

MARCH 1890.

# The Theological Monthly

---

## NATURAL RELIGION.\*

"LORD GIFFORD'S BEQUEST" provides certain lectureships for the discussion of "Natural Theology." It declares that "the lecturers shall be subjected to no test of any kind . . . they may be of any religion or way of thinking, or, as is sometimes said, they may be of no religion, or they may be so-called sceptics or agnostics or freethinkers," but they must be "able, reverent men, true thinkers, sincere lovers of, and earnest inquirers after, truth." The testator further directs, "I wish the lecturers to treat their subject as a strictly natural science, the greatest of all possible sciences, indeed, in one sense, the only science, that of Infinite Being, without reference to or reliance upon any supposed exceptional and so-called miraculous revelation. I wish it considered just as astronomy or chemistry is." It is not surprising that Professor Max Müller waxes jubilant over this bequest, and points to it as a gratifying indication of the approaching triumph of the newest of the sciences, "the Science of Religion." And certainly he is faithful to his reading of the conditions. He distinctly and formally warns "supposed exceptional and so-called miraculous revelation" off the ground. He does not deny the abstract possibility of supernatural revelation; but he does not treat it as a factor to be reckoned with practically.

Of course, there is an obvious defence of this procedure.

---

\* *Natural Religion*. The Gifford Lectures delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1888. By F. Max Müller, K.M. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1889.

The subject of the lectures is professedly *Natural Religion*. Supernatural religion, therefore, lies outside their sphere. Possibly this plea might be allowed were it not for the evident implication underlying the entire argument of the book that *Natural Religion* renders supernatural revelation unnecessary; that it includes the whole of religion within itself; that, at any rate, all religion is the product of evolution from purely natural elements. Religion, avowedly, must be confined within the limits of "science." Whether or no it should be content to take its place as one of "the sciences," as a mere branch of "science," is not stated explicitly. The question does not seem to have arisen. But the lecturer's windows look in that direction, though occasionally he manifests a certain consciousness that there exists a wider horizon. The position of the Christian student in this matter needs careful definition. He can raise no reasonable objection to the treatment of "Natural Theology"—religion—"as a strictly natural science," "as astronomy or chemistry is," provided that he is not forbidden to draw legitimate inferences from the facts which these natural sciences present. If the study of the visible heavens—"the moon and stars which Thou hast created"—irresistibly leads him to belief in an invisible Author of the universe, he must be permitted to follow whither his instincts, the unalterable laws of his thought, the fundamental postulates of his consciousness direct. And if his study of religion speedily convinces him that religion contains elements for which evolution cannot account; that *Natural Theology* is only the gateway to Revelation, that *Natural Religion*, properly understood, brings him into contact with an all-pervasive Supernatural, he must not be condemned as "unscientific," must not be accused of violating the conditions of the investigation, if he declines to make a perpetual halt at an arbitrary line of demarcation. And, further, he has a right to demand that all the facts shall receive impartial consideration. His attention must not be limited to one corner of the field. He must not be prohibited from looking upward as well as downward and around.

As a warning against the ever-present tendency to see

only that which we wish to see, Professor Max Müller tells an amusing story :—

“ Niebuhr was very anxious to discover traces of Greek in Italian, as spoken by the common people in the South of Italy. He thought that the occupation of the country by the Greeks, when the South of Italy was called *Magna Graecia*, ought to have left at least a few vestiges behind, just as the occupation of Britain by the Romans can be proved by such words as *chester* in *Dorchester*, Lat. *castrum* ; *coln* in *Lincoln*, Lat. *colonia* ; *cheese*, Lat. *caseus* ; *street*, Lat. *strata*, scil. *via*. Finding himself one day with Bunsen in a small boat, and being caught by a storm, Niebuhr listened attentively to the sailors, who were rowing with all their might, and shouting what sounded to Niebuhr's ears like *πλόη*. ‘Listen,’ he said to Bunsen, ‘they call for *πλόη* or *εὔπλοη* (*εὔπλοια*), a fair voyage. There you have a survival of the Greek spoken in *Magna Graecia*.’ Bunsen listened attentively. He saw that one of the sailors looked very English, and that the other simply repeated what he said, and what seemed to them to possess a certain charm ; and he soon discovered that what to Niebuhr sounded like *πλόη* or *εὔπλοη*, was really the English ‘Pull away.’ ”

Assuredly the caution is not unnecessary. And we are in equal danger of not seeing what we do not wish to see. It is very questionable whether the lecturer has escaped this second error. It is true that he does not profess to cover the entire ground—“the whole of that immense field of religious thought”—yet he almost formally sets forth these lectures as a summary of his life-work in this direction. He modestly depreciates the value of his discussion, yet he claims to have treated with an “approach to systematic completeness” three great “preliminary questions”—“(1) The definition of Natural Religion ; (2) The proper method of its treatment ; and (3) The materials available for its study.” The positions that he takes up are in thorough accord with the undefinable but ever-present and influential *Zeit-geist* ; and they are supported not only with varied learning and argumentative force, but with the deserved authority of the lecturer's illustrious name. Even a few fragmentary remarks—all that my space will allow—on a book of such importance may not be without their usefulness.

It will be convenient to start with the last lecture of the series, because it contains the practical conclusion of the whole matter. A contrast is drawn between those religions which have and those which have not "sacred books," not always to the advantage of the former. "There is no religion in the whole world which in simplicity, in purity of purpose, in charity and true humanity, comes near to that religion which Christ taught to His disciples ;" yet Christianity is only *primus inter pares*. Current unbelief is traced to "the neglect of our foundations, the disregard of our own bookless religion, the almost disdain of Natural Religion." If we inquire, What *is* Natural Religion? we are taught by a Blackfoot Indian that it is "that religion which is in the head and in the heart, and in the sky, the rocks, the rivers, and the mountains." Again, "It is that light which lighteth *every* man, and which has lighted all the religions of the world, call them bookless or literate, human or Divine, natural or supernatural, which alone can dispel the darkness of doubt and fear that has come over the world. What our age wants more than anything else is *Natural Religion*. Whatever meaning different theologians may attach to *Supernatural Religion*, history teaches us that nothing is so natural as the supernatural. But the Supernatural must always be *superimposed* on the Natural. Supernatural Religion without Natural Religion is a house built on sand."

Indubitably there are elements of truth in this putting of the case, as every reader of *Butler's Analogy* knows. It may possibly be that Christian theologians have not been sufficiently ready to acknowledge that God hath not left Himself without a witness in any nation under heaven. They may not have appreciated the full force of the Apostolic declaration, "the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity." The absence of capacity for religion, of the instinctive feeling after God if haply men might find Him would, of course, render religion impossible. Revelation could not be made to creatures incapable of receiving it. In that sense, assuredly

the supernatural is *super-imposed* upon the natural. But, despite the lecturer's lucidity of thought and statement, he does not distinguish between the two meanings of the word *natural*. Natural Religion may be the religion which is natural to man, which accords with his mental and spiritual constitution, which his heart and soul cry out for. Or, Natural Religion may be the religion which man learns and educes from physical nature. It is this latter signification that Professor Max Müller plainly wishes us to attach to the adjective; but he frequently, and apparently half-unconsciously, takes advantage of the other significance. At any rate, he does not notify his readers of the subtile change. "Nothing is so natural as the supernatural;" if the supernatural exists, if man's origin and nature connect him with it, if that supernatural can communicate itself to him and draw him upwards to itself, then the most *natural*, the most likely and credible thing in the wide universe is that the supernatural should make itself known, that man and the supernatural should meet. But if it is intended to say that the supernatural is evolved from the natural, that man can find out the supernatural by searching, that there has been no direct and immediate revelation from a personal God to His creatures, then the axiom is as untenable in philosophy as it is untrue in history. Somewhat suggestive is it that the Blackfoot's description of Natural Religion was given as the reason why he did not accept the white man's Bible. Natural Religion sufficed him. The inference seems to be that, so far as Supernatural Religion is trustworthy and valuable, it is only a development of Natural Religion. The Biblical account of primitive man shows a personal God near him and *speaking to him* from the first. Certain sober and reverent Christian thinkers would fain rid themselves of the idea of a primitive revelation. Perhaps the second and third chapters of Genesis do not absolutely prevent this course, though they encumber it with difficulties. But neither they nor the reason of the thing allow us to strip primitive man of his God-consciousness.

*Nihil in fide quod non prius in sensu* is another of the

lecturer's axioms, moulded upon the more familiar *nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*. Both sayings are obnoxious to the same kind of criticism. As Leibnitz pointed out in his celebrated addition *nisi intellectus ipse*, the mind insists upon making its own contribution to the material furnished by the senses. The spirit cannot be debarred from the exercise of a similar right, from obedience to a similar necessity. In both cases, but even more imperatively with regard to the spirit than the intellect, the endowment must be traced to the Divine Author. That endowment was essentially a revelation. If, again, the axiom means that the Revealer employed channels of communication proper to man, that the revelation was vouchsafed "in divers manners" as well as "in divers portions," it may be accepted with all freedom and readiness. But if it means that inspiration, such as is claimed by the Christian Church for the prophets, evangelists, and apostles, is impracticable; that a messenger sent from heaven, as was our Blessed Lord Himself, never appeared upon earth; that no direct action of the Spirit of God upon the spirit of man can be or has been effected—once more the would-be axiom becomes an arbitrary and inadmissible postulate. The distinction cannot be observed too carefully and maintained too rigidly between an uninterrupted and unguided evolution which renders religion the misty and insecure product of man's own thought—"the guess of a worm in the dust and the shadow of his desire"—and the gradually and wisely regulated discipline of our race whereby the Supreme Ruler has brought men to the knowledge of Himself as they were able to bear and understand it. Nor is there the slightest reason to doubt that physical nature has had its share in the process.

The lecturer propounds a formal definition of religion: "*Religion consists in the perception of the infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of man.*" He does not venture upon this definition until he has examined all other definitions which have a fair claim upon his notice. He dismisses them all as defective, or excessive, or as containing terms which themselves require definition. He is

especially severe upon "dogmatic definitions," inasmuch as they explain little more than the sense in which any given writer employs the term. But one lesson of his own elaborate investigation is that the term is essentially elastic, that difference of opinion as to its contents is inevitable. From one point of view it would not be easy to draw the line between religion and substitutes for religion. Professor Max Müller's own definition would leave the author of *Ecce Homo's* "Natural Religion" out in the cold, whilst it would afford a warm welcome to a multitude of equally vague sentimental deifications, and house-room to agnosticism, and even absolute atheism. It would exclude, too, many of the grosser forms of idolatry. I am not sure that it is safe to assert more than that the essential idea of religion is worship, though, of course, that worship may be rendered without any external ceremonies, and could not be satisfied merely with such ceremonies.

Look at the definition again. A definition *ex hypothesi* must not use terms themselves needing definition. But is the precise significance of "moral character" perfectly clear? Does it not, at least, take something for granted? Morals here have advanced beyond mere *mores*. Indeed, Professor Max Müller makes it abundantly clear that "moral character" includes emotions of reverence, convictions of duty, and so on. The definition approaches perilously near to tautology, "*Religion* consists in the perception of the infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the *religious* character of man." Against one obvious criticism the lecturer has prearmed himself. One might inquire whether *conduct* might not be substituted for "character" in the definition. The difficulty is sufficiently met by stigmatising as superstition all beliefs and observances that do not really "influence the moral character." There is no need to quarrel with this condemnation, but in the long run it amounts to the finding that truth and reality are indispensable to religion. If so, it would be difficult to establish that Southern Buddhism—the lecturer's crucial specimen—is a religion.

The phraseology of the definition is liable to other

objections. Religion must certainly be felt by the human heart and mind ; nevertheless we have religion if the infinite is perceived under such manifestations as *are able to* influence the "moral character of man," whether that effect is produced or not. Evidently, too, "under" is an awkward substitute for "through" or "by means of." "Manifestations," whether intrinsically appropriate or not, seems a peculiarly unsuitable term for a theory which, as we shall see in a moment, arrives at the idea of "the infinite" by a series of more or less emotional inferences. And, so far as words go, the definition makes religion an utter impossibility. "Religion is the *perception* of the infinite"—"the *perception* of the *infinite*" is a contradiction in terms. That which can be perceived by finite beings is, *ipso facto*, not *infinite*. These criticisms, which I write with the utmost respect, are not simple logomachy. They go to show that it is not feasible to frame a satisfactory definition of religion which omits the idea of God. Where Professor Max Müller has failed no one is likely to succeed ; and, after all, these investigations into the origin and meaning of religion are directed in reality to account for the belief in and worship of the Deity or deities.

How, then, does man reach this "perception of the infinite"? The answer is, "Though the senses seem to deliver to us finite experiences only, many, if not all, of them can be shown to involve something beyond the known, something unknown, something which I claim the liberty to call infinite." By way of illustration we are told :—

"Trees, mountains, rivers, and the earth seem all very tangible and completely perceptible objects ; but are they so? We may stand beneath a tree, touch it, look up to it, but our senses can never take in the whole of it. Its deepest roots are beyond our reach, its highest branches tower high above our head. It combines, as I said, the finite and the infinite, or it presents to us something infinite under a finite appearance. The same applies to mountains. . . . Next to mountains come rivers and waterfalls. . . . The mere sight of a torrent coming they know not whence and going they know not whither, must have called forth a feeling in the heart of man that he stood in the presence of powers which were to him invisible and infinite, and which he afterwards



called Divine. . . . When from some high mountain-peak our eye travels as far as it can, watching the clouds and the sky and the setting sun and the rising stars, it is not by any process of conscious reasoning that we conclude there is something infinite beyond the sky, beyond the sun, beyond the stars. It might truly be said that we are actually brought in sensuous contact with it; we see and feel it. In feeling the limit, we cannot help feeling also what is beyond the limit; we are in the actual presence of a visible infinite."

Such, according to these lectures, is the genesis of the conception of the infinite. From this beginning the idea increased by steady evolution. It will be noticed that as yet nothing is said concerning the moral influence of the "perception" or of the belief in a personal God. We have to do only with "the infinite," pure and simple. Even so, however, the foundation appears too narrow and too shadowy. From invisible or unknown accidents of things we can see, or both see and touch, is a long stride to "the infinite." The lecturer indeed appeals to other "manifestations." "The infinite disclosed itself not only in nature, but likewise in man, looked upon as an object, and lastly in man, looked upon as a subject." Man recognized in himself something beyond his ken, his spirit. He concluded that that spirit was immortal, because he had no reason for a contrary opinion, and immortality is closely akin to infinity. Allowing, however, that the idea of immortality is as natural as, or more natural than that death is the extinction of being, we are still very far from the infinite. All that we have reached is a notion of something behind or beyond nature and man. This is admitted in words. We read of "something beyond the known, something unknown, something which I claim the liberty to call infinite." These phrases intimate consciousness of the tremendous gulf to be crossed, and doubt as to the success of the attempt to bridge it. Nevertheless, the argument proceeds as confidently as though there were not the slightest conceivable obstacle in its path.

