

AUGUST 1890

The Theological Monthly

LUX MUNDI.

THE writer of the essay now become notorious states that his purpose in the latter part of it "has not been to inquire how much we can without irrationality believe inspiration to involve, but rather, how much may legitimately and without real loss be conceded." And his position generally may be regarded as an endeavour to maintain that there is a corrective element in the abiding inspiration of the Church, which may be safely trusted to counteract the influence of what is vaguely termed Modern Criticism. He has an equal faith in the abiding inspiration of the Church and in what he calls the "results" of "criticism," and in this belief he is prepared to surrender such points as the post-Exilic origin of a large part of the Pentateuch, the composite nature of Isaiah, the Maccabæan origin of the Psalms, the allegorical character of Jonah, and the lateness of the book of Daniel. He thinks that the position of the Church is independent of all discussion on these points if they are allowed to remain free, and even of an adverse decision if they are closed. His belief in criticism, therefore, is very strong, but his belief in the Church is somewhat stronger. He sits above, entrenched in what he calls "the religion of the incarnation," and contemplates with serene indifference the issue of the battle that is raging on these minor points below.

Now, my complaint against the class of writers with whom he must now be identified is the loose and indeterminate way in which they use the words "inspiration" and "revelation," as though they were words in their intrinsic meaning common to all alike. For instance, they will continue to speak of the

“inspiration” of the Pentateuch when they have reduced Deuteronomy to the age of Josiah, and Leviticus and Numbers to that of Ezra, as though “inspiration” could possibly mean the same thing to those who believe this and to those who have accepted the Pentateuch as they have received it. They will speak of the “revelation” of God in the Old Testament, when all the ground has been destroyed on which we can suppose that a covenant was made as the basis and token of a revelation. But I am persuaded that we shall never make real progress in our Old Testament studies till we have learnt to prosecute them without any reference to inspiration. We have no business to impart inspiration into the discussion; still less are we at liberty to use the word in a vague and indeterminate sense, as though we were all agreed upon the meaning of it. Inspiration, if it is a fact, will take care of itself: we must not allow the thought of it to influence our inquiry one way or the other. We are bound to study the Old Testament as we should study any other ancient book. If we study it fairly and honestly, without fear or favour, I believe that ultimately there is only one result we can come to, namely, that it is not like any other book. The real question is whether what the Old Testament says about itself is, or is not, to be trusted. If it is, then the result is plain; if it is not, then we may reasonably question whether after all we are studying it as we do study other books. At all events, inspiration, whatever it means, is to be arrived at inductively; it is not to be the peg upon which we deductively hang our argument. Inspiration is the net result of all the phenomena of the book when rightly and duly weighed. We must not reject the evidence of the Old Testament on every point, and then talk about its inspiration as though we had left that intact. Let us first know clearly what we all mean by inspiration, or else let us leave it out of the question altogether.

The true subject matter of our discussion is the nature and relation of the facts of the Old Testament, and that alone. For instance, this writer says (p. 353), “If we believe that the law as it grew really did represent the Divine inten-

tion for the Jews [Why should we believe this at the outset? Surely there is an assumption involved here!] gradually worked out upon the basis of a Mosaic institution, there is nothing materially untruthful, though there is something uncritical, in attributing the whole legislation to Moses acting under the Divine command." Is it possible that the writer can forget that every one of these precepts is specially introduced? "And the Lord said unto Moses"—sometimes with the circumstances of time and place, and very frequently concluding, "I am the Lord." Surely our ideas of truth must be perilously slack if we can bring ourselves to think that there is nothing "materially untruthful" in this.

Now my position is that we have certain books in which this formula occurs over and over again; the very nature of these books is that it does so, and unless we are to assume at the outset that the formula is only a form, we must decide how we are to deal with it, because if we decide that it means nothing, then we are not treating these books as we should treat any others which lack this characteristic feature. We are condemning them *ab initio*; and if we decide that Ezra and his priests inserted this formula whenever they pleased, and made use of no other—knowing all the time, as they must have known, that it was a lie—it seems to me that we are begging the very question that we have to prove. We may make this conjecture, but conjecture is not proof; and we have a right to insist upon incontrovertible proof before we allow the conjecture. And it is the same with revelation. What do we mean by revelation? If the Old Testament is the record of God's revelation, in what sense is it so? Is the form of the record part of the revelation? Did the revelation take the form of a promise to Abraham and a promise to David? If so, how was the promise given? by any natural means?—if so, what were they?—or by some method above nature and perhaps above our comprehension? Because it will not do to deny the reality of the promise to Abraham and the promise to David, and then speak of the revelation as contained in the record of these two promises, neither of which was true. It is all moonshine to talk of the revelation of God as the net result

of a series of illusions, misconceptions, misrepresentations, and what not, every one of which is a mistake in itself, though the whole together constitute the revelation. Doubtless, God has a revelation in the history of the Christian Church—its mistakes, sins, defections, divisions, and the like—but this, I presume, is different from His revelation in the acts and words of Christ. So in like manner He had a revelation of Himself in the history of the Jews after the death of Nehemiah, but this again, I believe, was different in kind and method from that in Old Testament times; and if it was not, we not only have read the Old Testament wrong, but the Old Testament itself has entirely deceived us, and the New Testament writers have deceived us in the use they make of it. We are told, indeed, by this writer, that “a myth is not a falsehood”; but his friends profess to have largely convicted the Old Testament writers of falsehood, and yet they ask us to accept the revelation which they imagine underlies the falsehood. For instance, we are told by Driver,¹ “Deuteronomy *does not claim to be written by Moses,*” and he prints the words in italics; but I turn to chap. xxxi. 9 and there I read, “And Moses wrote this law;” and again at ver. 24, “And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished,” &c. Now which am I to believe, the book itself or Driver? and if I am to believe Driver, why am I to believe that that, and that only, was the method which God adopted for revealing Himself? and why am I to believe that this is a revelation of God? and why not rather say that it is no revelation at all, but only the profession and pretence of a revelation? for it seems that this is the more reasonable thing to do, unless there is some *à priori* reason in reserve for believing that God made a revelation, and that He made it in this way. I repeat, then, that the question is not one of inspiration or revelation at all, but one of the good faith and simple trustworthiness of the book as a book.

