

NOVEMBER 1890

The
Theological Monthly

THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN
RELIGION.¹

THE excitement caused by the publication of Dr. Martineau's latest book has subsided to a greater or less extent. It seems to have startled the reading world, chiefly on account of the source whence it proceeded. We have so grown to regard Dr. Martineau as a defender of the essentials of the faith that we had almost forgotten that his Christianity was not that which generally is understood by the word. Nevertheless, he has never made the slightest attempt to conceal this fact. The noblest of his works, *The Study of Religion*, contains expressions, passages, lines of argument that could not have been adopted by a believer in the Godhead of Jesus Christ or the true and proper inspiration of the Scriptures. The present volume seems to be intended as a justification of its author's position as a Theistic apologist and a disbeliever in Christianity as dependent upon the real Divinity of its Founder and in the Bible as the Rule of Faith. However sorely we may regret the publication of this book, we can bring no charge of inconsistency or of ambuscade against its writer.

Both friends and foes have pronounced this book one of the most powerful and dangerous assaults that have been levelled against Christianity in modern times. There is truth in the appraisal, even if we do not rate the intrinsic force of the blow as highly as some have done. The lucidity and

¹ *The Seat of Authority in Religion.* By James Martineau. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1890.

gracefulness of Dr. Martineau's style lend a charm to his polemic. His reputation as a supporter of religion will attract many who would be repelled by the efforts of a pronounced sceptic or rationalist. His earnest faith in the things not seen and eternal throws a halo around his most destructive criticism, and often conceals its real drift and damage. And he excels in the art of putting things. Coarseness and violence are altogether absent. On the other hand, it has been pointed out that for his repudiation of Holy Writ Dr. Martineau adduces no new argument or evidence whatever. He urges nothing that has not been replied to over and over again. Even of the more importance is it that, specially with regard to the New Testament, the ground upon which he entrenches himself has been abandoned as untenable by the most scholarly and trusted authorities of the school to which Dr. Martineau belongs. Moreover, he does not appear to have acquainted himself with the most recent literature of his subject.

All this is correct enough, and it is absolutely necessary that it should be rendered manifest. When once this is seen clearly, the antidote to half the mischief is provided. My present purpose, however, is to leave details unnoticed as far as possible, and to estimate the worth and result of the argument as a whole. If we follow Dr. Martineau's guidance, at what goal shall we arrive? What remains to us when that is surrendered which he bids us let go?

The argument of the volume may be stated as follows: Book I. is entitled "Authority Implied in Religion." The reasoning is substantially that of "Types of Ethical Theory," though the links in the chain are somewhat different. Candid, intelligent, docile study of nature leads to the intellectual apprehension of God. But God is "in humanity" as well as "in nature." If a man will but interrogate his own being, he must be convinced of the existence and the action of God. "The moral intention exists, and the atheistic universe vanishes before its face. We know ourselves to be living under command, and with freedom to give or withhold obedience; and this lifts us at once into Divine relations, and connects us with One supreme in the distinguishing glories of

personal existence, wisdom, justice, holiness. We have only to open and read the credentials of conscience, and this discovery bursts upon us at once. That sense of authority which pervades our moral nature, and tempers it with a silent reverence, places us under that which is *higher than we*, which has claims on our personality, and hovers over it, and keeps near its problems with transcendent presence" (pp. 70, 71). From this man is able to rise to "the living contact of spirit with spirit—the communion of affections between God and man." When "cold obedience" is "exchanged for the *allegiance of personal affection*," "the veil falls from the shadowed face of moral authority, and the directing love of the all-holy God shines forth" (p. 75). God has also revealed Himself "in history," *i.e.*, by the education and gradual uplifting of the human race. This revelation has been vouchsafed through three main channels,—the Greek, the Jewish, and the German. Greece has given us the sense of Divinity in *space*, God immanent in the universe; Palestine, the sense of Divinity in *time*, God shaping the course of history, and providentially governing human affairs; Germany, the sense of the spiritual and individual character of religion, God immanent in the human soul and realizable by personal communion. The concluding sentences of Book I. read, "Not indeed that any of the tributary fountains of civilization can come down to us untainted—the limpid vehicles of perfect truth—all bring with them elements both pure and impure; and it must still be the problem of our wisdom to precipitate the latter, and lead the former to nourish the roots of whatever is fair and fruit-bearing. It yet remains, therefore, for us to consider how to fling down the evil, and reserve the good, and recognize whatever has Divine claims upon us in our historical inheritance of religion" (pp. 124, 125).

To the negative process Dr. Martineau now addresses himself. Book II. is headed "Authority Artificially Misplaced." The first example is "The Catholic and the Church." With the Romanist interpretation of the term it is not difficult to show that infallible authority does not reside in the Church. Thence Dr. Martineau proceeds to "The Protestants and the

Scriptures." He argues that the historical books of the New Testament are untrustworthy, looks with extreme suspicion upon even the generally accepted Epistles of St. Paul, and rejects the rest of the Epistles as indisputably spurious. The Apocalypse he considers to be a hectic production of a late date, and worth little or nothing. His strength is spent upon the Gospels and the Acts. He reasons that we have no personal guarantee for the truthfulness of their witness, that the names attached to the Gospels were after-thoughts, that the books were written so long after the events purported to be recorded that inevitably they contain a large proportion of myth and theological speculation. If these accusations can be substantiated, plainly the seat of authority in religion is not to be found in the Scriptures. Thus the Protestant position is declared to be as illogical and untenable as the Roman Catholic. According to Dr. Martineau, the inconsistencies and self-contradictions of the New Testament, and the non-fulfilment of its prophecies, alone suffice to condemn it as the Rule of Faith.

Book III. "Divine Authority Intermixed with Human Things," begins, "If neither the hierarchy nor the canon can make good a claim to dictatorial authority, it by no means follows that the sacred function ascribed to them is gone, and that nothing Divine is committed to their keeping. It may well be true that, for the religious guidance of men, there is a real order of dependence of the multitude upon the few, and of ordinary ages upon special crises and transmitted products of fresh spiritual insight, though the relation has degenerated into servility" (p. 287). The Divine and the human continually blend "like the melody and harmony of the same piece." Possibly the human may be severed from the Divine. Two sets of tests can be applied. First, "the tests by which we distinguish the fictitious from the real, the wrong from the right, the unlovely from the beautiful, the profane from the sacred, are to be found within, and not without, in the methods of just thought, the instincts of pure conscience, and the aspirations of unclouded reason." Second, "in the sphere of ends which, absent from human intention,

yet obviously lie within the embrace of an intellectual system of the world, we have a further test, no longer intuitive, but susceptible of outward application, for discriminating the Divine and human agencies in history" (pp. 297-99). Our principal test, however, is the intuitive.

Here the argument pauses to point out what is conceived to be the essential distinction between "natural" and "revealed" religion. The latter is discovered by personal intuition, and is therefore exclusively individual. It cannot, from the very reason of the thing, be formulated in words or confirmed by miracles. If it were communicated or authenticated by words or signs, it would avail itself of physical material, and, *ipso facto*, become "natural." This plea indicates unmistakably the meaning ascribed to "natural" religion. It is that which comes to us through nature, either as a direct method of communication—a revelation so given being, *ex hypothesi*, unverifiable, if not impossible—or as the phenomena upon which man exercises his powers of reasoning. A corollary to this theorem is that "revealed" religion precedes "natural," and furnishes it with all its force and value. The customary method both of stating the case and of investigating the facts is thus inverted. The justification of this change of front is that the very ideas of *will* and *cause*, without which natural religion has no basis, are intuitive, and therefore revealed.

The purpose of this rather peculiar usage appears at the very opening of Book IV., "Severance of Undivine Elements from Christendom." A distinction is drawn between "revealed religion" and "apocalyptic religion." The latter is Dr. Martineau's synonym for what most people call revealed religion. "Apocalyptic religion"—supposing it to have any real existence—is pronounced essentially untrustworthy because of the distorting effects of the human media through which it passes. It may contain valuable grains of truth, but they need to be detected and to be lifted from the mass of error and falsehood in which they lie embedded. The process of severing the "undivine elements" from the Christ of history looks, to a Christian, as though the *Divine* elements were being swept

away. Every claim to the Divine Sonship, every statement of special and direct revelation of God's will, every vestige of an atonement for the sin of the world, every exceeding great and precious promise, every miraculous work—above all, the Resurrection—are denied to Him. We may not come to God through Him. He is not the Mediator between God and man. He is not even a Perfect Pattern for us, as He fell into serious mistakes, encouraged hopes which He knew to be baseless, and was even guilty of personal fault. This, at least, is the contention. When the task of severance is complete, little more remains than a name, an influence, and some traditions which it is scarcely safe to rely on.

The title of the last Book, "The Divine in the Human," and the sub-titles of its two chapters, "The Veil Taken Away" and "The Religion Personally Realized," lead us to anticipate that the labour of destruction is ended, and a constructive process will commence at once. But we are doomed to disappointment. Some attempt is made to picture Jesus of Nazareth, but the effort consists rather in blotting out loved lineaments than in portraying a character. On the last leaf but one we read :—

"Christianity, as defined or understood in all the Churches which formulate it, has been mainly evolved from what is transient and perishable in its sources : from what is unhistorical in its traditions, mythological in its preconceptions, and misapprehended in the oracles of its prophets. From the fable of Eden to the imagination of the last trumpet, the whole story of the Divine order of the world is dislocated and deformed. The blight of birth—sin with its involuntary perdition ; the scheme of expiatory redemption with its vicarious salvation ; the incarnation, with its low postulates of the relation between God and man, and its unworkable doctrine of two natures in one person ; the official transmission of grace through material elements in the keeping of a consecrated corporation ; the second coming of Christ to summon the dead and part the sheep from the goats at the general judgment ;—all are the growth of a mythical literature, or Messianic dreams, or Pharisaic theology, or sacramental superstition, or popular apotheosis. And so nearly do these vain imaginations preoccupy the needs, that not a moral or spiritual element finds entrance there except 'the forgiveness of sins.'"

True, the concluding sentence of the book reads, "If Jesus of Nazareth, in virtue of the characteristics of his spirit, holds

the place of Prince of Saints, and perfects the condition of the pure religious life, he thereby reveals the highest possibilities of the human soul, and their dependency upon habitual communion between man and God." Previously, however, all but the most vague and indefinite "characteristics" have been blotted out.

On the several portions of the argument a very few observations must be advanced here. With the general tendency of Book I. we can have no manner of quarrel. Yet, despite its nervous and cultured English, its fervent but controlled eloquence, its forcible reasoning, it produces an unsatisfactory impression. The reader feels that the writer is on his guard against admissions which may be used against him at some subsequent stage of the argument. For example, we miss any phrase equivalent to "the unconditional mandate of the Right."¹ Conscience, again, is no longer a witness for the existence and authority of Right, however erroneous its information as to the demands and nature of that Right. It is a merely "selective" faculty, declaring "*This is worthier than that.*" But the real defect is the *petitio principii*, the patent but unasserted assumption that, as God reveals Himself in ordinary history, and as every revelation once given must, *ipso facto*, become a matter of history, no professed special or immediate revelation can possess higher authority than the general history of which it is an event. Dr. Martineau lays his foundation with care and skill, contemplates its strength, width, and beauty, and then pronounces it a platform on which a man can stand and look upwards, but God Himself can raise no superstructure upon it.

No objection can be taken to the treatment of the positions of Roman Catholicism with regard to the authority of the Church. Nevertheless, one is a little surprised that Dr. Salmon's recent work on *Infallibility* is passed over in total silence. As to the Protestants and the Scriptures, it would not be difficult to show that Dr. Martineau fundamentally misconceives the Protestant principle. For instance, our belief of the historic truth of the Gospels does not depend

¹ *Study of Religion*, vol. ii. p. 309.

(J. Mark)

upon the names of the men to whom they are attributed. If it could be proved that St. Matthew did not write the Second Gospel, we should still hold it to be inspired. But—not to lay stress upon the fact which I have adverted to already, that this new investigation does not produce a solitary fresh proof or plea—an almost fatal defect justifies a very light estimate of its real worth. The criticism is exclusively negative. Not the slightest notice is vouchsafed to the evidence in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of the historic portions of the New Testament and the Pauline letters. The difficulties connected with the rise and progress of Christianity, if our Lord did not rise from the dead, are not even heard of. The Fourth Gospel is pronounced a pure fabrication—a Life of Christ written with a deliberate theological motive, the author imputing to Jesus words and deeds which he never so much as imagined that it was possible that He spake and did. But the insoluble moral problem, how such a forger could utter holier and nobler sentiments than, *ex hypothesi*, the real Jesus ever gave expression to, is left unstated and unattacked. The means by which the Church was induced to receive so palpable a manufacture as genuine memoir from the pen of St. John are indicated nowhere. Omissions, of which these are merely samples, render the reasoning obviously incomplete.

There is much to be said on behalf the reversal of the usual order of "natural" and "revealed" religion, provided that we do not thereby assume that religion cannot be *revealed* by any other mode than intuition. Yet, after all, "natural" may just as well be understood to denote that religion which is *natural* to man apart from verbal communications from God as that which is taught through the study of the material universe. In that case "natural" religion includes the elements which Dr. Martineau denominates "revealed." Be this as it may, the ingenious device by which all other *revealed* religion is stigmatized as "apocalyptic" and discredited *in limine* is cleverly misleading. It goes far towards assuming the entire matter in dispute, which is whether God *can* give a direct revelation of Himself through man to man, or whether the

human medium necessarily vitiates the revelation. The argument amounts to no more than Hume's familiar fallacy that no evidence can be producible sufficient to authenticate a miracle ; whilst the new putting of it exposes itself to this further disadvantage, that it is associated with the distinct declaration that God can and does reveal Himself to His creatures by the very constitution of their natures. The supernatural is first postulated as penetrating through nature to the inmost spirit of man, and then bidden to confine Himself to the one avenue of access.

Anything better adapted to their purpose than the tests by which we must separate between the false and the true, the human and the Divine, in that which claims to be a revelation from God, *i.e.*, in the Christian Scriptures, can scarcely be devised. The decision rests with the individual sense of worth and fitness, due regard being paid to intrinsic quality and to manifest tendency. We may pick and choose, select and reject, very much at our own sweet will. The door is thrown wide open to the application of the most arbitrary causes, since every man becomes a law unto himself. Every scintilla of certainty incontinently disappears. Nor are we reassured as we watch the process at work. In Dr. Martineau's hands, "the methods of just thought, the instincts of pure conscience, and the aspirations of unclouded reason," refuse those very records which commend themselves the most strongly to other men of intelligence, refinement, and religious sensitiveness. Whether voices are weighed, or counted, or both, the majority inclines heavily towards the retention of that which Dr. Martineau casts away with confident emphasis.

The saddest chapters of all are those with which the volume concludes. Not merely, as I have intimated before, do they continue the destructive process, but virtually they surrender the task which their author has set himself as impossible of accomplishment. They leave us with "Jesus of Nazareth . . . the Prince of Saints." But what are we allowed to know of Him? The Gospel according to St. John perishes utterly. The Synoptic Gospels contain no

word or deed which certainly we can ascribe to Him. The witness of St. Paul is ruled out. Jesus of Nazareth lived, and died a violent death. He exercised enormous personal influence upon His disciples, and produced on them the impression of unexampled goodness and gentleness. Some floating traditions concerning Him have come down to us. At a longer or shorter period after His death, His adherents found themselves unable to account for His works and words, or to persuade the world that it ought to submit to their representation of His teachings, except by announcing that He was God Incarnate. This is nearly or quite all we may assert safely about Him. Whatever authority therefore He might possess becomes useless because of our ignorance.