For space' sake we must forbear to recount and to test the steps by which the evolution continues until the "something unknown" becomes a multitude of living personal agents, and

ultimately "Natural Religion in its lowest and simplest form—fear, awe, reverence, and love of the gods." Observe the goal—polytheism, gods not God. It was palpably impossible to reach any other by the road chosen. Whether monotheism was evolved from polytheism we are not told expressly. Yet again and again we find "God" substituted for "the gods" without a syllable of warning or explanation; and several of the quotations from the Vedas imply an original monotheism. Apart altogether from the Scriptures, it is extremely difficult to credit that men attained to the truth that there is one God, and to personal communion with that living God, through a series of deceptions and illusions. The God or gods so reached could scarcely be more trustworthy than the crowd of inferior deities who were forsaken in his favour. According to our Positivist teachers, the progress must be from polytheism to monotheism, from monotheism to atheism. If they are right as to the method, they are no less right as to the result. True, Professor Max Müller does not deposit us at that terminus, perhaps because he does not continue his journey far enough. If, however, we carry his premises to their natural conclusion, we can read no other condition than that of the blankest and most hopeless agnostic bewilderment.

Religion, by its very definition, influences moral character. Whence, then, sprang the idea of moral obligation? Whence did "ought" obtain its compelling and restraining force? History should give us some answer. Curiously suggestive is the lecturer's dissertation upon Conscience. We are set to discover "how such words as *σύννοια* and *συνείδησις*, from meaning to be conscious or cognisant, came to mean to be conscientious." Primitive man steals an apple; some other primitive man has informed him "that he ought not to take an apple that belonged to some one else." After that the evolution is facility itself, for "his consciousness of having done an act which by some authority or other had been judged to be wrong, would gradually become what we call a conscience." The blood rushes into the face of a man detected in wrong-doing, turning the white man's face red, the brown man's yellow. Hence, to blush, and to turn

yellow, grow to be names for shame, for conscience. "Conscience never tells us what is right or wrong, but simply whether we have done what, from some source or other, we know to be right or wrong." With this last statement I fully agree. Much mischief has been wrought by the elevation of conscience into an arbiter and instructor, whereas its function is only to acquit or condemn on facts laid before it. But this does not explain why conscience rewards with satisfaction and punishes with remorse. To say that "remorse" means merely that "sin bites back" does not advance an inch towards accounting for the sense of sin or its power to "bite back." What we want to know is how primitive man learnt that he ought not to steal apples. Some one told him is the reply. Who told that some one? how did he come to be wiser than his scholar? One can understand how the thief might come to be afraid of being found out, or afraid of punishment after he had been detected. But shame is an altogether different emotion. If conscience does not inform us what is right and what is wrong, these categories must at least have had some origin. Actually the lecturer is reduced to referring them to "some unexplained instinct." This confession of helplessness gives the *coup de grace* to the entire theory. You cannot account for "moral character," for sense of sin, for shame at having committed it, for remorse, for the fundamental notion of right and wrong, for the beginning of religion, unless you have recourse to God.

There is much else in this volume that calls for comment. Even the specifically Christian student can learn much from it. To praise its wealth of illustration, of philological information, would be almost impudence. It would be both useless and untrue to deny that some of the facts adduced present very serious problems to believers in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and that many popular conceptions of primitive revelation may require modification, may even prove quite untenable. But this differs *toto caelo* from accepting Professor Max Müller's contention concerning the origin and growth of religion, and the character of that religion which is natural to man.

J. ROBINSON GREGORY.

## ST. PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

SALUTATION  
AND  
OPENING  
BENEDICTION.

I thank God for  
the tidings of  
your  
(1) *faith*,  
(2) *love*,  
quicken'd by  
(3) *hope*.

—as a part of  
the Gospel—  
delivered to  
(1) *you*,  
(2) *the world*,  
*at large*,  
and fruitful in  
both alike.

From Epaphras,  
your former  
teacher,  
proof of your  
devotedness  
reaches me.

My prayers  
therefore are  
for your

(1) *illumination*,  
(2) *practical  
progress*,

(3) *strength to  
endure*,

(4) *joy and  
thankfulness*.

The Father has  
placed us in the  
kingdom of His  
Son, privileged  
with  
(1) *redemption*,  
(2) *forgiveness*.  
The Son is  
(1) *the image of  
the Father*,

1 I PAUL by Divine appointment an Apostle of Christ  
2 Jesus, with Timothy our brother, send greetings to the  
holy and faithful brethren in Christ at Colossæ:—may  
grace and peace from God our Father be yours.

3 To God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we give  
4 thanks, in our prayers for you continually, for the tidings  
of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love you show  
5 to all the Saints—a love quickened by the hope laid up  
for you in heaven.

Of that hope, indeed, as part of the message of Gospel-  
6 truth, you heard before—that Gospel which is a present  
fact among you as well as in all the world—and indeed it  
goes on with fruitful increase there, as well as among you  
from the first day that you heard and gave heed to the  
7 grace of God in truth. And this lesson you had of  
Epaphras our beloved helpmate and faithful as Christ's  
8 minister on your behalf. He has given us clear proof of  
9 your devotedness, and this makes us in turn, ever since it  
reached us, pray for you incessantly and entreat that a  
complete knowledge of the Divine will may be yours,  
10 attended with all insight of spiritual wisdom; also that,  
behaving in a way worthy of the Lord to His full satis-  
faction, you may make fruitful increase in every good work  
11 and in the fuller knowledge of God: further, that you  
may be gifted with every degree of strength for all  
endurance and persistency, suitably to His omnipotent  
12 Majesty: and yet further, may with joy give thanks to the  
Father who qualified us for our lot and share among the  
Saints in light.

13 He indeed is our deliverer from the power of darkness,  
who transplanted us into the kingdom of that Son of His  
14 love, in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness  
15 of our sins. The Son, too, is the image of the unseen

- 16 God, firstborn before all creation : for indeed by Him were created all that are in heaven or on earth, whether seen or unseen, to whatever order of spiritual hierarchy they belong :—they all were created through His agency
- 17 and for His service. He therefore is before them all and is the keystone of their whole system, and is Himself the Head of His Body the Church—Her premier too, Her firstborn from the dead, so that He becomes entitled to the first place among all. And this, because in Him vouchsafed all Divine completeness to dwell, and through Him to bring all things into reunion with itself (such was the peace effected by the blood of His cross)—through Him, I say, whether on earth or in heaven.
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 And yourselves too, alienated as you once were and rebelliously disposed—as shown by your deeds—for they were evil—yet now He has included in that reunion, by offering
- 22 bodily His flesh through death, so as to present you holy, without flaw, and irreproachable in His sight—if, *i.e.*, you
- 23 cling to your faith as your foundation and basis, and shift not away from the Gospel-hope which you heard, which was proclaimed in all the world-wide area of creation, and the minister of which I Paul became.
- 24 This being so, I rejoice in the sufferings endured for you, and in my own person make up the balance of Christ's afflictions on behalf of that Body of His which is the Church.
- 25 For I became Her minister by virtue of that stewardship which God assigned to me, to include yourselves, so as to
- 26 deliver fully His message—that Secret, hidden from earlier ages and generations, but now manifested to His saints. For it was God's will to let them know how vast a wealth of glory in the Gentile world is involved in this His Secret ; the outcome of which is a Christ in you—the personified hope of sharing that glory,—Whom it is ours to announce by instructing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, so as to present every man perfected in Christ. This indeed is the object of all my toils and struggles, consequent upon the energy which He puts forth in me as the instrument of His power. For I would
- (2) *Firstborn.*
- (3) *Creator of all ranks of being.*
- In Him the system of creation stands. Still closer is His relation to the Church as His Body, having for its object the reunion of all things with the Godhead.
- In that reunion He includes you, intending your perfection, which depends on your own steadfastness in the Gospel-hope, now world-wide.
- As for my sufferings they complete Christ's
- and my ministry is to deliver God's message
- His Secret, hidden once, disclosed now—
- (full of glory as regards
- (1) *the Gentiles at large,*
- (2) *yourselves,*
- in Christ, announced by us to every man, for his individual perfection ; which forms the object of my efforts through His strength conferred on me—a labour which

strives (on behalf of you and others) for your  
 (1) *consolation*,  
 (2) *loving union*,  
 and  
 (3) *intelligent assurance* ;  
 resulting in  
 (4) *your attaining the Secret*,  
 viz. Christ—the treasure-house of all wisdom : —a truth to be urged, to safeguard you from sophistry : (not but that your dutifulness delights me as though I saw it) : against this, your defence is to keep in Christ  
 (1) *your course*,  
 (2) *your root*,  
 (3) *your further development*.  
 Beware especially of false schools of philosophy, &c., opposed to Christ,

in Whom alone completeness is attained.

In Him you were  
 (1) *circumcised*,

(2) *(by Baptism) buried and raised through faith*.

Dead in sin, God

(1) *raised you*,  
 (2) *forgave you*,  
 (3) *cancelled the law* (like a bond nailed through), and  
 (4) *led in triumph through His cross all evil Powers*.

Let no one arraign you for observances ; nor carry against you his individual fancies,

2 I have you know how great a struggle I have on hand for you and those in Laodicea, and all who have not seen me  
 3 face to face ; that their spirits may be cheered, being cemented in the closest affection, reaching to the fullest amplitude of intelligent assurance, until they attain the complete knowledge of God's secret, viz., Christ, in Whom  
 4 are all the treasures of wisdom and science hidden. And  
 5 I dwell upon this that no one may sophisticate you by plausible talk ; for, even if I am absent in the body, I am in spirit present with you, and rejoice as I behold your orderliness and the solidity of your faith in Christ.  
 6 Therefore, as you received Christ Jesus our Lord, so in  
 7 Him continue your course. In Him be your root fixed, in Him let your edification proceed, and your confirmation in the faith, just as you were taught it ; and overflow with  
 8 thankfulness for it. Look to it that there be no enemy to despoil you of your treasure by false pretences or philosophy, in any human school of tradition, adopting the  
 9 rudiments of the perishable, and rejecting Christ—because  
 10 in Him dwells all the completeness of godhead embodied. In Him accordingly, as being the Head of all rule and all  
 11 authority, you attain your completeness. In Him was your circumcision effected, not by outward operation, but by stripping off the husk of the carnal man—the circumcision which Christ bestows. With Him in baptism you  
 12 were buried, with Him-raised again therein through faith  
 13 in God's manifestation of power by raising Him from the dead. Even you, dead as you were in transgressions and your then uncircumcised state of nature,—you, I say, He  
 14 raised with Christ to life, condoning for us all our transgressions, cancelling the bond which held us in its hard lines, ready to be enforced against us ; and has abolished its obstructive  
 15 power by nailing it to His cross. He despoiled the whole hierarchy of evil, and paraded them in open triumph by means of that cross.  
 16 So then, let no one call you to account for what you eat or drink, or on the score of monthly, weekly or other  
 17 solemn days : for these things were but the shadow of

18 things once future, of which the substance is Christ's. Let  
 no enthusiast for self-debasement and angel-worship steal  
 a verdict against you on such points, presuming on his  
 19 own visions in the self-conceit of a carnal mind, but losing  
 touch of the Head, from whom all the Body, knit to Him  
 by joint and ligament, draws its supply of life, and so  
 20 Joing puts forth the growth prescribed by God. For why,  
 if with Christ you really died to the rudiments of the  
 perishable—why, as if your life were in it still, bind your-  
 selves with rules resting on human injunction and  
 21 authority, "hands off this, don't taste that, don't touch  
 22 the other"—of things all made to be used and perish with  
 23 their use? Such rules (however pretentious to wisdom in  
 prostration of the will, debasement of self and inflictions  
 on the body,) are of no real value to combat fleshly in-  
 dulgence carnal man.

1 If then you were, as I said, raised again with Christ,  
 seek the things above where Christ is, seated at God's  
 2 right hand. Set your affection on things above, not on  
 3 things on the earth; for you died with Him, and your  
 4 life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ shall be  
 manifested—our true Life—then shall you also be  
 5 manifested with Him in glory. Mortify therefore your  
 animal instincts which cling to earth, fornication, impurity,  
 sensual passion, vicious appetite, and that greedy indul-  
 6 gence which amounts to an idolatry, for which thing's sake  
 the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience.  
 7 And to these practices you too were addicted once, while you  
 8 were living in them: but now put them all away—you who  
 practised them—anger, wrath, malice, evil-speaking, filthy  
 9 talk:—let no such word escape your lips. Lie not one to  
 another, you, who stripped yourselves of the former man  
 10 with his practices, you, who put on the new man, who is  
 being remoulded to higher knowledge on the lines of his  
 11 Creator's ideal. In that creation there is no room for dis-  
 tinction of Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised,  
 barbarian, Scythian, slave and free,—Christ is all in all.  
 12 Therefore put on, as God's elect, holy and beloved, feel-

(mere carnal self-conceit), losing touch of Christ, the Head, and Source,

(1) of life-strength, and

(2) life-growth.

Dead to the perishable in Christ, whyserve it still in petty observances—pretentious, but really unsatisfying.

3 On the contrary, risen with Christ, aspire to Him, and to Heaven His seat, and find your life hidden there in Himself, and to be manifested in Him.

Meanwhile mortify the baser instincts (enumerated) which entail God's wrath.

All these you clung to once: shun them now:—also put away

(1) angry passions,  
 (2) evil words,  
 (3) falsehood.

—all averse to the new man remoulded in God's image. In that ideal no social distinction finds room, but only Christ. Cultivate the

opposite graces, (especially that of personal forbearance) in charity which binds all in one.

Called to be One, let peace rule in you. Show wisdom in its results of mutual improvement, using psalmody as a means, but all in the Lord's Name.

DUTIES OF SPECIAL RELATIONS.  
 (1) *wives*, (submissiveness)  
 (2) *husbands*, (tenderness)  
 (3) *children*, (obedience)  
 (4) *fathers*, (gentleness)  
 (5) *slaves* (loyal service, as to God,

Who will reward your good, and requite your evil.)

(6) *Masters*, 4 (impartial justice) as subject to a higher Master.

DETACHED PRECEPTS UPON  
 (1) *Prayer*,  
 (2) *Attentiveness*,  
 (3) *Thankfulness*.  
 (Intercede for me that I may duly proclaim Christ.)  
 (4) *Discreet behaviour*,  
 (5) *Value of time*.

ings of pity, benignity, humility, meekness, longsuffering, putting up with one another and mutually condoning, if any have a complaint against any, even as Christ condoned your offences, so also do ye. And over and above all these put on charity, which binds all graces together in perfectness; and let the peace of God be paramount in your hearts, to which you were called in one Body, and be thankful for it. Let the lesson of Christ dwell within you fruitfully. In all wisdom carry on mutual teaching, mutual instruction, by psalms, hymns and devotional strains, singing with grace in your hearts to God; and whatsoever you do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him.

You, wives, be submissive to your husbands, as is seemly in the Lord. You, husbands, love your wives, and don't be harsh-tempered towards them. You, children, be obedient to your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing in the Lord. You, fathers, don't exasperate your children, lest they be disheartened. You, slaves, be obedient in all things to your earthly masters, not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but in sincerity of heart, as fearing the Lord. Whatever you do, let your heart be in your work, as done to the Lord, not to men; as knowing that from the Lord you shall obtain that inheritance which will be your reward; for the Lord Christ is your real Master. But the wrongdoer shall have requital for his wrong done, and there is no such thing as favouritism there. You, masters, deal justly and impartially with your slaves, as knowing that you too have a Master in heaven.

In prayer be unwearied, and keep your attention fixed the while, with thankfulness. And withal pray for us too, that God may open to us a door for His message, to declare His Secret centred in Christ, (prisoner as I am for its sake,) that I may fully publish it, as I ought to do.

