rattle of Pharaoh's chariots and the tramp of his rushing steeds; and as Jehoshaphat and his people listened, they appeared simultaneously to catch the inspiration which the words contained, and were intended to convey. Falling on their faces before the Lord, they performed a solemn act of worship, while the Levites belonging to the children of the Kohathites and the children

¹ Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 243.

of the Korahites "stood up to praise the Lord God of Israel with an exceeding loud voice."

With to-morrow's dawn they started for Tekoa. The king commanded in person. The inhabitants of Jerusalem contributed their contingent to the force, probably the flower of the nation's troops who served as the king's body guard. The warriors of Judah, at that time convened in the city, completed the armament. Standing in the city gate, as regiment after regiment filed into line and sallied forth, Jehoshaphat exhorted them successively to calm confidence in the ultimate success of the campaign upon which they were entering, recommending them to exercise absolute faith in Jehovah as their covenant God, and perfect trust in His prophets as the bearers of His message; he promised them as the result of their obedience the permanent establishment of their kingdom in spite of all attacks from without, as well as its certain prosperity through being exempt from unbelief, a sure but fatal source of weakness and division. Jehoshaphat besides made special preparations for encountering the foe. After consultation with the people he appointed singers, *i.e.*, Levitical musicians arrayed in sacred vestments, to march in front of the troops, and praise the Lord in the beauty of holiness, saying, "Praise the Lord, for His mercy endureth for ever." It is more than likely their singing and praising, began as they left the capital, was discontinued on the way to Tekoa, and resumed on reaching the vicinity of the enemy. It was certainly a novel method of warfare, and must have seemed to spectators as ridiculous as the tramp of Joshua's warriors round the walls of Jericho, and the music of their rams' horns did, to the inhabitants of that old Canaanitish fortress. Yet it proved as efficacious. A journey of four hours brought them to the wilderness of Tekoa. Climbing "the watch-tower," or conical hill, *Jebel Fereidis*, or Frank Mountain, so called "from the baseless, but not unnatural, story that it was the last refuge of the Crusaders," "I should say," writes Thomson, "800 feet from the bottom of the wady, an enormous natural mound, as trimly turned and as steep as a hay stack,"—climbing that elevation which over-

looked the desert of Jeruel, where the invading host lay encamped, and from which a view can be obtained of the Dead Sea and the mountains of Moab, they beheld a spectacle which must have filled them with astonishment—the whole valley strewn with corpses, and not the vestige of a living foe to be seen. Whether it was a case, as Josephus¹ asserts, of complete extermination, or, as Keil suggests, of the decampment of the survivors, leaving the slaughtered upon the field in such numbers that “to all appearance none had escaped,” may be open to debate, though the former would seem to be the judgment of the chronicler; but in any case not only did Jehoshaphat “gain a brilliant victory almost without any trouble,”² but exactly as Jahaziel had predicted, there was no need to fight at all. The allied brigands had fallen on and destroyed one another. At the moment when the army of Judah began its march from Jerusalem, praising Jehovah in the beauty of holiness—so runs the story—Jehovah set against the children of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Scir “liers in wait,” by whom they were smitten. It is not necessary to maintain with Ewald that these “liers in wait” were “a sort of evil spirits,” or with Bertheau that they were angels or heavenly powers sent by God, and called insidiatores (Vulgate) because of the work they did against the enemy; it is sufficient with Keil to regard them as having been a party of Seirites hanging on the outskirts of the invader’s camp, like jackals waiting for the carnage of a battle-field, who, having become impatient for spoil, surprised and attacked the Ammonites and Moabites; who in turn, getting alarmed for their safety, not only repelled their assailants, but fell upon and exterminated the Seirites who were with themselves; after which, when their blood was up, growing suspicious of one another, like robbers quarrelling over booty, they flew at each others’ throats, and rested not until all were annihilated. Be this, however, as it may, the field of war, as beheld by Jehoshaphat and his soldiers, was a scene of carnage and death. Descending from the height on which they stood, they began the work of plundering the

¹ *Antiquities*, ix. 13.

² Ewald, *The History of Israel*, iv. 55.

silent camp. Three days it took them to lift the spoil—cattle, tents, and such other property as constituted the usual wealth of nomad tribes; gay garments and precious jewels from the dead warriors; rich harness and valuable accoutrements from the prostrate steeds—a quantity so great that when collected it was more than they could carry.

On the fourth day they gathered in a dale near by, which, from what occurred in it afterwards, came to be known as *Emek-Berachah*, or the Valley of Blessing. As a trace of this rendezvous has been recovered in the *Wady Bereikût*, a wide open tract to the west of Tekoa,¹ and adjoining the road from Hebron to Jerusalem, there is no need to look for it in the upper part of the Vale of Kidron, which a Hebrew prophet half a century later styled the Valley of Jehoshaphat. Apart from the consideration that the Vale of Kidron seems too distant from the field of Tekoa, it is not certain that the prophet used the expression, Valley of Jehoshaphat, in any other sense than as a symbol for the theatre of God's judgments upon His enemies; if he did, it is still conceivable that he applied the designation to the Vale of Kidron only because he beheld in the destruction of Israel's assailants in the time of Jehoshaphat a type of the future judgment to be inflicted on the enemies of the Church.² Mustered in this secluded glen, five miles distant from Tekoa, Jehoshaphat and his people "blessed the Lord," poured out before Him thanksgivings for His marvellous interposition on their behalf, making the wilderness to echo with joyous anthems unto Him who had smitten great and famous kings, "For His mercy endureth for ever;" as five centuries before their fathers standing on the Red Sea shore had lifted up their voices in song to Him who brought again the waters upon Pharaoh and his chosen chariots, and whose right hand dashed in pieces the enemy. This done, they resumed the solemn and stately order of procession that had characterised their coming forth. Jehoshaphat the king rode in front,

¹ Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, ii. 189; Tristram, *Picturesque Palestine*, iii. 184; Conder, *Handbook to the Bible*, p. 405; *Mühlau in Riehm*, p. 165.

² Bertheau on 2 Chron. xx. 26.

attended by the white-robed trumpeters and harpers; the king's body guard, the corps of veterans supplied by the metropolis, followed next in order; the main body of the troops, the men of Judah, brought up the rear. Without delay, as if eager to be home with tidings of the great things Jehovah had wrought; without loss, not so much as a drummer boy being left upon the field; without disorder, each man keeping step with the strains of music that floated on before; without sorrow, every heart bounding with joy—every man of Judah and Jerusalem that had marched to Tekoa returned to the capital. First having proceeded westward till they touched the road from Hebron to Jerusalem, and then having turned northward, they crept slowly on, passing by on the right the long green valley of Urtâs, "unusually green amongst the rocky knolls of Judæa," writes Stanley,¹ near the head of which were the Pools of King Solomon—constructed by that splendid potentate when at the height of his magnificence—passing through the even then venerable city of Bethlehem, on whose plains their never to be forgotten David, the father of king Solomon, and the founder of their empire, had spent his youthful days, and at the gate of which they could still see the well of whose waters the brave outlaw would not drink, because it was "the lives of men;" passing near, perhaps, upon the left the spot then and still known as Rachael's Tomb, where their renowned ancestor Jacob had buried his best beloved wife; passing over the plain of Rephaim, where David had on two several occasions mustered his troops to do battle with the Philistines; till, having reached the Vale of Hinnom on the west of the city, and having swept round between the upper and the lower Pools of Sihon, they entered the metropolis by what is now known as the Jaffa gate. Surely such a home-coming from the wars had never been seen in that grey old city among the hills. Nor did they pause till, having crossed the Tyropœan Valley, they had entered the temple, where once more in a joyous outburst of music, with psalteries and harps and trumpets, they

¹ *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 165.

praised the Lord who had made them to rejoice over their enemies.

2. The *historic credibility* of the above incident cannot fairly be impugned on the ground either that it is recorded by the chronicler alone; that it belongs to the region of the supernatural; or that the view it gives of the character of Jehoshaphat does not harmonise with that presented in the Books of the Kings. If the *first* be a valid ground of objection, then not only must other incidents in Chronicles of otherwise unexceptionable character be set aside as non-authentic, as *e.g.*, the national covenant of Judah in the days of Asa, and the establishment of courts of justice throughout the land by Jehoshaphat; but considerable sections of other books will require to be repudiated for a like reason, *viz.*, that they rest on the authority of one penman only. But obviously such a mode of dealing with written testimony would be scouted as intolerable by every fair-minded critic; and unless it can be shown that special cause exists for suspecting the chronicler of having deviated—"intentionally and deliberately" need not be alleged, it may be "unintentionally and unconsciously," but still of having deviated—from the straight path of historical veracity, it will not do to subject his composition to different treatment from that accorded to documents by other authors. Of course, if the hypothesis of Wellhausen and Robertson Smith can be established, that the chronicler was "not so much a historian as a Levitical preacher on the old history," it will be even worse than injudicious, it will be perilous, to place implicit credence on his narrative, lest in some unwary moment one should find oneself accepting as sober truth what was designed merely for rhetorical embellishment. But a careful examination of the evidence adduced in its support will go far to convince the impartial inquirer that the case for this hypothesis has not been made good, and that probably the judgment expressed by Bleek approximates to the truth, *viz.*, that while the chronicler has his own way of looking at things, "we must not assume that everything which Chronicles contains over and above the older canonical Books of Samuel and Kings must

be unhistorical and untrustworthy, or that the alterations and additions are purely arbitrary." The *second* objection, it is manifest, can only carry weight with those who either deny the possibility or impeach the credibility of miracles ; to such as hold the contrary of these positions, there is nothing either impossible or incredible in the statements of the chronicler that Jahaziel foretold the victory without a blow, which Jehoshaphat obtained, or that Jehovah moved the Ammonites, Moabites, and Seirites to destroy one another. If every narrative that contains a flavouring of the supernatural is *ipso facto* discredited, there will be little of Scripture left to be believed when once the process of purgation has been completed ; and it is too much to expect that defenders of the authenticity of Holy Writ will concede without clear and irrefragable proof that only those paragraphs can be veracious which report nothing that transcends the horizon of either sense or reason. As regards the *third* objection, that, as Ewald expresses it, "it is only possible for a person who will not see to ignore the fact that the Jehoshaphat who is here described is quite a different person from the one depicted in 1 Kings xxii. and 2 Kings iii.," it is no doubt true that the Jehoshaphat who believed Jahaziel, and, depending on Jehovah's word, went forth to victory at Tekoa, was a better man than the Jehoshaphat who disbelieved Micaiah, and, in defiance of Jehovah's threatening, marched out to defeat at Ramoth ; and a better man than the Jehoshaphat who, at a later period, allied himself with Jehoram and the King of Edom to attack Mesha of Moab ; but surely one would require more convincing proof that an individual had lost his identity than simply the fact that at one period of his life he behaved more or less worthily than at another. Ewald perceives this, and recognises that it would be "altogether unfair" on this account "to deny that the narrative has a historical basis."

But not only is the narrative not open to valid indictment on the ground of being deficient in historic truthfulness, it contains as well a number of extremely interesting water-marks of its literal veracity. Passing by the names of

localities now successfully identified, attention may be called *first* to the time when this invasion of Jehoshaphat's kingdom occurred. It happened after Jehu's threatening of wrath upon Jehoshaphat for helping Ahab at Ramoth-gilead—at a time, that is, when Jehoshaphat had reason to expect some sort of calamity to befall him. It took place while Moab was independent—which she became on the death of Ahab, probably about B.C. 896¹—and was thus in a condition of unsettlement likely to induce her to favour, and perhaps head, such an enterprise as that of a raid into Judah; and it fell out before Jehoshaphat's relapse into a second sinful alliance with an Israelitish king, which a writer, anxious to glorify Jehoshaphat, would not have placed after, but before that sovereign's brilliant display of faith in connection with the Ammonite and the Moabite invasion. Then a *second* mark of authenticity may be noted in the name of the prophet who so prominently figured on this occasion. "Of the four ancestors of this Jahaziel mentioned in ver. 14," writes Ewald, "we know from 1 Chron. xxv. 16 that the first Mattaniah lived in David's time, and belonged to the family of Asaph. As Jehoshaphat belongs to the fourth and fifth generation after David, all this agrees together, and supplies a proof of the historical credibility of this event." A *third* proof may be found in the manner in which the invading hosts are represented as having exterminated one another. Possibly it was not unusual for half-savage hordes, engaged in a joint campaign, when taken by a sudden panic, to fly at each others' throats; and it may be that nothing more than a knowledge of this practice was required by the King of Moab to make him cry when he beheld what he deemed to be the blood of his opponents, "This is blood; the kings (of Israel, Judah, and Edom) are surely destroyed, and they have smitten each man his fellow."² Yet it is not without bearing on the point at issue that the triple alliance against Moab was formed some years later than the raid into Judah, and that the Moabites were here with the

¹ 2 Kings iii. 5; cf. *Records of the Past*, xi. 165.

² 2 Kings iii. 23.

Ammonites and Seirites at Tekoa when all three "helped to destroy one another." Still a *fourth* mark of authenticity may be traced in the designation given to the spot where Jehoshaphat and his soldiers offered up their thanksgivings for victory before returning to Jerusalem. Had nothing like the scene reported by the chronicler occurred in the *Wady Bereikât*, it is difficult to see how Joel should have come so soon to appropriate the name Valley of Jehoshaphat, to describe the theatre of Jehovah's judgments upon the nations for their evil treatment of Israel. That within less than half a century he could do so without challenge is the best proof that he and his contemporaries alike preserved still fresh in their memories a recollection of the splendid victory of the good king Jehoshaphat near the *Emek-Berachah*.

3. The *practical uses* of such a passage in ancient history as the foregoing are manifold and varied. Its outstanding lessons are of a kind that might be studied with advantage even in this highly cultured nineteenth century by individuals and communities, by churches and states. It emphasises, to begin with, a truth which in these days of materialistic science is much in danger of being driven to the wall, forgotten or ignored even when not formally denied—the truth, namely, that God still interposes in the movements of men and nations on the earth. He may not, indeed, endow any now as He did Jahaziel with the special gift of prediction, and may have long since ceased to make His active interference with mundane affairs visible by means of miracle; yet has He not on that account erected an impassable barrier between Himself and the soul of man, nor has He utterly withdrawn from all supervision and control of this insignificant planet: rather He has poured out on all flesh such spiritual influences as completely supersede and render unnecessary miraculous endowments of prophecy and such like; while in a fashion as real though not as conspicuous He lays His finger on the lines of natural causation, and constrains these while working out their own special ends to accomplish His sovereign behests. Again, the narrative suggests that a kingdom's best defence does not lie in monster armies and fleets, but in a

community pervaded by enlightened faith in the Supreme and heartfelt devotion to His word and will—a doctrine no doubt at which third-class politicians may laugh, but which, nevertheless, will command the approbation of every statesman of the first rank. Probably a more stupendous delusion never dominated the political intellect than the seemingly profound but in reality miserably shallow dictum of Napoleon, that God is always on the side of the strongest battalions—a dictum to which the history of warfare, not in Judah and Israel alone, but conspicuously in England and Scotland as well, has a thousand times over given the lie. The God of battles does not commit Himself in any case to give the palm of victory to the best disciplined and most multitudinous troops ; nor does He in every instance promise to defend the cause which on abstract principles can be shown to be right : the one rule that regulates His action is this, that He is ever found upon the side of His own Divine and gracious purposes. Hence in raising bulwarks to defend a nation, its rulers might display more wisdom if they expended less time and treasure on the preparation of armaments, and devoted more of their thought and energy to the problem of how most efficiently and speedily to strengthen the moral and religious fibre of their peoples. A third lesson hints that the shortest road to victory for the Church of Jesus Christ in its contest with the many forms of infidelity by which she is assailed, is, or may be, not to rush precipitately into the field of theological polemics ; but, while not neglecting legitimate defence, to apply herself with ardent faith and diligent enthusiasm to the prosecution of her own special business, that of praising the Lord in the beauty of holiness, leaving the different companies of her assailants, atheists, pantheists, materialists, agnostics, or by whatever appellation called, to be dealt with by her invisible Commander. Were she to do so, she might ere long see the wonder of Tekoa battlefield reproduced in her own experience, and her adversaries, instead of destroying her, annihilating one another. At least, it might be worth while for her to consider whether the experiment should not be tried.