In like manner the same writer¹ says, “Critical investigations concern really not the *fact* of revelation, but its mode.

¹ *Contemporary Review*, February, 1890.

or form, or course; upon Christian faith and practice they have no bearing whatever." Then be it so; but why, I would ask, upon *Christian* faith? I suppose the mode and form and course of Christ's revelation were exceptional, not to say supernatural; and why am I to accept them in His case and refuse to do so in the other? He tells us Himself that Abraham rejoiced to see His day, and he saw it and was glad. Abraham could not have done so unless he was divinely illuminated. Are we to suppose the illumination comes only to *us* through the illusory narrative which has to be critically re-adjusted, or is it to be taken in its naked simplicity when it tells us that the angel of the Lord called to Abraham out of heaven and gave him the promise of the seed? The alternative is not that of accepting all or nothing, but that of the broad principle on which we interpret Scripture, whether on that of receiving its own testimony or of inventing a scheme of our own upon which to correct the testimony.

We are told by the writer in *Lux Mundi* that "inspiration excludes conscious deception or pious fraud." Again I would ask, How does he arrive at his knowledge of inspiration, and what does he suppose the word to mean? Is his knowledge based, as it ought to be, on an induction of the facts as they are, or upon an induction of them after he has critically resolved them as seemeth to him right, or dissolved them altogether? But take the case of Deuteronomy. What are we to say of a writer who in the reign of Josiah, eight centuries after Moses, should put forth an ideal representation of the last months of the life of Moses, of which there was no record whatever, and say, among other things, "These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel, in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb"? Would this be conscious deception or pious fraud? or would it be a case in which the purity of the intention would justify the dubious character of the means employed? And is the theory of inspiration resorting to or adopting these means more reasonable than that of accepting the narrative as historically true—a simple record of fact? In the latter case

we should know within certain limits what inspiration is ; in the other we might not unreasonably doubt whether there was any inspiration at all but that of the unknown romancer, for that he was a romancer it is self-evident. Of course, it is impossible for me now to enter into details. That there are certain difficulties of detail either way is clear ; but it is principle—broad, comprehensive, and essential principle—for which I contend ; and as no one can maintain that the theory of late authorship does away with all difficulty, we must be content here, as in so many other cases, to be guided by the *balance* of proof ; and surely the theory of the law as ordained by angels, in the hand of a mediator, and that mediator Moses, is encumbered with fewer difficulties (always supposing the initial difficulty of a supernatural revelation surmounted) than the theory of no angels and no mediator, but only a designing priest in the time of Josiah, who combined the characters of iconoclast, puritan, and reformer, and was unscrupulous as to the means employed to accomplish his end ; for that he successfully imposed upon the king and the chancellor, and the prophetess and the priests, and the nation at large, or that they were all in league together to impose upon the world, is apparent on the face of it. Moreover, to conceive of Moses' career and character, gigantic and colossal as it was, without the closing scene on the top of Pisgah, is to deprive history of one of its sublimest chapters ; and to suppose that this consummation was the subsequent addition, after many centuries, of a late and unknown inventor, is to suppose that the conception and work of Michael Angelo could be worthily taken up and completed centuries afterwards by an unknown and inferior artist.

The nature and origin of Deuteronomy is one of the most crucial cases, and, curiously enough, it is not very unlike that of the authorship of St. John's Gospel. The internal evidence of St. John's Gospel is very strong ; so also is that of Deuteronomy. If St. John's Gospel is the work of the second century, it must be a romance—"idealized history," as we are now taught to call it ; and if a romance, inasmuch as it purports to be, by the beloved disciple, a

forgery ; it can be nothing else. And certainly, in this case, its testimony with regard to our Lord would be of little worth even if we regarded it as *inspired*. We could not *trust* the writer, nay, we could only distrust him, when he professed to speak as an eye-witness ; and however pure the writer's intention might be, we could not acquit him of "conscious deception" or "pious fraud," which are declared to be excluded by "inspiration." But what is the difference if in the age of Josiah—not one century, but seven or eight after Moses—a work is put forth, professedly with the design of centralizing the worship of Judah, which pretends to be the last words of Moses, spoken under peculiarly solemn circumstances, and pronouncing very stringent condemnation upon any one who adds to or takes from it. Surely if the Gospel of St. John is in any way essential to the faith of Christ and to the nature of His mission, the book of Deuteronomy is essential to our knowledge of Moses and to the right apprehension of his character. And it will not do to condone the wrong done to our conception of him on account of the pious intention, and the purity of the motive, and the worthiness of the purpose with which the injury was conceived and perpetrated. The question is, What do we know of Moses and of his latter days ? Is this merely what they might have been, and do we *know* nothing at all ? or is the picture presented to us one that we can sufficiently trust, not only because of its apparent and possible, but because of its real and historical accuracy ?