Behave discreetly to those outside the Church, and improve every opportunity as it arises. Let your speech



- be always with thoughtful kindness, seasoned with good sense, teaching you how you ought to answer every one.
- 7 All about me, Tychicus, our beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord, will let you
- 8 know ; and for this very reason I now send him to you, that you may know our circumstances, and that he may
- 9 cheer up your spirits—with Onesimus, that faithful and beloved brother, and one of yourselves. They will inform you of everything here.
- 10 Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner, sends his greeting, as do Mark, the son of Barnabas' sister, (about whom you previously had instructions—if he come to you, to receive
- 11 him,) and Jesus called Justus. These belong to the Jewish branch of the Church ; and these are the only fellow-labourers for the kingdom of God who have been a solace
- 12 to me. Epaphras, one of yourselves, a servant of Christ, sends his greeting ; ever striving for you in his prayers, that you may stand perfected and completed in every re-
- 13 quirement of the Divine will. For I bear him witness, what trouble he takes on behalf of you and those in
- 14 Laodicea and those in Hierapolis. Luke the beloved physician and Demas send their greetings. Greet the brethren in Laodicea and Nymphas, and the Church that
- 16 is in his house ; and when this letter has been read among you, take care that it be read in the Church of the Laodiceans also, and that you too read the letter which comes
- 17 from Laodicea. And give Archippus this message, "Look to the pastoral charge which thou receivedst in the
- 18 Lord, that thou fulfil it." Here is the greeting of me, Paul, in my own hand. Remember my bonds, and grace be with you.
- HENRY HAYMAN.

(6) *Conversation*  
(blending  
kindness  
with sense.)

CONCLUSION.  
Tychicus, my  
messenger, will  
tell you all about  
me ;

as will Onesimus,  
one of yourselves.

Receive greet-  
ings from Aris-  
tarchus, Mark,  
(the subject of  
previous instruc-  
tions) and Jesus-  
Justus,

Epaphras, ever  
earnest for your  
spiritual welfare

and zealous for  
you and others  
near you, Luke  
and Demas.  
Greet the  
Laodiceans with  
Nymphas.

Let this letter be  
read by them,  
and read you  
that forwarded  
by them.

With a last word  
to Archippus,  
and my personal  
greeting (signed)  
I conclude.

NOTE.—This Epistle was sent in charge of Tychicus, together with that to the Ephesians and that to Philemon, himself a Colossian ; which last contains greetings from the same group of persons as this, except Jesus-Justus. Onesimus, the now restored slave of Philemon, went with Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21 ; Col. iv. 9, 10-14 ; Philem. 10, 16, 24). These personal links connect these three Epistles in one group ; strengthened by the mention of Archippus, closely connected with Philemon and perhaps his son (Col. iv. 17 ; Philem. 2). Possibly the Ephesian Epistle may be the same as that "from Laodicea" (Col. iv. 16).

## THOMAS OF CELANO'S GREAT HYMN.<sup>1</sup>

THE twelfth century was rich in mediæval hymns. Bernard of Clairvaux, Adam of St. Victor, Hildebert, Peter the Venerable, and Bernard of Clugny, filled the Church with hymns of praise to God. These men all compare favourably with the monastic orders and hierarchies of their day. They were humble, holy men of God, notwithstanding certain errors and superstitions which clung to them, as belonging more to the age than to the men. Bernard of Clairvaux is the best known of all, and his "Jesu! dulcis memoria," as translated by Edward Caswell and Dr. Ray Palmer, is universally admired and cherished by true Christians everywhere, irrespective of Church and creed.

"O Jesus, King most wonderful ;"

"Jesus, the very thought of Thee;" and

"Jesus, Thou joy of loving hearts,"

are sung with perhaps equal fervour in the grand cathedral and in the humble mission-hall.

The day was a dark one, if it were not rather a night, when these men lived and worked and sang. The Papacy, which arrogated to itself the claim of *the* Church, was awfully corrupt ; and if the garden of the Lord was overgrown with thorns and briars, and the bear out of the wood wasted the vineyard of Christ, what must have been the state of the world outside ? The other Bernard, he of Clugny, tells us, and no one has charged him with exaggeration :—

---

<sup>1</sup> In preparing this paper the writer is greatly indebted, in addition to other works, to *Latin Hymn Writers and their Hymns*, by the late Samuel Willoughby Duffield, author of *English Hymns*, &c., edited and completed by Professor R. E. Thompson, D.D., of the University of Pennsylvania. Funk & Wagnalls, New York, and 44, Fleet Street, London. We can fitly describe it as a work of immense research, ably compiled and edited ; one which supplies a great want ; and one which will be the standard text-book on Latin Hymns for a great while to come.

“The world is very evil ;  
The time is waxing late ;  
Be sober, and keep vigil ;  
The Judge is at the gate.”

So these men thought, and these forebodings shaded somewhat their hearts and their songs. Yet their theme was joyous, as in the hymn by Peter the Venerable, *Mortis portis fractis, fortis*, of which one verse may be given :—

“Lo, the gates of death are broken,  
And the strong man armed is spoiled  
Of his armour, which he trusted,  
By the Stronger Arm despoiled.  
Vanquished is the prince of hell—  
Smitten by the Cross he fell.”

These sweet singers had all ended their pilgrimage, and the chorus of their voices had been hushed on earth, when, amid the thickening darkness and the stillness of the midnight, there arose a new song, deep, solemn, and awful, yet magnificent and grand. It was not, “Behold the Bridegroom cometh ; go ye out to meet Him !” Its burden or theme was not the approach of hope’s fulfilment, of faith’s realization, of love’s consummation, but the drawing near of that dread day when the judgment shall be set, and the books shall be opened, that men quick and dead, small and great, may be judged according to their works. There were then very few indeed anywhere who were “waiting for the hope of righteousness by faith.” A promise full of joy, and enkindling earnest faith and glad hope, was not what either the world or the Church needed. It was the trumpet-voice of warning, the awful thunder-peal of approaching doom that was required. In this sublime and awful hymn it came. The prophecy of Zephaniah i. 15 was the keynote of the song. As we read the words in our Authorized Version which the author had before him in the Vulgate, we shall cease to wonder that at the sound of them the earth trembles and all the inhabitants thereof are terribly afraid : “The great day

of the Lord is near, it is near, and hasteth greatly. . . . *That day is the day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness.*" There is a tenderness and a deep pathos pervading the hymn, which shows that it came from the very heart of a man who was himself passing, or had passed, through the tremendous crisis in his own soul. The hymn touches human feeling from beginning to end, from trembling awe and humble confession of conscious sin and other unworthiness, to pathetic pleading with One who, Himself the just avenging Judge, came to seek and to save that which was lost, sitting weary at the well of Samaria, treading the path of sorrow and suffering, and finally dying the bitter death of the Cross for sinful men and their salvation.

There are three versions in Latin, the variations being in the transposing of the verses, here and there their expansion, and also certain additions and omissions.

The following is the text of the Missal, commonly accepted as the correct :—

- 1 Dies iræ, dies illa  
Solvat sæclum in favilla,  
Teste David cum Sybilla.
- 2 Quantus tremor est futurus,  
Quando Judex est venturus,  
Cuncta stricte discussurus !
- 3 Tuba mirum sparget sonum  
Per sepulcra regionum,  
Coget omnes ante thronum
- 4 Mors stupebit et natura,  
Quum resurget creatura,  
Judicanti responsura.
- 5 Liber scriptus proferetur,  
In quo totum continetur  
Unde mundus judicetur.

- 6 Judex ergo cum sedebit,  
Quidquid latet, apparebit,  
Nil inultum remanebit.
- 7 Quid sum miser tunc dicturus,  
Quem patronum rogaturus,  
Dum vix justus sit securus?
- 8 Rex tremendæ majestatis,  
Qui salvandos salvas gratis  
Salva me! fons pietatis!
- 9 Recordare, Jesu pie,  
Quod sum causa tuæ viæ  
Ne me perdas illâ die!
- 10 Quærens me sedisti lassus,  
Redemisti cruce passus:  
Tantus labor non sit cassus!
- 11 Juste Judex ultionis,  
Donum fac remissionis  
Ante diem rationis!
- 12 Ingemisco tanquam reus,  
Culpa rubet vultus meus:  
Supplicanti parce, Deus!
- 13 Qui Mariam absolvisti  
Et latronem exaudisti,  
Mihi quoque spem dedisti.
- 14 Preces meæ non sunt dignæ  
Sed tu bonus fac benigne,  
Ne perenni cremer igne.
- 15 Inter oves locum præsta  
Et ab hædis me sequestra,  
Statuens in parte dextrâ.
- 16 Confutatis maledictis  
Flammis acribus addictis,  
Voca me cum benedictis.

- 17 Ora supplex et acclinis,  
Cor contritum quasi cinis,  
Gere curam mei finis.
- 18 Lachrymosa dies illa,  
Qua resurget ex favilla  
Judicandus homo reus ;  
Huic ergo parce, Deus !

It was long a question, and many considered it an open question, as to whom the honour belonged of producing this, of its kind, peerless hymn. There are nine persons for whom the honour has been claimed. Mr. Duffield considers it as good as proved that its author was Thomas of Celano, and the current of opinion, as well as the weight of evidence, is strong in his favour. "Two of these" (nine), says Mr. Duffield, "are excluded as having lived too early to have written a poem of its structure and metrical character; they are Gregory the Great and Bernard of Clairvaux. Two others, Augustinus Bugellensis (*ob.* 1490), and Felix Hammerlein (*ob.* 1457), are excluded by the fact that the hymn is mentioned in a work written in 1285. This leaves four rivals to Thomas of Celano in his own century, namely, John Bonaventura (*ob.* 1274); his brother, Cardinal Latino Frangipani, a Dominican (*ob.* 1294); Humbert, a French Franciscan, who became the fifth General of his order (*ob.* 1277); and Matthew of Acqua-Sparta, in Umbria, a Franciscan, who became Bishop of Albano and Cardinal (*ob.* 1302). But it is to be noticed that for not one of these is there a witness earlier than the sixteenth century. The first and last are named as having had the authorship ascribed to them by Luke Wadding, the historian of the Franciscans in 1625; but he ascribes it to Thomas of Celano. The other two are named by the Jesuit Antonio Possevino (1534-1611), and the Dominican, Leandro Alberti (1479-1552); the latter, of course, claiming the hymn for the Dominican Cardinal, as to whom there is not the smallest evidence that he ever wrote any poetry whatever. Besides this, the *Dies Iræ* is a Franciscan,

not a Dominican poem. It deals with the practical and the devotional, not the doctrinal elements in religion. Had a Dominican written it, he would have been anxious only for correct doctrinal statement.

"Thomas's claim to its authorship does not rest on the weakness of rival pretensions. In the year 1285, when Thomas had been dead about thirty years and Dante was twenty years old, the Franciscan, Bartholomew of Pisa, wrote his *Liber Conformitatum*, in which he drew a laboured parallel between the life of Francis of Assisi and that of our Lord. Having occasion to speak of Celano in this work, he goes on to describe it as 'the place whence came brother Thomas, who, by order of the Pope, wrote in polished speech the first legend of St. Francis, and is said to have composed the prose which is sung in the mass for the dead, *Dies Iræ, dies illa*.'

"This testimony out of Thomas's own century is confirmed by parallel evidence. Wadding, whose big folios in clumsy Latin give us the tradition which pervaded within the order, says, 'Brother Thomas of Celano sang that once celebrated sequence *Sanctitatis nova signa*, which now has gone out of use, whose work also is that solemn one for the dead, *Dies Iræ, dies illa*, although others wish to ascribe it to Brother Matthew of Acqua-Sparta, a Cardinal taken from among the Minorites.' Elsewhere Wadding says, 'Thomas of Celano, of the Province of Penna, a disciple and companion of St. Francis, published . . . a book about the *Life and Miracles of St. Francis* . . . commonly called by the brethren the *Old Legend*. Another shorter legend he had published previously which used to be read in the choir . . . three sequences or rhymic proses, of which the first, in praise of St. Francis, begins, *Fregit victor virtualis*. The second begins *Sanctitatis nova signa*. The third, concerning the dead, adapted by the Church, *Dies Iræ, dies illa*. And this Benedict Gonon the Calistine (in 1625) rendered into French verse, and ascribed to St. Bonaventura; others ascribe it to Brother Matthew, of Acqua-Sparta, the Cardinal; and others yet to other authors.'"

These direct testimonies to Thomas's authorship are

confirmed by local traditions in the province of Abruzzi, in which Celano is situated.

The statement of Bartholomew of Pisa, that already in 1285 the *Dies Iræ* was employed in the service for the dead, shows how soon it made its way into Church use. In earlier times there was no sequence in that service, for the reason that the *Hallelujah*, which the sequence always followed, being a song of rejoicing, was not sung in the funeral service.

"This enables us," Mr. Duffield adds, "to form an opinion on the controversy as to whether it was written directly for Church use, or adapted for that after being written as a meditation on the Day of Judgment for private edification. It would seem most probable that it was the wonderful beauty and power of the hymn which led the Church to break through its rule as to the sequence following the *Hallelujah* necessarily. The *Dies Iræ* was not written to fill a place, but when written it made a place for itself."

Thomas was an Italian by birth and parentage. At the time of his birth a great fight was going on between the Pope and the Emperor Frederick II., and there was a great stir in the intellectual life of the people. Celano, a town of the old Marsians, lay at the northern end of what was afterwards called the Kingdom of Naples, across the Apennines from Rome, and a little north of it. It was not far from the hereditary dominions of Frederick, and was one of the first to suffer under his hand. In 1223 it was besieged by the Count of Acerra, Thomas of Aquinas, the warlike uncle and namesake of the theologian and devotional writer. The resistance must have been stout, or the people were in bad odour with the Emperor or his captain, for the inhabitants were compelled to leave their houses, taking their movables, and the town was burnt to the ground, the Church of St. John alone standing among the ruins. To further punish their disloyalty to the Emperor, the people were transported to Sicily, Malta, and Calabria, whence they returned to rebuild their town after death had laid their enemy low.

How old Thomas was when this calamity occurred there



are no means of knowing, nor whether it had anything to do with his becoming a monk of the order of St. Francis of Assisi; but it is not unlikely that the sight or memory of the conflagration and the consequent devastation may have suggested or given a colouring to his immortal hymn.

As Celano was not far distant from Assisi—across the Umbrian region—it is not unlikely that Thomas in his early life was acquainted with Francis. Thomas was, indeed, both a disciple and a friend of Francis, besides being his most reliable biographer. As between Paul and Timothy, there was a close and intimate, even an affectionate, bond of union between the old Francis and the younger Thomas. In spirit and aims there was a oneness, but in temperament there was a wide difference. Thomas's temperament seems to have been reproduced or reflected in his great hymn, the deep and awful thunders of judgment almost drowning the "still, small voice" of mercy.

Francis, on the other hand, preached more about mercy than judgment, and more about repentance and Divine forgiveness, than about terrors and stripes and the wrath to come.

Before his conversion Francis was a troubadour, and won distinction as a singer of worldly songs in Provençal French, then the language of literature in Northern Italy. In this language he began to sing the praises of God, when converting grace had broken the yoke of sin and transgression. With the spirit of love and gratitude strong within him, he set out, with poverty as his daily companion, to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins. Without any thought of founding an "order," but only of helping the poor and suffering for Christ's sake, he went from place to place; but his preaching of the love of God, his own loving spirit, his humility and childlike simplicity, drew men towards him on all sides, and then came the thought of a vocation to call men into a new form of brotherhood. Like most earnest men, he was sanguine. "Fear not," said he to his early followers, "in that ye seem few and simpleminded. Preach repentance to the world, trusting in Him who hath overcome the world,

that His Spirit speaks through you. You will find some to receive you and your word with joy, still more to resist and mock you. Bear all that with patience and meekness. Take no heed for your simplicity nor mine. In a short time the wise and noble will come to preach with you before princes and people, and many will be turned to the Lord." Thus Thomas of Celano records his utterances.