THOMAS WHITELAW, D.D.

WHY WE SUFFER,

AND OTHER ESSAYS, BY HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

IT is characteristic of our soft and effeminate age that the existence of pain occupies a disproportionate amount of attention. The literary and educated classes are so largely protected against physical discomfort, that pain has become the enigma of the universe. Poets and philosophers, however widely opposed in other points, have united in raising a howl of indignation at the scene of suffering which this world presents. Mill in his famous *Three Essays*, Tennyson in the well-known lines of *In Memoriam*, gave utterance to the general thought of a softly cushioned public, who were delighted to find their feelings expressed in vigorous prose and terse melodious rhyme.

The wail of the old culture has been reinforced by those who have seized upon the Darwinian theory as a proof that this earth is little more than a scene of blood and wounds. The natural inference has been drawn that there is no God : for our age cannot regard as God such a being as Mill suggested, deficient either in power or benevolence. Wallace, the great champion of Darwinism, has shown that the struggle for life does not prevent the predominance of happiness over pain in the animal creation. Hence it becomes the duty of the Church to find a solution of the difficulties raised. Dr. Hayman has dealt with the problem in a very able manner in the essay which gives its name to the volume. He takes the facts of life as they are, and shows that they exhibit marks of wisdom and benevolence. Man being what he is, and the distribution of pain being what it is, the maximum of good is obtained with a minimum of suffering. Thus "economy of pain" is used in a double sense : it expresses the object and method of its infliction, and also the thrift displayed in securing the end desired.

The essay is divided into three parts. The first part treats of man's capacity for pain chiefly in the physical and intel-

lectual spheres. Dr. Hayman follows the line of argument rendered familiar by Mr. Rowell's essay ; and in a more popular form by Mr. Dixey, in the second series of the *Oxford House Papers*. Pain is (1) preservative, and (2) didactic.

Dr. Hayman starts with proving what appears at first to be a paradox, that man's capacity for pain exceeds his capacity for pleasure ; as Wordsworth wrote,

"Suffering is permanent, obscure, and dark,
And has the nature of infinity."

And it is well that this is so, for pleasure demoralises ; but pain warns man of danger, and stimulates him to action. A small amount of actual pain suggests to the reflecting mind its indefinite capacity for pain, so that the maximum of caution is attained with a minimum of actual suffering. Yet if we thought it possible to avoid all pain by careful precaution, we should devote all our energies to it and neglect our proper work. Pain, then, acts as a danger-signal, and is therefore useful for our preservation ; and so far pain may be said to be designed. But though capacity for pain is diffused through all our sentient being, we cannot say that any organ was actually designed to procure pain. For the more we obey the laws of nature the less pain we suffer ; so that pain always appears as an intruder, and as no proper part of our nature. There are, however, two cases where pain appears designed, viz., parturition and dentition. Dr. Hayman thinks that these serve a moral end by supplying a physical basis for filial affection (Cf. 2 Macc. vii. 27) and for sympathy with the pains of infancy. Yet we doubt whether any man ever loved his mother more from the thought of her travail pangs ; nor can we admit that adults need the pain of cutting their wisdom teeth "to mitigate that intolerant callousness which they are apt to feel" towards children who are teething. The pangs of parturition were imposed upon woman for her share in the Fall, and form an admirable illustration of Dr. Hayman's theory of pain. Adult dentition is often painless, and, perhaps, would always be so in a normal state of health. Infant dentition certainly serves many obvious moral ends, and to antici-

pate Dr. Hayman's conclusion supplies a very marked proof that infants share the moral corruption of human nature.

Dr. Hayman then shows that there is no gratuitous pain, no surplus of pain beyond what is actually needed : or if there be any surplus, it is needed in the moral sphere. That pain has developed man's intellectual powers is generally admitted : but experience shows that civilization is defective on its moral side. Dr. Hayman quotes Mr. Buckle's position that the evils of life have been lessened rather by intellectual than by moral advance. In such discussions there is much to be said on both sides, but it is not possible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion ; for we have no means of estimating with any degree of accuracy the amount of pain which may exist at any time. We cannot say whether the increase of pain due to the preservation of sickly life is more or less than the diminution of pain by the discovery of anæsthetics. Indeed, we hold it to be a radical error to attempt to introduce into the discussion of moral subjects those precise ideas of quantity which are the glory of physical science. The methods of physical science throw light on moral problems, but the idea of quantity is alien. It is waste of time to discuss with Mr. Buckle whether there be more virtue or vice among men, or to compare the rapid growth of mechanical invention with the slowness of moral improvement. The two are incommensurable. We travel sixty miles an hour in the train instead of ten miles an hour in a coach, but why should we expect a sixfold increase in charity or chastity ?

The second part of the essay gives the main part of Dr. Hayman's theory, viz., that pain is the needful witness of the corruption of man's nature. This corruption is proved from the degeneracy of men in crowded cities, or in mobs of any kind, from the destruction of savage races by contact with civilized nations, from the history of the best-known nations, Greece and Rome, from the strict discipline needed in our public schools. Dr. Hayman has no difficulty in proving the existence of what theologians call "original sin." It is the only adequate explanation of the otherwise inexplicable tendency of men to develop in the wrong direction.

We have seen that pain is productive of good in the physical and intellectual parts of man's nature: and it is therefore probable that pain is beneficial also to his moral nature. The interaction of physical and moral laws, and the interdependence of the physical and moral elements of our nature, combine to make it improbable that an imperfect being should live in a perfect environment, and suggest that the discipline of pain is needful; for nothing less powerful would suffice to stem the tide of depravity. Pain stimulates reflection. Reflection suggests that the excessive indulgence is contrary to the law of his nature. Conscience also reminds him that the moral sense has been outraged; he knew the right and yet chose the wrong.

But it is clear that this reasoning will apply only to a very small part of the pains which men suffer. At this point, however, Dr. Hayman breaks off to discuss two objections, which has the effect of weakening his position.

If all pain were retributive of individual delinquency, scarcely any difficulty would exist; its disciplinary purpose would be evident. The stress of the argument lies in the necessity for showing that pains which are not apparently retributive of the sufferer's sin yet serve a benevolent purpose. To do this we must consider the sufferer in his social relations, or as a member of the human family.

Pains are of three kinds: (1) those which are clearly retributive on the offender himself; (2) those which are clearly due to the delinquency of others; and (3) those which we cannot place in either class. In the first two cases pain has effect as discipline. For in the former case it gives each man a strong interest in his own conduct; and in the latter case it gives society a strong interest in the conduct of all its members. In dealing with the third class of pains, Dr. Hayman reasons thus:—The suffering of an individual may be due to the wrong-doing of many, nor can we fix any limit of number to the many who cause the suffering of the one; again, we cannot limit the number of those who suffer from the act of a single wrong-doer; hence in the infinite complexity of life it is possible that the inexplicable

sufferings of class (3) are due to the wrong-doing of the entire race, which is the outcome of the natural corruption of the race. These untraceable pains therefore are disciplinary of natural corruption, and are intended to bear witness to the fact of this corruption. This witness becomes all the more effectual in proportion as the pains are intense and apparently undeserved; for the concentration of pain in exceptional cases enforces attention. "Every one is compelled to be earnest in the presence of such pain. Its intense reality sobers and scares away all superficial triflers. It leads to nothing, and seems to be an end in itself; and thus to stand in awful possession of the whole area of being. The man seems to live for pain, and the more unaccountable his doom the more overwhelming the spectacle." A conviction comes naturally to all minds not tainted with pessimistic views that there must be a reason why such suffering should be, and as the physical and mental spheres fail to supply an adequate reason, we must seek for one in the moral sphere. Dr. Hayman shows that though partly true, it is not sufficient to reply, that "the 'reason why' is to stimulate our otherwise defective sympathies and to uphold the principle of altruism." We cannot, however agree with Dr. Hayman that the weight of this answer would not be much increased, "if to it were added as a reason the development of patience and fortitude in the sufferer, unless indeed, there were any special reason to think him exceptionally defective in those virtues." For is there any limit to growth in virtue? In our eyes the sufferer may seem a marvel of patience and fortitude, but will he himself affirm that he has reached the maximum of such virtues, and that all further advance under the stimulus of pain is impossible? Moreover, pain develops other virtues besides patience and fortitude, and we doubt whether in any case a truly devout sufferer would assert that the disciplinary work of pain in him was complete, so that he must look outside himself for the purpose of further suffering. That his sufferings benefit not himself only, but others also, is an additional support to the sufferer, and an additional proof of benevolent purpose.

That two ends are served by one act, is an instance of wise economy ; and if a third beneficent end can be shown to be served by the same act, we have a further proof of wisdom and benevolence. It is this third end that Dr. Hayman has set himself to prove ; and to bring it out in high relief, he has put the two former ends in the background. There are those who consider the intense pains of certain sufferers to be gratuitous, and therefore cruel. To such Dr. Hayman replies—

“ Evil in man is a fact of overwhelming power, needing something overwhelming to enforce it as a lesson, because the acknowledgment of it is feeble in proportion as its diffusion is wide. Human vices shock us only when enormous, or when turned against ourselves. But this inbred corruption, the protoplasm out of which they are all moulded, because diffused everywhere, strikes no contrast and challenges no observation, and therefore needs an abiding witness. And as a witness on this behalf, nothing is so powerful as otherwise unaccountable pain. Thus the mystery of evil is a key to the mystery of pain in man.”

With this we thoroughly agree. The corruption of our nature is seen in the fact that some degree of pain is necessary to develop men in the right direction. That intense pain is sometimes used shows us that the task is a difficult one from the intensity of the corruption and the steepness of the height to be scaled. But for the deeply seated character of this corruption a very small amount of pain, or even of discomfort, would suffice to show the man that he was acting contrary to the law of his nature.

We should not ourselves call this intense pain “ otherwise unaccountable,” for we have seen that it serves a disciplinary purpose on the sufferer and his immediate associates. Dr. Hayman has shown that it may also benefit the race generally by arresting attention and forcing men otherwise indifferent to reflect on the causes of such intense suffering. What is unaccountable is the selection of this man rather than his fellows. Dr. Hayman has proved in an earlier part of the essay that an equal pain tax, whether high or low, would fail to have a disciplinary effect on men ; and undoubtedly it would not have the same effect as the present

irregular incidence of pain. There is economy of pain in concentration, and reflection is stimulated.

The few, then, bear the burden for the many. For if the permanence of moral evil in the race demands as a witness to it a certain amount of suffering, and the equal distribution of this to all would make that witness nugatory, those on whom falls the large and unequal share bear it on behalf of humanity at large. Their suffering is to some extent vicarious, just as in a body of mutineers where all deserve death only a certain number are chosen to suffer as an example, while the rest go free.

Readers of Hinton's *Mystery of Pain* will be reminded of that attractive little volume. But Dr. Hayman's essay is a considerable advance. Mr. Hinton bade us accept suffering cheerfully, in the blind belief that somehow or other our pain was working out the redemption of mankind. This intuition, excellent as it was, failed as a practical motive. Dr. Hayman has done much to supply what was lacking. He has shown the use of any pain which may appear to us more than is needed for the development of character in the sufferer and his immediate friends. It benefits the race by reminding them of human corruption. He has given a solution of the problem raised by the excessive suffering of saintly men. It is a solution for the philosophical inquirer rather than for the saint, for no one conscious of his share in the world's sin would say that he suffered more than he deserved, more than was needed for the elevation of his character. Yet the solution brings to the aid of the sufferer an additional motive, and that one of the most powerful in our nature. As Hinton has shown, a noble nature will endure cheerfully for the benefit of others. The faith which is failing under chastisement may be reinforced by the thought that the good of others will be won by patient endurance. True it is that such sufferers have no choice, yet by the cheerful acceptance of pain, which is essential if they are to witness to human corruption, they earn the gratitude of those who are exempt, and are invested with a halo of reverence. At the same time, those who escape are warned against a presumptuous assurance, for their exemption is not absolute ; their turn may come to-morrow.

Dr. Hayman's essay is intended for philosophers of any creed or none. He has reasoned independently of all religious belief; but towards the close he shows that the economy of pain exhibited in the human race is an argument in favour of natural religion. Still more is it an argument for Christianity, "for we see the principle of vicarious suffering herein made co-extensive with humanity, and a central idea of our religion shown to be so far from exceptional that it is actually normal, and crowns the entire edifice of such suffering with an instance the highest in its own kind." Dr. Hayman expressly guards against this view being considered as affecting "the unique and sublime effect ascribed in Christian teaching to the Cross of Christ." But besides this higher aspect, the suffering of the Sinless, when He put Himself in the place of sinners, bore witness to the stern reality of human corruption. "Every victim of what is in human eyes an inscrutable visitation, in proportion as he is by every human standard blameless, becomes a closer realization of the great Ideal which in Him who suffered 'the just for the unjust' finds its highest expression." Not that their sufferings can atone for the sin of men, but "assume Him to have suffered in a mystery to atone for sin, and they suffer in a mystery no less real to attest its reality." We have given but the bare outline of the essay. There are subordinate points discussed with force and ingenuity; such as the ascetic idea, the results of a uniform pain tax, and of a regular apportionment of pain according to desert. The whole is deserving of careful study, and will be found to stimulate thought on one of the most prominent questions of the day. The remaining essays we are compelled to leave unnoticed. Those on classical subjects are such as would be expected from a scholar of Dr. Hayman's reputation. The three on the Greek dramatists are so interesting as to make us regret the absence of an essay on Sophocles. We cannot accept Dr. Hayman's views on Sunday, or on the Rights of the Laity; yet they deserve to be read as a temperate statement, supported by argument, of views which are held by an influential section of the Church.

JOHN SHARPE.

PAULINE USAGE OF THE NAMES OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER II.

ITS BEARING ON CRITICISM OF DOCUMENTS.

THE passages in which different names of Christ occur are so very numerous, that they enable us to say with confidence that in certain circumstances this or the other designation occurring in a given MS. or Version *cannot* be the true reading.