But, in truth, no authority is permitted to belong to Him. He may occupy a unique position as a Leader and Helper of men, as Pattern and Encouragement, but He can be no more than this to us. Any higher claim put forth for Him or by Him must be disallowed peremptorily.¹ Thus far the search for the seat of authority in religion ends in a perfect blank.

This, then, is the goal of our prolonged journey. We may argue from nature to God. We may believe that our personality involves His, and accept conscience as vindicating the obligatory power of right. We may trace

¹ Dr. Martineau can never be consciously unfair. But in conducting an argument, you may not begin by *dismissing* your opponent's contention. Dr. Martineau must admit that if Jesus Christ were truly God Incarnate, the sentiments which he condemns as spoken by Jesus or His disciples would be perfectly legitimate and natural. But half his reasons for rejecting the Gospels are drawn from these self-same sayings, which are *assumed* to be incorrect. Again, endeavouring to show that claims to "revelations" are necessarily untrustworthy, and are only unconscious figures of speech, he tells a remarkable story of a "Wesleyan elder" and "a stonebreaker," both simple-hearted and illiterate men, in which the latter claimed to have received a distinct Divine message from the Lord for a woman in spiritual trouble. Dr. Martineau argues that the stonebreaker mistook the workings of his own mind for a revelation from God, and that St. Paul must have fallen into a like error. That the retailer has not inquired very carefully into the story his phraseology proves, as it is utterly inconsistent with that of the religious body to which he ascribes it. But does Dr. Martineau soberly mean to insinuate that St. Paul stood on no higher intellectual level than that of the two uneducated labourers to whom he refers? The comparison cannot be sustained for an instant.

God's hand in history. For other revelations men have sought vainly hitherto; and reason would that we should abandon a quest that inevitably will terminate in disappointment, if not in despair. This is the plain outcome of the investigation. Dr. Martineau hopes by this route to lead men of education, knowledge, and thought, to cordial reconciliation with religion. But another aspect of the question forces itself upon us. If the case presented in this volume were proved, the result might be altogether different from the anticipation. We should have to ask whether the god of this representation could be *our* God. Could men believe in His righteousness and beneficence? Could they learn to return love for love? To say that we should begin to doubt God's love to us is immeasurably to understate the fact. We should never have begun to credit it. A God at so vast a distance from us, who did not care enough for His creatures to speak to them, who left us in dim uncertainty as to His very being, could hardly receive personal homage and devotion. We should feel that we had not been justly dealt with, that the inherent rights of moral and intellectual beings had been disregarded, that, in fine, we had not "a faithful Creator." From the intolerable positions Dr. Martineau would have us to take up, most minds would seek refuge in scepticism or agnosticism. At any rate, the contrast between the god which this volume commends to us and the God who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, the God whose Holy Spirit witnesses with our spirits that we are sons of God; between the coldly silent deity and the Father who has words of love and warning and command for His children, there is a contrast that exceeds our thought. If the emotions and the sense of need have ought to do with the choice of a Supreme Object of worship, assuredly they will affirm of Him whom the Christian Scriptures declare, "THIS is *our* God: we have waited for Him: we will rejoice and be glad in *His* salvation."

In proof of the existence of a personal God, and of the reality of *His* self-revelation to men, Dr. Martineau repeatedly adduces the saintly aspirations and character of eminent

individuals, *e.g.*, Bernard of Clairvaux. All his examples are drawn from Christianity. Would these men exchange the God of the Bible for the god of this volume? Was not their devotion inspired by love to a living God? Take from them the Word made Flesh, Christ and Him crucified, Christ the Atonement for sin, and the flames of their devotion would quickly expire. The testimony of the first preachers of the Gospel has been upheld consistently by all who attained to height of holiness and self-sacrifice:—"The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that One died for all, therefore all died; and He died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who for their sakes died and ROSE AGAIN."

It is not easy to ascribe too great weight to the patent facts that the religious progress of the world has been due mainly to that Christianity which we are urged to leave behind as an illusion and a relic of a past which we have outgrown, and that the God who has called forth the highest love and lowliest adoration of the noblest and most fervent human spirits is not the cold deity who will not break the eternal silence with a word, but the God who was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; who, having of old time, spoken unto the fathers in the prophets, by divers portions and in divers manners, hath in the end of these days spoken unto us in His SON. The devotion upon which Dr. Martineau expatiates so eloquently and feelingly has ever been kindled at and sustained by the fire he bids us put out.

From another point of view these chapters are almost equally saddening. At the close of a lengthy and elaborate investigation into the seat of authority in religion, we find two chapters, headed "The Veil Uplifted," "The Religion Personally Realized." Hence we expected to hear of man in actual contact with God, of the power and comfort derived from religion, of answered prayer, of an assurance based on personal experience. We hoped to reach the fundamental certainty which the Christian carries in his own secret soul. Surely the titles justify such an expectation. If the forecasts had proved correct, the volume would have conducted us to conclusions not readily distinguishable from the doctrine that traces assured conviction respecting the things unseen and eternal to individual experience of God. The real result, however, is blankness and gloom.

J. ROBINSON GREGORY.

THE STATE OF CATHOLICISM IN SWITZERLAND (1889).

THE census for the decade between 1878 and 1888, taken December 1st of the last-mentioned year, furnishes us with the following relative statistics of Switzerland:—Total population, 2,920,723. Protestants, 1,724,957; Catholics, 1,190,000. Of the inhabitants of eleven out of the twenty-five states the great majority are Catholics, and in some of these the Protestants are in such minority as scarcely to count at all. Especially is this the case in the Canton Valais, of which the last census gives us a population of 865 Protestants against 101,013 Catholics; Appenzell Rhodes Intérieures, which counts 697 against 12,206 Catholics; Unterwald, 457 against 27,097; Schwytz, 109 against 42,289; Uri, 378 against 16,892; Zug, 1,394 against 21,696. On the other hand, the only two cantons in which the Protestant population greatly preponderates over the Catholic are Appenzell Rhodes Extérieures (4,502 Catholics against 49,555 Protestants) and Schaffhausen (4,813 Catholics and 32,890 Protestants).

The cantons where the two confessions are most mingled are Basle (city), 50,305 Protestants against 22,426 Catholics; Berne, 468,097 Protestants against 68,226 Catholics; Aargau, 106,408 Protestants against 85,962 Catholics; Thurgau, 74,282 Protestants against 85,962 Catholics; Geneva, even, of which my English readers will no doubt learn with surprise that the majority of the population is Catholic (52,817 Catholics against 51,669 Protestants). According to that law of solidarity which is one of the most mysterious laws in human life, the respective centres of the two communions created at the epoch of the Reformation have remained the

same up to the present day. There are in history doors which open and shut again to open no more, excepting to isolated individuals.

We hear in Switzerland from time to time of individual conversions from the Church of Rome to Protestantism, and lately we have heard of some, which made much sensation at Geneva and Zurich, from Protestantism to Catholicism ; but the epoch of great exoduses is past, and whenever the proportion of the two communions does vary, it is simply the result of immigration.

Thus it is that the canton of Neuchâtel possesses two Catholic localities entirely isolated in the midst of a Protestant population. Tradition, which is after all but one form of history, relates how, at the period of the Reformation, the inhabitants were, like those of other places, in the habit of consulting what they termed "the mere fact," or as we should say, "popular suffrage." The votes at the public assembly which was convened being nearly evenly balanced, it was agreed upon that the casting vote should be given by the shepherd of the commune, who was accordingly requested to decide the knotty point, and whose suffrage consequently determined the religious fate of the village.

All that God does is good, and His ways, as seen in history often incomprehensible, will ultimately be understood to be just and beneficial. And we are obliged to confess that, in a political point of view, at least, the presence of Catholicism is to Switzerland a safeguard and a benefit, and an element of stability against the inroads of radicalism ; while, in a religious point of view even, it has proved a weapon of defence against atheism and materialism.

One ought not to judge Swiss Catholicism, more especially that of the central cantons, by what is seen in Italy, in Belgium, and even in France. More than once has that minority, in the opposition to the attempts of the Cantonal, indeed, of the *Federal* Government, represented the cause of liberty of conscience. In more than one department, too, of social life has the Catholic minority set the rest of the nation an example worthy of being followed. We may mention that

all the Catholic cantons occupy the last ranks in the statistics of divorce.

Since the institution of the *referendum* in Federal matters, allowing an appeal to the popular tide from every law passed in either of the two Chambers, the compact mass of our 70,000 Catholic electors has more than once helped to cause the repeal of measures inspired by the despotic radicalism, and have in that way rendered signal service to the cause of right. It was thus that in the year 1882, the radical party, then all powerful in the councils of the Confederation, absolutely laid a plot against the nation by causing both Chambers to pass a vote authorizing a project for giving the Confederation absolute and unconstitutional control over instruction both public and private, especially over the religious education of the young. The gravest political and religious interests were thus engaged in this campaign, which was at one and the same time directed against liberty of conscience and cantonal autonomy ; but, thanks to the concurrence of Catholic electors, the mischievous project was thrown out by the enormous majority of 140,000 votes.

The "Cultur Kampf" had its day in its turn in Switzerland as in Germany, in consequence of the proclamation of Papal infallibility by the Vatican Council. Here, as there, after having awakened the most brilliant hopes in the leading political men, it miscarried miserably, and the Old Catholicism which in Switzerland, as elsewhere, appeared to have, and indeed had, on its part, good sense, right feeling, learning, and conscientiousness, sometimes, indeed, eloquence, perished after a few years' time, crushed under the protection of the Governments.

Especially have the cantons of Geneva and Berne distinguished themselves in this duel to the death waged with a portion of their subjects, there being, however, this difference : that whereas the proceedings of the Bernese Government in the Catholic Jura were only brutal and revolting, that of the late M. Carteret understood here and there to temper what he called the "stray method" with something burlesque, thus throwing a certain element of gaiety into the drama.

The first cause of the conflict at Geneva was the bestowal in 1874 by the Roman Curia of the title of Vicar-Apostolic on M. Mermillod, *curé* of Geneva, and during a space of some years Bishop of Hebron, *in partibus*. The favours bestowed on this ecclesiastic were contrary to engagements into which the Pope had entered, never to designate any of the Geneva clergy, and to consider this canton as an appendage of the diocese of Fribourg. The Genevese Government, and the Federal Council itself, in place of ignoring the title, which, being a usurped one, had no legal value, committed the error of having recourse to coercive measures. Monsignor Mermillod, though a Swiss citizen, was expelled from the territory by a decree of the Federal Council, which thus gave him the opportunity of turning round in a majestic manner, while passing the frontier, and of blessing, with his episcopal hands, the country which had rejected him from her bosom.

This unconstitutional measure, which, it must be confessed, met with almost unanimous approbation from the Swiss press, was the signal for persecution being directed against that portion of the Roman Catholic body which was deprived by the Government of its places of worship, its priests being meanwhile rejected for the benefit of the Old Catholics. In the commune of Compezière the sight was even seen of an infant being taken by force with an escort of soldiers and locksmiths to an Old-Catholic baptism, which the *curé* and the local authorities were endeavouring to prevent by closing the doors of the church. Neither did the Genevese Government render itself less ridiculous by prohibiting the ecclesiastical habit, while, at the same time, they neglected to specify the length of the bands, the ribbons, and the buckles which were henceforth to fall under the blows of the law.

A further experience came very shortly after to confirm once more this truth, that a Government, even that of Geneva, could hardly be either a good father of the Church or a good theologian. One could decree the dismissal of Roman Catholic parish priests, installing Old Catholics in their stead; one could even, in order to elevate the governmental institution, call Père Hyacinthe to perform service in the new

church; one could not communicate to it life. The old Catholic places of worship continued to be forsaken; many of its official ministers returned on the first opportunity (and some with noise) to the pale of the Church they had forsaken; and Père Hyacinthe himself, who, with the *naïveté* of a good little choir boy, had lent himself to make the experiment, finding out soon into what a hornets' nest he had fallen, made haste to slip away out of the society of his new patrons. The crisis was partially terminated three or four years ago by the nomination (suggested to the Pope by the Confederation) of Monsignor Mermillod for the bishopric of Fribourg, which he has occupied ever since, but without having even yet acquired the right of setting his foot (at least, officially) within the territory of Geneva, his native country.

The persecutions to which the Catholics of the Bernese Jura were subjected from the Cantonal Government during 1874 were the consequence of the sentence of dismissal decreed by the Diocesan Conference against Monsignor Lachat, bishop of Basle, who swayed with his crozier the Catholics of seven cantons, of which Berne was one. Lachat, after having at the time of his nomination appeared in the light of a Liberal priest, had afterwards given in his adhesion to the doctrine of Papal infallibility, which was the motive of the sentence by which ninety-seven parish priests of the Bernese Jura, unwilling to recognize the deprivation of their bishop, were themselves not only dismissed from their livings, but expelled with stern prohibition from exercising any religious functions, even private. There is no madman equal to a delirious government; and the worst days of delirious governments appeared to have come back once more in the Bernese Jura in 1874. Sentences of fine and imprisonment were showered like hail both upon refractory priests and upon such of their congregations as remained faithful to them. One or two examples may be cited by way of proof:—

The parishioners of Charmoille, the *curé* of which parish had been banished by order of the Government, had proffered their assistance to him when moving. An enormous process

was immediately served upon the delinquents; and about thirty persons, among whom were women of sixty and seventy years of age, were prosecuted; and the total number of days of imprisonment adjudged to those who had been suspected of the crime of aiding a *curé* to remove his goods was 644.

M. C., *curé* of Glovelier, an old man of seventy, was incarcerated in the prison of Delemont without ascertained cause. After remaining in prison for a space of twenty-four hours, he learnt that the cause of his imprisonment was the having signed himself, at the close of a private letter, "*Curé of Glovelier.*"

M. H., *curé* of Rogembourg, was also incarcerated at Delemont, because, having been cited to appear before Prefect G. on the 31st of November, he observed to the functionary that in November there *are* but thirty days! Total time of imprisonment, five days.

So monstrous an abuse of power in free Switzerland, and in the nineteenth century, could only bring its own condemnation. The sword became bent within the paws of the bear, and some years later the Bernese Government, like M. Bismarck, was itself vanquished by the *curés*, who came back to take possession of their posts, being recalled by the votes of their parishioners.

One of the deplorable results of this pitiful campaign has been to render this region inaccessible for a long time to evangelization, as testifies the experienced evangelist, M. Pointet, who had for eighteen years gone up and down France, but who had to make a hasty retreat from the Bernese Jura before the violence of a populace excited to madness by that to which they themselves had just been subjected.

The Federal Constitution, revised in 1874, considers sacred, as we need scarcely inform the reader, liberty of conscience, of association, and of worship. But one exception exists, that of the Jesuits, since 1848 forbidden the country by Swiss Federal law. Without being the least in the world partisans of the Jesuits, and while holding in abhor-

rence the doctrines and practices immortalized by the author of the *Lettres Provinciales*, we cannot refrain from expressing our opinion that the exception made on this subject by the Swiss constitution is unjust and dangerous.

"I should be better pleased," says M. de Pressensé, "if in my country there existed one Jesuit the more rather than one liberty the less." For the present moment this country, so violently agitated fifteen years ago, is restored, at least externally, to its original tranquillity; but we have had full proof during the last few years in the troubles in connection with the Salvation Army, that that which governments and a populace have the most difficulty of learning to understand is *liberty of conscience*.

Post Scriptum.—Since the preceding lines were written two facts of the greatest importance relating to our subject have attracted the attention of the public. One of them is the promotion of Mgr. Mermillod to the Cardinalate, on account of which he was received in solemn audience by the Federal Council, and had a triumphant reception by the town of Fribourg. The Protestant Press has shown indifference enough to the so-called honour bestowed by Leo XIII. on Switzerland in the person of one of her sons; and even the decree of expulsion made by the Government of Geneva against the Apostolic Vicar has not been in favour of the new Cardinal.