Francis was distinguished from many teachers of his age by the views he entertained of God and His love to a lost world. This was his theme whether he wrote or preached. The poor streamed out of the Italian cities to hear him, and his words of comfort and joy to the downcast and heavy-laden. The third line of *Dies Iræ*,

"Teste David cum Sibylla,"

has given rise to much controversy. An unwillingness to allow a Sibyl to appear as bearing witness to Christian truth has caused this line sometimes to be omitted, and in its stead has been inserted.

"Crucis expandens vexilla,"

which has a reference to Matt. xxiv. 30, "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in the heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." This, however, is a late alteration of the text, and the original line, though quite out of harmony with modern usage, is quite in the spirit of early and mediæval theology. Mr. Miller says, in his *Singers and Songs of the Church*, "'Teste David cum Sibylla' may be regarded as a repetition of the error of the early Fathers, who, in their mistaken zeal, referred to the ancient Sibylline books for confirmation of their teachings and predictions." Of the hymn itself he justly says, "Part of the grandeur of the whole piece is due to the verses of Scripture it incorporates. Such passages as Ps. cii. 26; Ps. l. 3; Matt. xxiv. 30; and Rev. xx. 12, were evidently in the writer's mind when he wrote: he felt their inspiration, and gave them a poetic form in harmony with the requirements of his verse."

We come now to translations of the hymn. These have been chiefly into German and English. Of the German there have been, according to Dr. Schaff, of New York, more than a hundred; of English one hundred and fifty-four—ninety-six by American translators, and more than fifty by translators in the British Isles. We hesitate to supply all the names, as our space is small; but if the length of the list constitutes a tribute to the power of the hymn, so also does the weight of the names—a tribute such as never has been offered to any other hymn.

Luther's *Ein' feste Burg*, of which there are eighty-one versions in English, can alone compare with it.

The numerous translations of the hymn have been attributed, in addition to its innate grandeur and magnificence, to the entirely evangelical type of its doctrine, its freedom from Mariolatry, its exaltation of Divine mercy above human merit, and its picture of the soul's free access to God without the intervention of Church and priest.

The first English translator was Joshua Sylvester (1621). His version is in vol. ii. of his works in the Chertsey Worthies Series, edited by Dr. Grosart, under the heading, "A Holy Preparation to a Joyful Resurrection."

In the translation the verses are in some cases transposed; the triple metre and the double rhyme are exchanged for the single rhyme, and each stanza, excepting the last, has six lines of seven syllables. His beginning is abrupt, and his style is rather cumbrous, and in the commencement reads more like an imitation than a translation:—

"Deare, deare soul, awake, awake!  
Ah! what answer wilt thou make  
When *Christ* in glory shall appear?  
When Hee comes to take account  
Of thy sins that houely mount  
By acting or neglecting here?"

The third verse is numbered

1 "That, that dreadful day of Ire  
Shall dissolve the World in Fire;  
As holy prophets have foretold.

O ! what horror will be then,  
When the Lord shall come agen,  
Our deeds of darkness to unfold !

- 4 Shrillest trumpet, thundering sound  
Through earth's entrails abound  
To summon all before the throne.  
Nature, Death, shall stand amaz'd  
When the Dead (alive) be raised,  
To heare their Judgment, every one."

The cries for mercy and pardon distinctly embrace the mediation of Jesus as the only hope of their success ; while self is utterly disowned, His blood is that which purchased pardon.

Richard Crashaw comes next, in 1646. He was at first a clergyman, but was deprived of his benefice in the time of the Commonwealth. He passed the greater part of several years in St. Mary's Church, near Peterhouse, Cambridge. "There," says the preface to his works, "he lodged under Tertullian's roof of angels ; there he made his nest more gladly than David's swallow, near the house of God ; where, like a primitive saint, he offered more prayers in the night than others usually offer in the day. There he penned these poems, 'Steps to the Temple,' &c. He afterwards entered the Church of Rome. But there is no mention of pope or priest or saint in his faithful translation, only God and the sinner and the Saviour. There are some very happy thoughts and expressions in his verses. He uses the vocative very freely, "O that Fire!" "O that Trump!" "O that Book!" "O that Judge!"

"O that Book ! whose leaves so bright  
Will set the world in severe light :  
O that Judge ; whose hand, whose eye  
None can endure—yet none can fly."

The pleadings with the Advocate are tender, pathetic, and earnest indeed, and as true to the Gospel as if uttered by Whitfield, Wesley, or Spurgeon :—

- 8 " Dear Lord ! remember in that day  
 Who was the cause Thou cam'st this way ;  
 Thy sheep was strayed ; and Thou wouldst be  
 E'en lost Thyself in seeking me.
- 9 Shall all that labour, all that cost  
 Of love, and e'en that loss, be lost ?  
 And this lov'd soul judged worth no less  
 Than all that way and weariness ?
- 10 Just Mercy, then, Thy reckoning be  
 With my price, and not with me ;  
 'Twas paid at first with too much pain,  
 To be paid twice, or once in vain."

There were two other translators in the seventeenth century, and two in the eighteenth, the more notable being that of the Earl of Roscommon in 1717. Dr. Samuel Johnson had a very strong opinion of the inadequacy of all religious poetry—an opinion, we venture to say, due more to himself than the poetry ; but he would burst into tears on hearing or reciting the lines that follow :—

- 8 " Thou mighty, formidable King,  
 Thou mercy's unexhausted spring,  
 Some comfortable pity bring !
- 9 Forget not what my ransom cost,  
 Nor let my dear-bought soul be lost,  
 In strains of guilty terror tost.
- 10 Thou who for me didst feel such pain,  
 Whose precious blood the cross did stain,  
 Let not these agonies be vain !"

*The Christian Observer* for 1826 contains a striking version by Lord Macaulay, of which these lines may be taken as a sample :—

- " Though I plead not at Thy throne  
 Aught that I for Thee have done,  
 Do not Thou unmindful be  
 Of what Thou hast borne for me ;  
 Of the wandering, of the scorn,  
 Of the scourge, and of the thorn !"

Sir Walter Scott, too, must be placed among the imitators, if not the translators, of the hymn of Thomas. The following may be found in his *Lay of the Last Minstrel* :—

“That day of wrath, that dreadful day,  
When heaven and earth shall pass away.  
What power shall be the sinner's stay?  
How shall he meet that dreadful day?

When shrivelling like a parchèd scroll,  
The flaming heavens together roll ;  
When louder yet, and yet more dread,  
Swells the high trump that wakes the dead.

O, on that day, that wrathful day,  
When man to judgment wakes from clay,  
Be Thou the trembling sinner's stay,  
Though heaven and earth shall pass away.”

The excellence of this short piece raises the regret that the fine talents of the great novelist were not oftener turned to such themes and the brighter notes of Christian song.<sup>1</sup>

*Uncle Tom's Cabin* is hardly the place to look for such a hymn as that under notice, but two verses of a translation may be found in that charming novel. It is from one of thirteen translations of the hymn made by Abraham Coles, M.D., Ph.D., a practising physician, of Newark, New Jersey. It was first published in 1859, and Henry Ward Beecher introduced one of them into the *Plymouth Collections of Hymns and Tunes*. As the comparative merits of the different translations may be better seen, we quote different writers' translations of the same verses.

<sup>1</sup> Lockhart, writing of Scott's death, says of his incoherent utterances, “Whatever we could follow him in was some fragment of the Bible, or some portion of the Litany, or a verse of some psalm in the old Scotch metrical version, or some of the magnificent hymns of the Romish ritual. We very often heard distinctly the cadence of the *Dies Iræ*. In like manner, the Earl of Roscommon, in the previous century, died repeating his own version of the seventeenth stanza :—

“Prostrate, my contrite heart I rend ;  
My God, my Father, and my Friend,  
Do not forsake me in my end !”

Archbishop Trench, in 1850, contributed to *Fosbery's Hymns and Poems for the Sick and Suffering* a translation in similar verse :—

- 7 " Jesus, Lord, remember, pray,  
I the cause was of Thy way ;  
Do not lose me on that day ?
- 8 King of awful majesty,  
Who the saved dost freely free,  
Fount of pity, pity me !
- 9 Tired, Thou satest, seeking me—  
Crucified to set me free ;  
Let such pain not fruitless be."

Dean Alford's translation, given in the *Year of Praise*, has been deservedly popular :—

- 8 " King of awful majesty,  
Saving sinners graciously,  
Fount of mercy, save Thou me.
- 9 Leave me not, my Saviour, one  
For whose soul Thy course was run ;  
Lest I be that day undone.
- 10 Thou didst toil my soul to gain,  
Didst redeem me with Thy pain ;  
Be such labour not in vain !"

Mrs. Elizabeth Charles, author of the " Schönberg Cotta Family Series," narrative stories of the very highest order, has contributed somewhat largely to Hymnology, both in her *Voice of Christian Life in Song*, and by her original compositions and translations. Her *Dies Iræ* is above mediocrity.

- 8 " King of dreadful majesty,  
Who sav'st the saved, of mercy free,  
Fount of pity, save Thou me !
- 9 Think of me, good Lord, I pray,  
Who trodd'st for me the bitter way,  
Nor forsake me in that day.

10 Weary sat'st Thou, seeking me,  
 Diedst redeeming on the Tree,  
 Not in vain such toil can be !”

Rev. C. S. Pomeroy, D.D., of the United States, relates that when in Constantinople he entered an Armenian Church where the congregation was singing, with manifest emotion, which touched his own spirit though he understood not a word. The hymn was

“Rock of Ages, cleft for me.”

And the late S. W. Duffield records a similar experience in his own case, once in a crowded church, when a German divine rose to speak. “Turning to his fellow-countrymen, he began to pour forth a trumpet strain of lofty eloquence in his native tongue. He spoke of the ‘better valley,’ of a happy and peaceful land. He seemed to see its broad and gentle river, and to hear the chiming of its Sabbath bells. He peopled the air with its lovely citizens, and created about us the presence of a glorious joy. Faintly and brokenly, as now and then he uttered some familiar words, I could catch glimpses of *besseres Thal*, and its brightness and beauty, and the awe of its holy calmness came upon me—upon me, the stranger and the foreigner, in whose speech no word was said.

“But they who were of the lip and lineage of the land, they whose country was brought so near and whose hopes were raised on such strong and familiar wings—they truly were moved to the soul. I saw tears in their eyes; I heard their suppressed and laboured breath; I beheld their eager faces; and the glory of that land fell on them, even as I gazed. So, though we cannot here perceive the fulness of the Franciscan’s hymn, yet do we discern the stately splendour of Messiah’s throne, and

‘Catch betimes, with wakeful eyes and clear,  
 Some radiant vista of the realm before us.’”

This he makes his apology for attempting another—his fifth



—version of the grand and majestic hymn. We can give only a few verses :—

- 6 “ Therefore when the Judge is seated  
Each deceit shall be defeated,  
Vengeance due shall then be meted.
- 7 With what answer shall I meet Him,  
By what advocate entreat Him,  
When the just may scarcely greet Him?
- 8 King of majesty appalling,  
Who dost save the elect from falling,  
Save me, on Thy pity calling.
- 9 Be Thou mindful, Lord most lowly,  
That for me Thou diedst solely ;  
Leave me not to perish wholly ! ”

Of all the other English and American translators, our space will only allow reference to that of Dr. Irons, who inherited, perhaps, the gift of poetry from his father, a popular minister at Camberwell, of the Congregational order, and of high Calvinistic faith. In poetic talents, however, the son far exceeded the father, and he differed widely from him in his ecclesiastical principles and associations. It is no small honour to have succeeded so well where so many have failed, or occupy a position somewhere between success and failure. What Jeremy Taylor, in a letter to John Evelyn, asked him to do, Dr. Irons has done, and well done. It is not the highest praise that his translation has been selected by the compilers of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, as in that popular compilation “the rich and poor meet together,” whoever may be the maker of them. It is higher commendation that no one has so fully caught, and so adequately and accurately expressed, the grand thoughts of the author, as they progress towards the final doom and the final prayer. He retains throughout the triplets of Thomas, and the same double rhyme, which, like blow following blow, strike home the more completely, until the entire being trembles beneath the well-aimed strokes. We give a verse or two only :—

- 5 "Lo, the Book, exactly worded,  
Wherein all hath been recorded ;  
Thence shall judgment be awarded.
- 6 When the Judge His seat attaineth,  
And each hidden deed arraigneth,  
Nothing unavenged remaineth.
- 7 What shall I, frail man, be pleading ?  
Who for me be interceding,  
When the just are mercy needing ?
- 8 King of Majesty tremendous,  
Who dost free salvation send us,  
Fount of pity, then befriend us."

In *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, two alterations, both improvements, have been made in this hymn. Dr. Irons gave us as the second line of verse 1,

"See once more the Cross returning."

In allusion to Matt. xxiv. 30, the "Sign of the Son of Man" is rather the "great white throne" than the symbol of His sufferings. The former idea seems to relate to the legend of Constantine rather than to the verity of Holy Scripture. The altered verse reads :—

"Day of wrath ! O day of warning !  
See fulfilled the prophet's warning !  
Heaven and earth in ashes burning !"

The other change is in the last verse, instead of

"Lord, who didst our souls redeem,  
Grant a blessed requiem."

we have

"Lord, all-pitying, Jesu blest,  
Grant them Thine eternal rest."

It may be said, as doubtless it has been said, that the hymn, though confessedly good, does not give a perfect representation of Christian truth. That we admit, and readily endorse the statement. But look at the times, at the man and his surroundings. It was something for such a voice to be giving forth its witness for God then, and, at least, pointing the way to God through Christ, and to Christ without hint of

pope or priest or mass. It was something, too, to have this testimony sounding down the ages from generation to generation, confronting king and pope and monk and nun, and speaking in the ears of the learned, the noble, and the rich ; warning them of the day of retribution, and pointing, however feebly, to the one Redeemer, Judge, and Advocate. It is something, too, to have such a hymn bearing witness still to truths relating to the judicial side of God's character, which modern theology would gladly shelve, and a false charity hide, ignore, or deny. Sinai antedated Zion, and "the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." He who, like Thomas of Celano, realizes in his own heart the awful foreshadowings of the "Day of Wrath" will best appreciate the good news, "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." To such the voice of Jesus will be melody indeed : "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." The great truth of present salvation for all who receive Christ was as plainly revealed in the Inspired Word then as now ; but how few had access to it ; and of them how few read it ! It needed the Reformation to bring again to the front the great truth of justification by faith alone ; which God grant we may never send to the rear ! These words of our Blessed Lord, like others from the pen of inspired St. Paul, were practically a dead letter ; very few understood them : "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth My Word, and believeth in Him that sent Me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life" (John v. 24). "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii. 24). "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God" (Rom. v. 1). "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1). God grant that with our fuller light we may possess also the blessings of a more abundant life, deeper sanctification, more complete consecration, a more thorough and simple self-sacrifice, and a love which abounds more and more towards God and towards man !