We are told that "the battle of historical truth cannot be fought on the field of the Old Testament as it can on that of the New, because it is so vast and indecisive, and because (however certainly ancient is such a narrative as that contained in Gen. xiv.) very little of the early record can be securely traced to a period near the events." But I should like to ask, How do we certainly know that Gen. xiv. is ancient ? and how can we securely trace that early record to a period near the events ? It is simply absurd to maintain that we have any evidence in favour of that narrative which we have not in favour of chap. xxii., or of any other chapter in Genesis ; and it is only throwing dust in men's eyes to pre-

tend, or profess, that we have. Gen. xiv. comes to us precisely on the same ground as the rest of the book, and it comes to us on no other, except what we subjectively choose to conceive or invent. The writer in *Lux Mundi* asks, "Have we any reason to believe that inspiration means the miraculous communication of facts not otherwise to be known, a miraculous communication such as would make the reader independent of the ordinary processes of historical tradition?" I should answer distinctly, yes, in the one case, and distinctly, no, in the other. How was the institution of the Sabbath, *if a fact*, made known otherwise than by miraculous communication? How was God's working six days and resting on the seventh to be known but by such communication, *if a fact*? Supernatural communication is implied in the very statement if it can be relied upon as *true*; if it cannot, there is an end of the whole matter. But in the case where historical tradition was available, there is no more need to presuppose supernatural communication than there is to imagine, as this writer does, that the chronicler "idealized" his facts and gave "a less historical version" of the history, or that the writers of Samuel and Kings falsified it consciously or unconsciously by giving that "version which had become current in the priestly schools."

The fact is, that to the Christian believer the Old Testament is charged with such elements as to compel his acceptance of its testimony with reverence, even when we cannot explain it. And since the history of Jonah finds a place in that collection, and the personal reality of the man is vouched for in Kings, and his example appealed to by Christ in a very solemn manner, we may hesitate whether we are to regard it as a myth or to receive it as something better, notwithstanding its stupendous difficulties. However, as the Book of Jonah may well be regarded as typical of the mission of the Jewish nation, and a very early parable thereof, we may well notice that the miracle which the book relates is not the only difficulty we have to explain; while the probability of any writer at that early age inshrining such a lesson in such a story in order to inculcate the spiritual teaching he desired to

convey, is not appreciably greater than the truth of the story itself, being, as that story is, a perfect mosaic of minute incident and graphic description bespeaking the reality of a personal narrative.

With regard to the book of Daniel the case is different. The difficulty of believing it to have been written after B.C. 163, which it must have been if not genuine, is really greater than that of believing it genuine (if, that is, we are prepared to admit miracle and prophecy), and therefore *critically* it is easier to accept it than not: whether we are of the "few who could feel a difficulty in recognizing as inspired the teaching" of it in the former case, must depend, as I have said before, upon what our notion of inspiration is, a point which this writer discreetly, and no doubt intentionally, leaves undetermined.

It cannot too carefully be borne in mind that the genuineness and authenticity of the books of Scripture are distinct questions, but not seldom the one involves the other. For instance, St. Matthew's Gospel may be perfectly authentic—that is to say, it may relate matters of fact—even if it be not genuine, that is written by St. Matthew, which it nowhere professes to have been. On the other hand, nobody doubts the genuineness of the Cyropædia, though it is admitted not to be authentic; but in the case of the books of the Bible, one way, and a very sure one, of overthrowing their authenticity is to attack their genuineness. Thus if Deuteronomy be not genuine, it cannot be authentic, that is to say, it cannot be true; but if it be authentic, it can hardly be other than genuine. And so if Daniel is authentic, we may be pretty certain that it is genuine; and if it is genuine, we need have no doubt as to its authenticity. But if Daniel is not genuine, then it follows as a matter of course that it is not authentic, even if its "teaching" is "inspired." And then, as a matter of fact, we really know nothing about Daniel; we have no knowledge of his character nor of his work, for the book that passes under his name is a worthless romance which cannot possibly be true or worthy of the slightest credit, however pure, noble, and disinterested the object with which it was written may have been, however "*inspired*" its "teaching."

Daniel is a book about which we must decide one way or the other: it is either genuine and authentic, or it is neither; there is no intermediate position possible, as Dr. Pusey long ago said. Sad it is to find that those who sit in his seat have so soon reversed the testimony which he made the work of his life and supported with so much labour and learning. It is a strange instance of the uncertainty of so-called modern criticism that whereas some years ago Dr. Pusey said, "No one now believes in Maccabæan Psalms," it is actually proposed at the present time to regard them as almost wholly of that or of post-captivity date; though I, for one, cannot understand the critical judgment which would suggest that such compositions could be the product of such a period and such a history. Of one thing we may be perfectly certain, that before long the theory will be exploded, and very possibly shown by demonstration to be false.