The second event which interests Catholicism in Switzerland, and even abroad, is the founding of a Catholic University at Fribourg, which will commence its course at the same time as the new University of Lausanne for the term of 1890-1891. The programmes of theological instruction are inspired, they say, by the worship of St. Thomas and the scholasticism of the Middle Ages, and it is feared, not without reason, that this institution will quickly become the home of "*intransigent*" ultramontaniam in our Swiss country, and will send forth priests more devoted to Rome than to the cause of true liberty.

A. GRETILLAT.

WELLHAUSEN ON THE PENTATEUCH.

PART IV.

IN the last paper the new criticism was discussed from the point of view of Israelitish history. This time we will consider it in relation to the law. The limits to which these papers are confined will force us this time to confine ourselves to arguments endorsed by the English school of critics. In their case, we shall find dangerous admissions, but no direct irreverence to the Word of God. Professor Robertson Smith, in his *Answer* to the charges brought against him before the Presbytery of the Free Church at Aberdeen (p. 43), refers to the "holy boldness" with which Luther and Zwingle were wont to speak of Holy Scripture, and goes on to say that these very men "taught the Church to love and reverence the Bible as it never had been done before." It is quite true that we are bound to prefer the spirit to the letter; that the Revelation of God's Will has been progressive; that we owe it to the prophets of Israel as well as to Moses; that it has been the work of a developing Spirit resident in the Church, and gradually leading men to a higher knowledge of the truth. And it is only fair to Professor Robertson Smith to say that he distinctly dissociates himself from Kuenen in the most extreme of his statements. For instance, he altogether repudiates the notion that Deuteronomy was a forgery of the priestly party. It is not with any desire to deprecate fair criticism of this kind that these papers are written. If I have spoken of the moral or theological considerations involved,¹ it is in order to arouse the interest of the general public. I referred to those considerations, first, as reasons why we should weigh the question with special care, it being one on which it is eminently undesirable that our judgments should be formed off-hand; and next, because it is one on which each Christian man, and especially each Christian

¹ *Theological Monthly*, June, 1890, pp. 363, 367-69.

teacher, is bound to have an opinion, and to do his best that this opinion should rest on a basis of solid fact and argument.¹

But to one mode of dealing with the question here in England exception may fairly be taken. I would venture to protest against resorting to what has been called "psychological criticism" on a matter of fact. To psychological criticism of a certain kind there can be no objection. We ventured to resort to it in the last paper but one, though it was not called by so attractive a name, when it was suggested that there was usually some sort of connection between national institutions and the national life, and that only the strong conviction of a divinely-given law, wantonly and persistently disobeyed, could account for the history of the Jewish nation from the Return till the present time. To "psychological criticism," then, there can be no objection when dealing with human feelings as affecting human conduct. But what would those great masters of critical science, the late and the present Bishops of Durham, the present Regius and Margaret Professors of Divinity at Cambridge, say to "psychological criticism" as deciding on the authorship or contents of documents? Would they not tell us that matters of fact should be decided by evidence, and by evidence alone? "Psychological criticism" is, of necessity, subjective in its

¹ The Bishop of Durham, in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 493, has given a very wise and timely caution against "presumptuously staking the inspiration and Divine authority of the Old Testament on any foregone conclusion as to the method and shape in which the records have come down to us." He bids us remember the "many grievous mistakes" we have made in the past in dealing with the Scriptures, and reminds how God "trained a people for the Christ in many parts and in many modes" (πολυμέρως καὶ πολυτρόπως, Heb. i. 1). Yet it is difficult to see how a theory of inspiration can include deliberate falsification of history, such as we have seen ascribed to the writers of the Old Testament by German critics, though, of course, it is compatible with a theory such as that of Canon Driver (*Contemporary Review*, February, 1890, p. 228) that the present form of the Pentateuch is a "codification of the pre-existent usage." The idea, too, that "illusion" forms a necessary part of the Divine dealings with mankind (Professor Cheyne, *Men of the Bible—Jeremiah*, pp. 77, 78) seems at least as dangerous on moral grounds, and requires as emphatic a protest from every right-minded man, as the opposite error, against which the Bishop of Durham has found it necessary to caution us.

character, and it is therefore under strong temptation to assign such passages to an author, and only such, as it has settled beforehand he was likely to write. This is the kind of criticism at present prevalent in Germany, and its tendencies have been sufficiently exhibited in the former papers. We may be pretty sure that the English mind will not finally accept criticism of this sort. Love of novelty and paradox may make it popular for a moment. But as with the New Testament, so with the Old, the fairness and common sense of English people may be trusted to decide questions by the light of facts, and not by the aid of theories which, professing to be founded on facts, are in reality used to create them.

Even the English critics of the German school are not altogether free from the charge of magnifying contradictions when they exist, and sometimes of manufacturing them when they do not. As an instance of the invention of contradictions, we may take the one assumed to exist between Exod. xxi. 7 and Deut. xv. 17. It is clear, upon the face of Exod. xxi. 7-11, that the regulation refers to the case where the female slave has been concubine to her master or his son. Common humanity in this case forbids her being dismissed from captivity as an ordinary maidservant might be. Again, Exod. xxii. 31, Lev. xvii. 15, and Deut. xiv. 21 have been supposed to contain irreconcilable statements. But there is no necessary contradiction here. The first passage forbids the Israelite to eat what has been torn by beasts of the field. The second provides what is to be done in case he or the stranger has done so, or has eaten that which died of itself. He is to be unclean until the evening. The third forbids the eating only of that which died of itself, but adds the permission to give the unclean flesh to the stranger. It is not impossible to reconcile these passages. The stranger might eat that which died of itself, but if he did so, he must submit to the easy penalty of washing his clothes and remaining unclean until the evening. It is true that no heavier penalty was imposed on the Israelite if he accidentally or even wantonly transgressed the law on this point. But nothing whatever is said about penalties in Deuteronomy. We may, therefore, fairly explain the passages thus : that while

the stranger incurred ceremonial defilement, no moral guilt whatever attached to him, while the Israelite incurred moral guilt in addition to the ceremonial penalty.

An example of the exaggeration of divergencies into contradictions occurs in the endeavour to make out that Num. iv. 34 cannot be reconciled with Num. viii. 23. Here it cannot be denied that there is an apparent contradiction. But there is no inherent improbability that Moses first of all took the number of the Levites over thirty years of age, and that he afterwards permitted all the Levites under twenty-five to join in the sanctuary service. Those under thirty may have been undergoing probation, as our deacons do, and may not have been entitled to be numbered among those fully qualified to perform the duties of their office. The notion of the insertion of provisions of various dates in the Pentateuchal code of laws, if finally established, must rest upon stronger grounds than these. Yet few other cases are alleged.¹ It would surprise an inquirer to discover how slender are the foundations for the theory of the composite character of the Jewish law, as handed down in the Pentateuch, when shorn of all the random assumptions and unsupported assertions of the German critics. The question of the tithe, which will be mentioned below, is the only strong argument which is produced. Be it remembered, too, that the existence of contradictions in the Pentateuch, as we now have it before us, is as difficult to account for on the grounds on which its homogeneity is assailed as upon those on which it

¹ Canon Driver, in his article in the *Contemporary Review* for February, cites Delitzsch as saying that we have "evidently two narrators" of the arrangements for the tabernacle, because in Num. ii. 17 the tabernacle is said to be in the midst of the camp, whereas in chapters xi. and xii., as well as Exod. xxxiii. 7-11, it is said to be outside the camp. But Num. ii. 17 only gives us the order on the march. In Num. i. 52, 53, the various tribes, including the Levites with the tabernacle, were to pitch their camps separately. In Num. ii. 2 the people are described as encamping in four divisions at some distance from the tabernacle, yet surrounding it. On one occasion (Num. x. 53) the tabernacle is described as preceding the rest of the camp. The various accounts are difficult to reconcile without further information than we have. Exod. xxxiii. 7-11 does not appear to assert anything about the position of the tabernacle save that it was apart from the rest of the camp. Thus the divergence hardly amounts to a contradiction.

is defended. The former theory requires a redactor, and he may at least be credited with a little common sense. *Ex hypothesi*, the laws of Israel were revised. It is, we are told, a "codification of pre-existent usage." But in that case obsolete laws would be dropped out, and their place taken by the new regulations, just as in any ordinary legal hand-book or codification of existing laws. In collections of laws of extreme magnitude and complexity contradictions might be allowed to remain by an oversight. But no one will contend that the Pentateuch is a code of laws so numerous and intricate that contradictions would easily escape the redactor's eye. Granted that the Israelites were not trained in habits of critical research. But this is not a critical, but a practical question. Any one of ordinary common sense can tell when two regulations are distinctly opposed. And if the post-exilic priests felt themselves competent to undertake a thorough revision of the books of the law, we cannot doubt that they would also have imagined themselves competent to reconcile any contradictions in their first rough draft of the new code, the more especially as cases must almost certainly have arisen under it in less than six months after its promulgation in its present shape. Thus the difficulty of the supposed contradictions is not removed, nor even lessened, by supposing the Pentateuch to have grown gradually into its present shape. Nor, it may be added, do the extreme simplicity of the regulations point to a highly organized condition of society, but they rather seem to embody the main principles upon which the law should be administered when Israel was settled in Palestine.

The evidences of an early date contained in the Pentateuch as we now have it are beyond the limits imposed on us.¹ Mr. Bissell, Mr. Curtiss, and other writers have pointed

¹ Neither can we enter into the question whether the present form of the legal books (Leviticus and Deuteronomy excepted), interspersing as it does the legal enactments with snatches of narrative, does not lead to the conclusion that it was in the main composed at the time the events happened. Principal Cave, in a recent article, announces himself a convert to this theory. It would not necessarily preclude the insertion of some later laws. But it is altogether fatal to the

them out, and so has Dean Plumptre, in the letters in the *Guardian*, which have already been mentioned. But we may just touch on the provision that all the males of Israel should attend the three feasts. It does not seem too strong a statement that the promulgation of such a regulation for the first time in the period between Hezekiah and Josiah was an absolute impossibility. Judæa was then a petty kingdom, trembling for its very existence, and alternately relying on the support or the clemency of Assyria and Egypt. Israel had already been carried away captive. Judah had only been saved by what was regarded as a miraculous interposition.¹ We may not unreasonably ask, Was *that* a time when the priestly party could put forth a regulation to a "disobedient and gainsaying people," that every adult man among them was to leave his helpless wife and children a prey to the Assyrian and Egyptian invader, and go three times in every year to hold a religious celebration in the capital? Would not such a proposal have been received by a shout of derision from one end of the kingdom to the other, including all the more rational of the priestly party itself? It may safely be said that such a regulation could never have been proposed, except at the moment of the first promulgation of the law, and in a spirit of reliance on the Divine protection which had been so signally manifested in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, or after the return from the Captivity, when Israel had shrunk to a handful of people, who would have comparatively little difficulty in obeying the command. But this last hypothesis involves another reconstruction of the disintegration theory. All the portions of the law which relate to the three great feasts, on this hypothesis, becomes post-exilic. Perhaps this may be the latest shape assumed by the new criticism. But we may be sure that, when it is put forth, it will be found to present new difficulties of its own.

theory of a "codification of existing documents." On the "journal theory," as it has been called, the Pentateuch must on the whole have been contemporary with the events recorded.

¹ That the destruction of Sennacherib's army was a miracle is purposely not assumed.

The differences of style in the various portions of the Pentateuch have been immensely exaggerated, even if they do not rest wholly on imagination. But one assertion is certainly incontrovertible. There is a marked difference between the style of Deuteronomy and that of the other books of the Pentateuch. Even the ordinary English reader can detect this in an instant. But the inference drawn from it, that the book is by a different author, must be dismissed as "not proven." So also must the allegation that the first three chapters are an introduction by a different hand. This last statement rests upon Deut. ii. 10-13. But this is an obvious interpolation of later date. So obvious is the interruption of the continuity of the narrative, that the English translator has himself interpolated a "said I" in ver. 14, to restore that continuity. There is no evident difference of style between the rest of these three chapters and that of the remainder of the book. Moreover, such interpolations are not uncommon.¹ As for the difference between the style of Deuteronomy and that of the other books, we may ask, Is there any reason to believe that the divergence is greater than would be found between an impassioned harangue by Sir Henry James or Sir Charles Russell and the *précis* of a legal document by either of these distinguished orators and lawyers? Or can it be proved that the divergence between Deuteronomy and the historical portions of the Pentateuch is greater than it is between that of an historian when he writes history and the same man when he makes a speech on a subject on which he feels strongly. Compare, for instance, Professor Tyndall when he is narrating the progress of scientific discovery, with the same Professor when he is inveighing against Mr. Gladstone. If his collected writings were put into the hands of a German critic some two thousand years hence, would not that excellent man be tempted to make Professor Tyndall into two persons—to distinguish between the hortatory Deuteronomist Professor and the dry, curt, matter-of-fact narrator of the progress of science?

¹ *Theological Monthly*, June, 1890, p. 374.

I should have liked to say a few words on the subject of the distinction made between the style of the author of the Priestly Code and that of other contributors to the Pentateuch, but I must refrain. I will only say this. Let any competent scholar make a verbal analysis of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, and compare it with the rest of the so-called Priestly Code, in the manner in which the concluding part of St. Mark's Gospel, or the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, has been analysed by New Testament critics. They will find, as I have found, strong evidence against the theory that these passages are by another hand than the rest of the narrative.¹ The philosophical features of this chapter are as opposed to this theory as the linguistic. In the first place the author deals in a way with the subject of creation which suggests a master mind, such as did not arise after the exile. There is no necessity to suppose that he wishes to inform us of the chronological order of creation. We are only required to regard him as dealing with the phenomena of creation as they present themselves to the

¹ Take the first ten verses of Gen. i., which "general consent" declares to be written by the author of the "Priestly Code." There are only ten words in any way distinctive. 1. *B'reshith* only occurs in the same sense in Jeremiah, and without the preposition, or with another, in Genesis, Deuteronomy, Psalms, and Proverbs, but nowhere else in P.C. (the "Priestly Code"). 2. *Bara* is often found in the sense of "create," but only in Gen. v. and vi. in P.C. It occurs in Exod. xxxiv. and Num. xvi., but *not in the parts of those chapters assigned to P.C.* 3. *John vabohn* only occurs three times in the Bible. Neither word occurs again in P.C. 4. The same may be said of *zach aph.* 5. *T'honi* is found in Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy, and constantly in the Prophets, but never again in P.C., except in the account of the Deluge. 6. *R'kia'* is found elsewhere only in Psalms, Ezekiel, and Daniel. 7. *Badal* occurs five times in Leviticus, twice in Wellhausen's "peculiar little collection of laws" (ch. xvii.-xxvi), which he regards as to a certain extent distinct from P.C., and twice beside in P.C. (Num. xvi. 9, 21). But it is remarkable what results a careful analysis of the reconstruction theories produces. The word occurs in Josh. xvi. 9. But we are told that the part of that chapter belonging to P.C. ends at ver. 8! 8. *Jabasah* is found in Exod. xiv. 16, 22, 29; but, strange to say, these verses, according to our authorities, do not, while verses 15 and 28 do, belong to P.C. 9. *Kavah* in the Niphal, in the sense of "gathered together," only occurs elsewhere in Jeremiah. 10. Its derivative *mikoch* is in no way peculiar to P.C. It cannot be said that this examination does much to confirm the confident tone adopted in assigning the various portions of the Pentateuch to their authors.

eye of the beholder, the origin of the world in general, of the sea, of the dry land, of vegetable, animal, and human life. If the reference to a seventh day, when God rested from His works, suggest the chronological idea, the way in which the other days of creation are spoken of does nothing of the kind. The ordinary translation, "the evening and the morning were the first," "second," or "third day," is not correct. The proper rendering of the words is, "there was an evening, and there was a morning, a first," "second," or "third day." And then, again, another most important fact has been entirely overlooked. Heathen philosophy everywhere—Latin, Greek, and Oriental—has more or less connected the corruption of man with the evil inherent in matter. Judaism and Christianity alone have asserted, and with the healthiest moral results, the Divine origin of everything that is. What strikes the keynote of this bold defiance of the almost universal teaching of heathendom? It is the passage which ends the history of creation, "And God saw all that He had made, and behold it was very good." Is it more likely that such a passage emanated from an unknown author in the decay of Jewish civilization, or that it was penned by the prophet, priest, and law-giver who stamped his individuality on the whole history of the Jews?