ROBERT SHINDLER.

## THREE CHARACTER-STUDIES.

### II.—*ST. PETER.*

IN studying the character of St. Peter we are met by a consideration which at once arrests attention. He was the personal disciple of Christ. Except the half-dozen notices contained in the Acts of the Apostles, every incident in the life of Peter is in close connection with the life of the Lord Jesus. His personality is ever in touch with that of his Master. Hence it has come to pass that the passages referring to St. Peter have been studied, not for the sake of their bearing upon him, but as they illustrated the doctrine or the character of Christ. I cannot but think that the personality of Peter has been somewhat dwarfed on account of this very near proximity to his Lord. St. Paul differs from St. Peter in this respect. In his case there is no unconscious parallelism in the mind comparing him with One greater, nobler, higher, than himself. If Christ had been present, if His rebuking word had been heard, I do not think that the Church would have condoned so lightly the quarrel between Paul and Barnabas. If whenever the great Apostle of the Gentiles had given proof of that overbearing temper which is the fault of nearly all great men, the sorrowful gaze of Christ had been bent upon him, and His warning rebuke had been uttered, I cannot but think that the generality of Christians would hold him a little less highly than they do. Yet such was the position of St. Peter. Peter was the servant ever in the presence of his Lord. He was ever bowed down by the force and holiness, by the power and purity, by the majesty and grandeur of Christ. "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," is his own exclamation, as a mighty work of the Lord Jesus forced upon his mind the infinite distance between him, the sinful, and the Son of God, the Holy. Paul, too, was bowed down; he was ready to acknowledge himself to be the chief of sinners. But there was

a difference. Paul humbled himself before the invisible God, enthroned in heaven, dwelling in the unapproachable light, whom no man hath seen nor can see. Peter bowed down before the Son of Man, in form and fashion a man like unto himself. And this contrast, although we know that there is no real contrast, appeals to our senses, and, in our own despite, exercises a powerful influence upon the mind. As a consequence, we exalt one Apostle to a position which otherwise he would perhaps hardly fill in our judgment; on the other hand, we unduly abase that other Apostle to a level to which, but for this exceptional circumstance, he would not be lowered.

If any word be needed on the subject of St. Peter's writings, it may suffice to say that the writer of this essay accepts as genuine and authentic both the Epistles of St. Peter. The Church has always received the first Epistle; it was universally acknowledged as part of the Christian Scriptures. Modern sceptical criticism rejects it, as it rejects nearly all the New Testament. The leader of the Tübingen School accepted but five out of all the books of the New Testament, and these do not include any of the Gospels. There has been much greater difficulty about the second Epistle; but the controversy is too long and intricate to enter upon in this place, and we may add that the many books in which the question is discussed are so accessible that those who desire to study it need have no difficulty in obtaining information.

Nor need the question of Hellenism detain us. To trace out the influence of Greek thought on the mind of St. Paul is very necessary if we desire to understand the mental and intellectual training of his character. But St. Peter was not a philosopher; he never heard of those deep problems which have been the despair of all thinkers since thought dawned upon the world; and had he heard of them they would not have troubled him; he would have dismissed them, as he was inclined to dismiss the sayings hard to be understood in St. Paul's Epistles, as having no bearing on the practical life of a man who had but to do his duty in the world.

It is this plainness of thought which has exercised so much

the spirits of his German critics. They cannot understand an Apostle who has no philosophy to teach the world. The simple duty of loving Christ, of living in obedience to His command a pure and holy life, is in their idea too simple a matter. They complain that there is no originality in St. Peter's Epistles. And here again, perhaps, St. Peter suffers by being unconsciously compared with his Master. Much of Christ's teaching consisted in enforcing the simple duties of morality: for when He began to teach, these plain duties were so narrowed to external observances, and were so mixed up with ritualistic requirements, that His teaching came home to His hearers as something new, and up to that time unheard of. "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." There was no originality about St. Peter; the teaching of his Master had sunk into his heart, and he was content to reproduce it.

St. Peter's character may be summed up in a line. He was a man of an impulsive temperament, with the qualities and defects of such a nature. There is scarcely a single scene recorded in which the quality of impulsiveness does not appear. As their ship was tossed with cross winds and boisterous waves the Lord Jesus appeared to the disciples walking upon the water. Peter could not restrain his impatience, "Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee on the water." Like many another man of impulse, he had not waited to consider. "When Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water to go to Jesus." But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid. So again, while he was ready before the others to make his noble confession of faith, and to acknowledge his Lord as the Son of God, the same quick eagerness to speak betrays him into words of foolishness which call down upon him swift rebuke. He does not pause to think whether he will be doing his Lord true service, but, acting upon his first rash impulse, he lets his sword leave its scabbard and strikes the High Priest's servant. He is ready to follow his Master to prison and to death, but he cannot maintain his determination in the face of scorn. Even in after days the same vacillation of character remains. The Master's rebuke

might be borne with equanimity ; but it must have been hard for human nature to brook words of blame from a fellow-disciple, and that fellow-disciple the once persecuting Paul.

The impulsive character of St. Peter's nature, while, perhaps, it made the man more loveable, detracted seriously from the moral greatness, and from the usefulness, of the Apostle. Men who leave their mark upon the world are often enthusiasts, but they are enthusiasts whose enthusiasm is well under control. They are men of passion, but their passion is subordinate to their reason. They are cool, calculating, far-seeing. St. Paul was an enthusiast, but he rarely acted under the impulse of his enthusiasm. St. Peter was continually carried away by his impulsiveness. He spoke or acted first, and too often thought afterwards ; and he was acted on by the influence of others, and allowed them to guide him. The episode at Antioch furnishes an excellent illustration. It is a perfect parallel to the denial. The sin was not so glaring ; the consequences were not so great ; but in both cases the same fault in character produced like results. St. Peter did not mean to deny Christ in Jerusalem. St. Peter did not mean to act contrary to his own words, and to the decision of the Church, at Antioch. Fear of the scornful servant made him untrue at Jerusalem ; fear of the Judaizing Christians made him unfaithful at Antioch. A more thoughtful man would hardly have put the question which St. Peter asked our Lord at the Lake of Tiberias after the Resurrection. Even if a real interest in the future of St. John was the predominant feeling in his mind, the remembrance of the rebuke he had just received might have held him silent. The readiness to forget, and the weakness of the impression made by the prophetic announcement of the death which awaited him, was eminently characteristic. The Lord's answer shows how ill-timed the curious question was, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" It may seem a hard judgment, but the dying words in which the patriarch describes the character of his first-born son do not unaptly describe the character of Christ's first Apostle : "Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel."

St. Peter was no born leader of men. To the end he remained a Galilean peasant. Excellent as a lieutenant, he was not fit to occupy a position of command. During our Lord's life he was first among the Apostles; immediately after Christ's ascension, from the nature of circumstances, he took the lead. He held it but for a moment. He had no genius for government; he did not possess the mental power which compels obedience; he allowed his authority to be called in question; he was no organizer; he had not that calm, far-seeing judgment which weighs men, and, having discerned their character, uses them for the purpose of work. It was St. Peter, we may say, who chose Matthias; but, judging from the result, the choice was not a wise one. After his election to the Apostolic College, Matthias disappears from history. His very name does not again recur. Some have gone so far as to say that the Lord Jesus Christ put aside the election of Matthias, and selected Paul in his stead to take the place of Judas. On the Day of Pentecost Peter preached his sermon. Like himself, it was eager, stirring, from the heart. It gathered in the nucleus of the future Church. A few days later, on the occasion of the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, he again preached. This sermon brought him into conflict with the Jewish rulers. He showed no lack of courage, but stood his ground before them with noble determination. But in the infant Church itself organization was lacking. In it, as in the nation, there were two opposing elements. The Jews of foreign extraction, the Hellenists, murmured because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. It was a small matter, but it was to have great consequences. Paul understood that no detail was below his consideration; Peter failed to perceive this. As head of the Church, it was not his business to serve tables; but it was his business to see that the tables were served efficiently and without partiality. Peter let fall the reins of government; he allowed seven men, all Hellenists, and, therefore, if we may venture to say so, all belonging to the opposition, to be chosen with a view to this office. One, if not two of these, was a man of remarkable power. I do not doubt but that St.



Stephen served his tables thoroughly ; at all events we hear no more of the murmuring. But he did not stay at serving tables ; he had higher work to do, and he did it. His Hellenistic training enabled him to grasp what none of the Apostles had perceived. He recognized that Christianity was no mere modification of Judaism ; and he proclaimed the fact. His preaching raised an alarm among the Jews, and the Jewish chiefs, which Peter's sermons had not produced. It was no longer a question whether the Jesus Christ, whom they had crucified, was risen from the dead ; the fact was taken for granted, and other facts of momentous importance for the Jewish Church and Jewish nation were deduced as its natural effect. "This man," so ran the accusation, "ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law ; for we have heard him say, That this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall charge the customs."

Had Stephen lived he might have taken the place of Paul. But it is not with Stephen we have to do. What is incumbent to notice is that Peter entirely failed to perceive the new phase of development upon which the Church was entering ; and, after the martyrdom of Stephen, we hear (so to speak) no more of Peter. There are one or more single incidents recorded. He preached the Gospel to Cornelius, constrained thereto by a vision, and so inaugurated the Gentile Church. He raised Tabitha from the dead ; he went down in all the authority of an Apostle to Samaria, where Philip, Stephen's colleague, had been forming a Christian Church ; he nearly suffered martyrdom under Herod. For many years he was a pillar—St. Paul speaks almost ironically, "*seemed* to be a pillar"—of the Church of Jerusalem ; and he took a leading part in the Synod, in which it was decided that the Gentiles should not be brought under the yoke of Judaism. But he was not the head of the Church at Jerusalem ; strangely enough, James, not Peter, was the presiding Bishop. Peter was the Apostle whom Christ had specially chosen ; he was the acknowledged head of the Apostolic College ; so, from the time of Stephen, Peter may be said to have dropped out

of the narrative of the Acts. We hear practically nothing more about him. Doubtless he did good work for Christ; we know that he did so from the Epistles which he wrote, and which have come down to us. But the record of his work has perished. The one fact remains. So far as its founding was the work of man, Paul, not Peter, was the human founder of the Church of Christ. The chief Apostle of Christ lived and died in comparative obscurity, because he lacked that power of will, and dogged force of determination, without which no man can be great.

A circumstance, which is matter of history, brings this point into very distinct prominence. St. Peter, in the Roman communion at least, is exalted to the very highest position. But it is an official, not a personal, position.

It may be said that St. Luke in his history follows almost exclusively the fortunes of St. Paul, whose companion he happened to be, and that, therefore, nothing can be fairly deduced from the omission of St. Peter's name. St. Peter may have done a great work in founding churches, although no record of the fact has been preserved. But this can hardly be the case. We need not lay great stress upon the omission in the Acts, although the silence of St. Luke with reference to St. Peter does undoubtedly possess a certain significance. First there is the declaration of St. Paul, that he did more than all the Apostles in extending the kingdom of Christ. Again, had the result wrought by St. Peter been anything like that effected by St. Paul, we should probably have heard of it from the Apostolic Fathers, or, at all events, some tradition, more or less reliable, would have reached us. And once more, the sphere in which St. Peter could have worked must have necessarily been a circumscribed one. His work must have been confined to Palestine, to Babylon and its neighbourhood, or to Rome. Rome may be dismissed at once. He did not found the Church at Rome; he could hardly have been there when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to that Church; and we may certainly conclude from the silence of St. Luke that he was not at Rome when St. Paul arrived there a prisoner. If Peter, the great Apostle, had worked

largely at Rome, above all had he been Bishop of Rome, the fact would surely have come to our knowledge. We know as a positive fact that he spent many years at Jerusalem, and it may be readily believed that he had much to do with the extension and consolidation of that Church. We know that the Judaising emissaries, who disturbed the peace of St. Paul and troubled his converts, used to appeal to the authority of Peter, and that his name carried, as was most justly due, great weight in all the Christian communities. Babylon, ever since the days of the captivity, had had a large and an influential Jewish population; and it does not seem doubtful that in later years St. Peter was the main support, if not the actual founder, of the Church at Babylon. To suppose that by Babylon, Rome is intended is an idle surmise. If Rome is to be read for Babylon in the Apocalypse, that is no reason why it should be so understood in a matter-of-fact Epistle. The idea that some obscure place in Egypt is intended need not be seriously considered. We know that he was at Antioch, which he may have reached on his way to Babylon; and, as it is stated by St. Paul that he went on missionary excursions, he may have visited other Syrian and Asian Churches. He may even have crossed over into Europe. But when all has been said, how small was his sphere of action, and how insignificant his work, compared with that of St. Paul! And one thing more should be remembered. The Acts give the history of St. Paul, and from that source we know what he did. But if the Acts had perished, the Epistles which St. Paul wrote would be quite sufficient to let us know the large area over which his labours extended. The Epistles of St. Peter lead to no such conclusion. In fact they lead to a conclusion directly opposite. They are addressed to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. But these places were the scenes of St. Paul's labours. The Churches which existed there were founded by St. Paul, not by St. Peter. Both in ancient and modern times this conclusion has been impugned, and we are asked to believe that these Epistles of St. Peter were addressed exclusively to Jews, separate and distinct from the

Christian communities which St. Paul had formed in those regions. We are tempted to say, *Credat Judæus*.

There is indeed one other place which St. Peter may possibly have visited. It must be borne in mind that there are large gaps in the Apostle's life consisting of many years around which there is absolute silence. He was the Apostle of the Circumcision. It is only a chance word which shows that he was in Babylon. But there was another colony of Jews, quite as famous, and intellectually of greater importance, in Alexandria. An actual Jewish temple had been built there, and, so far as literature was concerned, it was for the Jews the great centre of mental activity. Except the unimportant notice that Paul sailed to Rome in a ship of Alexandria, there is only one fact mentioned in the New Testament concerning the city. It is that Apollos came from Alexandria to Ephesus, whence he proceeded to Corinth. The fact teaches two things which are very important to note. First, that the religion of Christ had penetrated to the Egyptian capital. Apollos, it is true, was not fully instructed in the Christian faith. He needed that Aquila and Priscilla should expound unto him the way of God more perfectly. But that is no proof that Christianity was not definitely taught in Alexandria. The partial ignorance might well have been personal to this particular convert. It shows, secondly, that the Christians were very ready to welcome the new philosophy, which had its home in Alexandria. The first of these facts is the only one which concerns us with reference to St. Peter. We may surmise that Christianity had reached Alexandria as it reached many other places. Converts to Christ's religion proceeding thither on business, or from other causes—possibly for the express purpose of preaching the Gospel—carried with them the new faith. A place of such importance called for the presence of an Apostle more urgently than some insignificant town in Samaria; and, having regard to the silence of the Acts, it is not at all impossible that St. Peter—the Apostle of the Circumcision—might have been sent to this second centre of Judaism in order to organize and consolidate the rising Church. It is

also easy to surmise that he would not make Alexandria his permanent abiding-place.