With regard to the twofold origin of Isaiah, I can only say that I utterly disbelieve it. The prophet is dismembered (as he is traditionally said to have been in fact), in defiance of such external evidence as there is, and in defiance of almost conclusive linguistic evidence of his integrity, and that for no other reason than that it is assumed to be impossible that he could have spoken as he does of Cyrus and of Babylon. I would only ask, How does it make the fifty-third chapter more intelligible to conceive of it as written at Babylon? and if there is but One in whom all its lines of sorrow and sadness meet and combine, and therefore only One of whom—if, indeed, it is *inspired*—the Holy Spirit can have spoken or meant it, what is there more easy of explanation in the fact that he should speak of Christ than of Babylon and Cyrus? What is there more contrary to human foresight in his doing this, than there is in his foretelling to Hezekiah that his treasures should be carried to Babylon, and his sons be eunuchs in the palace of the king? These things are not questions merely of scholarship; they are questions of common sense, and of a judicial capacity for weighing evidence; and I, for one, have no hesitation in deciding which way the verdict ultimately will be given.

It is the undisguised effort of the writer in *Lux Mundi* to shift the responsibility of evidence from off the Scriptures on to the Church. We are to accept certain truths because the Church tells us to do so; not because they are true in themselves, but because the Church has declared in favour of their truth. On certain points, raised by criticism, the Church has not spoken, because she could not anticipate them, notwithstanding her endowment of abiding inspiration; and, therefore, as she has not pronounced upon them, we may sit still and complacently let the critics say what they please in the confident assurance that our faith in the incarnation will not suffer. I am by no means sure, however, that the "Church" has been altogether so silent as it seems to be thought, when I find that the Nicene creed teaches that it was God the Holy Ghost "who spake by the prophets." But we may be quite sure that no doctrine like that of the incarnation can stand if we suffer its title deeds of evidence to be impugned. There is no more certain way of attacking the New Testament than by assailing it through the Old. The authority of the one is too intimately bound up in that of the other for either to be independent of the other; and it is preposterous to suppose that to cling tenaciously to a doctrine like that of the incarnation will render us independent of the testimony of Scripture. The Church is a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, and we may be quite sure that if she is unfaithful to her trust, the days of her own existence are numbered and her faith will infallibly be undermined and overthrown, and her deposit of doctrine will be rifled and dispersed if she attempts to dispense with Scripture. The life of the Church is based upon historic fact; it cannot exist if divorced from fact; and it is the Scriptures which are the ultimate witnesses to the facts on which the existence of the Church depends. She has learnt her doctrines from the Scriptures, and has not embodied them therein as she has done in the creeds, and if the Scriptures are assailed, the doctrines which they teach cannot survive. It is suicidal to attempt to make Christian doctrine independent of the Christian Scriptures. And though this is mainly true of the New Testament, it is true

also in its degree of the Old, for the Old Testament is the foundation of the New. There can be no Christ in the New Testament if there is not the framework, skeleton, and outline of a Christ in the Old. But if there was no promise to Abraham, and no promise to Moses, and no promise to David, and no vision vouchsafed to Daniel, I am at a loss to know where the framework of a Christ is to be found in the Old Testament, for if we cannot trust the history in these matters, we can trust it nowhere; and if these things are not histories, but illusions and late inventions which the spirit of truth has condescended to "*inspire*," and thereby to call out of the darkness of fiction and myth into the reality of fact, such as it is, then the historical foundations of Christianity are overthrown, and the long scheme of preparation for Christ is taken out of the region of fact into that of idea.

But for the completeness of the work of Christ, it is surely requisite that the foundations should be no less solid than the superstructure. If the person of Christ is not a myth, so neither is the preparation for Christ to be discovered in and rescued from the mass of romance, illusion, misrepresentation, and myth with which the Old Testament abounds. If the person of Christ is historical—and it must be proved to be historical to be of any value—so, depend upon it, the preparation for Christ was likewise historical; and if historical, then supernatural and miraculous, too. And we must be very careful how we deal with the historical character of the records containing our only evidence for the nature of this preparation. By all means examine it critically, but at the same time fairly and honestly, and with no bias *against* the supernatural; for if the evidence of the supernatural is to be found anywhere, it is to be found in the Old Testament.

If criticism is confined to the realms of the linguistic and philological, I, for one, am confident that on such points as the place of the Pentateuch in the Old Testament and the integrity of Isaiah the received belief has little cause or necessity for modification. If from this, which is its legitimate domain, it is removed to the more doubtful region of what is antecedently probable, possible, conceivable, and the like, there is no knowing whither it will or will not lead us.

The question is one of premises, and not of conclusions. If we start with the belief that Moses could not have known Genesis, as we have it, there are many things which may tend to strengthen that belief; if we suppose him to have done so, and believe the record is historical, I know of nothing to contradict the belief, not even the record of the kings of Edom, or the statement that Abraham, when he entered the promised land, found the Canaanite already there.

If we believe, as we have no ground for not believing, that chap. xiii. is rightly ascribed to Isaiah, we shall not be staggered by his mention of Cyrus. If we believe that his vision had nothing in it of the supernatural, then I cannot understand how he should have written the seventh chapter any more than the fifty-third, or the ninth any more than the forty-fourth or the forty-fifth. If it is a question of evidence, let us abide by the evidence which has not yet been, and is not likely to be, disproved; if it is a question of subjective impression, of antecedent improbability, of preconceptions as to the "analogy of prophecy" and the like, then let us frankly give up the appeal to evidence and be guided and ruled by our own imaginations. If Daniel was the prophet that our Lord declared him to be, there is more than one prophecy in his book which defies the supposition of a late date, and is not to be accounted for by any preconceptions as to the analogy of prophecy. For the prophecy of the kingdom which shall never be destroyed appeals as much to our faith now as it did in the second or the sixth century before Christ, and the prophecy of the seventy weeks which supplies the only evidence we have for the actual time when Christ appeared is the most marvellous demonstration of superhuman knowledge conveyed and imparted to a man of which we have any record; and no theory of the analogy of prophecy or of the nature and limits of inspiration can be accepted as satisfactory which fails to account for this prophecy, if given, as it purports to be, in the first year of Darius the Mede, or which fails to explain how it should ideally have been ascribed to Daniel in the middle of the second century before the coming of the Messiah, whose cutting off it foretold.

STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.

THE DAY OF OUR LORD'S DEATH.

THE precise day of the month on which our Lord was crucified is a vexed question among Biblical critics, the solution of which has not yet been discovered. The point of dispute is whether the day of our Lord's death was the 14th Nisan, that is the preparation day before the Passover, or the 15th Nisan, the Paschal day itself. On this point there is a real or a supposed difference between the accounts given us in the Synoptical Gospels and the account given us in the Gospel of John. It would appear that, according to the Synoptists, the last supper of our Lord and His Apostles was identical with the Paschal supper; whereas, according to St. John, it was partaken of on the day before the Passover.

Before entering upon a discussion of this subject, in order to understand the various notices of time mentioned by the Evangelists, it is desirable to make a few remarks on the time at which the Passover was observed in the days of our Lord. This great festival, instituted in commemoration of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, commenced on the evening of the 14th Nisan or Abib, which was the anniversary of that deliverance. According to the original institution, as given in Exod. xii. 1-20, it was to last for seven days, during which period the children of Israel were commanded to eat unleavened bread. It would, however, appear from a statement in Josephus that in the days of our Lord the period of observance was extended to eight days, the day of preparation or 14th Nisan being added to the original seven. It must also be remembered that the Jews reckoned their days from evening to evening, or rather from sunset to sunset. Hence the evening of 14th Nisan is a somewhat ambiguous term, but it is evident from the Mosaic account of the institution that it denotes the close of the 14th, that is, according to our reckoning, from three to sunset. On the 14th Nisan the work of preparation began; the heads of families searched for and

put away leaven from their houses. The Paschal lamb was slain "between the evenings"—that is, as Josephus informs us, between the ninth and the eleventh hour, or between three and four, according to our reckoning. The 14th Nisan was originally not reckoned as one of the Paschal days; it was the day of preparation for the Passover, the day on which the Paschal lamb was slain and prepared. Among the Jews work was permitted to be done on that day, as the Passover proper did not commence until the evening; whereas among the Galileans, we are informed, the whole day was kept sacred. The next day, or the 15th Nisan, was the great day of the feast. At its commencement, in the evening, the Paschal lamb was eaten. This day and the last day of the feast were regarded as holy Sabbaths to the Lord, on which no work was done, except that connected with the preparation of food. The intervening days of the feast were ordinary working days, and the only difference between them and other days was that certain special offerings were made and unleavened bread was eaten. But besides these special offerings, there arose among the Jews, connected with the Passover, another festival called in the Talmud Chagigah, consisting of free-will offerings, and which might be partaken of on any day of the feast, but generally on the evening or close of the 15th Nisan or the Paschal day; so that the Passover was partaken of at the commencement, and the Chagigah at the close of the same day.

Now, in reading the accounts of the last supper given in the Synoptical Gospels, the natural inference is that our Lord and His disciples partook of the Passover when He instituted the holy communion. On this point the testimony of the three Synoptical Gospels—Matthew, Mark, and Luke—coincide. Thus Matthew tells us that on the first day of unleavened bread (14th Nisan) the disciples asked Jesus, "Where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the Passover?"; that our Lord sent the message to a friend in Jerusalem, "My time is at hand: I keep the Passover at thy house with My disciples;" and that the disciples went and made ready

the Passover. Mark tells us that this was the first day of unleavened bread when they killed the Passover (14th Nisan). And the statements of Luke are still more explicit. He tells us that the day of unleavened bread arrived on which the Passover must be sacrificed (14th Nisan); that Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, "Go and prepare for us the Passover, that we may eat;" that they should say to the man in whose house they were to eat, "Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the Passover with My disciples;" that the disciples went and made ready the Passover; and that Jesus said to them, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer." According to the Synoptists, then, it would appear that our Lord partook of the Passover with His disciples; that consequently He was crucified on the Paschal day, the 15th Nisan; that He lay in the tomb on the weekly Sabbath, the 16th Nisan; and that He rose from the dead on Sunday, the 17th Nisan.

Now, if we turn to the Gospel of John, we shall find a difference in the statements. According to the natural interpretation of this Gospel, it would appear that our Lord partook of the last supper on the day before the Passover, the 14th Nisan, and on that same day He was crucified. In this Gospel we have the following five distinct intimations of date:—1. "Now before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knowing that His hour was come" (John xiii. 1). The natural inference from this is that the last supper occurred before the commencement of the Paschal feast.—2. "Some thought because Judas had the bag, that Jesus said to him, Buy what things we have need of before the feast" (John xiii. 29). From this it would appear that the feast had not commenced, and that preparation for it had to be made; besides, it is also intimated that purchases could be made, which could not be done on the Paschal day.—3. "They themselves entered not into the palace, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover" (John xviii. 28). This intimates that the chief priests had not yet partaken of the Passover, and that consequently the day was the 14th and not the 15th Nisan.—4. "Now it was the

preparation of the Passover" (John xix. 14). This phrase is most naturally taken to mean the 14th Nisan, the day of preparation, when all leaven was removed, and when the Paschal lamb was slain and prepared.—5. "The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain on the cross upon the Sabbath (for the day of that Sabbath was a high day)" (John xix. 31). Here the term "the preparation" may denote the day before the Sabbath; but the parenthetic clause, "for the day of that Sabbath was a high day," intimates that there was a special importance connected with that peculiar Sabbath, which would be the case, if the Passover in that year coincided with the Sabbath; in other words, if the Friday on which our Lord was crucified was the day of preparation, or 14th Nisan. From all these intimations the natural inference is that, according to John, our Lord was crucified on Friday, the 14th Nisan, remained in the tomb on Saturday, the 15th Nisan, the Paschal day, and rose from the dead on Sunday, the 16th Nisan.