This is best shown by an example. The designation *Jesus Christ* was never applied by any one to our Lord during His lifetime. Nor do the Evangelists ever employ it in the body of their narrative. They make use of it only in introductory matter, in which the historian is using his own words, not those of received tradition. When, therefore, we find that in a single instance *Jesus Christ* is introduced into the midst of a Gospel narrative in some MSS., we conclude at once, and without hesitation, that this reading is erroneous. The probability in favour of the reading *Jesus* is greater than that in favour of *Jesus Christ* by more than 600 to 1. Now in Matt. xvi. 21, instead of *Jesus*, we find *Jesus Christ* in two MSS. and one Version,—namely in the first hand of \aleph and B and the Coptic Version. Here it is unquestionable that these documents are in error; and it is further evident that there must have been one common source of error for all three. The variation in this one passage from the uniform usage of the Gospels is so extraordinary, that agreement in error on the part of the three documents as arising accidentally is inconceivable. Either \aleph must have copied the error from B, or *vice versâ*, or (which seems less probable) both must have copied the error from an older MS. The fact that the Coptic Version has the same reading is strong evidence that it followed the readings of \aleph or B.¹

¹ [A reference to the two Tables given below will show how high a place in

One of the surest results of this inquiry is to establish the generally high character of the documents. In St. Paul's Epistles the use of designations of our Lord is so abundant, so varied, and so discriminating, that we are quite warranted in saying that under certain conditions such a reading, if found, *cannot* be correct. For example, when he wishes to express the truth that Christian believers are in vital union with their Lord, he usually employs one of three forms of expression,—*in the Lord* (ἐν Κυρίῳ), *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ), or *in Christ Jesus*. In four places he writes "in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. vi. 23; viii. 39; 1 Cor. xv. 31; Ephes. iii. 11). He never expresses this relation by the words "in Jesus" or "in Jesus Christ;" and never by ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, but always by ἐν Χριστῷ. There are a few apparent exceptions, but only apparent.¹ It might have

the list of accurate documents is due to each of the authorities which in Matt. xvi. 21 support the reading Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, viz., \aleph B and the Coptic Version. Hence, before we venture to set aside their *united* testimony here, it is well to consider the suggestion that the verse before us is of the nature of an introduction to a new section of the Gospel. "The high though limited attestation of Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is sustained, and the *prima facie* presumption against it as at variance with the usual language of the Gospel narratives is removed by the absence of erroneous introductions of Ἰ. Χρ. elsewhere in the Gospels, by the want of apparent motive for introducing it here and the facility with which it would be changed to the commoner form, and, above all, by the special fitness of Ἰ. Χρ. to mark the beginning of the second half of the Ministry. The introductory phrase Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο is used in like manner in iv. 17 to introduce the first half of the Ministry, and occurs nowhere else in the Gospel; while the double name could not well be used in narrative till the climax of the Ministry had been reached, as it is in xvi. 13-20" (Westcott and Hort, *Introd.*, *App.* i. p. 14). See also Westcott's note on John xvii. 3.]

¹ [ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ occurs five times, but never in the sense of ἐν Χριστῷ, explained above: see a note towards the close of chapter III. In Gal. iii. 14 there is very good authority for ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ; but this reading presents no difficulty. St. Paul is tracing the *historical* fulfilment of the Divine promise: "the blessing of Abraham" comes to the Gentiles in the appearing of *Jesus Christ*. In one passage, Eph. iv. 21, we find ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, preceded by ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν (ver. 20): these believers have learned *the Christ*—the Head and Divine ideal of humanity (1 Cor. xi. 3, xv. 22)—and found the ideal realised in *the Jesus* who is set forth "in the word of the truth of the Gospel" (Col. i. 5—compare John xiv. 6). It is very possible that the words quoted in the text from Eph. iii. 11 should be similarly analysed: "in the Christ, Jesus our Lord."]

been supposed, prior to examination, that in many copies we should find at all events very slight variations from this rule:—that, for instance, we should not unfrequently find *ἐν Ἰ. Χρ.* instead of *ἐν Χ. Ἰ.*, or *ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ* instead of *ἐν Κυρίῳ*, or, at least, *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* instead of *ἐν Χριστῷ*. But such examples are very rare indeed.

There is one particular class of examples in St. Paul's Epistles in which we may, with a great deal of confidence, judge of the true reading on the ground of the Apostle's prevailing, if not invariable, usage.

In the following fourteen passages, for example, the readings of the documents vary between *Jesus Christ* and *Christ Jesus*, but the argument derived from usage is strongly in favour of the reading *Christ Jesus* in every case: Rom. i. 1; xv. 16; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Ephes. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 1; iv. 6; 2 Tim. i. 1; ii. 3; Tit. i. 1; Philemon 1, 9. In all these passages, although the Apostle does not speak of vital union between Christ and believers, he still speaks of a relation subsisting between a believer in this world and the living, present Christ; and refers to himself or a fellow-labourer as apostle, servant, or prisoner of Christ Jesus. Seeing that he so constantly uses *Christ Jesus*, rather than *Jesus Christ*, to denote the present Lord in whom and by whom he lives, it is almost certain that in every instance in which he speaks of himself or another as now serving Christ on earth, *Christ Jesus* is there the true reading. This *à priori* conclusion is in harmony with the documentary evidence. This is strongly preponderating, except in Rom. i. 1 and Tit. i. 1. It is possible that in the former instance the reading *Jesus Christ* may be due to the fact that the copyists, when they began Romans, would be influenced by the habit of writing *Jesus Christ* always in the Catholic Epistles, which immediately precede. There is no apparent reason for the occurrence of *Jesus Christ* in Tit. i. 1. As to these two examples, however,—

(1) That in Rom. i. 1 the reading *Christ Jesus* is supported by B.

(2) That in Tit. i. 1 it is supported by A, and that here B is wanting.

(3) That if the Apostle wrote *Christ Jesus* in 12 instances, it is improbable that he would write *Jesus Christ* in 2 others, when he wished to express *precisely the same thought*. I think, therefore, that we may, without much hesitation, assume *Christ Jesus* to be the true reading in all 14 places.

There are eight other passages in which there is strong presumptive evidence in favour of *Christ Jesus* as the true reading. These are as follows:—

2 Cor. xiii. 5: "Jesus Christ is in you" (A.V.). It is quite contrary to the Apostle's usage to employ the designation *Jesus Christ* when speaking of the living, spiritual relation of our Lord to His living servants. Therefore, whether we render *ἐν ὑμῖν* by "in you" (*i.e.*, individually), or "among you" (*i.e.*, collectively), it is almost certain that *Christ Jesus* is the true reading.

Ephes. ii. 20: "Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone" (A.V.). Here again our Lord is conceived of as a living presence in vital union with those built upon Him. *Christ Jesus* must be the true reading, in accordance with the Apostle's usage.

Phil. i. 8: "In the bowels of Jesus Christ" (A.V.). Here the conception is spiritual and transcendental, and Christ is thought of as in spiritual union with His servants. *Christ Jesus* is to be preferred: "in the tender mercies of Christ Jesus" (R.V.).

Phil. ii. 21: "All seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ" (R.V.). Here our inference is less certain. Still, as the Apostle is thinking of the possessions or affairs of our Lord here on earth, over which He now watches from heaven, *Christ Jesus* is most likely to be the true reading.

1 Tim. i. 16: "For this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering" (A.V.). Here the living presence and action of Christ in His Church are referred to, and *Christ Jesus* is preferable.

1 Tim. v. 21. Here the Apostle gives Timothy a solemn charge "before (*ἐνώπιον*) God and the Lord Jesus Christ"

(A.V.). There is but little authority for reading "Lord" here; and when we have to choose between *Jesus Christ* and *Christ Jesus*, we can scarcely hesitate to prefer *Christ Jesus*. Our Lord is viewed as present with His servants. For precisely the same reasons, the reading *Christ Jesus* is to be maintained in 1 Tim. vi. 13; and also in 2 Tim. iv. 1, where the ordinary text has *the Lord Jesus Christ*.

Assuming that *Christ Jesus* is the true reading in all these cases, and testing our chief ancient witnesses by the standard thus given, we obtain the following interesting results as to the comparative worth of documents:—

TABLE II.

EXAMINATION OF 22 PASSAGES.

MSS.: Versions: Fathers.	Right.	Wrong.	Silent. ¹	Uncertain. ¹
Σ	14	8
A	14	7	1	...
B	10	1	11	...
C	5	2	15	...
D	12	9	1	...
D ^c (corrector of D) ...	1	7
E	6	11	5	...
F	10	11	1	...
G	12	10
K	4	16	2	...
L	4	18
P	14	8
17	13	8	1	...
Vulgate (common text) .	9	13
Cod. Amiatinus	13	8	...	1
Cod. Fuldensis.....	17	5
Cod. Demidovianus .	13	9
Cod. Toletanus	10	12
Syriac: Philoxenian ...	12	10
" Peshito	0	22
Armenian	5	15	...	2
Æthiopic	0	20	...	2
Coptic	15	7
Gothic	8	5	9	...
Ambrosiaster	15	6	1	...
Chrysostom	1	17	...	4
Damasceus	7	13	1	1
Euthalius	6	14	...	2
Theodoret.....	3	16	...	3

¹ A Version is marked "uncertain" for any passage if the MSS. of that Version there disagree. A Father is "silent" if no quotation from his works is recorded in Tischendorf's Crit. Appar. *in loc.*; "uncertain," if the passage in question is quoted by him variously in different places, or if the manuscripts are discordant.

If these conclusions are even approximately correct, then we find that, amongst the uncial MSS., B (Codex Vaticanus) holds undoubtedly the first place. Next to B in point of trustworthiness stand \aleph (Codex Sinaiticus), A (Codex Alexandrinus), and P (Codex Porphyrianus, 9th century). Next, amongst uncial MSS., come D (Codex Claromontanus) and G (Codex Boernerianus). A very high place must be given to the cursive 17, a MS. in the Paris National Library (= 33 of Gospels, 13 of Acts): judged merely by the present test, it stands but little below \aleph A P.

Of MSS. of the Vulgate, Codex Fuldensis stands highest. Among the other ancient Versions the Coptic occupies the first place, the Philoxenian Syriac the second. The ordinary text of the Vulgate is much inferior. The Peshito Syriac and the Æthiopic appear to be the least trustworthy of all; the former is in error in every one of the 22 selected passages.

Of the five Patristic authorities, Ambrosiaster (Pseudo-Ambrose, probably of the 4th century) ranks highest. The other four Fathers are more frequently wrong than right; and we are justified in saying that little comparative weight is to be given to their testimony, when it is opposed to the best MSS. and Versions.

Out of these 22 examples, the reading *Christ Jesus* is placed in the text by Westcott and Hort in 18 instances. In Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 5, *Jesus Christ* is given in their text, but *Christ Jesus* in the margin.

This concurrence of results is remarkable, when it is considered that the methods of obtaining them are absolutely independent of each other.

I now give a selection of 17 passages in regard to which usage supplies an *à priori* test of readings. These are as follows:

Acts iii. 20; iv. 33; xvi. 31; Rom. vi. 11; viii. 34; xv. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 2; ix. 1; 2 Cor. i. 19; iv. 6, 10; Gal. vi. 17; Ephes. iii. 9; Phil. i. 6; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; Heb. iii. 1.¹

No. 1. Acts iii. 20.

"And He shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you" (A.V.).

"And that He may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus" (R.V.).

¹ Several of these passages are also noticed in the First Chapter of this Essay, pp. 75-84.

Here usage is in favour of the reading adopted in the Revised Version. *Jesus Christ* is only sparingly used by the first preachers when addressing the Jews: this title *assumes* the Messiahship which the Apostles laboured to establish. The reading of R.V., which distinctly asserts that Jesus is the Christ, accords well with usage.

No. 2. Acts iv. 33.

“The resurrection of the Lord Jesus” (A.V. and R.V.).

This is, no doubt, the best reading, though variants are found in \aleph A D E, the Peshito Syriac and other Versions.

No. 3. Acts xvi. 31.

“Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ” (A.V.).

“Believe on the Lord Jesus” (R.V.).

There can be little doubt that the shorter reading is preferable. There are only two certain examples of the use of *the Lord Jesus Christ* by speakers quoted in the Acts; and in both these cases the name is used by believers, speaking or writing to believers. The longer reading assumes too much knowledge on the part of the jailor.

No. 4. Rom. vi. 11.

“Alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord” (A.V.).

“Alive unto God in Christ Jesus” (R.V.).

Here the second reading is undoubtedly preferable. For (1) There seems absolutely no manuscript evidence for the reading *Jesus Christ* here, and (in this sense) the Apostle never writes “in Jesus Christ.” (2) The choice lies between *Christ Jesus* and *Christ Jesus our Lord*; and, whilst the latter reading is very appropriate in ver. 23, at the close of a paragraph occupied with the thought of *service* (*δουλεύειν*), it is clear that in ver. 11 “alive in Christ Jesus” is most in harmony with Pauline usage.

No. 5. Rom. viii. 34.

“It is Christ that died” (A.V.).

“It is Christ Jesus that died” (R.V.).

Here usage is in favour of the A.V. In St. Paul, the thought suggested by *Christ Jesus* is not that of the Saviour in His life on earth, or the historical Christ; but that of the living Saviour present with His people in the fulness of His Divine power.¹

¹ [May we not say that *Christ Jesus*, as thus defined, is in full harmony with the Apostle's thought? “Christ Jesus is He that died, yea rather, that was

No. 6. Rom. xv. 5.

“To be like-minded one toward another, according to Christ Jesus” (A.V. & R.V.). Here Tregelles, with \aleph A and other weighty authorities, reads *Jesus Christ*; but usage is in favour of *Christ Jesus*, who is conceived of as present with His people—the model now set before them, to which they are to conform.

No. 7. 1 Cor. ii. 2.

“I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified” (A.V. and R.V.).

That this is the true reading is almost self-evident; but *Christ Jesus* is the reading of some authorities. Compare 2 Cor. i. 19, discussed below.

No. 8. 1 Cor. ix. 1.

“Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?” (A.V.).

“Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?” (R.V.).

The second reading is preferable for reasons already given in Chapter I. (p. 83). *Jesus Christ our Lord* designates the Saviour conceived of as glorified in heaven, both God and man.

No. 9. 2 Cor. i. 19.

“Jesus Christ who was preached among you” (A.V. and R.V.).

This is the right reading; although Tischendorf, with \aleph A C, reads *Christ Jesus*. The reference is here historical. The Apostles first spoke of *Jesus*, then affirmed that He was *Christ*. So elsewhere we read of the “preaching of Jesus Christ,” τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰ. Χ. (Rom. xvi. 25).

No. 10. 2 Cor. iv. 6.

“In the face of Jesus Christ” (A.V. and R.V.).

Here the reading “in the face of Christ” is preferable on the ground of usage; *Christ*, and not *Jesus Christ*, being used to denote our Lord conceived of as a living presence in His Church.

No. 11. 2 Cor. iv. 10.

“The dying of the Lord Jesus” (A.V.).

“The dying of Jesus” (R.V.).