At first sight it strikes us with surprise that the chief Apostle should have fallen into what may comparatively be called insignificance. But our astonishment ceases when we consider the manner in which it seemed good to our Lord to act. The last thing that Christ aimed at was what the world calls success. In one sense we may say that His own life was unsuccessful. He gathered round him a few followers, poor, unlearned, unimportant. The multitudes, who were attracted by the cures He wrought or by the words He spoke, melted away, and never became an organized body. With the exception of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, no ruler, or senator, or chief man among the Jews, joined Him. And He ended an unsuccessful life—that is to say, unsuccessful as men count success—by an ignominious death, which was His enemies' triumph. We need not now inquire why this was so. Christ so willed it. But if it were thus His will to efface Himself, can we wonder, if it were also His design that the same obscurity—so far as the world was concerned—should be the lot of His immediate followers, or need we be surprised that the work of founding and establishing His Church should fall into other hands than those of His chosen Apostles? For what has been said of St. Peter holds good of all his companions. None of them rose to eminence; scarcely one of them emerged from obscurity. Did we not possess his Gospel, even the Apostle John would be to us little more than a name; and the Gospel was not written till the close of his life, when he was a very old man.

When we compare St. Peter with St. Paul, another difference besides the want of power strikes us between the two men. St. Paul was a gentleman. Using the word in its English acceptation, it is impossible to make a study of St. Paul without the fact being brought home to the mind. St. Paul was a gentleman. Doubtless he could be coarse upon occasion, as the English gentleman may now and again be coarse. When we turn to St. Peter this quality is lacking. It would have been strange had it been otherwise. He was

but a fisherman, brought up in an outlying province among men of the same class as himself. It is, of course, difficult to define in what the difference between the men consisted ; and it is quite impossible to bring forward any particular thing to illustrate its meaning. But as we study St. Peter's character, as we observe his conduct and note what he said and did, as we read his Epistles, we are conscious of an absence of something which is not lacking in St. Paul, and also of the presence of something which we do not find in the pupil of Gamaliel. If we may venture to say it, there are not about St. Peter those indescribable touches of refinement and culture which we find in St. Paul and St. Paul's Epistles. Peter could hardly have written the Epistle to Philemon. Perhaps this becomes more noticeable when we compare St. Peter with St. John. St. John was brought up under the same conditions : he lived in the same province, and probably in the same town ; the companions of St. Peter were the companions of St. John ; both were Galilean fishermen ; they were actually partners in their business ; and yet how marked is the contrast between them ! There is no lack of refinement in St. John. If St. Paul was a gentleman by birth, training, and education, St. John was one of nature's gentlemen.

The notices of St. Peter in the Gospels are very numerous. Some of these notices are incidental. He asks a question, or requests the explanation of a parable ; but the greater number brings into relief either the character of the man, or the relationship existing between the Master and the disciple. His call to the discipleship was threefold, and on two of these occasions the name of honour was given. He was a married man, and, as St. Paul tells us, was accustomed to be accompanied by his wife on his missionary excursions. He ever put himself forward as the spokesman of his companions, and they appear to have allowed his claim to speak in their names without protest or resentment. Indeed, it would have been hard to take offence at a man whose impulsiveness often made him blunder, but whose every word proved him to be incapable of any designed or deliberate offence. It was Peter who, in his noble confession of faith, first hailed the Lord Jesus

Christ as the Son of God. It was Peter to whom the Lord referred the matter of tribute. It was Peter whose quick eye noticed that the fig-tree had withered, and to whom the promise was given that the prayer of faith should assuredly be answered. It was Peter who expressed the difficulty of receiving Christ's new laws of morality concerning marriage and the forgiveness of injuries. It was Peter who was astonished at our Lord's words concerning riches ; and it was Peter who, calling to Christ's remembrance that he and his companions had left all, asks what reward shall be theirs in the kingdom He was about to found. Almost always, in all circumstances, it is this ardent, passionate, loving man who puts himself forward, asking questions, raising difficulties, declaring his supreme confidence in his Lord.

The love which St. Peter bore to Christ was profound. It was a deep personal attachment ; it was the enthusiastic love of the pupil for the Teacher ; it was the ardent affection of the clansman for his Chief ; it was the loyal devotion of the servant to his Lord ; and, with it all, it was the worship and homage and allegiance and utter submission of the man to his God. But it was ever a personal love. Peter would never have penned the words which St. Paul wrote, "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more." Paul had had no personal knowledge of Christ. Had he followed in the footsteps of the Lord, had he wandered with Him through Galilee and Judæa, had he listened to His words, had he witnessed the cures He performed, had he been an eye-witness of His acts of pity—it is more than possible that St. Paul would have hesitated ere he wrote the words. Peter assuredly could never have written them. He had no thought of forgetting the human Master who had often strengthened him, who had sometimes warned him, who had more than once rebuked him, and who had forgiven him and restored him to His love. There is almost a ring of pity as he writes to his converts, "Whom not having seen, ye love ; in whom, though now ye see Him not, ye rejoice." He not only remembers the sufferings of Christ, he remembers also that he himself was a witness of them. The

conversation in the early morning by the Lake of Galilee has not passed from him ; he reminds his readers of it, telling them that he must shortly put off this his tabernacle, even as the Lord Jesus Christ had showed him. It is more for his own sake, because the remembrance is very dear to him, than for that of those to whom he wrote, that he calls his Apostleship to their memory. And once more, in that passage which has been such a stumbling-block to the critics, he looks back upon the time when he was still with his Master, and, as an eyewitness of His Majesty, beheld His glory in the Holy Mount. Contrasted as their characters were, in nothing is the contrast between these two Apostles brought out in greater prominence than in the love they bore their Master. In both the feeling was as intense as it was deep ; in both it was the mainspring of all their actions ; in both it was the very element of their life. But while in St. Paul it was a lofty principle in which the mind and intellect had almost a greater part than the heart ; in St. Peter it was a fervid sentiment filling the heart to overflowing,

Of this profound love there are many indications in the Gospels. It was not always a wise love. When the Lord Jesus, immediately after Peter's confession, went on to add that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected, and be killed, the Apostle, in his human affection, hurries to interrupt him, " Be it far from Thee, Lord ; this shall not be unto Thee." A wiser love would have understood better. Had the sympathy been more perfect, the foolish word would have remained unspoken. Love should be a help, not a hindrance. Had Peter grasped the meaning of Christ's death as he understood its import after the Day of Pentecost, he would have strengthened the Lord in His purpose instead of making the struggle harder. The same lack of sympathy appears on another occasion. Christ had uttered many parables, and had given the key to their understanding. But the disciples were obtuse ; like the people at large, their eyes were blinded, and they could not see. Peter, once more their spokesman, comes with his interrogation, " Declare unto us this parable." The Lord answers sorrowfully, " Are ye also



yet without understanding? Do ye not yet understand?" They loved, these disciples; but it was with a love which neither understood nor comprehended; and Peter, in this respect, was not better than the rest.

There is at least one instance on record in which the love of St. Peter for his Lord shines forth most nobly. The Lord Jesus Christ was overwhelmed with a depression of sadness which in any other would have been despair. He had fed the people with miraculous food. The loaves and fishes had multiplied beneath His hand. So far it was well. The next day He taught these same people spiritual verities, and pressed home to them truths which were unpalatable. Then they rejected Him. The Scribes and Pharisees had rejected Him before; but now it was the people—the people to whom He had preached, whose infirmities He had borne, for whom He had laboured and was to suffer. The rejection was very bitter. In anguish of spirit He turns Himself to the twelve, "Will ye also go away?" The crisis called forth all that was best in Simon Peter. He steps forward as the mouthpiece of the rest. His speech rings out in noble words which must have carried no small comfort to the pained heart of his Master: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure, that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."

The other side of the picture should not be overlooked. If the love of the disciple towards his Master was true and deep, the tenderness and forbearance which Christ felt for his servant was ever manifesting itself. Christ's love for St. Peter was not marked by the reposeful confidence which the Lord placed in St. John. It was a love called forth by the nobility of character which Peter possessed, and by his single-heartedness of purpose. Christ singled out Peter for commendation and honour. He surnamed him Peter. He more than once appealed to him. He more than once praised him. He selected him, with James and John, to be the witness of His greatest miracles. He chose him to be present at the manifestation of His glory on the Mount of Transfiguration. He allowed him to see His deep humiliation in the Garden of Gethsemane.

But it was the fall of Peter that brought Christ's loving pity into special prominence.

The story of the denial repays a careful study, for it throws a flood of light upon St. Peter and his surroundings. More than any other incident in his life, it brings out both the good and the bad points of the Apostle's character. It portrays in vivid colours the close tie which existed between Christ and His chief Apostle. It lifts into clear relief the hastiness of the servant, his unwillingness to yield to guidance, and the contradictory attitude he too often assumed; on the other hand, it pictures to us the longsuffering nature of the Lord's love, which bore with the impatient and provoking temper, and controlled it, and forgave it. And further, the narrative illustrates the spirit of affectionate and faithful comradeship which marked the relationship between Peter and his fellow-disciples.

Peter had been forewarned. But such a thing as desertion seemed so far removed from his impulsive affection that he could not regard it as possible: "Though all men shall be offended because of Thee, yet will I never be offended." Still less could he entertain the idea of denial: "Though I should die with Thee, yet will I not deny Thee." St. Luke characteristically tells us how Christ had prayed for His disciple: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." But Peter can give no heed. His mind is stirred to its very depths by indignant scorn at the mere notion of such a deed. "He spake the more vehemently." And so, refusing to be warned against that which he cannot believe possible, the Apostle of Christ goes forth to sin and shame. He trusted in the strength of his own love, instead of relying on the grace and love of Christ, and his strength failed.

Yet what a difference between the sin of Peter and the sin of Judas! Judas deliberately entertained the thought of betrayal, and planned its accomplishment. Peter must have been false to all his nature could he deliberately have thought of denying Christ. A paltry bribe caused Judas to be a traitor. Not all the fair fields and goodly heritages round Jerusalem could have seduced Peter from his allegiance.

Judas fell, because almost from the first he gave himself up to Satan. "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil," are the awful words of Christ. "He bare the bag, and was a thief," is the scathing comment of St. John. Peter fell, because in the warmth of his love and affection he did not think a fall could be.

The fatal words were hardly uttered before the Lord's sorrowful pity was manifested. It was in the midst of His own examination before the High Priest. Around Him were false accusers, unjust judges, scribes, and rulers, all thirsting for His blood. But Christ forgets His own pain as He thinks of His Apostle's shame: "The Lord turned, and looked upon Peter." How the look must have haunted him! How it must have gone forth with him into the darkness, giving a keener edge to his grief! "As he thought thereon he wept." But during the three days of suspense and sorrow the look must have come back to him with a truer perception of its meaning. He had denied his Lord. But his Lord had understood, and, understanding, had pardoned. His last act was the act of forgiveness.

Christ had thought of Peter in His passion; He remembers him upon the morning of the resurrection. The command of the angel to the women is, "Go, tell His disciples and Peter," that the Lord is risen. A further word is added by St. Luke. As Cleophas and that other disciple came from Emmaus with their wonderful story, they are met with the ejaculation, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon!" No details are given. No word of the conversation is recorded. Yet it is not difficult to spell out the reason why Christ appeared unto Simon. On the blessed day of the resurrection the joy of the erring Apostle, which otherwise had been mixed with sorrow at the thought of his unworthy deed, had been made full. For the Risen Lord Himself appeared, and gave to His penitent servant the assurance that the sin, which bore with such a weight upon his heart, had been forgiven and blotted out.

The fact of the denial would not long remain unknown. The open-hearted Peter could never have carried about with

him such a secret. Possibly St. John, who was in the palace of the High Priest, might have been an ear-witness, even as the Lord Himself had been. Were it not so, Peter would have unburdened his mind to John, or some other of his fellow-disciples. That it was known is clear by its being recorded in the Gospels. The Apostles understood him. They comprehended how the warm-hearted man would follow Christ into the place of judgment; and they comprehended, too, how in that place, surrounded by hostile faces, the natural courage of their companion would gradually ooze away, leaving him weak and helpless. But they knew, further, that he was staunch to the backbone. There is something singularly beautiful about this episode, as it bears upon the relationship between Peter and the other disciples of Christ. Peter had been accustomed to take upon himself, and put himself forward. If any ill-feeling or spitefulness existed, here was an opportunity for its exercise. But of this there is no appearance. There is no trace of any jealousy. No one appears to have cast the fault in his teeth; nor does any disagreeable, or even condemning, word appear to have been spoken. We find him on the Sunday with the others, in their midst, holding his old position. It is to Peter that the women bring their news. It is Peter who, with John, runs to the sepulchre in order that their own eyes may verify the astounding news. Later in the day it is of Peter they all speak as having been favoured with an appearance of the Risen Lord. A most beautiful picture of trust, confidence, and faithful fellowship!

His fellows, who knew him well, were ready to condone his fault. Yet the fault was great. It might be, that, in after days, others who knew him not so well might cavil that this man, who had thus grievously denied his Lord, should be esteemed a chief Apostle. So the Lord Himself reinstated him. As the denial had been threefold, so three times must the Apostle, no longer comparing himself with others, answer the question, "Lovest thou Me?" and three times is the command, assigning to him once again the Apostolic office, given, to feed the lambs, and tend the sheep, and

herd the choice flock of Christ. A word is added. His courage had failed, but it should not always fail. The time should come when this Apostle, who through fear had weakly denied his Lord, should stand, without fear, before a more terrible tribunal, and, freed from weakness, should follow his Lord's steps, passing through the dreadful death of crucifixion into the eternal glory which lay beyond.

The tradition which tells the story of St. Peter's martyrdom is singularly beautiful. He was at Rome when the persecution of the Christians commenced. In accordance with the Lord's command, that persecuted in one city the disciples should flee into another, St. Peter prepared to leave the capital. He had already passed the gates. Presently he sees a figure coming to meet him. He recognizes his Master. He asks, "Lord, whither goest Thou?" And Christ replied that He was going to Rome there to be crucified again. St. Peter is quick to comprehend. He remembers the prophecy by the Lake of Galilee. He understands that his Lord is to be crucified once more in the person of His Apostle. He is without fear now, for his confidence is no longer in himself. He had escaped the danger; but at the bidding of his Lord he is ready again to face it. He turned back; he re-entered the fatal city. On the morrow he is apprehended; he confesses himself a Christian, and is doomed to die. The axe is reserved for Roman citizens; and he stands a spectator while his great colleague, St. Paul, thus meets his death. He himself, an ignoble Jew, shall be crucified. And then the legend adds a little touch of exceeding beauty. The loving, erring, faithful, impulsive man has learned at last the lesson Christ would have him learn. He is clothed with humility. In his lowly devotion to the Master he loved so well, he is unwilling to die as He died. So he makes one last request to his executioners, with which they mockingly comply. And the Apostle of Christ, faithful at the last to the Lord whom he had once denied, dies crucified, with his head downward.