I have only space for a few very brief remarks on the general question. Whatever German writers may have done, the English supporters of the disintegration school have done nothing whatever to show that the sacrificial system of Leviticus, so ably expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, was wholly, or even to any great extent, post-Mosaic. Rightly or wrongly, it has been the belief of the Christian Church from the very first that this sacrificial system foreshadowed the life, death, and perpetual priesthood of Christ. This view derives some support from the fact that, hack and hew and dissect the prophets as we will, there remains the incontrovertible truth that previous to His coming the Jews looked for One who should at once fulfil and spiritualize these enactments. Such a belief, resting as it does on a "psychological" basis of very wide general accept-

ance, has a very strong claim on our attention. How do the English supporters of the new criticism regard the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch? Is it Mosaic or post-Mosaic in its origin? Do they hold, with Kuenen and Wellhausen, that it derives its existence from an unknown author subsequent to the Captivity, or do they believe that this mysterious foreshadowing of the Deliverer who was to come was imparted in all its main features to Moses, comforted Israel through its wanderings, and formed a rallying point for men like Samuel, David, Hezekiah, Josiah, in times of national apostasy? This question demands an answer, a full and explicit answer. A few scattered contradictions which fuller information than we possess would possibly clear up in an instant, are not enough to justify us in abandoning a belief of so much importance to the true theory of the development of religion. It is of little consequence whether we can see traces of different documents in the Pentateuch or not. It is vital to know whether this marvellous and elaborate system of type and antitype, this prefiguring of One who was to sum up in Himself the whole career of humanity, who was to fulfil all our duties, centre in Himself all sacrifices, make full propitiation for the sins of a fallen world, was a mere matter of chance and accident, or whether it came from the hand of God.¹

The only formidable arguments which have been brought forward reduce themselves to two: the regulations in regard to tithe in the other books and in Deuteronomy respectively, and the relations of the Levites to the priests in the earlier books and in Deuteronomy. The former is an extremely difficult question, and no doubt, so far as it goes, tends to support the view that the law in Deuteronomy is of

¹ It ought in fairness to be admitted that the notion of a gradual perfecting of the Jewish sacrificial worship is not incompatible with a belief in inspiration, but quite the contrary. The Spirit who "spoke by the prophets" might well have taught them to "fill up what was lacking" in the completeness of Mosaic institutions. But in that case, instead of a sudden development during and after the decay of Israel as a nation, we should have seen a steady and continuous growth of the Mosaic idea, fostered by men like Samuel, David, and Isaiah, and linking itself indissolubly with the fortunes of the Jewish race.

different origin and date to that in Numbers. It must be frankly acknowledged that of the regulations as they at present stand no satisfactory method of reconciliation has been found. But one serious difficulty of this kind in a book supposed to be more than three thousand years old can hardly be regarded as decisive in favour of the theory which assigns the books to different periods. On the German hypothesis of a redactor who has carefully edited the document, the existence of the discrepancy is at least as unaccountable as under that of the Mosaic origin of the books. Still, the English critic, who is simply concerned to prove that the various parts of the Hexateuch were composed at various times and finally embodied in the volume which has come down to us, is entitled to make the most of his discovery. But it is a "far cry" from this to the establishment of his thesis. And there are still some difficulties to be faced, even on the supposition of its truth. Deuteronomy, by a tradition at least as old as the Septuagint, and probably much older, is the *later* edition of the law.¹ It has, moreover, all the appearance of being what it professes to be, not a book of ceremonial enactments, but a republication of the law for the benefit of the people at large. Yet, according to all the more recent critics, the form of its arrangements for the priests proves it to be the earlier. Now, whether a nation has the critical spirit or not, it generally hands down its political and religious system with at least some approach to accuracy. It is therefore difficult to understand how a nation like Israel

¹ I can but draw attention most briefly to the fact that if Deuteronomy and the "Priestly Code" be later than Moses, the book of Joshua has been falsified in the interest of the later legislation. No scholar would deny that the phenomena of the text in Josh. viii. 30-35 justify a suspicion of interpolation. But what was the "book of the law" (Torah) which Joshua is recommended in chap. i. to read? Why does the passage in which this recommendation is made quote Deuteronomy? Why was the Deuteronomic command of Deut. xxi. 23 obeyed in Josh. x. 27? Why do the priests, and not the Levites, bear the ark (Josh. iii., iv., vi.)? What is the meaning of the whole story of the altar Ed in Josh. xxii.? Of course it is dismissed by Wellhausen as post-exilic. But even he is compelled to recognize a foreign element in the Priestly Code. Thus is his system "with cycle and epicycle scribbled o'er." At least, it can hardly be said to simplify matters very much.

fell into so singular a mistake as it is supposed to have made. The circumstances under which the return from Captivity took place were favourable to a rigid preservation, rather than a bold modification of the past institutions of the country. It is therefore highly improbable that a more developed sacerdotal system should have been invented at that time.

Moreover, the difference between the regulations for the priests in the Priestly Code and in Deuteronomy seem to have been much exaggerated. The way in which the whole tribe of Levi is spoken of in Deuteronomy, a book addressed, be it remembered, to the *laity*, is in no way different to the way in which the clergy, priests and deacons alike, would be spoken of in a manual addressed to the laity now. And yet we know that the duties and powers of deacons and priests in the Christian Church differ at least as widely as those of Levites and priests did under the law. But for the emphasizing this distinction, for the careful apportionment of the duties of each order in the Christian ministry, we should surely turn to a book written for the clergy. Nor is there wanting a reason for the way in which the duty of respect for the Levite is impressed on the Jewish people. In Joshua we find the fact repeatedly mentioned that the tribe of Levi alone had no inheritance among its brethren. The duty of its maintenance would unquestionably have been neglected, had not stringent provision been made for the *status* of the Levite in the regulations for the conduct of the people at large. This consideration will do much to attenuate the force of the argument raised against the contemporary date of the books of the Hexateuch.¹

One more consideration, and I have done. One particular feature of the destructive criticism is its strange want of literary instinct. The whole of Deuteronomy, save the purely legal passages, has been felt to be overflowing with dignity,

¹ Mr. Robertson Smith (*Answer*, p. 36) thinks that the Levites had cities entirely of their own. This appears doubtful. Keil, in his *Commentary*, and Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. 49) suppose that they had a settlement in cities inhabited by other tribes (see Josh. xxi. 12, 13).

majesty, and poetry of the very highest order. It may even be said that there are in it passages of greater sublimity than are to be found anywhere else in literature. I cannot stop now to mention them; nor need I. The whole book teems with them, though perhaps the marvellous catalogue of blessings and curses in chap. xxviii. surpasses anything else in this or any other book. Who wrote them? They were the work of a master mind. If it were not that of Moses, whose was it? Samuel has left no remains behind him. David, thorough poet as he is, cannot rise to that majestic level.¹ Isaiah is the only writer who approaches it. Even Jeremiah in his finest flights falls far short of it. What nameless scribe penned the rising and falling cadences of that noble apostrophe, as it alternately praises, elevates, warns, chastens, threatens, condemns? There is many a man who can take a dissecting knife in hand and tear to pieces a human body, but few comparatively are there found to say, "I will give thanks to Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made." So, too, it is to be feared, there are many who can take in hand to point out minute discrepancies in the Scriptures as we now have them, who utterly fail to see what unity and grandeur of conception there is about them, how infinitely they were above the spirit of any age to which they have been assigned, how marvellously calculated they are to be the παιδαγωγός to lead us to the perfection that is in Christ.

But I must pause. I feel how inadequately I have dealt with the great theme that has been allotted to me. Not only is it impossible to exhaust a vast subject like this in a few pages, but one who has spent a great deal of his time and strength in other directions feels how scantily furnished he is with materials for a subject requiring such special qualifications. But as has been said from the beginning, this is a matter on which we are all bound to have some definite opinion, and therefore I have ventured to state the reasons

¹ Modern criticism has almost abolished David as a poet. But many gifted with literary instinct have believed that the Deuteronomist, and he alone, could have written that noble Psalm xc., "the noblest lyric in the world," as Canon Kingsley has called it in *Alton Locke*.

which, so far, compel me to throw in my lot with the traditional school. In the first place, I must believe the methods of most German critics to be so unsatisfactory in themselves as to count for very little in the investigation, while their conclusions appear to be wildly improbable. In the next, it seems to me that the case of their English followers rests ultimately almost exclusively on the discrepancy as to the tithes; too narrow a basis, it seems to me, to bear so heavy a superstructure. Lastly, it will seem to many, as it does to me, that the whole question of the national institutions of the Jew, so intimately intertwined as they are with Christianity, demand a wiser, more comprehensive, and more careful treatment at the hands of investigators than they have as yet received. For more than two thousand years they have been believed, by Jew and Christian alike, to have been an important element in the Divine education of the world. By all means let them be examined as fearlessly and impartially as other writings are examined; but let them at least be touched with a reverent hand. Let us remember that the question is not infinitely little, but infinitely great. It is no mere splitting straws over minute difficulties, or building theories upon the use of certain names for God. It must cover a wide surface. It must embrace the study of comparative history, archæology, and philosophy. It must include the highest order of literary criticism. It must be able to deal fairly with the question of the origin and growth of religious ideas, as well as their connection with national and individual character and life. Let the importance of the work be fully recognized, and the conclusions as carefully sifted as befits a question of such magnitude. If the facts are found incontestably to demand a revision of our views as to the sources of the Old Testament, the Christian conscience will not hesitate to make it. But we refuse to enter upon such a revision on the strength of crude theories passed from mouth to mouth, depending on assertion rather than argument, and not unfrequently put forth by men utterly incapable of rising to the height of the great problem they are endeavouring to solve.

J. J. LIAS.

THE FOURFOLD REGENERATION.

“ Ring out the old, ring in the new—
—Ring out the want, the care, the sin,
The faithless coldness of the times—
—Ring out old shapes of foul disease ;
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold ;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.
—Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be ! ”

So sings our Poet-Laureate. He embodies in felicitous phrase the yearnings of thoughtful men after a new and better order of things than that which now prevails. Even secular journals recognize the disorder of our present state, due to men setting aside the Divine law as the regulator of life, and substituting short-sighted regard to present interests.

Worldly men are all the while dreaming of “ a good time coming ” through the diffusion of secular education, the marvellous discoveries of science, and the modern inventions ministering to material comforts. Similarly, one might have expected that the age before the first Advent, characterized as it was by the development of man’s reason, imagination, and æsthetical culture, would have been also an age of moral progress. The voice of God’s revelation was silent for four hundred years down from Malachi, the last of the Old Testament Prophets. It was the age of Demosthenes, the orator ; Praxiteles, the sculptor ; Plato and Aristotle, master minds in philosophy. God left man to himself to see what he could do by art and science to regenerate the world. The result was corruption, and a deep sense of wretchedness. Plato, in the *Alcibiades*, acknowledges the need there was of some Great Teacher to come from heaven. Side by side with high civilization and refinement existed moral depravity, and an aching void in man’s spirit which no earthly culture could fill. Then, where man could devise no remedy, God broke

the long silence with the New Testament call in the wilderness, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Again, for a greatly longer period the spoken voice from heaven is silent, ever since the manifestation of Him who is the Brightness of the Father's glory, and the express Image of His Person. The Written Word indeed witnesses for God and His Christ. But man's tendency now is to deny its Divine authority as the rule and standard of life. Hence, side by side with his dream of a new and better age to be ushered in by his own working independently of God, there are ominous symptoms of desperate evils lurking beneath the glazed surface of our boasted civilization, and ready at any moment to upheave the social system.

I. God's plan for renewing His own world is the reverse of man's. Man begins from without; God begins within. Man sets up his kingdom with show, and "a mouth speaking great things:" throughout this age, "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation." The first step toward it is *the regeneration of individual souls* by the Holy Spirit. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Born of fleshly parents, we cannot but be fleshly in nature. Water cannot rise above its own level; nor can we of ourselves rise above our sin-tainted birth-nature. If we are to dwell with heavenly beings in a kingdom of holiness, we must receive a new and spiritual nature corresponding to that kingdom's environments. The Holy Ghost is the power from above which quickens man's spirit, so that he is born again, and becomes in Christ "a new creature." This is the FIRST REGENERATION. The new word (*παλιγγενεσία*, Tit. iii. 5) is coined in the Christian mint to represent a new spiritual truth. To be born of the Holy Spirit is to be born into a new world, altogether distinct from the world into which we are born by nature. It is as great a miracle in grace, as in nature it would be to enter a second time into the mother's womb and be born. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually discerned; but he that is spiritual judgeth all things. So completely alien to the kingdom of God is the

fleshly or natural mind, that Holy Scripture declares "it is enmity against God," and not only is not subject to the law of God, but even "CANNOT be" so. Whereas, if the Spirit of God dwell in a man, he is spiritually minded, which is life and peace: he has the marks of regeneration; "he does not practise (*ποιεῖ*: present tense, I John iii. 9) sin" habitually: "he by faith overcometh the world:" "he knows that he has passed from death to life because he loves the brethren." All these fruits of the Spirit are due not to the believer's works, but to God's mercy, which "saves us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Regeneration is the Father's gift to them that ask Him. It reveals Christ the Son in the soul. It is the work of the Almighty Quickening Holy Spirit.

II. THE REGENERATION OF THE BODY. The only other passage in the New Testament in which the word "regeneration" is found uses it in reference to the future. The Lord Jesus promises to His followers, as their reward, "In the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. xix. 28). God's order in restoring a lost world is beautifully progressive. He begins by regenerating the souls of believers now. There can be no regeneration to glory hereafter, except there be first the regeneration by grace now. Wherever this has been wrought here, though the body be still subject to death, the spirit has in it life from above. This life imparted by the Holy Spirit to the believer's spirit is the pledge that the body, too, shall be quickened by the same Almighty Spirit. The resurrection of Jesus' body is the earnest of our resurrection, if we be already born again of the Spirit. It is the same Divine Worker who puts forth His energizing might in our resurrection as in His. For only "if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelt in us, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also our mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in us" (Rom. viii. 11). Such alone as are spiritual are "counted worthy to obtain the resurrection from the dead" (Luke xx. 35). All shall

arise. The saints alone attain unto the "resurrection from out of the rest of the dead" (τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, Phil. iii. 11). This is the grand object of ambition to them, as it was to Paul. It is not mere reanimation or revivification, as that of Lazarus. It is *regeneration* of the body to a higher life: as the soul has been previously raised from the fleshly to the spiritual life. The body is sown a psychic or animal body, it is raised a pneumatic or spiritual body. The animal soul ruled in that, the Spirit rules in this. Sown in corruption, dishonour, and weakness, the saint's body is raised in incorruption, glory, and power (1 Cor. xv.). No longer will our vessel of clay weigh us down, when our spirits would soar to God. For, whatever attribute Christ's ascended body possesses, ours too shall possess: at His coming, "He will transfigure the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things unto Himself" (Phil. iii. 20, 21). This is the first resurrection. It ushers in the millennial reign of Christ and His transfigured saints in the heavenlies over Israel and the nations in the flesh upon earth. The rest of the dead shall not live again until the thousand years are finished. "Blessed and holy is He that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death has no power, but they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years." Material obstacles will not impede the glorified body, just as the closed doors could not prevent the risen Saviour from standing in the midst of the disciples. Equal to the angels; we shall move with lightning-speed whithersoever we will.