Here R.V. is correct, for in this whole passage (2 Cor. iv. 10-14) the prominent aspect of our Lord's character presented to us is that of His humanity; and this is strongly emphasised

raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.”]

because the hopes of His servants rest upon the assurance that the death, resurrection, and new life which *as man* our Lord experienced, will have their counterpart in themselves. Although the reading *Lord Jesus* is strongly supported in ver. 14, it is still doubtful whether we ought not there to read *Jesus* instead. In that case *Jesus* is found 6 times in this passage. Outside this chapter it is used by St. Paul 11 or 12 times.

No. 12. Gal. vi. 17.

“The marks of the Lord Jesus” (A.V.).

“The marks of Jesus” (R.V.).

The reasons which lead us to regard the reading *Jesus* as probably the right one throughout 2 Cor. iv. 10-14 apply here. When the Apostle dwells on his own sufferings, he delights to think that *Jesus* suffered also. The readings here vary between *Jesus, the Christ, the Lord, the Lord Jesus, the Lord Jesus Christ*. The last reading (found in \aleph D F G) is a good illustration of what Westcott and Hort call “conflation.”

No. 13. Eph. iii. 9.

“Hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ” (A.V.).

“Hid in God who created all things” (R.V.).

Here R.V. is certainly correct. “Jesus Christ” is so completely the product of *history*, that this name could not be given to our Lord *in this connection*.

No. 14. Phil. i. 6.

“Until the day of Jesus Christ” (A.V. and R.V.).

This is no doubt the true reading, and not *Christ Jesus* (B D E L Vulg., &c.). St. Paul also writes, “the day of the Lord,” “the day of Christ”; but if we examine all the examples of *Christ Jesus* (more than 80 in number) we shall not find one in which the Apostle makes use of this name in connection with our Lord’s Second Advent, with the doubtful exceptions of Rom. ii. 16, Tit. ii. 13.

Nos. 15, 16. 1 Thess. ii. 19.

“In the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming” (A.V.).

“Before our Lord Jesus at His coming” (R.V.).

It is true that it is in accord with the Apostle’s usage to speak of “the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,” as in

1 Thess. v. 23; but the shorter reading is, in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, the prevailing and characteristic form in this connection. For the same reason the reading *Lord Jesus* is to be preferred in 1 Thess. iii. 13.

No. 17. Heb. iii. 1.

"The Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus" (A.V.).

"The Apostle and High Priest of our confession, even Jesus" (R.V.).

The reading *Jesus* is undoubtedly correct, though some authorities read *Jesus Christ*. *Christ Jesus* (a name not found in this Epistle) has here hardly any documentary support. It is to the human experience and offices of Christ that the context refers (ch. ii. 11-18).

If now we combine the evidence of the 17 passages last reviewed with that of the 22 primary examples previously discussed, we obtain the following results:—

TABLE III.
EXAMINATION OF 39 PASSAGES.

<i>MSS.: Versions: Fathers.</i>	<i>Right.</i>	<i>Wrong.</i>	<i>Silent.</i>	<i>Uncertain.</i>
N	24	15
A	26	12	1	...
B	26	2	11	...
C	10	9	20	...
D (of Acts).....	1	2
E (of Acts)	1	2
D (of Pauline Epistles) ...	21	14	1	...
D ^c (corrector of D)	1	10
E (of Pauline Epistles) ...	13	18	5	...
F " " "	14	20	2	...
G " " "	17	18	1	...
K " " "	9	23	4	...
L	7	30	2	...
P	23	14	2	...
17	24	13	1	1
Vulgate (common text) ...	15	24
Cod. Amiatinus	23	15	...	1
Cod. Fuldensis.....	26	13
Cod. Demidovianus.....	22	17
Cod. Toletanus	17	22
Syriac: Philoxenian	22	17
" Peshito	7	32
Armenian	10	25	...	4
Ethiopic	6	28	...	5
Coptic	23	16	...	1
Gothic	11	11	17	...
Ambrosiaster	17	14	6	2
Chrysostom	5	29	...	5
Damascenus	10	21	4	4
Euthalius	12	18	6	3
Theodoret.....	7	24	2	6

The conclusions to which we are led by the consideration of the larger number of passages do not materially differ from those which are stated above (see the remarks on Table II.). We still recognize the unapproached excellence of the Vatican MS. (B). The next place is due to A, the cursive 17 being but a little way behind. P, \aleph , and D follow. Of the palimpsest C neither Table affords a true test, as in more than half the passages this MS. is "silent." The excellence of the Codex Fuldensis is still sustained; the ordinary text of the Vulgate is more frequently wrong than right. Among the other ancient Versions, the Coptic stands highest; the Peshito Syriac and the Æthiopic lowest. Of the Fathers quoted, Ambrosiaster is, as before, the most trustworthy authority.

A few additional examples of disputed readings may be given, in illustration of the principles we have followed. In each case our criterion, though it cannot determine the true text, will be found to help our judgment as to the intrinsic probability of the several readings.

No. 1. Luke xxiii. 42.

"And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me" (A.V.).

"And he said, Jesus, remember me" (R.V.).

On merely *à priori* grounds the reading of A.V. seems preferable, because there is no other instance in the Gospels in which any one addresses our Lord by the word "Jesus" without any addition. Such a mode of address here might seem to indicate a want of due reverence on the part of the penitent robber, who is nevertheless an example of true faith in Christ. But the best authorities are so decidedly in favour of the shorter reading of R.V., that we are obliged to adopt it. It is, besides, much more likely that *Lord* (Κύριε) would be added to the text if at first wanting, than that it would be omitted if St. Luke had written it. The shorter reading being accepted, this solitary example in which the name *Jesus* (by itself) is used in speaking *to* our Lord must be compared with the few instances recorded in which men during the Lord's life on earth speak *of* Him as *Jesus*. The examples are John v. 15; ix. 11; xii. 21; and all are instances

of those who had never seen Jesus, or had met with Him only a few hours at most before they so spoke. Their ignorance of our Lord is the explanation of the lack of higher terms of honour in their speech.

2 Cor. v. 18. Usage points to the expression "through Jesus Christ," when our Lord's mediatorial work is spoken of. But this thought is often expressed by the words "through Christ;" and the one word *Christ* is used so often in the context that we can hardly imagine the Apostle exchanging it for *Jesus Christ*, unless there were stronger reasons for doing so than are here apparent. Yet it is to be urged that *Jesus Christ* is the Apostle's chosen designation for our Lord when viewed in the great historical moments of His work on earth. Decision on *à priori* grounds is here difficult.

Gal. ii. 16. The reading of the Received Text is: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ." If this were the true reading, it would be very difficult to explain the occurrence of three different designations of our Lord in one verse, and especially the change from "the faith of Jesus Christ" at the beginning to "the faith of Christ" at the end. The Apostle doubtless varies greatly his appellations, but not without cause. Is the historical Christ present to the writer's thoughts, rather than the living Person? The remaining portion of this chapter, even the latter part of this verse, shows clearly that the Divine, living presence chiefly fills his thought; and for this reason the text is to be preferred which reads *Christ Jesus* twice and *Christ* at the end of the verse.

In Gal. iii. 22 the reading "by (out of) the faith of Jesus Christ" is no doubt the true reading; and here a distinctly historical reference is present to the writer's mind.

No. 2. 1 Thess. iii. 11.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ" (A.V.).

"Our Lord Jesus" (R.V.).

Here the testimony of usage is conflicting. It accords best with the general usage of the Apostle to speak of *our Lord*

Jesus Christ when he thinks of Him as associated with the Father as the dispenser of grace (so in 2 Thess. i. 12, last clause); but the name *Lord Jesus* best accords with the usage of this Epistle.

No. 3. 2 Thess. i. 8.

“The Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ” (A.V.).

“The Gospel of our Lord Jesus” (R.V.).

The usage of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians makes the shorter reading the more probable. Similarly in 2 Thess. i. 12 : “The name of our Lord Jesus” (R.V.)

No. 4. Tit. i. 4.

“Grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour” (A.V.).

“Grace and peace from God the Father, and Christ Jesus our Saviour” (R.V.).

No complete parallel is found to either expression elsewhere, although in Phil. iii. 20 the name employed is almost identical with the reading followed by A.V. *Christ Jesus our Saviour* has no support from any other passage. Prevailing usage would lead us to expect *the Lord Jesus Christ*. The documentary evidence strongly preponderates in favour of *Christ Jesus our Saviour*. So read \aleph A C D 17; the Vulgate, Gothic, Coptic Versions; Origen (in the Latin), Theodoret, Jerome.

No. 5. Tit. ii. 13.

“The glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” (A.V.).

“Appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ” (R.V.).

Christ Jesus is read instead of *Jesus Christ* by \aleph F G and the Coptic Version. *Jesus Christ* by \aleph^o A C D E K L P; the Vulgate, Syriac (both Philoxenian and Peshito), Armenian, Æthiopic Versions; Clement, Cyril, Epiphanius. Usage is in favour of *Jesus Christ*. Our Lord is, I think, never designated *Christ Jesus* when His second coming is referred to.¹

B. HELLIER (The late).

¹ [Compare what is said above on Phil. i. 6. As to the passage before us, it may fairly be urged that the close connection of the words in question with “our” (or “the”) “great God” might naturally lead to the use of the “transcendental” Name, *Christ Jesus*. We can hardly appeal to parallels here; this passage is unique.]

UNFULFILLED PROPHECY.

IT is hardly possible to enter on a discussion of this subject without raising the question what the fulfilment of prophecy means. To avoid misunderstanding, let me say at once that I take *prophecy* in the sense of *prediction*, and the *fulfilment* of prophecy to be *the accomplishment of that which is foretold*; whatever further meaning these words may bear. And I write for those who will not deny that the Bible contains predictions of accomplished facts. Those who admit this to be true will admit also that predictions are found in Scripture which have as yet had no fulfilment in history. There are words in the Bible which are not yet "filled" with fact.

The word "fulfilment" in relation to "that which was spoken of the Lord through prophets" is very nearly confined to the New Testament. There are a few Old Testament phrases—such as, "Thou spakest with Thy mouth, and hast fulfilled it with Thine hand"; and, "To fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah"—which anticipate the common phraseology of the New Testament. But the word "fulfil" occurs, I think, oftener in the Gospel of St. Matthew alone than in all Old Testament Scripture. Everywhere in the original language it has the same significance. It means simply to fill. The spoken word is regarded as the outline, or empty vessel. The fact accomplished *fulfils* it, *i.e., fills it full*. When the words are satisfied, and nothing further is required to justify their utterance, the prophecy is said to have been fulfilled. And there are two ways of calling attention to the process of fulfilment. To say, "This was done, that it might be fulfilled," is something. This is the more usual phrase, and indicates a step in the process. Every drop is poured in with a view to fill the vessel. To say, *Then was fulfilled*, is more. This phrase is of rare occurrence, and indicates that the fact recorded is the last to which the prophecy can refer. The examples of this phrase in the New Testament are very instructive. Can the one in St. Mark

xv. 28¹ by any possibility be regarded as an interpolation? I do not think so.

At this point it is natural to raise the question of a double sense of prophecy in Scripture. Few things have created such a prejudice against the study of prophecy as the differences of opinion existing on this double sense. Interpretations apparently most opposite have been put upon the same words. The "double sense" has been urged in explanation on the one side, and vehemently denied on the other. But what is meant by the double sense of prophecy? If the words spoken are of wide meaning and far-reaching import, is it not possible that a series of events may be necessary in order to satisfy them? No one event may be of sufficient import, or concern, to *fulfil* the prophetic words. And if the events to which they refer are a true series, or connected as links in a chain of causation, or relation, it is hardly fair to say that the prophecy has been interpreted in a *double* sense, because it is taken to refer to more facts than one. For example, when the prophet Amos said to Israel, in the name of the Lord, "I will cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus"; and St. Stephen, reciting the same saying, altered the phrase thus, "I will carry you away *beyond Babylon*" (Amos v. 27; Acts vii. 43), we should not say that the prophecy has a *double* sense, but rather that it receives a further application. "Beyond Babylon" is beyond Damascus with a vengeance, if we regard the prophecy from any standpoint in the land of Israel. The meaning of the sentence is not altered. But when the drying up of the river Euphrates—a catastrophe which helped to bring about the fall of Babylon, and was seen again in a vision of the Apocalypse—is referred to the wasting away of the Turkish Empire, it is hard to evade the charge of giving to the same set of words two wholly unconnected meanings. The link between the Turks and

¹ "And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors." The Revisers evidently thought this an interpolation. But it is not found in the parallel passage in any other Gospel. Who would have ventured to say that at that moment the Scripture *was fulfilled*—the most unusual form of quotation in the New Testament—without the express authority of inspiration itself?

Euphrates, as usually indicated, is geographical. It is said that they came from "Baghdad by the Euphrates." But in the Old Testament the drying up of the Euphrates is represented as a prelude to the destruction of Babylon. The Euphrates was to Babylon on earth what the pure river of Water of Life is to Jerusalem above. Either city is on both sides of its own river. One would have supposed that the drying up of Euphrates in the Apocalypse had some reference to the Babylon of the Apocalypse rather than to the Turkish Empire. If it had been said that in Isaiah (vii.) Euphrates is used as a symbol of the Assyrian power; that Assyria in Isaiah stands for Antichrist; and that the Mohammedan power is the Antichrist of true Judaism, just as Romanism has been viewed as the Antichrist of true Gentile Christianity, then we might at least admit that some logical connection between Euphrates and Turkey is attempted to be set up.

At this point, I think, I may venture to say that the unfulfilled prophecies of Holy Scripture can be classed in two divisions. The first division would comprise those predictions which certainly include some events recorded in history; but of which we cannot safely assert that they include no more. The other class would contain predictions to which we are as yet wholly unable to refer any historical fact. As an instance of this latter class, take the siege of Jerusalem described in Zech. xiv. As an instance of the first class, we may take the words of Malachi, "Behold, I will send you Elijah, the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." For it is certain from the Gospels that these words have some reference to John the Baptist. Their context is even quoted by the angel in Luke i. 17. But we cannot say that the words are fulfilled to their utmost scope, in the face of John the Baptist's own answer to the question, "Art thou Elijah?" [He saith I am not], and of those other words of our Saviour, "If ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come;" words sufficiently ambiguous and mysterious to allow of something further, which we have not yet seen. Not to mention, that, if Christ Himself has a first and second coming, it is but

reasonable that His Forerunner should also appear twice. But in the Old Testament considered by itself, the coming of Messiah is all one. There is no trace of a suspicion that He was to come twice, until men saw that His first appearing had ended before He had accomplished all that was written of Him. The two comings of Messiah, as known to the Church of Christ, not only divide Old Testament prophecy in general into two large sections, but even divide single prophecies, which in form appear to be one. For example, Isa. lxi. 1-3. And this brings us to a second observation. Since "the testimony of JESUS is the spirit of prophecy"—that is, not only every actual prediction, but the prophetic spirit itself, is the uncontrollable impulse to bear witness to that which concerns Him—it is clear that all prophecy cannot be fulfilled until all that He can do to make it good has been brought to pass. The sense of prophecy is only limited by the destiny of the Last Adam in the counsels of Omnipotence itself. We observe, therefore, that His work is set forth to us in Holy Scripture in three stages. First, the work accomplished at His first Advent, in "the days of His flesh," when as the Son of Man He "came to visit us in great humility." Next, the work that is being done now, since Jesus was glorified, by the power of the Holy Ghost, who proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son; a work that must continue and expand until the close of this present dispensation. Thirdly, the work of our Lord at His second Advent, during the time of His *Parousia*, or presence in the world as King, until He shall deliver up the kingdom, "when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power."