H. N. BERNARD.

## CHRISTIAN SECULARISM.<sup>1</sup>

### No. II.

WE have now to consider the historical allegation of the secularists, "Whatever it may be theoretically, Christianity has actually and historically exerted an anti-secular influence, and retarded progress." Here to a great extent we may admit the facts, but deny the conclusions. A false asceticism has undoubtedly been very common in all ages, and among all denominations of Christians. Self-denial has been pushed beyond its proper limits, based on wrong principles, not seen as it should be, in relation to those higher and universal truths of the dignity of man, the use of the world, the liberty of Christians of which I have spoken. Many practical mistakes and misconceptions have been the consequence. Self-denial *in itself* became to many the one great thing in religion. The more they mortified the flesh, and gave up every natural pleasure, and tried to reduce their earthly wants and wishes to a minimum, the more favourable were the conditions for their spiritual welfare. Others selected particular objects, occupations, and amusements, as "the world to be renounced," and fell into the double error of too much self-denial in one direction, denying the lawful use of many things that were natural, and therefore in their place useful; and of too little in another, forgetting the possible or probable abuse of the earthly things they allowed. It must further be admitted that in many cases the influence of religion for the time being has been against social, political, and educational changes which experience has proved to be for the common weal. But this was generally due to error of judgment, not unnatural at the time, as to the measures in question being for the good of the people, rather than to any jealousy or dislike on religious grounds of too high a standard of earthly prosperity and

---

<sup>1</sup> See the first part of this article in the September number of this Magazine.

happiness. Just as mistaken views of medical or sanitary requirements, of social science or political economy, prevalent in their times, may often have led the most honest philanthropists into practical mischief—and yet philanthropy was blameless—so Christianity cannot be blamed because Christians were wrong oftentimes in their science and in their politics, and therefore missed at times the right, and chose the wrong ways of doing good to their brethren. This class of misdeeds ascribed to Christians was not owing to mistakes in their Christianity, but to mistakes in their physical or mental or social science.

But before we deal further with the secularist's case, let us state our own. To history we both appeal. What tale has it to tell of the secular work and influence of Christianity? "Art Thou He that should come, or look we for another?" was St. John the Baptist's question. "Go and shew John the things ye have heard and seen," was our Lord's reply. So in the name of Christianity we reply to the question, "Art thou that religion that in the interests of humanity should come, or look we for another?" "Go and show the questioner," we say, "the things that through history ye may see and hear. Judge our religion by its fruits, by what it has done for the welfare and happiness of mankind in the present world." From the blindness of prejudice we appeal on this point to the general sense of civilized humanity. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*. To deny the beneficent effects and influence of Christianity on man's condition, social and individual, is to mistake the eddies for the current; to take, as has been said of Scripture, some favourite texts and passages of history and hold them so near the eyes as to shut out the general drift and bearing of the whole. Surely the old and oft-urged claims of Christianity to have befriended and bettered man for this world never have and never can be repudiated. Its historical record is a noble one. It has cared and worked and pleaded for the sick, the poor, the suffering, the fallen, the outcast, the prisoner, the waifs and strays of society, in a way the world never knew before and never has known, on any scale sufficient for observation, apart from it. To it the

world is mainly indebted, so far as it has them, for just and equal laws, for the abolition of slavery, the elevation of woman, the mitigation of war's horrors, the growth of right feeling and opinion in respect of many of the worst evils and vices that curse humanity—as cruelty to man and beast, unnatural lusts—and for that long list of similar gains and blessings for the life that now is, of which these are but a sample, recalling to us all an almost infinite number of ameliorations in all spheres and relations of life. “Awake but one, and lo, what myriads rise !”

To all this, unbelief makes two replies. (1st) “What of the failures of Christianity? You have been speaking of the successes. What of the terrible inequalities of modern society, the great wealth side by side with the most abject destitution; what of the vices of our cities, the state of our streets and slums, the intemperance that flaunts abroad; what of the armaments of Europe, draining the nations—in *peace* of their means, their industry, and their results, *in war*, with its fearful perfection of destructive agents—of the life-blood of thousands of their best and bravest? Is a religion which has failed so conspicuously, which has left so much more undone than it has done in the long period it has been tried, a religion for this world?” My answer is simple. “The failures of Christianity, exaggerate them as you please, do not disprove nor detract from the value of its successes. If it has done what without doubt it has done all along the ages for the bettering of man's condition here below; if these actually accomplished benefits have sprung from the essential spirit and principles of the Faith; if a continuous growth, progress, and promise is observable therein, working like the leaven to which its Author likens His kingdom, in the whole lump of humanity—it is beside the question to point out the work that is still undone, the hopes as yet unfulfilled. Deny or minimize the benefits if you can, but, in the name of logic, do not argue that what it has not done disproves or does away with the value of what has been done. Just as every alleviation of the pain, every improvement in the condition, of the sick and wounded is a real gain, remain what will unmeddled, so



with what Christianity has done for man's temporal good, and what is yet undone."

But unbelief says (2ndly), "Let the failures pass, if, as you say, they cannot fairly, in such a case, be set off against the successes. But what of the *positive* injury, the actual harm and *evil results* which Christianity, we contend, has wrought upon earth? What of the *odium theologicum*, the party spirit, the religious wars, the cruel persecutions, the torturing of heretics, the long and gloomy catalogue of human miseries and sufferings of which Christianity has been just as productive as any other of the leading religions of the world?" "There are," I reply, "two descriptions of things mixed up in this indictment: those which have been done honestly but mistakenly in the name of Christianity; and those which have been done against men's consciences, through the weakness of their nature, in spite of their Christianity." I am disposed to concede what comes under the first head to the objector. "O Christianity"—we may well say as of Liberty—"what things have been done in thy name! How did men so mistake thee?" But in an estimate of the actual results of Christianity, I think the honest mistakes that have been made about it ought fairly to be taken into account. The answer of some apologists, that Christianity is not responsible for any of the misconceptions, however honest and natural, of its adherents, is, to my mind, insufficient. In estimating the good or evil resulting from any gift or possession of humanity, you must take all that has really resulted from it, all that it has given rise to, into account, whether by its sole action, or in conjunction with other causes—the wrong as well as the right that has been done in consequence of or by means of it. So far as men persecuted their fellow-men on religious grounds, thinking they were doing God service; so far as any evil was done because, like Saul, they thought it was not evil, but ought to be done for Christ's sake, so far let Christianity share the responsibility of the consequences. But how small is the sum of the evils done through the honest mistakes of Christians in comparison of its beneficent results! Let us hear an impartial witness, Hallam, who says

of the middle ages, when such errors were most prevalent, "Beyond all doubt, the evils of superstition in the middle ages, though separately considered very serious, are not to be weighed against the benefits of the religion with which they were so mingled."<sup>1</sup>

Then we come to those things done by Christians in connection with their religion, but not in obedience to its principles and motives. Men have quarrelled about religion, hated one another on account of it, committed all manner of crimes about it; but in doing so they have known more or less clearly that they were acting wrongly, acting against the spirit and principles of the religion they professed. These things, and it needs but little reflection to see how a large a field they cover, how large a portion of the alleged delinquencies of Christianity they include, are not fairly chargeable to Christianity, but to the infirmity of human nature. It is, alas! but too possible that, as the Psalmist says, "The things that should have been for our wealth may become to us *an occasion* of falling." But the abuse we may wilfully and wittingly make of our blessings is not chargeable on them. We might as well charge our health, our strength, or any organ or faculty of our nature, with those misdeeds which without them we could not have done, as charge Christianity with those bad passions and evil actions of which indirectly it has been the occasion.

On some such lines as I have endeavoured to indicate in these rough outlines of a great subject, we may, I think, best meet the secularist's charges against Christianity. This "gospel of the secular life," as it has been called, is of the greatest importance, especially in our times. "Probably," says Dr. Kay, in his *Promises of Christianity*, "the greater part of the unbelief and almost Christianity which prevails now in Europe, has had its origin in imperfect views of this subject—the relation of the present world to the next." And Girdlestone, who quotes this, adds, "Modern secularism could not have existed had we not been defective in this matter."

---

<sup>1</sup> Hallam, *Middle Ages*, Vol. 3, Cap. IX. (Note 1848).

Just now it seems to me peculiarly important that the sympathy and aid of religion in the improvement of man's earthly state and circumstances should be heartily given. There is a general longing abroad for more "sweetness and light" in the lives of the people—a firm persuasion that a much more enjoyable existence than has been hitherto their lot is within near reach of the masses of the community. Much that is wild and visionary, requiring an essential change in the nature of man and the conditions of life (as though he set his heart on having wings like the angels), is in the air as to this ideal state of man on earth. But all due allowance made, there does seem a general consensus among the wisest and best Christian thinkers and workers of the day, that a general advance and improvement in the secular condition of the masses is both possible and desirable; that we must deal more wisely and radically than we have as yet done with the condition of the poor; that the amusements and recreations, the higher tastes and aspirations of the working classes should be recognized and provided for; that in all ways and in all classes of society we must aim more and more, not at taking men out of the world, but at delivering them from the evil—claiming all departments of life, all natural pleasures and amusements for Christ, rather than give any up as hopelessly bad. A most difficult task, no doubt, and one in which we may well pray for a right judgment and sound sense, knowing when and where "for the present distress," for the present evil that is so inextricably mingled with them, it is the Christian's duty to "touch not, taste not, handle not."

To conclude. Having vindicated for Christianity a true and hearty good-will and good influence for the welfare of man in this world, we may assume the aggressive, and affirm our belief that secularism without religion is a delusion and a dream; that it is at best like a fair and lovely flower cut from its parent stem, which for a time may preserve its life and beauty, but soon will wither and fade; that there are several fatal defects inherent in its nature and constitution, which must bring it to an untimely end, frustrate its most

carefully devised schemes, and shatter its most ably constructed systems. First, secularism, or this world alone, this life by itself, lacks real working motives to make men labour and persevere in labouring for the ideal earthly state. The vision of this happy state is not enough to overcome the strong forces that in the case of most men make for sensual, selfish indulgence. It is lost labour for amiable idealists to construct society on a purely human and secular basis. The stone will ever keep rolling down and humanity falling back, as it has before, from bad to worse. To point to heathen nations that are stationary is futile. The question is, What will become of apostate Christendom, of people that have had faith and hope, but have lost, though not forgotten, them? Secondly, it takes no account of the wretchedness and imperfection of life at its best. "If in this life only he has hope, then is man of all creatures most miserable." Pessimism, with its doleful cry that life is not worth living, with its mad orgies of present indulgence, with its cynical contempt and indifference for everything, is the inevitable end and doom of human society that knows no life, no world but this. So strong is this feeling about this life and all belonging to it being vanity, that it needs all the sense of duty, the consciousness of its relationship to and the hope of another, which Christianity gives us, to keep alive in us a healthy secularism that hopes and loves and works in and for a world where sin and death and disappointment reign.

So we come to the conclusion that "Godliness hath the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come;" and that this being so, "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." For, as the love of man and of God are each necessary to the existence of the other in its integrity and fulness, so there is a world-love which is the antecedent condition of a true heaven-love, and though at the call of Christ the best and highest this world can offer may be, must be, renounced, yet its beauty must be seen, its heavenliness must be recognized, by all who have the true vision of the heavenly life and the heavenly world.

C. H. CROFTON.

## OUR LORD'S TEMPTATION VIEWED IN RELATION TO JOHN VI.

THE object of the following article is to indicate in the first place, generally, how, when we have grasped the true significance of our Lord's Temptation, the significance of all His after life on earth is by so much enhanced; and, in the second place, more particularly, how the victory then gained has left its after-glow on the pages of St. John's Gospel, though St. John himself has not preserved the record of the Temptation.

There is, of course, no reason for restricting investigation to the sixth chapter of the Gospel. I have only done so because, by what seems to me a marked coincidence, that one chapter contains in itself all that is requisite for the purpose in hand.

Following the order of St. Luke, the three temptations of our Lord were these: (1) To turn stones into bread for the satisfaction of His own bodily wants; (2) To gain a world-wide dominion by an act of homage to the Tempter; (3) To expose Himself to what for any other must have proved certain death, in reliance on the promise of angel-hands to bear Him up. Turning now to the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, we find (1) that the power He declined to exercise for the supply of His own wants, Jesus was willing to exercise to relieve the wants of others; (2) that when Jesus perceived that they would come and take Him by force to make Him a King, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone; (3) that He who refused to cast Himself down from a pinnacle of the temple for mere display was yet willing to walk upon the waves to His disciples' help, and was borne up.

Having thus drawn out the comparison in bare outline, I

pass to the consideration of the significance of our Lord's Temptation. It followed immediately upon His Baptism. The Holy Ghost had then visibly descended upon Him, and a voice had been heard from heaven, "Thou art My beloved Son: in Thee I am well pleased." It may be that at that moment He attained to a fuller consciousness than ever before of the dread mystery of the union of the two natures in His own Person, of what it was to be both God and man, uniting in Himself the possibilities of both—the possibilities of power as He was God, the possibilities of weakness as He was man. How were these to be reconciled, what relation were the Divine possibilities to bear to the human in the fulfilment of His earthly mission, how was the Divine Almightyness to adjust itself to the human limitations? Such we may deem to have been the problem pressing for solution in the Saviour's breast, when driven by the Spirit into the wilderness. It may be that during those forty days of solitude the thoughts took shape, which, emerging into clear consciousness at length as temptations of the evil one, were once for all decisively rejected and dismissed. So that (to quote from Professor Godet) "if, from the very first step in His arduous career, Jesus kept the path marked out by God's will without deviation, change, or hesitancy, this bold front and steadfast perseverance are certainly due to His experience of the temptation. All the wrong courses possible to Him were thenceforth known; all the rocks had been observed; and it was the enemy himself who had rendered Him this service. . . . When He left this school, Jesus distinctly understood that, as respects His *Person*, no act of His ministry was to have any tendency to lift it out of His human condition; that, as to His *work*, it was to be in no way assimilated to the action of the powers of this world; and that in the employment of Divine *power*, filial liberty was never to become caprice, not even under a pretext of blind trust in the help of God. And this programme was carried out." I cannot but think that the incidents of John vi. acquire fresh interest when viewed in their relation to the carrying out of such a programme; and that it is not uninteresting if we can dis-

cern the memories of the Temptation which St. John does not record underlying particulars that he has recorded.

It is surely remarkable—and this, indeed, has never been overlooked—that out of pity for the famishing multitudes Jesus was willing to put forth a power which to satisfy His own hunger He would not exert. Of those that were pressing round Him when He afterwards spoke the words, "Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life," none probably were aware how true the Teacher had shown Himself to His own teaching, when at the close of His long fast He rested on the words, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." But what was hidden from them has been revealed to us. We have been permitted to take knowledge of the secrets of that Teacher's inner life. And brightly glow for us the words of Jesus to the multitude in the light let in upon them from the first temptation. Out of pity Jesus had done for them what He would not do for Himself. It was simply pity. Had the people afterwards dispersed, there might have been no further reference to the miracle than to that which followed, the walking on the sea, which had apparently no direct ulterior object than the relief of the disciples in their terror and distress, and is never alluded to again. But when the people followed on to Capernaum seeking for Jesus, and that with no loftier aim than "because they did eat of the loaves, and were filled," then must He make an effort to draw them too up to that higher level on which He stood, the teaching must be pressed home how "man shall not *live* by bread alone, but by every *word* that proceedeth *out of the mouth of God*." I will dwell no longer on this point save to put in contrast the claim of Jesus at the close of His discourse, "*The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life;*" and to draw attention to the effect on St. Peter. The tempter had begun with an "if." "*If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread;*" give proof of your Divinity so, was the request. And Jesus had refused the proof. Was no proof, then, to be forth-

coming, or was Peter speaking at random as a man who cared for no proof when he declared, "We believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God"? Nay, the proof is in the verse preceding, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." St. Peter, then, at least had learned the lesson, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Of the walking on the sea I shall say little beyond pointing out how significant is the utter absence of anything like display attending it. When the Tempter had urged Him to cast Himself from the pinnacle of the temple, the only purpose would have been to create an effect, and Jesus refused. Taking place publicly in the presence of numbers it might have made a great stir for the moment, but Jesus cared not for that. He, however, who thus declined to commit Himself to the air, did yet on one occasion commit Himself to the waves, and He was miraculously borne up. But He was alone, and it was in the darkness of the night. None saw Him save the disciples in the boat, and, whether or no it was that He charged them to keep it secret, no allusion was ever made to it afterwards; and when asked the question by the people, "Rabbi, when camest Thou hither?" He avoided making answer. For a mere enthusiasm for the marvellous as the marvellous was exactly at that moment what He was most concerned to repress. Is not all this in keeping with the resolve attained through the Temptation, to make no presumptuous and capricious use of His Divine gifts for mere display? What was the real bearing of the temptation in question? asks Professor Godet. "With God power is always employed in the service of goodness, of love; this is the difference between God and Satan, between Divine miracle and diabolical sorcery. Now the devil in this instance aims at nothing less than making Jesus pass from one of these spheres to the other." But it was in vain. And it is indeed beautiful to think how in the darkness of that stormy night upon the Sea of Galilee that power was employed in the service of goodness and love, which the devil, could he have directed it, would have



prostituted to the gaining of a passing glory from a gaping crowd.