Connected closely with the saints' resurrection is their heavenly sonship. It was so with Jesus; it shall be so with them. He was as truly the everlasting Son of the Father when "He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, and being made in the likeness of men," as when He shares the Father's glory before the world was.

"As much when in the manger laid,
Eternal Ruler of the sky,
As when the six days' work He made
Filled all the morning stars with joy."

But in His humiliation His Sonship, though real, was not manifested. It was His resurrection that vindicated His claim, the Father Himself attesting Jesus' Sonship by raising Him from the dead. This is expressly affirmed by St. Paul (Rom. i. 4), "Jesus Christ, born of the seed of David according to the flesh, declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead." He is therefore named "The Firstborn from the dead" (Col. i. 18). So believers are sons of God from the moment that they first believe in Jesus Christ (Gal. iii. 26). But as the unbelieving did not recognize Jesus' Sonship in the days of His humiliation, so they cannot recognize our sonship as yet. It will be our resurrection in His glorious likeness that will manifest our sonship, as St. John testifies (1 John iii. 1, 2), "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God; and such we are. For this cause the world knoweth us not, because it knew Him not. Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, when He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is." Our sonship is real now; then first it shall be manifested. Therefore, though in a true sense already adopted, we still "wait for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." A forcible word expresses the saint's intense longing for the manifestation of their sonship, "The earnest expectation (*ἀποκαταδοκία*, with uplifted heads and outstretched necks) of the creature waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God" (Rom. viii. 19).

The resurrection or regeneration of the body at Christ's coming will be the preliminary to the gathering of the saints unto their everlasting communion with one another in Him. In their disembodied state between death and the resurrection they are "absent from the body," which is the instrument of the soul's activities, and "present with the Lord," shut up unto Him alone. St. Paul does not comfort the Thessalonian mourners with the prospect of restored communion with their deceased loved ones at death, but at "the coming of our Lord Jesus, and our gathering together unto Him" (1 Thess. iv. 13-18;

2 Thess. ii. 1). Therefore Holy Scripture does not rest our chief hope on the bliss of the soul at death, but on our Lord's return to transfigure the bodies of the elect whose souls have been already regenerated by His Holy Spirit. "We must all be then made manifest before His judgment seat, that each may receive the things done *through the body* (διὰ τοῦ σώματος, 2 Cor. v. 10), whether it be good or bad." How this truth ought to constrain us to "cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

III.—THE REGENERATION OF THE NATIONS. This age begins with the translation of the Lord Jesus. It is consummated in the transfiguration and translation of the saints. They shall be "caught up to meet the Lord in the air." Then He, and they with Him, as "the armies of heaven," returning, inflict the decisive blow on Antichrist and his apostate hosts, which issues in the overthrow of the usurper Satan's reign, and in the establishment of the kingdom of Him "whose right it is." Jerusalem, the scene of the conflict, shall become "the throne of Jehovah Jesus, and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of Jehovah, neither shall they walk any more after the stubbornness of their evil heart" (Jer. iii. 17).

This shall be the REGENERATION OF THE NATIONS. Now is the time of the regeneration of individuals. God is now "visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name" (Acts xv. 14). Therefore our age is designated "the times (opportunities, *καιροί*) of the Gentiles." This is their day of grace and privilege, wherein all believers, without distinction of Jew and Gentile, are being gathered into the elect Church. This Church, when completed, will reign with Christ in the heavenlies over the millennial nations on earth. Jerusalem, now trodden down of the Gentiles, shall then assume the primary place among the nations which was designed for her from the beginning: for "when the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the children of men, He set the bounds of the peoples, according to the number of the children of Israel" (Deut. xxxii. 8).

Jerusalem will, then, first realize God's gracious purpose of making her the spiritual metropolis, and Israel the centre and mediator of blessing to the world. As God saith (Ezek. v. 5), "I have set her in the midst of the nations." Thus, "Jehovah will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem" (Zech. ii. 10), and Jerusalem in the midst of the nations.

In our age "the Gospel is being preached for a witness unto all the nations," and when that witness shall have been completed "the end shall come" (Matt. xxiv. 14), the elect Church (comprising "the remnant according to the election of grace" out of Israel, and "the fulness of the Gentiles") having been gathered out from Jews and Gentiles (Rom. xi. 5, 25). The Lord's coming shall introduce an age wherein "a nation shall be brought forth at once; and as soon as Zion shall travail, she shall bring forth children" (Isa. lxvi. 8, 9). It is when the Father shall have "set His King upon His holy hill of Zion," that "He will give the heathen for His Son's inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession" (Psa. ii. 8). The veil shall be taken off Israel first, then off all people (2 Cor. iii. 16; Isa. xxv. 7). There cannot be a conversion of the *nations* in our age before Christ's coming, since His first act in introducing His manifested kingdom will be to smite the apostate nations with the rod of His mouth (Isa. xi. 4-9; Zech. xii., xiii., xiv.); then shall follow His reign in peace and righteousness (Psa. ii. 9; Dan. ii. 34, 35; Rev. ii. 26, 27; xi. 15-17; xix. 11-xx. 6) The seventh and last trumpet must first sound before "He shall take His great power and reign, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ."

The manifestation of Christ and His transfigured saints in glory, the destruction of Antichrist, and the binding of Satan (Rev. xv. 4; xx. 1), will predispose the nations in the flesh to embrace the Gospel. It is because "the Lord's righteous judgments shall have been made manifest, that nations shall all come and worship before Him." "The receiving of Israel," after their being so long outcast through unbelief, "will be life from the dead" to the Gentile world (Rom. xi. 15).

"The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains" first; then "all nations shall flow unto it; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isa. ii. 2, 3): men shall call the Jews "priests of Jehovah, ministers of our God" (lxi. 6), because they shall be God's mediators of blessing to the nations. So "Jehovah will be King over the whole earth; Jehovah shall be one and His name one" (Zech. xiv. 9). Jesus first "will declare God's name unto His brethren" (the Jews), then "all the ends of the earth shall remember, and turn unto Jehovah" (Psa. xxii. 22-27).

The heavens must receive Jesus now "until the times of restoration of all things." When He shall visibly come forth from the heavens, Israel shall be restored to their own land and to His favour. The Kingship over all the nations shall be restored to the rightful Owner, "the King of Israel," and "King of the nations." The millennial people will be prepared for passing without death into a higher state, as Adam would, had he never fallen. Death will exceptionally occur on earth in the millennium, but only as a judgment on the sinner; for though Satan shall be bound, and the world be pervaded with Divine influences, there will still remain *the flesh*, whence shall arise the possibility of sin (Isa. lxxv. 20; Eph. ii. 2, 6; vi. 12).

When "Jehovah shall punish the ten anti-Christian kings of the earth upon the earth," Satan, "prince of the powers of the air," and his "host of high ones on high" (Isa. xxiv. 21, 22), shall be supplanted by Christ and His transfigured saints in the heavenlies, who from thence shall reign over Jerusalem and the nations in the flesh. Christ and His saints of the first resurrection will be the mediators of blessing to these, as Israel in their turn will be to the nations. Thus there will be a blessed chain of giving and receiving: God the Father, Christ the transfigured Bride (the translated Church), Israel in the flesh, and the world of nations in the flesh; Church and State will be co-extensive; the Church and the world will be no longer mutually antagonistic: the distinction will cease, for the

Church will be co-extensive with the world, and the world with the Church ; art, science, and music will be the handmaids to spiritual worship, not, as too often now, abused to sensuousness. It will be especially the time of liturgy of "the great congregation" (Psa. xxii. 25 ; Ezek. xl.-xlviii. ; Zech. xiv. 16-20 ; Isa. ii. 3), as now is the time of preaching. It will be a time of Sabbath peace, uninterrupted by wars. Even the savage beasts shall lose their ferocity, and be subject to man, as in Eden. Christ's King-Priesthood shall be explained in the services of the glorious temple at Jerusalem. The theocracy of God in Christ shall supersede the misrule of earthly potentates over the nations ; and "the kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms *under the whole heavens* (*i.e.*, UPON EARTH) shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve Him" (Dan. vii. 27).

IV. REGENERATION OF THE EARTH. Even during the millennium there is a separation between heaven and earth, the transfigured Church in the heavenlies and the nations in the flesh on earth. It is true there will be during the millennium an intercommunion of Christ and His transfigured saints in the heavenlies with Israel and the nations in the flesh on earth, such as was the intercourse of Christ, and Elijah, and Moses in glorified bodies with Peter, James, and John in the flesh on the mountain of transfiguration. Such also was that of Christ with His disciples during the forty days between His resurrection and His ascension. It will be one sweet joy of the transfigured saints who reign from heaven over the earth to lead their brethren in the flesh to the precious Saviour. But still there will be a distinction between heaven and earth, humanity transfigured and humanity in the flesh. Man's old birth sin, *i.e.*, "the flesh," will remain, when the other two sources of evil, Satan and the world, shall be restrained. From it will break out the last apostasy headed by Satan in person. In the judgment on it by fire the world of nature shall be destroyed. The leper's house had to be taken down because of the fretting leprosy cleaving to its walls.

As the regeneration of individual SOULS takes place now,

and the resurrection of the saints' BODIES and the regeneration of the NATIONS at the millennium, so the regeneration of THE EARTH, man's home, shall be after the millennium. The new earth and new heaven will be the abode of perfect righteousness. The same Holy Spirit who brooded over the waters at the original creation, and who regenerates the souls of believers, and who will raise their bodies to immortality and regenerate the nations, will finally, at the Father's word, "make all things new" (Rev. xx. 11; xxi. 1; 2 Peter iii. 6-13). "Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created: and Thou renewest the face of the earth" (Psa. civ. 30). Then shall the upper and lower congregations be no longer separate. For the New Jerusalem, the Church of the Firstborn, the Firstfruits of redemption, shall descend from God out of heaven. She shall have the glory of God in her; and "the nations," regenerated in the millennium and then translated, "shall walk amidst the light thereof" (Rev. xxi. 24). The millennial earth shall not be the home of the transfigured saints, but the kingdom over which they rule (the extent of that rule being proportional to their present faithfulness, Luke xix. 16-19). On the other hand, the post-millennial earth, regenerated from all past imperfections, such as the raging and restless sea, the earthquakes and convulsions of nature, and the trail of the serpent, shall be the saints' fit abode and home for ever. The elect Church, as the New Jerusalem, in whom God Himself dwells, the centre of the regenerated nations, shall hold the primacy among the saved, because she alone shall have witnessed for Christ in the face of the present opposing world and the prince of darkness (Rev. xxi. 24).

A *solitary* pair was in the original Paradise. In the final one, city and garden shall be combined; perfect *communion* of saints with INDIVIDUAL blessedness. No more pain, no more crying, no more death, for there will be no more sin. The saints will be under the blessed necessity of sinning no more. God in Christ will be all in all, and "His saints shall reign for ever and ever." Lord, hasten the time and Thy kingdom!

A. R. FAUSSET.

EVANGELICAL PREACHING.

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY, in his Treatise on Logic, points out and corrects a mistake that had been extensively prevalent before his time as to the way in which logic had been regarded. It was invariably defined as the "art" of using reason aright, in acquiring and communicating knowledge. He shows that it is more than an "art"; it is a "science" as well. And his reasoning may rightly apply to "preaching." It is not only the "art" of applying the principles of Revelation to the human mind, but it is also the "science" or knowledge of those very principles. And woe betide the preacher who is merely a preaching "artist." He may, indeed, indulge in high-swalling words—*sesquipedalia*—as they are called, and he may indulge in new words coined in his own ever-fruitful brain; and his voice at one time may be loud as the roaring of Niagara, and the next soft as the sound of a gentle zephyr; but as to the "*science*" of his "art" he may be an utter stranger; for the testimony of the Lord Himself is this, "That many shall say unto Me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not cast out devils in Thy name, and done many wonderful works." And His reply will be, "Depart from Me, I know you not." It is important, therefore, that the preacher should know the nature of his office; and if he would only consider that he "negotiates between God and man" on the two great questions that should affect the human race, namely, the "goodness of God" and the "sinfulness of man," then the minister of religion—the Christian preacher—would feel the dignity of his post, and the vast importance of the business entrusted to his charge.

We would venture to point out that while the preacher of the Gospel has much to discourage him, he has much to support him. When he looks at the enemies against him, at the corruption within him, at the different inlets for sin to

approach, whether by thought, word, or act; whether by omission of what is right, or the commission of what is wrong; whether by ignorance, hardness of heart, contempt or neglect of God's holy will, law, precepts, and commandments, he must feel cast down, and exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things?" But again, on the other hand, he must feel the greatest comfort when he knows that He who is *for* him is greater than *all* that are *against* him; and when he knows that this Friend who is *for* him is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and therefore can provide against all contingencies, and make even evil to become productive of good, and cause all things to work together for good for them that love Him—oh, surely there is much here, very much, to stir up, urge on, and inspire the Christian witness, the Gospel preacher, the true evangelist.

What is his work? To preach Christ as the Way, the Truth, and the Life—that is, as the Living Way that leads direct to God. And how can he do this? By looking to others who had gone before him, and who left behind them a noble example. The first preacher of righteousness of whom we read was Noah. He walked with God, and he preached, relying on the simple word of God. And his audience was made up of mockers, not one of whom, we have reason to believe, heeded one word of what he said. Still, he preached on, and the subject-matter of his preaching was based on the "Word of God," and contained a threat. And why a threat? Because of the imagination of man's heart, which, from the beginning, had been only evil. John the Baptist had also been a preacher; he preached before our Lord; and the subject-matter of his preaching was, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. iii. 1). Our blessed Lord also became a Preacher, for after His baptism we read (Matt. iv. 17), "From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and, again, ver. 23, "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom;" and again, Matt. ix. 35, we have another account that "Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their

synagoges, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom." And in Matt. x., after He had appointed the Twelve, the commission contained this clause, "And as you go, preach, saying The kingdom of heaven is at hand." And as we read in Luke iv. 18, 19, when He stood up in the synagogue of Nazareth, He found the place where it was written, and He applied the passage to Himself, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed (*i.e.*, made Me the Messiah) to *preach* the Gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted, to *preach* deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, and to set at liberty them that are bruised. To *preach* the acceptable year of the Lord." The preaching of John was, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The preaching of Jesus was, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand; yea, is within you" (Luke xvii. 21). But after the death of Jesus the subject-matter was changed. Henceforth it was—trust in Jesus. None but Jesus can do guilty sinners good; for we must not forget, or rather we should know, that "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved," means *trust* in the Lord Jesus Christ. This is a matter so important that it must be constantly before the mind; in fact, forced on the mind—that *believing* in Jesus is *trusting* in Him; and it is well to notice how deeply the word *trust* was engraved on the mind of the Psalmist. It occurs upwards of seventy-five times in the Book of Psalms, thereby showing how holy men of old were influenced by this deeply impressive word, *trust*.