It is clearly the last of these three stages of His work with which unfulfilled prophecy has most to do. The fulfilment of prophecy regarding our Lord's first coming has been sufficiently indicated by the Apostles and Evangelists in the pages of the New Testament. It is hardly possible for us to add anything to what they have set forth. Some eyes may recognize more distinctly than others those traces of rejection, humiliation, and persecution, which beset the path of all the saviours and anointed ones of Jewish history

and anticipate the experience of our Lord. But no new discovery seems possible in this region. And not only so, but the fulfilment of Pentecostal prophecies has been indicated in the New Testament with sufficient clearness ever since St. Peter began the exposition of it, by saying on the Day of Pentecost (in Acts ii.), "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel." Following the guidance of St. Peter and St. Paul, we may easily trace the description of the Christian Church under the name of Jacob and Israel in Old Testament Scripture, reading for Jacob "the Church militant," and for Israel "him that overcometh," even all the people of the Lord. In this community nations as nations have no place—"There is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free—all are one man in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 28). But when we come to the third chapter of our Saviour's work as predicted in Scripture, our course is not so easy. Here is the region of unfulfilled prophecy; and here it is that men chiefly differ. Whether in regard to the work of our Lord at His *Parousia*, or the future of the Israelitish nation, the most opposite opinions prevail among men whose judgment is equally entitled to respect. Speaking generally, there are two distinct views of the future on both the topics indicated in the last sentence. Concerning our Lord, there are those who think that at His second Advent He comes only to judgment; that after His appearing no unregenerate man will be evangelized or saved. The heavens and the earth shall pass away. New heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, will at once take their place. And concerning the Jewish nation, it is held that they have now no future except as believing members of a Church where all national distinctions are abolished. The Jew can only be saved by becoming a Gentile, although the Gentile was not required to receive salvation by becoming a Jew. Obviously, on this supposition, the Jews must be restored and converted (if ever) before the second coming of Jesus Christ.

The other view is, that the Old Testament abounds with promises to the Israelitish nation which can have no adequate fulfilment but that which is national. That the land of

promise itself is implicated in these prophecies. That Jerusalem on earth must be restored. That it is to no purpose that the Jewish nation has been kept distinct as a nation through the dispersions, persecutions, and vicissitudes of eighteen centuries, unless it still has a distinct future before it. And further, that this national future is inseparably connected with the *Parousia* of our Lord Jesus Christ. That the restoration of Israel is a *consequence*, not a *presage*, of His second coming. To use St. Paul's words, "There shall *come* out of Zion the Deliverer (*i.e.*, the Redeemer), and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob" (Rom. xi. 26; Isa. lix. 20). Or as St. Peter said before, "He shall *send Jesus Christ . . . whom the heavens must receive until the time of the restitution of all things*, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" (Acts iv. 20). Or, once more, as St. John and Zechariah, joined in one sentence, have declared, "Behold He cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him; and all the *tribes of the land shall wail because of him*," in that day when there shall be "a fountain open to the House of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness" (Rev. i. 7; Zech. xii.-xiii.).

I cannot say that in this question I am unprejudiced. My mind is made up. Ever since I was invited (seven-and-twenty years ago¹) to enter on an investigation of the whole testimony of Scripture as to the Premillennial or Postmillennial Advent, I have been satisfied that our Lord's personal coming is to *precede* the restoration of His people, and that this alone can bring about the accomplishment of many a prediction in the Old and New Testament.

But, though not unprejudiced, or myself in doubt as to what Scripture says, I have honestly endeavoured not to be unfair. On the contrary, I have done my best to understand all the considerations and appreciate all the difficulties which prevent many students of Scripture from taking the same

¹ With my father, who had been secretary to a Clerical Society at Wolverhampton, where he had heard the subject discussed. We spent eighteen mornings consecutively on the study of the passages bearing on this question in Holy Scripture.

view as I do. This brings me to another observation regarding prophecy, which I take to be an axiom. *In any particular dispensation the fulfilment of prophecy must necessarily be in accordance with the ruling principles of that dispensation.* For example, we who live under the dispensation of the Spirit are not warranted in expecting any fulfilment of prophecy so long as this dispensation lasts, except such as can be brought about by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the world in which we live. In this respect our times differ from the times of the Jewish Church that was before us, and also from the lifetime of our Lord and Saviour upon earth. The history of Israel did not enable them to forecast what actually happened when Christ came. In the same way, the laws of the present dispensation supply no rule by which we can forecast the fulfilment of Scripture prophecy during the *Parousia*, when our Lord has come again. It is here that those who do not accept the Premillennial Advent appear to me to fall into error. They can see nothing after our Lord's second coming except the final catastrophe. Consequently, all prophecy that is not yet fulfilled, except just what concerns the day of judgment, *they are forced to spiritualise.* All unaccomplished predictions must, for them, be explained by the work of the Holy Ghost, or they cannot be explained at all. For them the Jew has no present or future place in Scripture, except as a denationalized Christian. The distinction between Jew and Gentile is not *only* suspended for the time being, but absolutely destroyed. In so short a paper as this it would be folly to attempt anything like a complete sketch of the arguments of Holy Scripture on which a belief in the Premillennial Advent is based. "*All the prophets, from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days.*" I will but put one or two salient points in the form of questions, as hints to be worked out. First, to take the plainest words of Scripture, did St. Paul, in the eleventh chapter of his Epistle to the metropolis of the Gentile world—did he, I say, indicate, or did he not, that, as the Gentile has for the present taken the place of the Jew in relation to God and the outside world; so the time will come when the Jews as a nation will return

to their former estate, and resume that prerogative among nations which God has irrevocably conferred?

If this is to be, by what means do the prophets indicate that it will be brought to pass? Will it be through the personal coming of our Saviour, or will it be effected by anything less? "*At the second time, Joseph was made known to his brethren,*" and no human mediator intervened. Does Zechariah say that the *mourning* over Him whom they pierced will be attended by repentance and pardon? (Zech. xii.-xiii). And does St. John, in Rev. i., say that this will be when "He cometh with the clouds?"

Again, two bodies cannot possibly occupy the same space at the same time. While the Church remains on earth she must hold the key of the position. No *national* body can dispossess her or take her place. So long as the Church founded on the Day of Pentecost remains on earth, the centre of gravity of God's kingdom upon earth must remain in her. It cannot be shifted from the company of the faithful to the Jewish *nation*, whatever the attitude of that nation may happen to be.

But if the Church of Christ is once removed from earth to heaven, manifestly there is a clear field for the restoration of the Jews. Will the Church of Christ ever be removed? Yes, at His second coming. The two events coincide exactly. In the first moment of the *Parousia* the whole Church will be caught up to meet the Lord.

Now turn to Revelation vii., the chief passage of the New Testament which describes the bliss of that moment for the great multitude out of all nations and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues. They are in heaven. Meantime, where are the Jews? Their restoration is being effected at that very moment. The tribes of Judah and Reuben, of Gad and Asher, of Naphtali and Manasseh, of Simeon and Levi, of Issachar and Zebulon, of Joseph and Benjamin—six notable pairs of brothers—are being once more identified (as no one can identify them now) and sealed as servants of God in their foreheads. And that they are sealed *on earth, not in heaven*, is manifest from the third verse of the chapter. The four winds *of the earth* are restrained, that they may not hurt

them. Were the tribes in heaven this restraint would be wholly needless ; as needless as it is for the great multitude whose safety is described in the closing verses of the chapter.

In this passage we see the centre of gravity of God's kingdom upon earth shifting from the Gentile to the Jew. Let it once be recognized that the coming of our Saviour in the clouds of heaven is the starting point of the Apocalypse, the *terminus a quo* of the whole vision, instead of the *terminus ad quem*, and it will not be long before the Church comes to something like an agreement on the interpretation of the book.

As I said before, it would be absurd to attempt even a sketch of the entire argument in this paper. I will only add one or two reasons why I desire to press this view of the subject as widely as I can. I find it such an unspeakable comfort in the pressure of the times in which we live. That the present dispensation should last for long centuries, would be, to my mind, a most dreary prospect. To suppose that the whole world was ever meant to be turned to God by the means granted to us in our present state, would be to confess Christianity up to the present hour a failure in very deed. If God is at present only "visiting the nations to *take out of them a people* for His name" (Acts xv. 14), I can understand it. What else do we see? But if He intends the nations as a whole to be turned to Him by the means at our disposal, we may well ask, Why has not one of them turned hitherto? To beget national religion, national religion is required. Restore Israel, and you have the pattern. Take a select number only, and selection repeated again and again in various phases is the only possible result.

The near approach of our Saviour's coming is a most stimulating and encouraging prospect. Already the Jews are beginning to seek after "Jesus our Brother." "The branch of the fig-tree that is tender and putteth forth leaves" foretells "that summer is near." Does it not even justify the direct application of our Saviour's words to the present season, "Verily I say unto you, *This generation shall not pass till all is fulfilled.*" If we do not ourselves live to see it, yet surely our children will. "Shew Thy servants Thy *work*, and their children Thy glory!" And then, how does it brighten

our prospect for the world outside! If we cannot so adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour, or so shine as lights in the world, that all men will believe on Him, is it not some comfort to think that a brighter light than ours may yet arise, and shine with far wider effect? What if Israel, after all, should be the subject of that wonderful forecast of Epiphany, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For behold, darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people. *But the Lord shall arise upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and their kings to the brightness of thy rising*"!

The very word *Parousia*, always used in the New Testament to describe our Saviour's second Advent, of itself implies that which we do not always realize. It is not His *coming* to us, but His *presence* with us; and this not as He is now present, invisibly by the Holy Ghost, but in the completeness of His nature. He came once, and departed. When He comes again, He will never depart until He gives up the kingdom to the Father, and God is become all in all. But may not the several manifestations of His power and glory, the several operations of judgment, the several steps to the establishment of His kingdom, take place in order, and with due regard to season, and time, and place? The common notion, that the second coming of Christ is one great catastrophe, may be a misconception. Many passages of Holy Scripture imply that everything belonging to His second coming will be as much in order as the events which were accomplished "in the days of His flesh."

Before the first advent of our Saviour, the people to whom He came made one fatal mistake. *They supposed the rules and principles of the dispensation under which they lived would last for ever.* If God had not removed them, what would have been our darkness now? And so may it be also with the men of this generation. When we have done what we can, will there be nothing left that we cannot do? Will "all nations come and worship before" Him whom they know only through our partial Christianity? Will "His requirements" be thus "made manifest"? C. H. WALLER.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

NOTWITHSTANDING the great importance which is throughout the New Testament attached to the Resurrection of Christ, and its immense value in the scheme of Redemption, it is to be deplored that it does not occupy that prominence which it demands either in Christian literature or public teaching. Even the agnostic, Mr. S. Laing, is compelled to admit:—

“There can be no doubt, therefore, that if any miracle is true, this must be the one; and on the other hand, if this miracle cannot be established by sufficient proof, it is idle to discuss the evidence for other miracles. In order to go to the root of the matter, therefore, it is necessary to consider, in a calm and judicial spirit, the evidence upon which this miracle of the Resurrection really rests. In the first place, we must consider what sort of evidence is required to prove a miracle. Clearly it must be evidence of the most cogent and unimpeachable character, far more conclusive than would be sufficient to establish an ordinary occurrence.”¹ So far we agree, but the writer proceeds by saying, “Now it is absolutely certain that portions of the Bible, and those important portions relating to the creation of the world and of man, are not true, and therefore not inspired.”

He next informs us that there are many things which were produced in ways altogether different from those mentioned in the Bible. Here we join issue with the writer, and are quite prepared to rest our proof of Christ's Resurrection on the testimony of history. It is true Mr. Laing refers to the testimony of the four Gospels, but he says that, “Until the middle of the second century they are never quoted, and were apparently unknown.”² Yet on pp. 253-54 he rejects the account of the destruction of Jerusalem, as though it

¹ *Modern Science and Modern Thought*. By S. Laing. Sixth Edition. P. 249.

² P. 256.

were a prophecy of the end of the world, thus showing that the writer was not inspired, but unworthy of confidence. Although we believe that certain of the events foretold by the Saviour will only take place at the end of the age, we consider that, in the main, it describes the calamities which would befall Jerusalem, and on that very ground receive it as a proof that the Gospel of Matthew was written before the destruction of that city. The year 43 A.D. appears to be the most probable period of its production. Celsus, the bitter opponent of Christianity, and the heretics Marcion, Valentinus, and Basilides knew the Gospels; and Justin Martyr produces more forcible evidence of their existence before his day, 89-180 A.D. He says, "For the Apostles have so handed down in the memorials produced by them called Gospels." "Both the memorials of the Apostles and the writings of the prophets are read." "As those who have written in memoirs all things respecting our Saviour have taught;" "which things are also written in the memoirs of the Apostles."

Another modern writer says, "The fact of the Resurrection being of primary importance, it being a Gospel of the Resurrection which was actually preached by the earliest preachers, it would seem quite essential that the narrative of the Resurrection should be placed upon exceptionally clear ground, and supported by exceptionally cogent proofs. But no, the actual fact to be faced is that we have four accounts which tax—and may we not say defy?—the utmost ingenuity of harmonists to weave them into a consistent whole. We seem to have recorded for us the broken, excited impressions which the fact made on the first witnesses, rather than the calm and judicial statement of the fact itself."¹

It is quite true that, according to Mark xvi. 9, the Lord appeared first to Mary Magdalene; according to Matt. xxviii. 9, to her and the "other Mary" together; and according to Paul's account to Cephas. But none of these pledge themselves to relate all the appearances of the risen Saviour?

¹ *Inspiration and the Bible.* By Robert F. Horton, M.A. Second Edition. Pp. 76, 77.

If we compare the Gospel narratives with that of Paul, we find that there were ten occasions on which the Saviour is said to have appeared after His Resurrection. It is highly probable that they occurred in the following order:—(1) Mary Magdalene sees the Lord first, on visiting the grave a second time (Mark xvi. 9; John xx. 16), after having told Peter and John that the stone was rolled away, and the grave was empty. (2) The other women, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, having heard the angel's joyful message, hurry back in fear and great joy, whereupon the Lord meets them (Matt. xxviii. 9, 10). (3) He also appeared to Peter in the course of the same day (Luke xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5); (4) in the evening, to two disciples on their way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 15, &c.); (5) and after this to the ten Apostles (without Thomas) assembled in Jerusalem Luke xxiv. 36-44; (John xx. 19, &c.). (6) On the Sunday following He appeared to the Apostles, with Thomas (John xx. 26, &c.). All these appearances took place in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood, shortly after the Resurrection. The next appearance (7) was at the Lake of Tiberias to seven disciples (John xxi. 1, &c.). (8) Then followed the great manifestation on a mountain in Galilee to all the disciples (Matt. xxviii. 16, &c.; Mark xvi. 15-18; Luke xxiv. 45-49), and probably at the same time to the five hundred mentioned in 1 Cor. xv. 6; (9) the special appearance accorded to James, the Lord's brother (1 Cor. xv. 7), when, perhaps, the disciples were exhorted to return earlier than usual to keep the feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem. (10) The final appearance mentioned is that to the Apostles on the Mount of Olives, which concluded with the ascension (Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxiv. 50, &c.; Acts i. 4-12).