I pass now to consider the one other temptation, and its parallel in this chapter of St. John. The order of the three temptations, by the way, I am not concerned to discuss. For convenience sake I have, when entering into detail, abandoned the order of St. Luke for the order of St. Matthew. And first it will not be beside the point to consider shortly the devil's claims in regard to "all the kingdoms of the world." "All this power will I give Thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it." Was this a lie? we naturally ask, or had he any right to speak thus? Seeing that he is three times spoken of by our Lord Himself as "the prince of this world," it would seem that in some sort he had. He had usurped a power over God's world, and the usurper had grown secure in his possession. Long use had given him a title. He had so long been king in fact, that he reckoned himself now king by right. Yet even in advancing such a claim he betrays perhaps a consciousness of its weakness. He has begun to have more than a suspicion that this Jesus is the long-promised Deliverer come forth to bruise the serpent's head, to dispossess him of his dominion, and to reclaim the world for God. He is like the rebel-leader who has long had it all his own way, but who realizes that a stronger than he is now at last in the field against him. Strongly posted in his chief stronghold, he is conscious of his ability to hold out for long, but something tells him that sooner or later he will have to yield. And this being so, he resolves to offer terms. He offers immediately to surrender, but on his own conditions, conditions that would be favourable to himself, but dishonourable to him who should accept them. And, as was likely, they are rejected. His high-souled adversary chooses rather the long strain of a protracted siege than to acquire by base concessions immediate possession. Even so in the Scripture narrative, as it seems to me. The devil, the rebel-leader, has recognized in Jesus the stronger than he who is come to dispossess him; and, forecasting the issue, he proposes to

surrender now upon his own conditions. "If Thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be Thine." No need to say such terms could not be listened to. Jesus accepts the alternative of a protracted siege. For a moment, doubtless, the thought had presented itself to Him, and the thought was tempting, by one great exercise of power to bring the world beneath His feet. But this could only be by consenting to methods sanctioned among his own subjects by "the prince of this world." The fact of its being in its very conception an empire after the pattern of the empires of this world, would have involved concessions to the spirit of evil which Christ could not make. And the thought was instantly dismissed. To quote once more from Professor Godet, "Jesus thereby renounced all power founded upon material means. . . . He confined Himself, in accomplishing the conquest of the world, to spiritual action exerted upon souls; He condemned Himself to gain them, one by one, by the labour of conversion and sanctification,—a gentle, unostentatious progress, contemptible in the eyes of the flesh, of which the end, the visible reign, was only to appear after the lapse of centuries. . . . Death inevitably awaited Him in this path. But He unhesitatingly accepted all this, that He might remain faithful to God, *from whom alone He determined to receive everything.*" Such was the decision come to once for all after looking the Tempter in the face. Such was the determination once for all deliberately taken, and from that moment steadfastly adhered to. Wherefore when upon a subsequent occasion Jesus "perceived that they would come and take Him by force to make Him a King, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone." They followed Him and pressed Him with questions, and in His replies occur such words as these, "*All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me; and him that cometh to Me, I will in no wise cast out. . . . And this is the Father's will which hath sent Me, that of all which He hath given Me, I should lose nothing.*" "No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him." "But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who

should betray Him. And He said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto Me, *except it were given unto him of My Father.*"

And now to conclude. What I have tried in some measure to draw out in this article has been the reality of our Lord's Temptation—its reality as temptation I mean, its reality as discipline, leaving its permanent impress on all the after life of Him who was so tempted. It was not merely a dramatic incident, of which the interest is exhausted when we have satisfied ourselves that it may be reputed historically authentic; nor is it a mere symbolical presentment of the fact that there was war on earth, the devil fighting, and Jesus fighting in a combat wholly and utterly unique. No; it seems to me that the true significance is in great measure missed, if it be not regarded as a critical moment, a determining-point in the human development of the God-Man. Whatever may have been the precise form they took, the temptations were as real to Him as ever our temptations are to us. Unquestionably He did feel tempted to use His Divine power to satisfy the wants incident to that condition of human poverty of which He was now beginning to taste the sharp experience. He was conscious of the wants. He was conscious of the ability to satisfy those wants. He never used it. Here, then, was a prolonged exercise of self-control. Had either consciousness been wanting, there had been no temptation. But the very fact of their co-existing seems to postulate an interior conflict; though the completeness of the victory might have left such a conflict unsuspected, had there not been preserved to us the record of the first temptation. As certainly was Jesus really tempted to make His presence on earth conspicuous by invoking startling and impressive signs from heaven. Why did He refuse all such displays? They were looked for. They would have been welcomed. To refuse them was to court the people's scorn. To have vouchsafed them would have been easy. There was an apparent readiness to accept such signs as conclusive. The waverers might once for all have been determined by them. Why, then, were they withheld? There had been a resolu-

tion going before, hard to take, as we conjecture ; but, once taken, final. Jesus would rather seem to fail—however bitter the experience He thus nerved Himself to face—than consent in any way to tempt the Father who had sent Him.

Yet once again, Jesus was really tempted to hasten His reign on earth by condescension to the methods of this world and its prince. The way seemed open. There was a vast amount of enthusiasm ready to be transferred to one who would declare himself the national leader of the Jews, to one who could restore the throne of David. The whole of the East might not improbably have given in its submission, for expectations of some great one to arise were in the air. Visions of a world-wide empire with boundless possibilities of good might not unreasonably be entertained. But Jesus never advanced one step upon this course. From first to last He utterly repudiated any idea of such a thing. Not that He had never entertained the idea. The record of the Temptation opens our eyes upon this point. And by the very decisiveness of the after-repudiation we may perhaps measure the force with which it had once assailed Him, and the struggle it had cost Him to resist it. Think with what sharp severity He once rebuked the astonished Peter, "Get thee behind Me, Satan." What did that mean? Did it mean that Jesus was insensible to what Peter urged? On the contrary, it meant, I think, that the temptation to shrink from suffering was strong enough in itself without being backed by the solicitations of a beloved Apostle.

Much doubtless yet remains to be written on the mystery of our Lord's Temptation. In the interval it is good to realize that our Lord's perfection as man was no mere matter of course, as would seem to be sometimes supposed ; that if He was sinless, it was through no impossibility of sinning ; and, above all, that the fact of His Godhead, strange as this may sound, so far from exempting Him from being tempted, may have actually laid His manhood open to the inroad of more subtle and more formidable temptations.

F. G. CHOLMONDELEY.

## CURRENT LITERATURE.

*Protestant Episcopacy in Great Britain* (1) is a heavy indictment against the Romish doctrine of Apostolical Succession, illustrated especially by the case of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Mr. Tod tells us his endeavour has been rather "to write into the text the opinions of persons who may be considered to be authorities for or against any of the matters discussed than to express his own views; and so there is reference given for every statement of fact of any moment." The work, then, is authoritative on its own-side, and is well worth careful consideration by all who take an interest in such matters. It is written in an old style which is attractive, and it bears the impress of great carefulness in preparation. The aspect of the doctrine, as it regards a section of the English Church, is set out on p. 55, where Mr. Tod affirms that in the Church of England "the archbishops and bishops have neither mitre, crozier, nor pastoral staff, and in which, should any articles of the kind be used, they would be illegal. There are, besides, no altars and no priests, or any vestments used to represent chasubles, albs, or tunics; and in which the central catholic doctrine and central ceremony of the mass has never been held or performed, and cannot be held or performed." Mr. Tod's account of the Tulchan, Spottiswoodean, and Sharpean Bishops in Scotland is most interesting, though somewhat lengthy. The author concludes his treatise by stating that "by giving a proper estimate of the value of the Romish doctrine, Episcopalianism in Scotland will have a fair chance to stand its ground upon its own intrinsic merits, as being Scriptural, as being formulated by the primitive Church and existent ever since, and as being, if properly used, a fairly efficient ecclesiastical system, direct in government and free from the defects of the parity, more nominal than real, claimed for systems of modern adaptation." The book is well printed and carefully got up, and its leaves are cut, which is an advantage.

*Paul of Tarsus* (2) seems to be a work of fiction, in which the author takes the events and circumstances of St. Paul's life as given in the New Testament, and weaves them into a narrative seldom amusing and sometimes absurd. He attempts to prove that St. Paul—and our Saviour too—were Essenes; and that

the Essenes were really Buddhists. But we believe that the arguments in favour of this thesis are as weak as can be ; nor indeed does the author claim for his work any higher or larger motive than to satisfy those who have already become followers of the Esoteric philosophy. His pages are penned "not to trouble the hearts of those whose faith is firmly fixed in the lessons of their childhood ; not to anger pious souls, or to seek effect by denying what so many men and women, good, honest, and convinced, hold to be true and sacred." So these are recommended not to read the work, and we cordially agree with the author ; and if the others are satisfied with such mental fare as is here presented to them, they must be easily pleased.

In five lectures, stretching in all to eighty-six pages, Mr. Howatt has essayed to set forth the *Fallacies of Agnosticism* (3) ; but though his work is in many ways commendable, it can hardly be considered comprehensive. Each lecture is headed by a text from Scripture, that of the first lecture being the famous Athenian inscription, Ἄγνώστῳ Θεῷ, in which Mr. Howatt says the existence of a God was assumed and then declared to be unknown ; which "is demanding too much from the flexibility of language." However, St. Paul was not so critical ; but made the motto the peg for a wondrous homily. Mr. Howatt makes a good point when he says that agnostics often substitute history for science ; his little story about *katalysis* is very amusing ; and he remarks how evolution fails to account for the religious instinct. Mr. Howatt sets gnosticism against agnosticism ; but surely he does not do this without a forgetting of Church history ; and when he tells his readers the reason for the rise and fall of Greece and Rome, he almost proves too much. The work is of such a compass that it can be easily read and mastered ; and so may perform a function which a larger volume would possibly fail in.

The connection or contrast between *Socrates and Christ* (4) has often occupied the attention of learned men, and has derived a new interest in these latter days from the attention paid to the subject of Comparative Religion. Mr. Wenley's volume is a weighty and thoughtful essay, in which he maintains that "the development of Greek thought and the peculiar character of Judaism necessarily rendered Christ's work different from that of Socrates. While dogmatic theology undoubtedly contains very many elements derived from Greek philosophy, Christianity at its source is in nowise Greek. Philosophy partly prepared the way for it, and originated not a few

doctrines which afterwards became incorporated in Christian dogma. This, however, was only a secondary relationship." The account of Socrates is full and fair; the significance of Philo-Judæus is well brought out, and the differences between Socrates and Christ are distinctly shown. Socrates taught men that by taking thought they might put opportunity to better uses, or might be enabled by the application of discoverable methods to substitute dignity and beauty for the querulousness customary in common life. Laudable and indispensable as an aim of this sort is, one cannot but admit that it differs widely from the object of religion. What Christianity has to tell is embodied in a life; the teaching of Greek philosophy is that happiness must be sought in wisdom, but what that wisdom contains for the bettering of men it never definitely declares. This is one difference between Socrates' teaching and that of Christ: there is another difference between the two infinitely greater and deeper, but that Mr. Wenley says very little about.

*The Coat without Seam Torn* (5) is the title of "A plain appeal to the Holy Scriptures on behalf of unity among English Christians in the one Apostolic Church." It is apparently a bundle of ninety-nine leaflets, in which an attempt is made to show the fact and the value of the one true Church, and the danger of schism. The book is divided into eight sections, and the leaflets composing each are arranged in some kind of logical order. The author's statements are made in such a way as to be as little offensive as possible, and the arguments are supported with quotations from the Scriptures and from divines of various schools. The book is as fair as an *ex parte* statement can be expected to be, but we do not imagine it will be convincing to any very great extent to those who are not of the author's way of thinking. He does not say in so many words that salvation is alone of the Church he defines; and indeed it would be difficult to deny that the Spirit of God has blessed the efforts of many whom Mr. Maclean would call schismatics. We heartily echo his desire for unity.

(1) *Protestant Episcopacy*. By John Tod. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 15s.

(2) *Paul of Tarsus*. By the Author of "Rabbi Jeshua." London: G. Redway. 1889.

(3) *Agnostic Fallacies*. By the Rev. J. Reid Howatt. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 1s. 6d.

(4) *Socrates and Christ*. By R. M. Wenley, M.A. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1889.

(5) *The Coat without Seam Torn*. By Douglas Maclean, M.A. London and Sydney: Griffith, Farran, Okeden & Walsh. Price 3s. 6d.

**Apologetics.** *The Witness of the World to Christ* (1) is an apology which is notably different in cast and character from that of Justin or of Tertullian. Justin's efforts were directed towards showing that Christianity was the outcome and the improvement of Grecian philosophy: Tertullian's was a sort of indignant *tu quoque*; Mr. Mathews' is an attempt to reconcile the Scriptural account of things with the conclusions of men of science. In order to do this he has to modify, to some extent, several commonly received notions; and though Mr. Mathews has skill in dialectic, it is yet doubtful if his work will strengthen the faith of believers, remove the difficulties of doubters, or satisfy scientific requirements. He truly says that science ought to recognize the *facts* of Christianity, and argue from what is observable rather than make any *à priori* conclusions. He shows that the systems of Rome, of Calvin, of Luther, are all tainted with the radical vice, that they are based only on certain parts of Revelation; such objections as those of Bishop Colenso are in reality against popular perversions of the Bible's meaning. He quotes the saying which the Patriarch of Constantinople returned to the Bishop of Rome when invited to the Vatican Council that "The only way of uniting Christendom again was the historical way." After a discussion of the etymology and use of the terms "religio" and *θηρησκεία*, which Mr. Mathews says makes up the sum of religion of all ages and times, he comes to the somewhat startling conclusion—that Christianity is not a religion, but a life—a carrying out in all human relations of the "royal rule"—the Magna Charta of Christianity. He amusingly describes geology as being the "infant of the family of sciences; and the cries by which she would arrest our attention are out of all proportion to her importance." We should from this imagine that this work was projected, if not completed, some time ago; for, surely, geology is getting staid and steady by now. There is an Appendix on the "End of the Age," which Mr. Mathews explains of the fall of Jerusalem. He shows the distinction between *αἰὼν* and *κόσμος*, and points out that neither *τέλος* nor *συντελεία* ever occurs in connection with the latter. Altogether, we must say, that there is a good deal in Mr. Mathews' little treatise worth attention, and we think that much of it would be all the better for being expanded and emphasised.

(1) *The Witness of the World to Christ*. By the Rev. W. A. Mathews, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 3s. 6d.