The duty of the Christian preacher is to take up this word and put it perpetually before his hearers; for, like St. Paul, to this office he was appointed or ordained. In the second chapter of the Acts we have a specimen of St. Peter's preaching and the results—3,000 souls were added to the Church. In the eighth of the Acts we have another account of successful preaching, for the word occurs no less than six times in that chapter, and the conversion of one was specially noted, namely, the Ethiopian eunuch. The Apostle Paul was pre-eminently a preacher, although he tells us he was "rude in speech, yet not in knowledge," and he tells us what the subject-matter of his

“preaching” was, namely, “Jesus Christ and Him crucified.” And why does he lay stress on this subject? Just for the reason that at Athens, on Mars’ Hill, as we read in Acts xvii., he had expended all his power, and put forth all his eloquence, and showed his perfect acquaintance with Greek literature, as he disputed with the Epicureans and Stoics; and then finding that he had laboured in vain, for he established no Church at Athens, on proceeding to Corinth, he resolved on a new course of action. No more display of book-learning, no more eloquence, no more Pagan theology, no more philosophic disquisitions, but simply and solely this one topic—“Jesus Christ and Him crucified.” The death of Christ the turning-point in the world’s history—that is to be the subject-matter of the Apostle’s preaching. And how does he manifest it? Just look at what he says to Timothy (1 Tim. ii. 3, 7) regarding the duty of praying “for kings and all that are in authority.” “For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who would have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God and one Mediator, between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. Whereunto I am ordained a *preacher* and an Apostle.” And again, 2 Tim. i. 10, speaking on the great topic of all His discussions, he writes that it was Jesus “who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through His Gospel, whereunto I am appointed a *preacher*, and an Apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.”

“Preaching,” then, with St. Paul was manifestly a science and an art. It was a *science* because it dealt with sin, and the penalty of sin, and the remedy against sin; and it was an *art* because it applied to practice this all-important knowledge. So far as the “preacher” referred to *speculation*—*e.g.*, to ascertain the nature of the malady and the cure for the human race—so far was this investigation to be regarded as a *science*; but when he applied the result of his investigation to practice, then preaching became an *art*. Hence the whole of religion itself may be regarded as a science and an art, or, more properly speaking, as an art; for inasmuch as

religion as a theory or speculation is useless according to Bishop Butler, it is an art, inasmuch as it is pre-eminently practical. Religion may be regarded, then, as the art of cultivating holy relations with heaven; and one of the most effectual aids to this cultivation is supplied by the human voice, which, when set on fire by the flame of heavenly love, bursts out into a holy blaze of happy, heavenly, soul-inspiring words.

Evangelical preaching, then, should be practical; and therefore it should be fruit-bearing. It should not consist in mere words. It should be filled with action, for wherever the Spirit breathes there is life; and a preacher who forgets himself in his subject is the man who approaches most nearly to the very best of ancient preachers, even Paul himself. But the man who is perpetually talking of himself, and parading the "ego" and its concomitants, "me" and "mine," is far from forgetting himself; indeed, it is to be feared that he forgets the Master, and instead of preaching "Christ crucified," it is "Joseph glorified," a fatal error of the Roman Church.

But a question arises here—I. Is not the house of God a house of prayer? How, then, can it be regarded as a house of preaching? II. Is not the minister of the New Testament a priest rather than a prophet? III. And is not the highest type of evangelical preaching that which shows forth the Lord's death till He come, in the celebration of Holy Communion or the administration of the Lord's Supper?

1. To each of these questions the following answer may appear pertinent. The house of God is doubtless a house of prayer, and it was spoken of as such to those who had perverted its use and made it a house of merchandise; and if, as in the present day, man would pervert the house of prayer and make it a show-room for the exhibition of a "Passion Play," he would be no less guilty than those persons were who had been rebuked by our Lord. 2. But although the house of God is essentially a house of prayer, it is no less essentially a house of preaching. Witness the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke iv. 16-21), when our Lord eulogized preaching

to such an extent as to refer to it three times ; and when He actually did preach, by applying the whole passage to Himself ; and His preaching had such effect upon the hearers that "all bare Him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth." And His preaching ended in the people being "filled with wrath, and rose up and thrust Him out of the city, and led Him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast Him down headlong. But He, passing through the midst of them, went His way." 3. What is preaching—evangelical preaching? We reply, it is the act of a herald announcing pardon and peace to rebels and deserters. When, then, the herald of the Gospel announces pardon and peace, without money and without price, and invites all to accept the proffered terms, even to draw nigh to the Throne of Grace and plead the Saviour's sacrifice ; and when the herald of the Gospel tells of the love of God, and reminds his hearers that such a topic is one that the angels love to scan, but cannot fathom, will any one dare to say that the act of preaching is not a holy act, and that the attention of the hearer is not also a holy act? Is not the preaching of the Gospel an act of worship? People go to the house of God for the following four objects, viz. :—

1. To render thanks for the great benefits that they have received at His hand.
2. To set forth His most worthy praise.
3. To hear His most holy Word.
4. And to ask those things that are requisite and necessary as well for the body as the soul.

Surely each of these four acts is an act of worship—is an act of religion—that is, is an act calculated to "bind back" (for that is the meaning of the word religion) the soul to God. We worship God as we kneel and pray ; we worship God as we stand and sing ; we worship God as we sit and listen ; and to draw a distinction between these acts of devotion seems strange indeed. There are some people, however, who maintain that the highest act of devotion is the celebration of Holy Communion. But how is it the highest? What does

it effect especially? In it we show forth the Lord's death till He come. But the same great and glorious truth is also presented to the worshipper in preaching. And preaching has the advantage over communicating, that it is available at all times, and in all places, and in all companies. The preacher is in his place in the highway, in the market-place, amid a thousand people who are stamping and raging against him; he is also in his place when speaking to one only. Thus in preaching he is like his Lord and Master, who at one time had crowds listening to Him, at another had only a poor woman who stood by a well and heard Him patiently. Preaching is intended to convert the unconverted and to edify the believer; and thus it has an advantage over communion, which is intended only for the believer. Surely no one would think of saying that the Twelve as they sat at the Last Supper were engaged in the highest act of religious worship. It they were, it is to be feared they were not conscious of the fact. But as they listened to the discourse of the Master, and heard His wondrous words as He spake, such as no other had ever done, and as they listened to His glorious prayer, they must have felt indeed the power of His presence, and that in the prayer for oneness between themselves and Him, and between themselves, Him, and the Father, there was undoubted devotion and genuine worship. It seems a pity that such distinctions should be dwelt on, and that in order to disparage preaching the minister of the Gospel should be set down as being chiefly employed in sacrificing; in fact, that he should be regarded as a priest rather than a prophet, and that he is chiefly engaged in the work of the ministry, when it is his hand that is engaged at an *opus operatum* rather than his tongue telling of the power of redeeming love and giving utterance to the feelings of his heart.

As an instrument for converting the unconverted, preaching occupies the foremost place in the Church of Christ. And as to how this instrument is to be rightly employed is the all-important question. Here we maintain that as the work is God's work, so the servant who carries on the work

must be God's servant, and receive directions from God Himself. It is manifest, therefore, that the servant of the Lord must be a man of prayer, and that while he is to employ every means at his disposal for illustrating the word, the Book itself, with lexicons, commentaries, and grammars, must be before him, and the breath that breathes the words must be the breath that still imparts life, and that breath must breathe into the preacher's soul and give him life and power. The preacher must seek direct instruction from the Great Master, and tell in plainest language the tale of redeeming love, and in childlike simplicity say how God loved the world, and gave His only begotten Son to redeem the world.

If there is one thing more than another against which the preacher should be perpetually on his guard, it is politics in the pulpit. Oh! how many a bright flower blooming in the garden of the Lord has been blighted by politics! Whenever the politics of the world enter into the sermons of the preacher, woe betide that preacher and his hearers! Point out a single instance where Paul or any other Apostle took to politics as the subject-matter to attract an audience! No doubt Paul was fully aware of his privileges as a Roman citizen, and when these privileges were assailed he defended himself on three distinct occasions—at Philippi (Acts xvi. 37), at Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 25), and at Jerusalem again, before Festus (Acts xxv. 11). But never did he make politics the subject-matter of his preaching. Nor is there any occasion for such unseemly conduct in the present day. Were a preacher seriously to consider what his character really is—a messenger from God, a man of God, a steward in the family of God, gifted with the gifts of a prophet to a greater or less degree—he would not sink down to the level of a political hack, nor would he presume to raise politics to the level of the pulpit. Cowper's description of a preacher should be printed in letters of gold, and if studied would do an immense deal of good in these degenerate days of declamation.

HUGH MCSORLEY.

“THE HEREAFTER.”

ALTHOUGH the stress of theological controversy has for the moment been transferred from the subject which is generally known by Canon Farrar's title of the "Eternal Hope" to that of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament and the Personality of our Lord, still it has not passed out of the purview of theologians, and of course it is not possible for it to lose either its interest or importance. We have noted at the foot¹ three lately published works on this matter, which show that men's minds are still at work upon it; that learning and skill are still being employed in its elucidation; and we welcome heartily any attempt to make the doctrines of "the Hereafter" more intelligible. In treating of these doctrines, there are three principal modes of procedure, all of which are useful, though, of course, some are better than others. We can reason from analogy, which is the method pursued by Mr. Pitchford; we can call in the aid of the imagination, which is strikingly done by M. Petavel, a translation of whose papers on this subject is given by the Rev. C. H. Oliphant; or we can resort simply to the Revealed Word, which, after all, must be the only reliable source of information on such a matter. There is the appeal to history; but then that can only be the record of what people in other times and places have imagined, or of the way in which they have explained revelation. Mr. Fyfe has, in his book on "the Hereafter," brought before his readers the testimony of history to a future life and retribution, and also the testimony of archæology; and this forms a very interesting introduction to the examination he has made of the Old Testament, the Apocryphal Books, and the New Testament.

-
- ¹ 1. *Beata Spes*. By J. W. Pitchford, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1890.
 2. *The Extinction of Evil*. Three Theological Essays. By Rev. E. Petavel, D.D. Boston: Chas. H. Woodman. 1889.
 3. *The Hereafter*. By James Fyfe. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1890.

Mr. Pitchford's work is a tolerably satisfactory performance within the limits he seems to have set himself. He discusses the various aspects of the subject with calmness and without especial prejudice, and he arrives at a very satisfactory and orthodox conclusion. His book may well be recommended to those who do not care for any deep critical discussion, but who wish to have the subject brought before them in an every-day sort of fashion. He considers many of the arguments which have been alleged in support of the impossibility of continued life after death; he shows how scientific and philosophical thinkers differ amongst themselves on this subject; and concludes that, at any rate, "in the presence of these conflicting arguments we have abundant reason for concluding that, till further and more positive evidence is forthcoming, the materialistic philosophy does not exclude the possibility of a continued existence after death." Other chapters bring us to the study of the various ideas of death entertained by different nations; and it is pointed out how "in modern Christian hymnology, with but little countenance from Holy Scripture, further than a supposed analogy between the wanderings of the Israelites, their passage of the Jordan into the Holy Land, and the course and ending of the Christian life, there is the same idea of death as a journey which is found in Virgil and Homer, and an ancient writer whose remarks are preserved by Stobæus." Mr. Pitchford then shows that any knowledge of futurity can only really be gained from revelation; as Channing says, "Where but from God Himself can I learn my destination?" and he proceeds to show how the future is revealed in the Bible. The chapter upon the agreement of the Christian revelation of futurity with the laws of nature is a very important one. Mr. Pitchford takes death in its natural sense to be a punishment for sin. He says nothing about that death which geology shows was antecedent to the appearance of man upon the earth; and when he speaks of death at all, he confines it to that of the human race. He then proceeds to discuss our Lord's miracles of raising the dead, Christ's own resurrection, and the state next after death; then there are

chapters about the general resurrection and everlasting felicity.

The *Extinction of Evil* is the somewhat taking title of the three theological essays of the Rev. E. Petavel, to which the Rev. E. White has written a preface. We have always considered Mr. White's views, as well as those of Canon Farrar, to be the outcome of a humane heart, which seeks to modify and lessen the terrible prospect which others have shown to await the impenitent. There are undoubtedly many passages of Scripture which lend support to the doctrine of conditional immortality, and that notion is one which commends itself to the more pitiful part of our nature. The leading idea of this school of theologians is that man, although capable of survival as to his spirit, in the death of time is not absolutely immortal or by nature destined to endless life; but is under sentence of capital punishment, or extinction of all life through sin, original and individual; a destiny from which he is to be saved only through the Divine Incarnation, that is, the union of the eternal life of God with human nature in the Person of Christ, by regeneration and by resurrection in glory. False religions everywhere represent salvation as man's natural work towards God. The one true religion of Christ represents salvation as God's supernatural work towards man. This work of God consists in three acts of grace: (1) in the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, that thereby in the Atonement by the sacrifice unto death of the God-man He might "make an end of sins," and bring in the free gift of justification of life, or acceptance for sinners; (2) in the gift of the Holy Spirit to dwell as in a temple, in the body of the believer (1 Cor. vi.) to communicate the Divine Image and Eternal Life to the soul; (3) in the future resurrection of the dead in "glory, honour, and immortality" (Rom. viii. 1-14). Then the message of the Gospel of God is summed up in Divine words thus—*Unless men are born twice, they will die twice.* Ye must be "born again" or die the "second death" (John iii. 1-7; Apocalypse xx. 14). Those who do not possess the sanctifying, renewing, immortalizing Spirit will perish everlastingly. Those who are born of God,

will "live" in the glory of the Father, in this boundless universe, "for ever and ever." Dr. Petavel and M. Charles Byse, both now of Lausanne, have taken the lead in the diffusion of these ideas upon the Continent; and Mr. White was some years before them in this enterprise in England, his work entitled *Life in Christ* having now become famous and almost classical. The views of this school of theologians appear, primarily, to be in opposition to the doctrine of Universalism advocated by others. We shall see presently whether they are in themselves orthodox or fairly maintainable in the face of revelation viewed as a whole. That these essays contain many striking passages goes without saying, and that the author is actuated by an earnest desire to find out the truth we are quite ready to believe, though whether the way to do this is, to make up one's mind first and seek for scriptural and all other available proof of one's conclusion, is certainly open to question. We quite agree that "nothing is more palpable at present than the unsettled condition of Christian eschatology." To quote Mr. Oliphant in his introduction, "It appears in controversial points, in sermons, in newspapers, in processes for heresy, and in the table-talk of intelligent people everywhere. Nowhere, however, is it more manifest than in the loss of a certain moving power which the pulpit formerly possessed in its appeals to healthy fear. By whatever access of 'sweet reasonableness' or of the 'larger hope' this loss may be compensated, it is a serious thing for the prophet, when he bears down upon his lever, to feel that it is the fulcrum, and not the weight above, that is yielding to his pressure. And it does seem that men no longer tremble when he reasons 'of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.' The denunciations of the pulpit are heard with indifference tempered with respect. Hell is 'hollow' indeed. The terrible legend, 'He who enters here leaves hope behind,' has been smilingly removed from its portal. If hope is eternal, the masses will be saved by hope. The preacher may indeed suggest that 'hope deferred maketh the heart sick;' he may even venture to assert that eternal hope to him by whom

it is never realized is but a form of hell. But he who should preach the traditional orthodoxy upon this subject, as it was formerly preached, would very soon miss his audience, without being at all puzzled to know what had become of them." "It is the doctrine of this book that the 'living soul' of which the Scriptures speak can perpetuate itself as a living soul only by conforming to the law of God and of its own spiritual nature. That it can be eternized in sin and disorder is believed to be a theory full of all subtlety and mischief." Dr. Petavel first considers the essential conditions of being; he points out that man does not perish for ever in the first death. "A future life," he tells us, "is revealed to us by more than one passage in the Old Testament and by the most explicit assurances in the New." According to the Bible, men at the resurrection are to be separated into two great divisions, the first of which contains those who have trusted in Divine mercy and lived a godly life, and the second consists of hardened sinners, and those who have never heard or understood the good news of salvation. The latter are, by their condition, naturally exposed to perdition; but we think that there are passages of Scripture which imply that they will be subjected to a fresh trial, and that a special appeal will be addressed to them (1 Peter iii. 19, 20; iv. 6). With regard to the fate of impenitent and irreclaimable sinners, Dr. Petavel believes in their annihilation; supporting his opinion with the usual arguments about our inability to realize the length of eternity, and the cruelty of the theology which teaches otherwise. He also says that the Bible speaks of "endless justice," "endless life," everlasting joy; but "endless woe," "eternal moments," "everlasting misery" are expressions which, in common with the terms "deathless" or immortal soul, are never found in the Sacred Text in reference to men or any other living creatures. This doctrine is worked out with a considerable amount of skill, and the details are almost made to fit in too well. Dr. Petavel examines the orthodoxy of the Apostolic Fathers, and remarks that the doctrine of eternal torment is found neither in the Apostles' nor the Nicene Creeds, nor in two of the principal confessions of faith of the sixteenth