We must not omit reference to Saul of Tarsus, who was met by the Lord in his journey to Damascus. The gospel which he afterwards preached as the Apostle Paul was that *Christ died, was buried, and rose again*. This he reduced to the briefest expression, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

The Resurrection of Jesus Christ is thought by some to

be only a resurrection from *apparent death*. This theory is untenable, and is contradicted by the unanimous voice of Scripture, which represents the death of Christ as real.

There are others who speak of Christ's Resurrection as a *spiritual resurrection only*. If the word ἀνάστασις means nothing more than the survival of the spirit, it follows that Christ's ἀνάστασις occurred on the day that He died. But it did not take place until the third day after His death on the cross. It will be found that Paul bases his hope of the ἀνάστασις of Christians entirely on the ἀνάστασις of Christ on the third day. "ἀνάστασις in biblical Greek only used intransitively—*rising up, e.g., after a fall*. Specially of the resurrection from the dead, of the return to life conditioned by the abolition of death, which return, considered qualitatively, is the entrance on a life freed from death and from the judicial sentence centralised therein."

In the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 18-20) the same Apostle prays that believers may "know what is the hope of His calling. And what is the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places."

Again (Phil. iii. 21), in referring to the resurrection of believers, he says, Christ "shall change the form of this body of our humiliation, that it may become like to the body of His glory, according to the energy whereby He is able to subject all things to Himself."

The *historical testimonies to the Resurrection* of our Lord evidently refer not to spiritual manifestations of the glorified personality of Jesus Christ, but to an actual resurrection from the dead. By surreptitiously changing what is said respecting the resurrection of His body into something quite different, while outwardly keeping up a show of adherence to New Testament teaching, by writing and speaking of a "spiritual resurrection and glorification," many confuse the whole issue. Christlieb very forcibly says, "Whosoever denies a bodily resurrection should be honest enough no

longer to speak of resurrection at all. *Resurrection does not refer to the spirit*, the continued existence of which Scripture takes as a matter of course, *but only to the body, and its issuing forth alive from the grave.* Only that can rise again which has before been laid down in the grave, and that is only the body, not the spirit." "But according to Scripture, the body of Christ was a sinless body, broken only for the sins of the world. Hence His death was freely undertaken (John x. 18) by One who, as the Son of God, possessed life in Himself, and had received from His Father power to lay down His life and to take it again (1 John v. 26; ii. 19; x. 17, &c.). The question, therefore, is whether by the raising up of this—His body—Christ really was '*declared to be the Son of God*' (Rom. i. 4), and His most important self-testimonies confirmed or not; whether He was indeed '*crowned with glory and honour*' (Heb. ii. 9), or whether, forsaken of God, He merely died on the cross? We must decide whether His death was accepted by God as an *atonement* for us or not; or, in other words, whether *the work of redemption was indeed accomplished.*"¹

The desire of the Apostle was, "That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death" (Phil. iii. 10). And when I speak of knowing Him, I mean that I may feel the power of His resurrection; but to feel this, it is first necessary that I should share His sufferings. The essence of knowing Christ consists in knowing the power of His Resurrection; hence the words *καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ* are added by way of explanation. But these words again suggest another thought: no one can participate in His Resurrection who has not first participated in His death.

"The participation in Christ's sufferings partly follows upon, and partly precedes the power of His Resurrection. It follows as the practical result on our life; it precedes as leading up to the full and final appreciation of this power."

¹ *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, p. 449.

“The conformity with the sufferings of Christ implies not only the endurance of persecution for His name, but all pangs and all afflictions undergone in the struggle against sin either within or without. The agony of Gethsemane, not less the agony of Calvary, will be reproduced, however faintly, in the faithful servant of Christ.”¹

If we realize that we are “crucified with Christ,” and “dead with Christ,” we are “dead to sin,” and “dead to the law.” Our death comes through the sacrificial death of Christ, and our life as Christians through His risen life. God hath quickened us together “with Christ.” As “risen with Christ,” it behoves us to be “always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.”

There are many others who describe Christ's reported meeting with Saul of Tarsus, on his journey to Damascus, as being only *subjective*, in direct opposition to the plain Scriptural narrative of an *objective reality*. Mr. Laing, for instance, after admitting that 1 Cor. xv. 3-8 “is undoubtedly very distinct evidence that the appearances described by St. Paul were currently believed in the circle of early Christians at Jerusalem within twenty years of their alleged occurrence,” proceeds, “This is strong testimony, but it is weakened by several considerations. In the first place, we know that Paul's frame of mind in regard to miracles was such as to make it certain that he would take them for granted, and not attempt to examine critically the evidence on which they were founded, and this was doubtless the frame of mind of those from whom he received the accounts. Again, he places all the appearances on the same footing as that to himself, which was clearly of the nature of a vision, or strong internal impression, rather than of an objective reality. Upon this vital point, whether the appearances which led to the belief in Christ's Resurrection were subjective or objective—that is, were visions or physical realities—Paul's testimony

¹ See Bishop Lightfoot on the Epistle, and Westcott's Gospel of the Resurrection.

therefore favours the former view, which is quite consistent with the laws of nature and with experience in other cases."¹

With these and certain other statements before us it is almost impossible to avoid arriving at the conclusion that Mr. Laing, although he considers himself of sufficient importance to take the place of a representative of the Negative School, is wanting in the very rudiments of Christian apologetics. He assumes that, because we take the Bible to be inspired, we accept its teaching respecting miracles, including Christ's Resurrection, as proof of its inspiration, and then attempt to prove such inspiration by the miracles which it records. On the contrary, we believe the Bible to be inspired, and proved to be so from its contents generally; and rest our argument in favour of Christ's Resurrection and other miracles in the Bible on the testimony of history.

Mr. Laing makes a mistake in supposing that Christianity is based upon the New Testament, and not upon the *historic facts* recorded therein. The facts were published far and near, but they were not recorded in writing before the Church was formed which could appreciate their worth, as well as preserve them from corruption and destruction.

Baur goes so far as to rest "the whole development of the Church not on the objective fact of Christ's Resurrection, but on the subjective belief of His disciples in it, not on Christ Himself, but on His disciples; not on a *Divine act*, but on a certain inexplicable *condition of human consciousness*. Instead of the *fact*, we have a fiction, *i.e.*, the mere conception of a fact, which may or may not have a real objective foundation." Yet, notwithstanding, he is compelled to acknowledge that "by no analysis, psychological or dialectic, can the inner mystery of the act in which God revealed His Son in Paul be disclosed." Rénan refers to the persecutor's conversion as if it resulted from some hallucination of which he was the subject. It appears to be overlooked by those who adopt these theories that we have a threefold minute history of Paul's conversion in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. x. 1-30;

¹ *Modern Science and Modern Thought*, p. 256.

xxii. 1-21 ; xxvi. 4-23); and in both the latter passages it is Paul himself who is relating his own history. Even Straus is compelled to confess that this threefold narrative "sounds quite as if it had been an outward sensuous phenomenon." It must be admitted that there is abundant evidence that the means of the mighty change, from Saul the enemy to Paul the friend and follower of Jesus, all lay in the one fact that, "At that awful moment *he had seen the Lord Jesus Christ.* To him the persecutor—to him as to the abortive-born of the Apostolic family—the risen, the glorified Jesus had appeared. He had been apprehended by Christ. On that appearance all his faith was founded; on that pledge of resurrection—of immortality to himself, and to the dead who die in Christ—all his hopes were anchored. If that belief were unsubstantial, then all his life and all his labours were a delusion and a snare—he was a wretch more to be pitied than the wretchedest of the children of the world."

It only shows the untenableness of their position when critics endeavour to weaken the evidence, by pointing out the small variations in the three accounts of Paul's conversion, seeing that, in the main, they thoroughly agree. In all three there is the visible appearance of the light which cast him to the ground and blinded him for some days, the same voice, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" and the same answer, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." Were the Apostle inventing a tale, or, as a writer on miracles has put it, "even substituting an internal impression for an external fact, here was a golden opportunity to convict him either of fraud or of gross enthusiasm, and so to discredit his pretensions for ever. It was a most hazardous stake to publish the Book of Acts, with the story, substantially the same, thrice repeated in it, at the date to which common belief ascribes the book, if the facts did not occur as they are described."

Coming to the *historic reality of Christ's Resurrection*, it will be granted that the same threefold test considered necessary in scientific investigations will be admitted to be sufficient in testing the veracity of New Testament teaching concerning the Resurrection of Christ. It is as follows—*Facts must be*

FACTS—*Reasoning must be LOGICAL—Knowledge must in all respects be ADEQUATE.* With regard to FACTS, we are told that Pilate consented to the transfer of the body of Jesus to Joseph and Nicodemus when the centurion had certified to His death. That, after receiving the body, Joseph and Nicodemus prepared it for burial. The body was then buried in a rock-hewn sepulchre, where no one had previously been entombed. A great stone was rolled up against the opening of the sepulchre; and, to make it more secure against surprise, the stone door was sealed with the official seal; and a guard of Roman soldiers appointed to watch the tomb. The same Jesus, who had been crucified and buried, appeared to the women who went to the sepulchre on the morning of the third day. He afterwards appeared to others, on different occasions, and in different places. No *fact* was ever better ATTESTED. The reasoning from such well-established facts, that Jesus the crucified and risen is both Lord and Christ, is surely most LOGICAL. But what about our knowledge of these FACTS? Is that in all respects ADEQUATE? YES, we reply, arising as it does from the existence of Christianity up to the present date, and the moral effects which accompany the believing acceptance of Christ as the promised Saviour, to which the consciousness of every believer bears testimony.

Even so keen a critic as the celebrated Ewald admits that, "Nothing stands more historically certain than that Jesus rose from the dead and appeared again to His followers, or than that their seeing Him thus, again, was the beginning of a higher faith, and of all their Christian work in the world. It is equally certain that they thus saw Him, not as a common man, or as a shade or ghost risen from the grave, but as the only Son of God—already more than man at once in nature and power; and that all who thus beheld Him recognized at once and instinctively His unique Divine dignity, and firmly believed in it thenceforth. The Twelve and others had, indeed, learned to look on Him, even in life, as the true Messianic King and the Son of God; but from the moment of His reappearing, they recognized more clearly and fully the Divine side of His nature, and saw in Him the conqueror

of death. Yet the two pictures of Him thus fixed in their minds were in their essence identical. That former familiar appearance of the earthly Christ, and this higher vision of Him, with its depth of emotion and ecstatic joy, were so inter-related that, even in the first days or weeks after His death, they could never have seen in Him the Heavenly Messiah, if they had not first known Him so well as the earthly."¹

The testimony of contemporary and early writers, alluded to at the commencement of this paper, is not only a proof of the existence of Christianity, but may also be accepted as evidence to the fact of Christ's Resurrection. *The formation and continued existence of the Church of Christ*—not the pagan or apostate Church of Rome—since the day of Pentecost, when, according to the promise of Christ, the Holy Spirit was sent down, and the prophecy of Joel began to be fulfilled, affords additional evidence of the fact that the Saviour arose from the dead and ascended to heaven. It receives additional support from the *weekly observance of the first day of the week*, instead of the seventh, and the institution and observance of *certain ordinances* up to the present date.

Before closing it may be well just to notice the question which is often asked, If Christ was raised from the dead, why did He not show Himself openly in the streets of Jerusalem? The shame was notorious and open; and it is again asked, Why in the same open way did God not roll back the stone from the sepulchre in the sight of many, and to the confusion of those who had put His Son and our Saviour to an open shame? It appears to be overlooked by those who ask such questions that the Jews had already been furnished with convincing proofs that Jesus was indeed the Christ, but they attributed the power by which His miracles were performed to Beelzebub, and demanded that He should be crucified. As to their obtuseness, the Lord on one occasion said, "Neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

HENRY H. BOURN.

¹ *Geschichte*, vi. 75.

THE "BOOK OF COMMON ORDER," OR
KNOX'S LITURGY.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH.

THE purpose of the present paper is accurately set forth in its title. We desire merely to sketch the history of the Scottish Liturgy, leaving altogether out of consideration the question which is now engaging the attention of a portion of the Scottish Church, as to whether or not it would be expedient to resume the use of a liturgical form of service in that Church. There is reason to believe that many excellent people who now object to such a form are altogether ignorant of the fact that the Church of Scotland ever possessed and used a liturgy of its own. When Dr. Binney, some thirty years ago, wrote a preface to an American work on the subject of liturgies, he could imagine that many readers of the book would be surprised to find "that Knox prepared an order for public worship, which was adopted and sanctioned by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; and that his own last hours were soothed and solaced, and his soul refreshed by a prayer being read to him out of a book." Even now these words might not unfittingly be applied; and it is just because we believe that a widely diffused knowledge of the Scottish Church's early practice in regard to its forms of worship will do something to help the praiseworthy cause of reform in its present ritual, that we have sought to tell again the story of the Scottish Liturgy. Our limited space will be the cause of the omission of many interesting facts in connection with the subject, but our readers may be assured that all the leading details will be fully and carefully presented.

It was in the early part of the year 1554 that John Knox, finding it no longer safe to remain in his native country, where the cause of Protestantism was suffering violence under the tyranny of Mary, left for the Continent, and after some wanderings among the Helvetian Churches, settled at Geneva.

Here was John Calvin, now at the very height of his reputation, and with him Knox soon formed an intimacy which ultimately ripened into the most cordial affection. The two reformers had but little in common, for Knox was a "rough, unbending, impetuous man," while Calvin was "calm, severe, often irritable, but never impassioned." Notwithstanding these differences of character, they were perfectly agreed on most points of faith and discipline; and in respect of the forms of public worship, their practice was all but entirely harmonious. Knox seems to have been delighted with the purity of religion established in Geneva. "In other places," he tells us, "I confess Christ to be truly preached; but manners and religion to be so sincerely reformed, I have not yet seen in any other place beside."

Towards the close of the year 1554 Knox left Geneva to take charge of a congregation of Protestant refugees at Frankfort, but he had scarcely entered upon his duties when differences of opinion arose respecting the order of public worship, one section urging adherence to the English Liturgy, and another contending for a simpler form. Several attempts appear to have been made to unite the parties, but here it is necessary to notice one only. In the *Brief Discours of the Troubles begonne at Franckford*, ascribed with great probability to William Whittingham, we find the following passage:—

"The congregation could not agree upon any certain Order; till after long debating to and fro, it was concluded that Maister Knox, Maister Whittingham, Maister Gilby, Maister Fox, and Maister T. Cole should draw forth some Order meet for their state and time; which thing was by them accomplished and offered to the congregation (being the same Order of Geneva which is now in print). This Order was very well liked of many; but such as were bent to the Book of England could not abide it. . . . In the end another way was taken."