Mr. Sanday, following Caspari, gives the following useful table of events according to John's Gospel:—

Julian Day.	Jewish Day.
<i>Thursday</i> , 6 p.m.	14th NISAN BEGAN. The last supper, Gethsemane.
Midnight.	Examination before Annas and Caiaphas.
<i>Friday</i> , πρῶτῃ	Examination before Pilate.
9 a.m. (Mark) 6th hour (John).	Sentence pronounced.
12—3 p.m.	Crucifixion.
3—5 p.m.	Sacrifice of the Paschal lamb.
	15th NISAN BEGAN.
	The Passover.
<i>Saturday</i> .	The great day of the feast.
	Jesus in the grave.
6 p.m.	16th NISAN BEGAN.

Thus, then, it would appear that, according to the Synop-
tists, our Lord on the night before He suffered partook of the
Passover with His disciples; whilst, according to John, on the

day of our Lord's death the Passover had not been eaten. It is to be observed that there is a perfect agreement among the four Evangelists regarding the day of the week on which our Lord was crucified ; that day was Friday, the preparation day before the Jewish Sabbath. All agree that on Saturday, or the Jewish Sabbath, our Lord remained in the grave ; and that on Sunday, or the first day of the week, He arose from the dead. But whilst there is this agreement as to the day of the week, there is an apparent disagreement as to the day of the month ; it would appear that, according to the Synoptists, this was the Paschal day, or 15th Nisan ; whereas, according to John, it was the preparation, or the 14th Nisan. From John's account, this year the 15th Nisan or the Paschal day coincided with the Jewish weekly Sabbath, so that the day before, or the Friday, was the preparation day both for the weekly Sabbath and for the Passover. Now, the question which meets us is, How are these apparently discrepant accounts to be reconciled ? Which of these days is correct ? Was the day of our Lord's death the 14th or the 15th Nisan ? This is the question which we intend to discuss in this article. And in doing so, in mentioning the various theories of reconciliation, we shall proceed from the less to the more plausible.

I. Some suppose that the supper recorded in John's Gospel, at which our Lord washed His disciples' feet, is different from that recorded in the Synoptics, at which our Lord instituted the Holy Communion. This is the opinion adopted by the great Hebrew scholar, John Lightfoot, and by Bengel. Lightfoot identifies it with the supper in the house of Simon the Leper, when Mary poured the precious ointment on our Saviour, and which occurred two days before the Passover. This accounts for the want of all allusion to the Holy Communion in the discourse of our Lord to His disciples. If the supper was identical with that mentioned by the Synoptists, it is argued that it is difficult to account for the absence of any reference to that solemn feast which was to supersede the Passover, and which was to be a perpetual memorial of the Lord's death. Besides, this supposition

explains several references in St. John's Gospel, such as that the supper occurred before the feast of the Passover, and that the disciples supposed that our Lord gave directions to Judas to purchase those things which were necessary for the feast.

But this explanation, founded on the supposition of two suppers, is completely untenable, and would not, even if the supposition were correct, solve the problem. The supper recorded in St. John's Gospel is the same as that recorded in the Synoptics; in both accounts Judas is pointed out as the betrayer, and Peter is forewarned of his impending defection; and at the conclusion of both Jesus and His disciples repair to the garden of Gethsemane. Thus in John's Gospel we read: "When Jesus had spoken these words, He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into which He entered, with His disciples." The omission of all reference in our Lord's discourse to the Holy Communion is accounted for by the supplementary nature of John's Gospel, which omits various events of the highest importance recorded by the other three Evangelists. Nor would the supposition of two suppers remove the difficulties. Supposing that the supper recorded by John occurred two days before the Passover, and the supper mentioned by the Synoptists was the Paschal supper, although this accounts for two intimations in John's Gospel (John xiii. 1, 29), yet it does not account for other intimations, as that at our Lord's trial before Pilate the chief priests would not enter into the pretorium lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover, and that the day of the trial was the preparation of the Passover. The difference between the accounts of the Synoptists and John remains as it was.

II. Another theory of reconciliation is that the Passover partaken of by Christ and His disciples mentioned by the Synoptists was not the actual Passover, but the Feast of Preparation, which occurred on the 14th Nisan. This explanation was advocated in a very ingenious manner by Caspari, and is adopted by Bishop Westcott. The time is designated by the Synoptists "as the first day of unleavened bread when they sacrificed the Passover," consequently the

14th Nisan, when the eating of unleavened bread commenced, and when the Paschal lamb was sacrificed. This day was observed by the Galileans—and our Lord and His disciples were Galileans—as a holy day, and was, in the time of Christ, reckoned as the first of the Paschal days. It is supposed that the Synoptists intimated that it was at the commencement of this day—that is, according to the Jewish reckoning the evening at the beginning of the 14th Nisan, that Christ sat down with His disciples. Besides, it is observed that in the account of the last supper by the Synoptists there is no mention of any Paschal rites. One, on reading it, would not guess that it was the feast of the Passover: Jesus gives to His disciples bread and wine, but there is no allusion to the lamb the eating of which constituted the chief part of the feast, nor is there any mention of the bitter herbs. According to this explanation, we are mistaken when we affirm that Christ partook of the Paschal lamb with His disciples. “The evening of the supper,” observes Bishop Westcott, “would thus be as John represents it, the evening at the beginning of the 14th Nisan. The same day after sunrise next morning is rightly described as a preparation—‘the Preparation of the Passover’—though the preparation, in the strictest sense of the term, was limited to the last three hours from the ninth hour.”