century, viz., the otherwise rigid creed of the French Reformed Churches and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. He concludes that the writings of the earlier Fathers—Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria—all show them to be faithful to the "Apostolic doctrine" of the final destruction of the wicked, and that the dogma of everlasting torment did not creep into the Church until she yielded to the influence of the Platonic philosophy. The second essay is directed especially against the doctrine of universal salvation, called Origenism, Apocatastasis, or Restitutionism, and finally Universalism. This, according to Dr. Petavel, found numerous advocates, especially in the East, such as Gregory Thaumaturgus, Pierius and Theognostus, Pamphilus of Cæsarea, Eusebius the historian, Gregory of Nyssa, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. In the West, Augustinianism prevailed over the opinions of Origen; but his doctrine, in a more or less modified form, appears with Bengel in Germany, Bishop Newton in England, and the venerable Oberlin of Ban-de-la-Roche. Mademoiselle Huber, of Geneva, and Pastor Ferdinand Olivier Petipierre, of Neuchâtel, maintained this view; and a work of the latter, entitled *The Plan of God*, attained considerable celebrity. He himself, however, was condemned by the Venerable Company of Ministers, and obliged to go into exile. In spite of all his zeal, talent, and virtue, he left no disciples; the fault lay in his system, which conducted to a deadlock. Neander, Von Kapff, of Stuttgart, Maurice, and Tholuck have, to a greater or less extent, adopted this doctrine, although there is a reserve to be made in the case of Tholuck, who says, "Dogmatically, I feel myself drawn towards Universalism; but, exegetically, I can hardly justify this opinion." Dr. Petavel also quotes Archbishop Tait as expressing the hope that, after the day of judgment, Divine mercy will find in the infinity of ages some means of reclaiming lost souls without compromising His justice. He expresses his sympathy, to a great extent, with the optimism of Dr. Farrar; the more so, as he believes, even more positively

than the Archdeacon, that there will be an *end of evil*. However, Dr. Petavel rebuts Universalism on account of its novelty ; because, according to him, it is irrational ; because it contradicts *universal analogy*, which shows us that the great law of nature is this : Be transformed in order to live ; and because it is unscriptural. He avers, moreover, that it is morally dangerous, and he quotes the sayings of several eminent men in support of the position that Universalism is wildly optimistic, popular at little cost, and insists upon viewing everything in a rosy light. The third essay is on what Dr. Petavel calls Christ's favourite maxim, "Whosoever shall save his life, shall lose it ; and whosoever shall lose his life for My sake, shall find it." One word here, he says, has been the despair of translators ; they have all stumbled at the term *ψυχή*, which they have rendered sometimes by *life*, and sometimes by *soul*, although neither one expression nor the other is entirely satisfactory. Dr. Petavel would construe it by "himself," a personal pronoun which bears at times a double sense, designating by turns, according to the sequence of thought, the present life of the individual, and that which survives the body. Dr. Petavel has some acute remarks on the variety of expressions used by the four evangelists in reference to the manner of obtaining immortality. "According to St. Matthew, the believer will find (*εὕρησει*), he will discover, as by miracle, that which he had lost." This evangelist has in view the Jewish hope of the resurrection of the body. St. Luke, on the contrary, delights often in portraying the finer shades of Greek thought. According to him, the believer will *reproduce* his life (*ξωογενήσει*). This is the philosophical idea of palingenesis. St. Mark represents rather the Roman faith, the faith of the soldier who hardly reasons at all. Without inquiring *how*, he knows that the believer, like the combatant, will finally come forth safe and sound from the conflict with death ; he will wrest his life from the enemy who menaces it ; he will *save* it (*σώσει*). Finally, as represented in the Gospel of St. John, the believer cannot die. He will not recover his life, nor will he reproduce it ; he will not beat off death in a desperate encounter. Calm and

tranquil, though vigilant, he will keep his life (*φυλάξει*). To be saved, to obtain eternal salvation, it is necessary to lose something, *e.g.*, earthly life for the martyr; and for every Christian, the voluntary suppression of certain pleasures. To be lost, according to Christ's teaching, is to be destroyed, soul and body, to be despoiled of every faculty of one's being; to enter finally into the horror of eternal nothingness. There are three appendices to these essays; in the first, objections against conditional immortality are urged and answered, but the objections and answers are evidently the compilation of a very friendly critic of the doctrine; the second appendix is on the word "death" in Holy Scripture, and it is maintained that this word ought always to be understood in its ordinary sense; the third appendix is of texts in support of the doctrine.

Mr. Fyfe's work is a larger and more complete treatise than either of these, and is conceived and carried out in a reverent manner, with an evident desire to arrive at the entire truth on this most important subject. He takes the Bible as being God's revelation to man, and "having no conscious predilection to influence him, no pet theory to sustain; his simple and sole desire has been to understand and *explain*, not to *defend*, the Word of God. In Part I. Mr. Fyfe gives us the historical, archæological, and exegetical evidence about Sheol, Hades, and Hell: the World to Come. The beliefs of the most ancient peoples forming the three great divisions of mankind are briefly reviewed; and certainly he makes out, without much fear of contradiction, that all the world over there has existed a belief in an eternal future of rewards and punishments. The pyramids of Egypt and the monumental mounds in Mexico are standing records of a belief which must have been strongly held by those who undertook such herculean labours; and when from "China to Peru," from the cultivated Assyrians of old to the benighted negroes of the present day, we find that all people everywhere have held a belief more or less well-defined in a future state of rewards and punishments of an eternal character, we are warranted by all the rules of scientific inquiry to affix a cause outside the bounds of

humanity—it is hardly less than a revelation. But, of course, for the clearest testimony on such a matter we apply to Holy Writ; for “though history, art, burial rites and customs, expressing human desires and necessities, aspirations and experiences, may go a long way to show the high probability of a future life, they cannot establish its absolute certainty. That is the high prerogative of the Sacred Scriptures. The faith of the world in a life to come rests on the strongest of all foundations, the *sure Word of God.*” And so the solution of the questions surrounding this subject become a matter of exegesis, and Mr. Fyfe conducts his inquiries in a manner worthy of high praise, for he seeks simply to know what Holy Scripture says, and what is its true meaning; and apparently he does not shrink from any conclusion to which this inquiry may lead him. The distinctive name given to the unseen state is *Sheol*. That is the Hebrew state of the dead, and answers precisely to the Greek *Hades*, the Latin *Orcus*, and the Anglo-Saxon *Hell*. All these are the names given to the world beyond this, the unseen region where disembodied spirits live and move and have their being. *Sheol* occurs sixty-five times in the Old Testament, and in the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611) it is rendered *Grave* thirty-five times, *Hell* thirty-one times, and *Pit* three times. In the Revised Version (A.D. 1885) it is untranslated thirty times, it is rendered *Hell* fifteen times, *Grave* fifteen times, and *Pit* five times. In the Septuagint it is rendered *Hades* sixty times. Originally *Sheol*, *Hades*, and *Hell* had the same meaning. As the material heavens, the hemisphere above the earth, was conceived to be a hollow arch, so *Sheol* was thought to be a hollow world underneath, the one really answering to the other. That the national creed of the Israelites contained a belief in a future life can be abundantly proved from their sacred writings, and these are not only beautiful descriptions of the joys of the unseen world (cf. Job. iii. 11-19), but also of trouble and distress (*e.g.* Ps. xviii. 5; cxvi. 3; Isa. xxxviii. 10; Ps. cxli. 7; lxxxviii. 3-7). In the patriarchal age, *Sheol*, like Homer’s *Hades*, was the general gathering-place of spirits, apparently without distinction; but in the later literature of

the Jews, it becomes divided into two states—the abode of the righteous and the wicked. In this respect it has undergone the same modification as Hades in Greek literature, or Orcus in the Latin, or Hell in the Anglo-Saxon. We have not space to show this, but Mr. Fyfe establishes this fact with abundant illustration. He then goes on to show that destruction is the portion of the wicked, and salvation the portion of the righteous. There are a dozen Hebrew words that are rendered destruction, according to the different ways in which it is brought about ; but the most significant of them all in this connection is the verb *abad* and the noun *Abaddon*. These terms mean an act or event, but also they indicate state, condition, and sometimes even *place*, like Sheol. The verb *abad* means to lose, be lost, destroy, perish, and sometimes includes death, even a violent death, but not extinction, and is used to describe the wretched miserable condition of animals, men, and nations lost and ruined. It is translated into English by lost, ready to perish, destroy, failing. Gesenius says that *Abaddon* is nearly synonymous with Sheol, and, like it, indicates *state* and *place*. Against the troubles of Sheol stands the salvation of the righteous. It is no doubt true that in the Old Testament salvation very frequently means deliverance from present affliction and threatened disaster, as from Egypt and enemies and disease. But it is often used in a higher and more spiritual sense, especially in connection with the Messiah and His kingdom. The destruction and salvation are exhibited in contrast in such passages as Prov. xiv. 32 : "The wicked is thrust down in his evil doing, but the righteous hath hope (a refuge) in his death" (cf. also Isa. lvii. 1, 2, 20, 21).

From his examination of the Old Testament Scriptures, Mr. Fyfe concludes that evidences of a future state abound therein ; and that they teach also a distinction in the states of the dead. Yet very little is revealed concerning the nature and mode of that life. As however with kindred truths—God, moral government, human responsibility, the Messiah and His kingdom—progressive development is visible, so also is it with the doctrine of a future state. The Sheol of the patriarch is the general gathering-place of the dead, but the

distinction, if any, in their condition is dim and shadowy. But as time advances, Sheol becomes divided into two states—a higher and a lower—with characteristic differences more or less clearly marked. The higher division—heaven—is the dwelling-place of God, whence He blesses people in this life and takes them to be with Himself hereafter. On the other hand, in the lower division there appear to be indications of a low, lower, and lowest deep; and while the righteous have life, light, salvation, and blessing, the wicked have death, darkness, destruction, and fire as their portion. This is Mr. Fyfe's conclusion drawn from the plain, grammatical, and evident sense of the writers after the obscurities of translation, &c., have been removed. Mr. Fyfe next proceeds to discuss the testimony of the Apocrypha to a future life and retribution; quoting an apposite passage out of 2 Esdras vii., where it is said, "The day of judgment is Thy decisive day. . . . All shall then bear each for himself his own wrongdoing or well-doing." After citing suitable passages out of the various books, he thus sums up: "Concerning the nature of rewards and punishments, the same metaphors are employed as in the Old Testament. In the description of the state of souls after death, though the wicked are in 'torment,' and the righteous in blessedness, no *material* element is mentioned. Here we have the word immortality for the first time, though the *idea*, if not the name is in the Old Testament. The Apocrypha represents rewards and punishments as irrevocable and perpetual; and in it we have the same perplexity with regard to the mysteries of Divine Providence—the introduction of moral evil, its continuity and results, here and hereafter—that has troubled and oppressed the wisest men in all ages. The same passionate cry for deliverance that has always come from earnest souls; the same fierce conflict between good and evil, with the victory and palm, the failure and misery, that has ever characterized humanity. And lastly, we have the ultimate reference made, as it ever must be, to God, the righteous Judge of all the earth." Of course, Mr. Fyfe does not put forth these quotations as infallible utterances of the standard of truth, but rather as historical

evidence of what was the national belief in the interval between the Old and New Testaments. The historical evidence is, at any rate, valuable. Coming to the New Testament, Mr. Fyfe finds the references to "the Hereafter" so numerous that he cannot treat them in the way he did those in the Old Testament; so instead of giving the passages, he selects the principal terms employed in connection with the subject, groups them, and carefully examines their import. By taking the *key words* of the subject, and ascertaining their force and meaning, he is of opinion that he will come to a clear understanding of the matter. This takes up a large portion of the work, and we can only remark here that Mr. Fyfe carries out his task with great care and candour, and there is every evidence both of learning and fairness in his method. His researches lead him to the conclusion that religion is built upon the idea of the immortality of the soul, which is an ancient and universal belief. "The Scriptures nowhere attempt a formal proof of a life to come, but they teach clearly and unmistakably that men have souls that live through and beyond death." The annihilation theory is therefore untenable. Nor can conditional immortality be proved from Scripture: Mr. Fyfe tells us that it would require a new Gospel to establish it. Universalism, too, fails to establish itself under Mr. Fyfe's criticism. And so after duly weighing every part of the subject, our author comes to the conclusion that Holy Scripture, which must be the final court of appeal open to us on this matter, sets forth unmistakably the doctrine of eternal retribution. Fire, indeed, and such terms, are symbolical expressions of mental or spiritual punishments, but these punishments are nevertheless real and everlasting. *Æonial* may mean "age lasting," if such a term be coined for the purpose, but then it must be applied all round; if there is only to be "age lasting" sin, punishment, judgment, destruction, hell, there can only be *æonial* life, salvation, kingdom, inheritance, comfort, glory. Christ the Holy Spirit and God the Father are *æonial* too. "Taking, then, the entire range of the use of the terms indicating duration," Mr. Fyfe says, "it is difficult to conceive how any

candid mind can deny that, when applied to the future spiritual state, they convey the idea of absolute, endless duration. And unless we have recourse to an arbitrary and reckless criticism, we seem shut up to the conclusion that it is the Divine intention, by the use of these terms, to impress upon men the idea that future punishment is as eternal as the life and blessedness of the saints, and as the life and blessedness of the ever-living, ever-blessed God Himself." Mr. Fyfe says very little about the intermediate state, or the question of a second probation, either because it did not come strictly within the limits he set himself, or because he concluded that his researches rendered any more detailed statements unnecessary. And he concludes with a review of the moral difficulties that lie in the way. Eternal punishment may be repugnant to human feeling, and many may echo Canon Kingsley's passionate utterances in this respect. But was Canon Kingsley, is any human heart, satisfied or content with the sufferings of God's creatures in the present life? By the Canon's criterion, the whole course of nature stands condemned. Are we to place everything here and hereafter under the universal malediction of pessimism, or can we say that the Judge of all the earth does *right*? As Mr. Fyfe shows, whatever may be said about its being inconsistent with the character, or the conduct, or the Fatherhood of God; whether eternal punishment is necessary or not, or however disproportionate it may seem to us; the same arguments may be applied to the things that are going on in the world around us, and they cannot alter the facts. "The government of God in both worlds is of a piece, and proceeds upon the same lines." It would, at any rate, from our point of view, be a glorious consummation if all sin and sorrow and suffering were banished from the universe, and every created being shared the love and joy of the ever-blessed God. But have we any ground for expecting an intervention of this kind? "After most careful and candid examination," says Mr. Fyfe, "we are bound to say, we can find no foundation for this beautiful theory either in Scripture or nature."