This occurred early in 1555, and in March of that year Knox found it necessary for his own peace of mind to withdraw from Frankfort. For some time he resided at Geneva, but a longing to visit his native country had come upon him, and he returned to Scotland. In the meantime, Whittingham—who,

though an Englishman, had taken sides with Knox in recommending the non-adoption of the Book of Common Prayer—seeing no hope of adjusting the differences at Frankfort, left for Geneva, taking with him such of the refugees as agreed with his own views. An English congregation was thus formed there in November, 1555, and Knox was invited to return and take charge of it. At this time the Reformation in Scotland was making steady progress, and Knox was sorely needed in his own country. He was strongly counselled to decline the call to go abroad, but he would not listen to the advice, and in September, 1556, he returned once more to Geneva. It has been suggested that the genial climate and the quiet life of the Swiss town may have allured him; but as he was already a marked man in Scotland, it is much more probable that, thinking discretion the better part of valour, he took advantage of the call from Geneva to escape from danger. Be that as it may, it is from his connection with this obscure congregation that the introduction into Scotland of what was called the *Book of Common Order*, but now more frequently Knox's Liturgy, is to be traced; and our purpose will be now to follow out, as fully as may be, the history of this interesting work.

We have already seen that a form of service based upon the Genevan Liturgy had been prepared for, though not adopted by, the Frankfort refugees. All that remained, therefore, to be done when the dissentients removed to Geneva was to have this service revised and published for use in the congregation; and accordingly we find that in February, 1556, it was issued under the title of *The Forme of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, etc., used in the Englishe Congregation at Geneva*.¹ In the "Contentes of the Booke" twelve pieces are enumerated. The first ten have reference to the Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline of the Church; the

¹ The title of this book as subsequently reprinted was, "The Book of Common Order, or the Order of the English Kirk at Geneva, whereof John Knox was minister: approved by the famous and learned man, John Calvin. Received and used by the Reformed Kirk of Scotland, and ordinarily prefixed to the Psalms in metre."

eleventh and twelfth refer respectively to the Psalms (51) which up to this time had been rendered into metre by Sternhold and others, and to Calvin's Catechism. A somewhat copious preface, attributed on good grounds to Whittingham, is attached to the volume, and from this it would appear that the design of the compilers was not merely to meet the immediate needs of the exiles, but to provide a form of service which could also be used in their own country.

From the time that the first Scottish Reformers resolved to absent themselves from Mass, they had been in the habit of meeting in small bodies, generally in private houses, for the purposes of worship. To what extent a liturgy was adopted by these primitive Protestant congregations cannot be said with any certainty, but one point is perfectly clear, namely, that the English Prayer Book was used by many as a guide in their devotions. It is matter of history that the lords who signed the first Covenant in 1557 followed up that action by passing a resolution which was intended to compel the curate to lay aside his missal and to adopt the Book of Common Prayer in its stead. This was, of course, beyond the power of the lords to enforce, except, perhaps, in those districts where they had feudal jurisdiction; but all the same, there is not the slightest doubt that the Prayer Book of Edward VI. (as revised in 1552) was in actual use in the country before the definite triumph of the Reformation. In a letter from Cecil to Throkmorton, of date 9th July, 1559, we read, "The Protestants are at Edinburgh. They offer no violence, but dissolve religious houses, directing the lands thereof to the Crown, and to ministry in the Church. The parish churches they deliver of altars and images, *and have received the service of the Church of England according to King Edward's Book.*" A letter of the same period from Kirkcaldy of Grange to Sir Henry Percy tells us that "as to parish churches, they [the Protestants] cleanse them of images and all other monuments of idolatry, and command that no masses be said in them; in place thereof *the book set forth by godly King Edward is read in the same churches.*"¹ These extracts place the fact—once

¹ See Cunningham's *Church History of Scotland*, edition 1882, i., pp. 246, 265.

hotly debated—of the use of the English Liturgy by the early Scottish Reformers beyond all controversy.

It was not to be expected that Knox, who had stood out against the introduction of the English Prayer Book into the service at Frankfort, would look with favour upon its use by the Scottish people. In the letter of instruction written from Geneva to his Protestant countrymen we accordingly find him recommending an order such as was then observed among the Genevan brethren. This letter is so well expressed that we must find space for a rather lengthy quotation:—

“Your beginning,” says the Reformer, “should be by confessing of your offences, and invocation of the Spirit of the Lord Jesus to assist you in all your godly enterprises. And then let some place of Scripture be plainly and distinctly read, as much as shall be thought sufficient for a day or time. In reading the Scriptures, I would ye should join some books of the Old and some of the New Testament together, as one of Genesis and one of the Evangelists, Exodus with another, and so forth; ever ending such books as ye begin, as the time will suffer; for it shall greatly comfort you to hear that harmony and well-timed song of the Holy Spirit speaking in our fathers from the beginning. It shall confirm you in these dangerous and perilous days to behold the face of Christ Jesus, and His loving spouse and Church, from Abel to Himself, and from Himself to this day, in all ages to be one. Like as your assemblies ought to begin, with confession and invocation of God’s Holy Spirit, so would I that they never finished without thanksgiving, and common prayers for princes, rulers, and magistrates; for the liberty and free passage of Christ’s Gospel; for the comfort and deliverance of our afflicted brethren in all places now persecuted, but most cruelly within the realm of France and England; and for such other things as the Spirit of the Lord Jesus shall teach you to be profitable either to yourselves or yet to your brethren, wheresoever they are.”

This letter was written some time before Knox’s final return to his native country, and it is important to note that the Order of Geneva appears to have been used in some places before its formal sanction by the ecclesiastical authorities. The evidence of this we shall presently see.

It was in 1559 that Knox returned for the last time to Scotland. The Reformation had already made considerable

progress, and in 1560 Protestantism received its parliamentary establishment. In the same year the first General Assembly of the Church was held, and a Book of Policy was drawn up. The latter is known as *The First Book of Discipline*, and what we have here to note regarding it is that it recognizes the *Forme of Prayers* as "owre Book of Common Ordour" and "the Ordour of Geneva, which is now used in some of oure Kirks." Sometimes the work is referred to as the Psalm Book, but the psalms with the liturgy attached is always meant, not only at this period, but for long afterwards. Thus was sanctioned the first, and as yet the only, liturgy of the Church of Scotland; before pursuing its history further, let us see what was its nature and what were its contents.

First in importance is, of course, the form for the ordinary Church service. This, the rubric informs us, began with a prayer containing a confession of sin; then followed the reading of the Scriptures; "this done," the rubric continues, "the people sing a psalm all together in a plain tune; which ended, the minister prayeth for the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, as the same shall move his heart, and so proceedeth to the sermon." Following the sermon come a long "Prayer for the whole estate of Christ's Church;" then a psalm, after that the benediction, "and so the congregation departeth." The officiating minister had permission to deviate, if he so desired, from the forms of prayer prescribed:—

"It shall not be necessary," says the rubric, "for the minister daily to repeat all these things before mentioned, but, beginning with some manner of confession, to proceed to the sermon; which being ended, he either useth the prayer for all estates before mentioned, or else prayeth as the Spirit of God shall move his heart, framing the same according to the time and matter which he hath intreated of. And if there shall be at any time any present plague, famine, pestilence, war, or such like, which be evident tokens of God's wrath, as it is our part to acknowledge our sins to be the occasion thereof, so are we appointed by the Scriptures to give ourselves to mourning, fasting, and prayer, as the means to turn away God's heavy displeasure. Therefore it shall be convenient that the minister at such time do not only admonish the people thereof, but also use

some form of prayer according as the present necessity requireth ; to the which he may appoint, by a common consent, some several day after the sermon weekly to be observed."

In addition to the form for the usual Church service, as outlined above, the liturgy contained morning and evening prayers, an order of baptism, an order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, a form of marriage, a visitation of the sick ; and there were afterwards added to it a form for the election of superintendents and ministers, and an order for excommunication and public repentance.

The entire work was mainly the composition of Knox ; and as we would naturally expect from this, much of it is prolix and involved ; sentences occupying whole pages are by no means rare. Some of the prayers are no prayers at all, but mere sermonizings ; and there is throughout too much of the doctrinal element, too little of the devotional. With the possession of many noble qualities, there were some points in the Scottish Reformer's character wanting to a perfect adaptedness for the work of devotional writing. As Mr. Baird has said in his work on Liturgies, "The delicacy, the tenderness, that should deal with certain phases of religious experience, that should express certain emotions of the soul ; of these, though not destitute, neither was he remarkably possessed." When Dr. Cumming republished the *Book of Common Order* in 1840, he wrote (p. xxiii. of Preface), "I have no hesitation in observing that we have a liturgy little less beautiful and impressive than that of England." But this description, as the late Dr. Lee was careful to point out, is very nearly the reverse of the truth.¹ Of "beauty and impressiveness" the Scottish Liturgy is indeed almost totally devoid. As Dr. Lee has said, the prayers are destitute of nearly every one of the requisite qualities—"of pathos, tenderness, and unction ; of beauty and sublimity ; of the meekness, gentleness, mercifulness, and sweet charity which are the true characteristics and living power of Christ's religion." Nevertheless,

¹ The Crown Court divine, it may be noted, had a Psalm Book printed for the special use of the Scottish Church, in London, in which a portion of Knox's Liturgy appeared.

with all this it must be admitted that there is a good deal which, if regard be had to transparency of diction and beauty of piety, is wholly admirable. The special services are much superior to the forms for ordinary worship. The order of Baptism and the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper contain some fine passages, the latter service especially forming, by its conciseness and simplicity, a refreshing contrast to the "endless preachings and insufferable tediousness that have so long afflicted the Church in the dispensation of the Lord's Supper." Other portions there are which, for appropriateness, vigour, and solemnity could hardly be equalled. Taken as a whole, however, the book is cold, hard, and dry; and it would no more work itself into the hearts of the present than it did of a past generation. If the Church of Scotland is to have a liturgy at all, that of Knox can at the most be used only as a foundation.

A brief synopsis of Calvin's order of service for the Lord's Day may now be given in order to show in what respects the Scottish usage differed from that of Geneva. In Calvin's service the reading of a portion of the Scriptures, including the ten commandments, is made introductory to the prayers. When this reading, performed by a clerk, is finished, the minister enters the desk and begins with a sentence of invocation; then calling the people to accompany him in prayer, he proceeds to the confession of sin and supplication for grace. This ended, the congregation join together in the singing of a metrical psalm. Then the minister, having offered up a voluntary prayer invoking the Divine favour, begins the sermon. This exercise being a spiritual instruction, forms part of the service of Divine worship, and prepares the way for the intercessory prayer which follows it, and which is the longest of these forms; and the whole is terminated, unless the Communion be administered, with the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Benediction.¹ Whilst it was evidently his desire that those parts of the liturgy which were *prescribed* should not be deviated from, Calvin yet made

¹ See Baird's *Chapter on Liturgies*, pp. 22, 23.

special provision for extemporaneous prayer. The prayer before sermon was entirely voluntary ; and all other services besides that of the Lord's Day morning, whether on week-days or on the afternoons of the Sabbath, are unrestricted and free. At such times, the preacher is to use "such words in prayer as may seem to him good, suiting his prayer to the occasion, and the matter whereof he treats."¹

In its union of free prayer with the use of a liturgy, the *Book of Common Order* thus followed the Order of Geneva, and so far the practice of the Scottish Reformers may be said to have been commendable. Following Calvin in this particular, Knox, however, on several points departed from the model of the Genevan Reformer, and in doing so his action was less commendable. Christmas, Good-Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whit-Sunday—all feasts observed by the Calvinistic body—were taken no account of by the Scottish Protestants, who thus deprived themselves of one of the richest devotional resources of the Church. In this respect Knox undoubtedly erred ; but let us not forget to put on the other side the fact that in some particulars in which he followed the Genevan usage the Church of to-day has quite as culpably erred in not continuing to follow him. It was recommended, for example, that where practicable, and especially "in great towns, there be either sermon or common prayers with some exercise of reading of Scriptures every day."² On Sundays there was, besides the ordinary service, a catechetical exercise for the young in the afternoon ; and on some week day also was held a meeting for free and familiar exposition of the Scriptures, at which "every man had liberty

¹ Calvin's Liturgy was first published in 1543. In 1551 a Latin version reached England, and this version would appear to have been in the hands of those who, in 1552, revised the English Prayer Book. The latter has several forms borrowed from the Genevan Order ; and as Professor Story has observed in his Lee Lecture on "The Reformed Ritual in Scotland," it was no doubt this which made the book acceptable to the Scottish Protestants.

² When Mr. Robert Bruce was relegated to Inverness, A.D. 1605, he "remained there four years, teaching every Sabbath before noon, and every Wednesday, and exercised at the reading of the prayers every other night."—See Calderwood, p. 496.

to utter and declare his mind and knowledge to the comfort and consolation of the Kirk." Thus were the first Scottish Churches regarded—not simply as a place of meeting on Sundays, but as "a sanctuary and asylum always open to the solitary worshipper, who sought opportunity of quiet devotion." It is a positive delight to look back upon these early days of open Churches and frequent services of praise and prayer: would that the practice were still common in all the Churches!

As regards the other usages sanctioned, or rather implied, in the *Book of Common Order*, we can mention only those referring to postures at prayer and in singing. The posture of the people during prayer seems in the early days of all the Reformed Churches to have been that of kneeling. That it was so in the Scottish Churches cannot be said with absolute certainty, though the *Book of Common Order* apparently bears out the supposition. The congregation engaged in prayer are described as "We thy children and people *here prostrate* before Thee;" and as a preparation for kneeling, the people are called upon "not to stand up;" but "inasmuch as before our Lord Jesus Christ all knees are compelled to bow, let us humbly fall down before Him, and in this manner pray." The Rev. Neil Livingston, in his dissertation prefixed to the reprint of the Scottish Psalter, argues that standing at prayer must have been the usual posture, otherwise, of course, a change from sitting to standing must have taken place at some period, and, says Mr. Livingston, "it is scarcely credible that this could have happened without previous discussion and appointment by the General Assembly, or at least some historical notice of it." On the same grounds he concludes, contrary to the usually accepted belief, that sitting must have been the ordinary posture in praise. Great deference is due to these opinions; but we think Mr. Livingston reckons too much on the part which the General Assembly was likely to take in the matter under consideration. The Church of Scotland (leaving aside the implied usages of the *Book of Common Order*) has always treated the question of postures in public worship with indifference: so far as we are aware, such matters

were not made subjects of censure or remark till the year 1858, when a Committee of the Presbytery of Edinburgh reported that in the Greyfriars Church the "innovation" had been introduced of standing to sing and kneeling at prayer. Even then the General Assembly, when the subject came before it in 1859, neither pronounced nor indicated any opinion respecting the question of postures in public worship. On the whole, we think there is no reason to doubt that the early Scottish Church followed the practice of kneeling to pray and standing to sing; and that the subsequent reversal of this practice was in itself really an "innovation," introduced perhaps in the middle of the seventeenth century, in imitation of the forms or in compliance with the feelings of the English Puritans.¹

We may now glance briefly at the records of ecclesiastical action taken by the Church in regard to the *Book of Common Order* after its introduction in 1560. In 1562 it was again confirmed by the General Assembly "that an uniform order should be kept in the ministration of the sacraments, solemnization of marriage, &c., according to the Kirk of Geneva." In 1564 a further act was passed "ordaining that every minister, exhorter, and reader shall have one of the Psalm Books lately printed in Edinburgh, and use the order therein contained in prayers, marriages, and ministration of the sacraments in the *Book of Common Order*." Again, in the same year, it was provided "that ministers have Psalm Books, and use orders therein in prayers, marriage, and ministration of the sacraments." In 1567 the Church ordered the liturgy to be translated into Gaelic; and this was accordingly done, the translator being John Carswell, Bishop of the Isles.² In 1601

¹ See further as to these points Dr. Lee's *Reform of the Church of Scotland*, pp. 90-108.