But this explanation does not correspond with the natural meaning of the language employed by the Synoptists. Although there is no mention in their accounts of the Paschal lamb, yet the evident impression which their words leave is that our Lord actually partook of the Passover with His disciples. The message which our Lord sent by Peter and John was, “The Master saith, My time is at hand: I will keep the Passover at thy house with My disciples.” And to His disciples He said, “With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.” Words cannot more distinctly assert the fact that Christ did eat the Passover; and to explain them as if they meant only that our Lord partook of a preparatory feast, but not of the actual Passover, appears to be a perversion of that meaning. Besides, it is

very uncertain if the Jews had such a feast of preparation ; the references, adduced in favour of it, are doubtful and ambiguous.

III. Another opinion is that the chief priests postponed the Passover from the 15th to the 16th Nisan. This opinion was suggested by Chrysostom as an alternative, and has been adopted by Bishop Wordsworth. So eager were the chief priests to put our Lord to death, that in order to seize the opportunity of crucifying Him which presented itself, and at the same time to avoid the desecration of the Paschal day, they deferred the Passover to a day later than that prescribed by law. Thus, according to this theory, our Lord and His disciples, in accordance with the Synoptists, partook of the Passover on the lawful day, the 15th Nisan, the same day on which our Lord was crucified ; but the chief priests, in order not to profane the Passover, deferred its observance until the following day, the 16th Nisan ; and this accounts for the statement given in the Gospel of John.

But there is no ground whatever for this opinion. There is not a shadow of reason for the supposition that the priests postponed the Passover ; indeed, such a supposition approaches to an absurdity. The chief priests, who were so scrupulous in their legal observances, who, although they would imbrue their hands in the blood of an innocent man, yet would not enter into the judgment hall of Pilate lest they should be defiled, would not commit such a glaring breach of the Mosaic law as actually to change the day of the celebration of the most sacred of their feasts. Besides, even admitting the supposition, the discrepancy still remains, the problem is unsolved. St. John expressly tells us that Jesus and His disciples partook of their last supper before the feast of the Passover.

IV. Another supposition is that our Lord anticipated the Passover, because He wished to partake of it with His disciples before He suffered. This opinion is adopted by Grotius, Neander, Kahnis, Weiss, Godet, and Bishop Ellicott. The anticipation of the day is supposed to be hinted at in the Synoptic Gospels. Our Lord said, " My time is at hand : I will

keep the Passover at thy house with My disciples." As if He had said, "It is My intention to keep the Passover this evening; I will not defer it until to-morrow, the proper Paschal day, for to-morrow will be too late. My time is at hand—the time when I shall be offered up as the true Passover." So, also, He said to His disciples, "With desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer." "I have earnestly wished to partake of the Passover with you before My death (this Passover), and therefore I do not defer it until to-morrow." He who as Son of Man was the Lord of the Sabbath, and had authority to change the day, was also Lord of the Passover, and had power to alter the day of its celebration. The Lord's Supper was now to take the place of the Passover, and therefore there was a fitness and propriety in the symbolism that the last typical Passover should be partaken of by Christ and His disciples on the day of its institution. Moreover, it is argued that the vast number of lambs, amounting to several thousands, which were slain in the courts of the temple, and the time necessarily occupied in doing so, may have occasioned a difference of time in the partaking of the Passover. In consequence of this, there may have been some irregularity in the time of eating the Passover, or at least in the time of slaying the lambs, so that this anticipation of the Passover might have occurred. "There is now," observes Weiss, "no possibility of proving that the custom of the feast made it permissible to offer the sacrifice and to partake of the Supper a day before the actual Passover, but it is rendered highly probable by the apparent impossibility of slaying all the Paschal lambs on one day. In that case Jesus partook of the Passover with His disciples on the 13th Nisan, and in His own free way observed those customs connected with the observance which possessed any significance for Him, or which He could invest with a new and higher meaning."

This solution is exceedingly plausible, and removes many difficulties in the accounts of the Evangelists. Jesus and His disciples actually partook of the Passover according to the accounts given us by the Synoptists, but it was by anticipation

and before the legal Passover according to the account given us by John. But it is difficult to imagine that the lamb could be sacrificed before the appointed time ; there is no intimation in the Jewish records that this was done notwithstanding the multitude of sacrificial animals ; and if this was not permissible, there could be no anticipation of the Passover. Besides, the above explanation only removes half the difficulty. If the Synoptists only stated that Christ ate the Passover, the difficulty might be solved by the supposition that He anticipated the rite ; but as they also state that He gave orders for it on the first day of unleavened bread (Luke xxii. 7), 14th Nisan, the day on which according to John He was crucified, a difficulty still remains.