F. THORNE.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

On Church Government. THE Rev. James Gall has written a volume to prove that the Synagogue, and not the Temple, is the Germ and Model of the Christian Church, and that statement forms its title (1). It is written in forcible language which is pleasant to read; the author has no hesitation or doubt about the truth of his theory, and he certainly has the power of expressing his views in terms which cannot be misunderstood. If his opinions are correct, however, it is evident that, as far at least as the administrative side of Christianity goes, it is all wrong. "Upon investigation," Mr. Gall tells us in the Preface, "two gigantic errors presented themselves, sufficient to account for all the difference between the Apostolic Church and our own. The first is the loss of the baptism of the Holy Ghost as an 'endowment with power,' without which the Apostles were forbidden to go out upon their mission. The other is the abandonment of the Synagogue with its elders as the model of the Church, and the adoption of the Temple with its priesthood instead." After describing the Synagogue and the Temple system to some extent, in order to show the *rationale* of the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants and institutions, and what he calls *kat oikon* churches—such as are hinted at in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles—Mr. Gall proceeds to prove that "Templeism" is the root of the Papacy, and that the Papacy is an overgrown wrong. Christmas is a mistake, and Good Friday should be Good Thursday (here he refers the reader to another treatise of his). In the Apostolic Church, when the Temple system was abolished and the Abrahamic covenant alone remained, there were no priests. There were apostles and prophets, and evangelists and pastors, and teachers appointed by Christ—but where do we find any mention of priests? So far as the Bible is concerned, any Christian may, *with the Church's sanction*, administer baptism or dispense the Lord's Supper, and any man may perform the marriage ceremony whom the civil magistrate may authorize to do so. So there are no sacraments in the usual sense. The union between the Church and State is really a union between the Church and the world, and is actually a cause of disaster. The parochial system is a mistake; and archbishops

and bishops, as well as rectors, vicars, and curates, are an undiluted drawback. Under the parochial system, with its parish minister or priest, the "Church" is no longer a society of believers, as in Apostolic times, but a consecrated building, in which public worship is performed by the parish minister in the presence of the parishioners and all who choose to attend. There are seats in the building appropriated to different worshippers, but they have no fellowship one with another, for the only connecting link which binds the congregation together is the pulpit, just as in the theatre the only connecting link is the stage. . . . A *Parish* Church is a contradiction in terms. Mr. Gall boldly asserts that there is no such ordinance as *public* worship to be found in the Word of God. It is a Popish invention, founded on the Temple theory for the very purpose of debasing the Church of God and exalting the clergy, and has been fraught with ruin to the interests of evangelism. . . . The pulpit, also, is a comparatively modern institution, never mentioned in the Bible. There was no pulpit in the Temple, there was no pulpit in the Synagogue, there was no pulpit in the Apostolic Church. We have quoted enough of Mr. Gall's opinions to show that he has made a clean sweep of everything that ordinary people would imagine to be appertaining to the Church; and if we followed his advice everything would be begun *de novo*. But let us at least be thankful that all is not lost. "Christ has left two ordinances which ought never to have been confounded: the one is preaching the Gospel to those who are without, the other is the tending and feeding of those who are within. And corresponding with these there are the two offices, that of the evangelist and the pastor." What does Mr. Gall recommend? He allows that organization is needed; and he sees how difficult it would be to upset all existing arrangements. So he would keep the churches, retain the pastors, and pay them well for doing their appointed work; and take every pains that they should be learned and godly. There would also be evangelists, who might follow trades, &c., for a maintenance, whose duty it would be to bring people into the Church. It would not be difficult to show that Mr. Gall proves too much; and that while we are quite ready to admit his zeal for true religion, his methods would not work. He forgets that the circumstances of mankind vary from age to age, and what was possible and proper in the Apostolic age would be futile and possibly foolish now. We agree with Mr. Gall in his desire for a deeper sense of dependence upon the assistance of the Spirit of

God in all Christian endeavours; and we quite believe that the fellowship meetings he recommends would do a good deal towards deepening spiritual life. But we cannot believe that the great Head of the Church has suffered it to go so entirely wrong as Mr. Gall seems to think; we are sure that He has always been with His disciples, and though many and various errors of opinion and practice have crept into the Church and obtained a hold there, still He has not left it, and, according to His gracious promise, will be with it even to the end. Mr. Gall's book is extremely interesting from the very extraordinary views therein expressed, and beneath them all there is evidently an intense desire to bring all men everywhere to a knowledge of the truth.

The Framework of the Church (2) is a Treatise on Church Government, in which Prof. Killen maintains that the proper form for ecclesiastical order is the Presbyterian. In Part I. he shows what distinction may be drawn between the visible Church and the Church of God. There is a visible Church which is Christ's peculiar heritage, and the form of its government is a matter of the highest importance. Dr. Killen holds very properly that we should seek to ascertain how the Church was arranged by the Apostles, and he shows that in Scripture doctrine is more largely dwelt upon than discipline. The Apostolic Church was governed by a variety of rulers; but Church functionaries made their appearance towards the end of the second, or in the course of the third century, which had no existence in Apostolic days; and therefore, says Dr. Killen, "if we read of *prelates*, and *priests*, and *high priests* in the third and fourth century, not to speak of readers, acolytes, sub-deacons, and others, we may fairly infer that there must meanwhile have been a departure from primitive arrangements." But then that is not a proof that such departures were wrong; for, as Dr. Killen very properly says, "Were we disposed to defer to the practice of antiquity in regard to questions of polity and worship, we could not, in many cases, arrive at any definite conclusion, inasmuch as the various Christian societies at an early period were not distinguished by any uniform system of ecclesiastical order." Part I. concludes with a chapter on the various forms of Church government, which, excluding cases of an abnormal character, the author reduces to three, viz.—Congregationalism, Prelacy, and Presbytery. "The Congregationalists or Independents form the smallest of these denominations; they were not known as a distinct religious body till some time after the Reformation, and, as a Church polity,

their system has not had a very wide and prosperous development. . . . Those who adopt the ecclesiastical policy of Prelacy—though perhaps in a minority within the pale of Protestantism—occupy the largest space in the map of nominal or visible Christianity. They are not, however, united either in doctrine or discipline. They form the Greek Church, the Romish Church, the Church of England, the American Methodist Episcopal Church, the Churches of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, the Moravian and other Churches. Before the time of the Reformation all Christendom, with the exception of a few small and obscure communities, adhered to the Episcopal system." Prof. Killen points out that the Irish Episcopal Church has, since the passing of the Act for its disestablishment, been completely revolutionized, being now governed by prelates, clergy, and lay representatives. The Professor notes, moreover, that events have falsified the prediction of Cardinal Cullen, "that Protestantism has no other hold on its followers than the mere temporal endowments;" for, though twenty years have elapsed since the disestablishment of the Irish Church, Irish Protestantism exhibits no indications of diminished vitality. The English Establishment is by far the most extensive Protestant Church of the Episcopal form in existence; and though Prof. Killen points out that "it has long laboured under the disadvantage of a house divided against itself, as it harbours preachers and teachers of the most conflicting religious sentiments under its latitudinarian canopy," still he confesses that "it displays much zeal," and "its rich endowments have enabled it to take a high place in literature, and its influence is felt all over the world;" though "it cannot be said that our best and most useful treatises on theology have been produced by its divines." Presbyterianism is not claimed to be co-extensive with Episcopacy; but its virtues are many, and now that the tendency to split is not now so great as it was, it can prepare itself for "making more vigorous efforts to evangelize the world." Part II. of Prof. Killen's treatise is occupied with the consideration of Congregationalism; and its insufficiency is pointed out. Part III. is a discussion of the claims of Prelacy, beginning with the alleged Primacy of Peter. Prelacy as distinguished from Popery is then considered, and exception taken to the views of Archbishop Potter and others on these matters. Prof. Killen has a chapter to prove that Prelacy is a "dangerous, thriftless, and very imperfect form of Church government," but his proofs seem mainly to be derived from his own ecclesiastical history of Ireland.

"Prelacy," he maintains, "is not the agency appointed of God to accomplish the evangelization of the world and the unity of the Church," which is a most serious statement, depending, apparently, merely on the Professor's opinion that there has been a tendency on the part of many Protestant Episcopalians to make peace with the Church of Rome. . . . Part IV. contains the arguments in favour of Presbytery, according to which system of Church government all ministers of the Word are of the same order; every congregation under the superintendence of the Session, consisting of the pastor and the ruling elders; and congregations are associated under the care of Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies. Deacons have charge of the temporal affairs of the Church. Prof. Killen maintains this form of Church polity as being the proper one from a consideration of our Lord's instructions to His disciples, and from New Testament evidences; and then proceeds to treat of Dr. Campbell's theory of the Ruling Eldership, &c., of deacons and their appointment, of the election of ministers, and ordination; and we freely admit that his arguments are learned and forcible, though the bias that underlies them is very apparent. The work concludes with a chapter on Apostolical Succession, and Prof. Killen's verdict on this matter is thus given: "There can be no right to Apostolical succession where there is not the teaching of Apostolic truth. The real successor of the Apostles is the man who walks in their ways, exhibits their spirit, and preaches their theology. When judging of the credentials of a minister of the New Testament, we are not to enter into a bootless attempt to settle his clerical genealogy. We are simply to consider his gifts, his character, and his present position." So that Apostolical succession is not a question of fact and of history, but of sentiment; and the idea can only be a subjective one. In an Appendix, Prof. Killen discusses the Ignatian Epistles, and says that "it is passing strange that such a man as Dr. Lightfoot toiled on throughout the greater portion of his life with a view to establish the credit of these silly and self-condemned epistles. . . . Though High Church reviewers, and some others who should be better informed, may announce to their readers that Dr. Lightfoot has settled for ever the question of their genuineness, he has really settled quite a different conclusion. After a whole life spent in their defence, he has left the question in no better position than he found it, and he has thus demonstrated the hopelessness of any future attempt to establish their reputation." Prof. Killen's treatise is learned

and interesting. He does not expect all his readers to adopt his conclusions, and he would be disappointed if he did; but in so far as it throws light on the controversy in question, it is welcome, and we may join the author in his hopes that the "serious inquirer will find some of his difficulties removed, and be encouraged to look forward confidently to that glorious day when the commonwealth of the saints shall present the spectacle of a united brotherhood."

The Church (3) is a pamphlet designed to show that "not one of the existing religious bodies has the right to call itself the true Church; but in every nation—and, we may add, in every smaller society—he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with God. These are the true building stones for that spiritual temple which no power in the world can destroy; these alone may be called members of Christ." In the author's opinion, it is not advisable to leave one society and join another, merely because certain men or forms please us. Failings, weaknesses, and sins will be found everywhere, whatever society we may choose to select. He also maintains that "what is necessary to salvation is put clearly before us in the Bible, and may be understood by every one without commentary or explanation. It is the perfect harmony with the requirements of our conscience, and commends itself to everybody's heart." But how the truths of Scripture are to be made known and brought home without the aid of ministers of the Gospel the author does not say. If the intention of the author of this pamphlet be to increase the mutual love of Christians of various denominations, and to assist towards their unity, we wish him success; but as they are set down, his sympathies towards heathens and others are broader than generally obtain. The little work forms part of a larger treatise entitled *On the Object of Life*.

In *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1890, there is an article on the Seven Failures of Calvinism, a striking article analogous to the subject alluded to above; and in the *Canadian Methodist Quarterly* of the same date (published at Toronto, Montreal, and Halifax), the Rev. W. Harrison discusses the question of Church and State in England, which may be read in the same connection. Both these periodicals present articles of the usual standard of excellence, and they deserve recognition in all parts of Christendom.

(1) *The Synagogue, not the Temple, the Germ and Model of the Christian Church*. By the Rev. James Gall. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co. Edinburgh: Gall & Inglis.

(2) *The Framework of the Church*. By W. D. Killen, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1890. Price 9s.

(3) *The Church; The Body of All True Worshippers, no Matter what Human Society they may belong to*. London: Nisbet & Co. Price 4d.

A remarkable pamphlet on the Rights and the Wrongs of the Papacy (1) has just been published in French under this title. It is the work of a Protestant theologian in whose mind the ideas to which he has thus given publicity have been working for many years. Having felt the need of fixing for himself the true position of the Papacy in the Christian world, as the mariner determines and fixes on his chart the position of a sunken rock, and being convinced that the Pope is neither the Antichrist of the extreme Protestants, nor the infallible vicar of Christ of the Ultramontanes, Doctor Petavel believes that he has found the true solution of the problem in the parable of the steward reported by Matthew (xxiv. 45-51) and Luke (xii. 41-46). At first sight it will certainly excite astonishment that a Protestant should suggest that the Pope has been established in his office by God Himself; but the explanation is found in the fact that in the Bible God is often said to do that which He permits, and in Paul's declaration that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" and the author is careful also to apply the Biblical corrective of that much-abused principle in the equally authorized right to withhold obedience to the power when it involves disobedience to God. Whatever may be thought of the arguments on that point, it is certainly remarkable how closely the seven verses of the parable in Matthew correspond with seven successive stages in the history of the Papacy. In fact, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to put that history into so concise a form and so small a compass as it is found in the parable, at the same time indicating its moral lessons. This correspondence is brought out with great clearness in Dr. Petavel's pamphlet, wherein it is shown that while the early Bishops of Rome were, like the steward in the parable at the beginning of his career, both faithful and skilful, and so were, like him, entrusted with greater authority, yet afterwards, during the Lord's continued absence, by personal misbehaviour and by ill-treatment of fellow-servants, like the steward again, the Popes, too, have incurred the just judgment of the Lord, and have had to suffer accordingly. It may be thought that Dr. Petavel makes too many concessions, and goes too far in some of his admissions, as, for example, that Peter may have been at Rome, and that the Popes may be considered his successors; but if the Pope, or any one of his obedient subjects, should be induced by these early concessions to admit that this is the right application of the parable, he would soon discover that in the hand of Dr. Petavel it is a weapon that cuts both ways, and he will find himself

compelled to accept also some distasteful lessons, and to admit that the cutting strokes of the Divine judgment have not been undeserved. Without accepting all Dr. Petavel's views, and without abating in the least degree our dislike of the Papal system which has produced such unspeakable horrors, and would again if it had but the power, we may all heartily agree with the practical aim and purpose of the pamphlet, which is to point out the duty incumbent upon Christians to treat their fellow-Christians in the spirit of Christ. Protestants, in dealing with Roman Catholics, should distinguish between the system and the persons; and while cordially hating the former as a horrible perversion, should treat the latter with charity as fellow-Christians. If our pity is excited by seeing them so entangled in the meshes of the Papal net as to be unable to break loose from it, we should be willing to lend them a helping hand if only they will accept it.

(1) *Les Droits et les Torts de la Papauté, ou les devoirs des Protestants envers leurs frères Catholiques Romains.* Par E. Petavel-Olliff, D.D. Lausanne: F. Payot, 1 Rue de Bourg. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 33 Rue de Seine.

Bible-Class Primers. Edited by Professor Salmon, D.D.

The Life of Abraham, by Charles Anderson, B.A., gives, in a very concisely-written and portable booklet, accurate and well-up-to-date information upon the essential points in the history of this patriarch.

The Old Testament: Its Place and Authority in the Christian Church. By Rev. A. F. Simpson, M.A. Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot.

A timely paper. After a brief review of the character of modern destructive criticism, Mr. Simpson contends that if the framework of the Old Testament be imagination, that the idea itself is deprived of authority and driven from the sphere of objective reality.

Men of the Bible.

In *Gideon and the Judges*, by the Rev. John Marshall Lang, D.D., the story of a far-past and rough age is well reproduced, and its reading will be found historically interesting and homiletically profitable. Unlike some of the series, the biographical and practical, rather than the exegetical and critical, predominate. Though the author has judiciously availed himself of the valuable and manifold help given by other labourers in the same department, still his work bears throughout the impress of independent and original thought.

The Expository Times enters upon a new and important stage of life. With the October Number the second volume is commenced. Few ventures of the kind have proved such a decided success in so brief a time. The reason is obvious. There is exhibited everywhere in its pages sympathetic interest on the part of the Editor and writers with their readers.