² This is said to have been the first book ever printed in Gaelic. It was entitled, *Foirm na Nurrnuidheadh*, or Forms of Prayer. The bishop knew that the book would be treated with ridicule by the bards who still continued Papists, and who would regard printing as an innovation. "Well do I know," said he in his introduction, "that the Papists especially, and above all the old satirical priests, will vomit malice against me, and that my work will procure me from them only scandal and reproach" (see Cunningham's *Church History*, i. p. 287). A curious and interesting notice of this work will be found in Leyden's *Scottish*

another enactment was made in regard to the book. In that year a proposal was laid before the General Assembly that additional forms of prayer might be submitted for approval, and that some of those already existing should be altered; but the Assembly "concludit that it is not thocht good that the prayeris alreadie conteinit in the Psalme Booke be alterit"; and "gif ony brother would have ony uther prayeris eikit quhilkis are meet for the tyme, ordaynes the same first to be tryit and allowit be the Assembly."

With the hope of a general union of the British Churches in the Directory of the Westminster Divines, the Church of Scotland ultimately (in 1645) consented to lay aside her proper and peculiar order of worship. It is impossible to believe that the Church thus yielded without some reluctance. Indeed, we find that in the Act sanctioning the use of the Directory the appearance of repudiation of the older forms was guarded against by a distinct ratification of previous acts and regulations approving thereof. At any rate, the *Book of Common Order*, though not speedily disused, was undoubtedly virtually superseded by the Act of 1645, imposing the Directory. Had its forms been of such a nature as to have taken hold of the people's minds, or to have touched their hearts, the people would surely never have allowed it to perish, as they did, almost without a sigh. In England thousands were ready to peril everything rather than give up the Book of Common Prayer; but in favour of the Scottish Liturgy no one stands up to speak a word: "it is buried, as itself appointed the dead should be, without solemnity or ceremony." Its fate need not, however, concern us in these days. What is important—and what this paper has been written mainly to show—is, that the Church of Scotland, as well by law as by custom, had once its own liturgy, which continued to be the established and received order until the period of conformity with the standards of the Westminster Assembly.

J. CUTHBERT HADDEN.

Descriptive Poems. One copy only is known to exist of the original edition (said to be in possession of the Duke of Argyle), but an excellent reprint, edited by Dr. McLauchlan, was published in 1873.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Polemics. *A Gauntlet to the Theologian and Scientist* (1) is, to say the least, a bold title for such a little book. Dr. Clarke advocates the doctrine of Conditional Immortality. There is nothing new about the treatment of the subject, or the arguments adduced in favour of it. So far as the psychology affects the subject, Dr. Clarke differs little from the views set forth in Mr. Heard's *Tripartite Nature of Man*, though the Author seems to think that he has hit upon an absolutely new discovery.

In the next book, the *Fate of the Dead*, (2) Dr. Clarke starts with pretty much the same premises. This work, however, he tells us, is an attempt not only to solve the problems of *life* which are so interesting to everybody, and more especially to the medical man, but it is something more, "It is an attempt to show that Christ was what He proclaimed Himself to be; to supply an epitome of the New Testament doctrines; to simplify the reading of that book, to prove that its religion is a rational one, and to demonstrate that its theology—if rightly understood—runs as smoothly as if it were a treatise on some *exact science*." This is a grand idea, but it is one which can hardly be expected to be duly treated in 196 pages. Dr. Clarke shows a good deal of skill in argument, together with some strength of language. He has studied the New Testament, he says, for twenty-five years; but as he starts with a preconceived notion, he probably has missed something that we trust further reading, if undertaken without prepossession, will teach him.

Our interest as theologians in some of the *Problems of the Future* (3) which Mr. S. Laing proposes for solution is rather remote. From our point of view, it is of no great moment what the universe is made of, nor how the solar heat is maintained; we are quite contented with the theory of gravitation, and can await further investigations into its nature with sufficient equanimity. Mr. Laing tells us how greatly geologists and astronomers differ in their requirements and estimates of time, and he apparently throws in his lot with the geologists who pile æons on æons, and ages upon the top of them, and still cry out for time. The Glacial Period has but little theological significance, and we can wait to discuss that theory when the scientific men have come to a definite idea of what it is. Of Taxation and Finance, of Population and Food, Mr. Laing writes learnedly; but his discussions here, too, are only on the edge of our province. We take more interest in the Tertiary Man, though he is at best a very far off ancestor; and in the Missing Link, which is farther away still. The Creeds of Great Poets is an important consideration; for great poets,

we imagine, are poets that have, and ought to have, a great influence : that being so, their belief and their reasons are matters of moment. All these essays are interesting and clear in their statements, and may be useful to those for whom they are written, viz., "the semi-scientific who have some elementary ideas about science, and desire to know more." The parts of this work that are more within our special province are those concerning the Religion of the Future, Agnosticism and Christianity, the Historical Element of the Gospels, and Scepticism and Pessimism. And here, while we say again that Mr. Laing writes forcibly, he does not always state things fairly, and we cannot accept his conclusions. He treats the theory of evolution as a fact, and that, of course, tinges his arguments all through. Mr. Laing says agnosticism has no quarrel with that definition of Christianity which is founded on love and admiration for Christ, and which are translated into a desire to imitate Christ as far as possible, and to act upon His precepts. But with "the definition of Christianity, which is theological or dogmatic, which, commencing with St. Paul and St. John, and culminating in the Athanasian Creed, has been accepted from the early ages of Christianity, almost until the present day, as the miraculous revelation of the true theory of the universe; agnosticism has nothing in common;" and such agnosticism is the superior thing in Mr. Laing's opinion. Mr. Laing is not satisfied with Cardinal Newman's celebrated theory of the "illative sense"; creation, immortality, the nature of the soul, have no meaning for Mr. Laing, he cannot define them; and when he comes to the word "incomprehensible" in the Athanasian Creed, he appears not to know that it means "not included in space," but takes it to mean simply "what cannot be understood." St. Paul is quoted as saying that the judgments of God are unsearchable, and His ways inscrutable, and that is true; but will Mr. Laing claim St. Paul as an agnostic and set him beside Huxley and Spencer? However, he says, "that agnosticism is the best of all arguments against atheism and materialism, for if we cannot prove an affirmative, still less can we prove a negative." Mr. Laing notes that Darwin, Herbert Spencer, Huxley, Carlyle, and Mill have drifted away from Christianity; so, says he, so much the worse for Christianity. He forgets, however, the many eminent men of science who still are sincere believers. Mr. Laing is not better satisfied with Positivism, which has been said to be Catholicism without Christianity; and altogether he thinks it best to be a Zoroastrian. He has no fear for morals, however; for morality, he opines, will take care of itself, and a system which can produce a Darwin is good enough for anything. Mr. Laing approves of the addresses of the Bishops in Manchester Cathedral, at the meeting of the British Association, in 1887; and though not quite so well satisfied with the Bishop of London's Bampton Lectures, he claims him as a learned man advancing towards the high agnostic position. Mr. Laing would not upset everything,

for if he did, "what would become of the priests who are very good as workers in the matters of charity and mercy, though of narrow opinions, and bigoted very often." The female portion of the community, too, would be at sad loss without churches and ceremonies and clergy; these are a relief from the monotony of life, these give the ladies topics of interest to talk about, and they promote a feeling of decency and respectability. Mr. Laing is very kind, but we claim for religion a better foundation and a greater security of tenure than that, and certainly than anything he would substitute for it. We agree that the duty of the nineteenth-century man is to follow truth at all hazards; and let us hope he will meet with something better and more substantial than the Polarity which Mr. Laing lauds so highly. As regards the historical element in the Gospels, Mr. Laing does not seem to have gone very much further than Strauss would lead him; the later criticism he does not appear to have grasped. Miracles, of course, he discards; the resurrection and ascension he tries to argue away; and he is not satisfied with the description of faith given in the Epistle to the Hebrews. He assents to the authenticity of the sayings and parables of Christ culled from St. Mark's Gospel, which he considers to be the foundation of the Evangelists' stories; but he says that he can find no solid historical ground until Paul "met the Pillars of the Church at Jerusalem, except the general fact that the Apostles returned there from Galilee, preached publicly, made numerous converts, and that Peter probably played a leading part." The chapter on Scepticism and Pessimism is a political essay mostly; it is against pessimism, and maintains that the world is wiser, kinder, and better than it was; that ecclesiastical religion is less of a motive power than it used to be; that religious persecutions and religious wars are bygone experiences; and generally the truth is, that morals are built on a far surer foundation than that of creeds which are here to day and gone to-morrow. Morals, he maintains, are built upon the solid rock of experience and of the "survival of the fittest," which, in the long evolution of the human race from primeval savages, have by "natural selection" and "heredity" become almost instinctive. Mr. Laing is as radical in politics as he is in matters religious; and so we are not surprised to find Mr. Parnell designated the Bismarck of Ireland, and Lord Beaconsfield a "sort of glorified Gil Blas." Mr. Laing's book is well written, and contains a good deal worth thinking about; but we must withhold our commendation: the perusal leaves an unpleasant sort of odour behind, and does not increase our respect for anything or anybody.

(1) *A Gauntlet to the Theologian and Scientist.* By T. Clarke, M.D. London: Frederic Norgate. 1888.

(2) *The Fate of the Dead.* By T. Clarke, M.D. London: Frederic Norgate. 1889. Price 1s.

(3) *Problems of the Future.* By S. Laing. Third thousand. London: Chapman & Hall. 1889.

Pen and Pencil Sketches (1) is an autobiography of the late **Miscellaneous.** Vicar of Wooburn, who was for several years in the Army, and then took holy orders, and spent most of his time at his benefice in Buckinghamshire. It is a very interesting account of how an Evangelical clergyman conducted his affairs in the beginning of the Oxford Movement, and shows that, while he was in no wise behind-hand as regards Church restoration, reverence and care in the Church services, or energy in parochial matters, he retained the old Evangelical mode of thought, and the black gown in the pulpit. He seems to have had the entire respect of his Diocesan, the famous Dr. Wilberforce, and the respect of his neighbours, as well as the affectionate regard of his parishioners. The work is worthy of being widely read, and any clergyman may peruse it with profit. It is illustrated with many drawings by the author's own hand, which are effective, if not entirely artistic.

Self-Discipline (2) is a memoir of Mr. Percy Clabon Glover, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford, written by his father, and dedicated to his mother. He was a very good and promising young man, whose life was ever a suffering one, and whose early death cut short a brilliant career. The memoir is written in a very loving and indulgent style, and makes fairly good reading. There is an introduction, in which the author gives his opinion on the value of biography, and amongst other remarks makes this: "That every unwritten biography is published in heaven, and by it even its principalities and powers may be taught and learned; and the library of heaven, that will instruct eternity, will doubtless consist of such works." Mr. Percy Clabon Glover apparently wrote a good hand, but we should say that only such a father would be able to find in it proofs of "order, care, pains, perseverance, lucidity, beauty, regularity, punctuality, conscientiousness, even in little things." Mr. P. C. Glover is also said to have had a wonderful sentiment for the beautiful both in nature and art, and this is the extract from his diary which is given as a proof of it: "On Magdalen Bridge, about nine. Magdalen Tower, moon and one star. Soft, clear light. St. Mary's spire, Queen's, All Soul's, Univ., and Carfax. Enjoyed it all deeply. Sad that this should be my last summer term." Reading this, we fancy Mr. Glover must indeed have had an uncommon eye; for how it is possible to stand on Magdalen Bridge and see Carfax Church is beyond us. The memoir will doubtless be interesting to those immediately concerned, and it may be useful to a wider circle of readers.

A story by A.L.O.E. is sure to be interesting and of the highest tone, and *The Hartley Brothers* (3) is no exception; but the plot, what there is, is extremely unlikely. There is little doubt, how-

ever, that young people will find both amusement and profit in reading it. It is preceded by what A.L.O.E. calls a New Year's Gift, an adieu to the old year and a welcome for its successor, in a little poem written for little people to recite, and so to wile away a wet day or a dark evening.

The Cross and Crown Cards (4). No. 1 has been designed with a view to aid the study of a deeply interesting passage in our Lord's earthly history, viz., that in which He appeared before the Jewish and Roman tribunals. By none of the four Evangelists who report this is a complete account furnished of the incidents that occurred between Christ's apprehension in the Garden on Thursday evening of the Passover week and His surrender by Pilate in the early hours of Friday morning to be crucified. Yet by a careful comparison of the existing records it is possible to arrive at a tolerably accurate idea of the course which events took on that memorable night. Such a comparison has been made by Mr. Neil, and its results tabulated in a series of well-arranged and clearly-expressed statements, with the corresponding passages from the different Gospels exhibited in parallel columns. The whole is presented on a single page, and may thus, as it were, be surveyed at a glance. It may rightly be characterised as a bird's-eye view of the trial of Jesus—first of the occurrences that took place before the Ecclesiastical Court or the Sanhedrim, and next of those that transpired in the civil court, when Christ stood before the Roman Governor. The amount of information, and even of valuable exposition, which the author has contrived to compress into one page, not unduly large, is surprising, and hardly less so is the light which his sententious and often happily-phrased headings shed upon the scenes which the narratives describe. In both respects the Card is a veritable *multum in parvo*. To a student anxious to master for himself this portion of the story of Jesus, to a preacher desirous of effectively presenting its thrilling scenes to his hearers, to a teacher aiming at both securing the attention and enlisting the interest of his scholars in this Divine tragedy, *The Cross and Crown Cards* cannot fail to be of service.

(1) *Pen and Pencil Sketches*. By Nemo. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 16s.

(2) *Self-Discipline*. A Memoir of Percy Clabon Glover, M.A. By his Father, the Rev. Richard Glover, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 4s. 6d.

(3) *The Hartley Brothers*. By A.L.O.E. London and Edinburgh Gall & Inglis.

(4) *The Cross and Crown Cards*. By Rev. C. Neil, M.A., Incumbent of St. Matthias, Poplar. London: James Nisbet & Co. Price 6d. (cards), and 3d. (paper edition).