V. A further solution of the problem is that when John speaks of the Passover he does not allude to the particular day, 14th Nisan, when the Paschal lamb was eaten, but to the whole Paschal feast, which lasted seven or eight days. This solution has been advanced by Olshausen, Wieseler, and Tholuck. These days are included in the feast of the Passover ; they were "the days of unleavened bread," and on them there were special offerings ; and especially the feast called in the Talmud the Chagigah, which was regarded by the Rabbins as being almost as sacred as the Passover. When, then, it is said that the priests entered not into the judgment hall lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover, the allusion is not to their eating the Paschal lamb, but to the whole Paschal feast, and especially to their eating the Chagigah. So also when it is said that it was the preparation of the Passover, the allusion is to the Sabbath in the Paschal week, of which the Friday was the preparation, and which is called by the Synoptists "the day before the Sabbath" (Mark xv. 42). When also it is said that that Sabbath was "a great day among the Jews," the words receive their significance by considering that it was the Paschal Sabbath and the day on which the sheaf offering was presented.

However ingenious this solution of the problem is, yet it must be confessed that it gives a forced interpretation to the words of John, which will not stand the tests of criticism.

We are distinctly told that the last supper occurred before the feast of the Passover (John xiii. 1), that is before the commencement of the seven days which constituted that feast. However wide a meaning may be given to the word Passover, as embracing the whole Paschal feast, yet the phrase "the preparation of the Passover" (John xix. 14) must denote the preparation day, or 14th Nisan, when the Paschal lamb was sacrificed and prepared. To put any other meaning into the words is to distort the sense in order to accommodate it to our preconceived opinions. The phrase "to eat the Passover" in its obvious and natural sense can only mean to eat the Paschal lamb, and it is putting a forced interpretation into the words to apply them to the eating of the Chagigah, which, properly speaking, constituted no part of the Paschal feast at ali, as it was eaten at other festivals besides the Passover.

Such are the various hypotheses which have been advanced to reconcile the apparent difference between the Synoptists and John regarding the day of our Lord's death. Some of them are more plausible than others; but it cannot be affirmed that even the most plausible is completely satisfactory. So far as appears to us, the correct solution has not yet been discovered; the difficulty in the way of reconciliation still remains. It is our duty as Biblical critics, as seekers after truth, frankly to admit the difference—that it appears that, according to the Synoptists, Christ and His disciples partook of the Passover at one time; whilst, according to St. John, the Jewish rulers partook of it at another; according to the one our Lord was crucified on 15th Nisan, according to the other on 14th Nisan. "A thorough exegesis," observes Bleek, "will not suffer us to deny that we have here a real difference between the narratives of the Synoptists and that of John." "That there is here a real difficulty," observes Professor Salmon, "I freely acknowledge; for there seems a force put on the words of John, if our Lord's last supper be made the Passover supper, or else a force put on the words of the Synoptic Evangelists, if it be not. It probably requires only a fuller knowledge of some of the facts connected with the usages of the times to remove the discrepancy."

But whilst we frankly admit the differences and the failure of all methods of reconciliation hitherto advanced, I do not think that we are thereby constrained also to admit that there is a real contradiction, that a satisfactory solution is unattainable. There are various matters connected with the mode of the celebration of the Passover in the days of our Lord on which we require more information. The regulations laid down in the Talmud have more closely to be examined; and it has to be determined whether these regulations were observed in the days of our Lord. There was, then, a difference in the mode of observing the Passover from that enjoined in the Mosaic law, but the nature and extent of the modifications have not been ascertained. "The ancient authorities (the Bible, Josephus, and Philo)," observes Professor Salmon, "leave some points undetermined on which we desire information, while regulations cited from the Talmud are open to the doubt whether they are as ancient as our Lord's days. Without knowing, for example, what latitude the usages of that period permitted as to the time of holding the feast, we cannot tell whether to accept solutions which assume that the priests did not eat the Passover at the same time as our Lord's disciples." But allowing the difference to remain, we must ever recollect that differences in the statements of the concomitants of facts do not necessarily destroy the evidence of the truth of the facts themselves. There are many differences in the accounts given us by the several Evangelists of the resurrection of Christ, and there is an acknowledged difficulty in reconciling them, but these differences do not at all affect the fact that Christ rose from the dead. So also here the difference as to the precise day of the month of our Lord's death does not in the slightest degree weaken the truth of the fact that Jesus Christ suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried. Admitting the difference in the accounts on this point, the general credibility of the narrative in its main particulars is not affected thereby.

With regard to the precise day of our Lord's death, after careful examination we have come to the conclusion that it

was the 14th Nisan, the day of preparation, in accordance with the intimations given in John's Gospel. That day was not regarded by the Jews as a sacred or Sabbatical day ; it was a day on which work might be done, inasmuch as the feast of the Passover did not commence until the evening ; and therefore there is no incongruity in the supposition that it was the day of the crucifixion. This accounts for the extreme haste of the crucifixion, in order that it might be completed before the Passover commenced. Our Lord was judicially examined by the Sanhedrim, tried by Pontius Pilate, brought before Herod, condemned, and crucified on the same day ; and the Jews were anxious that the bodies should be taken down from the cross, because the next day was a high day, a peculiar Sabbath among the Jews, being not only the weekly Sabbath, but the Passover. St. Paul, in speaking of the Lord's Supper, intimates that it took the place of the Passover ; and he represents Christ as the true Paschal Lamb : " For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ "—words which would receive their full significance were our Lord crucified at the very time that the Paschal lambs were being slain in the temple, which would actually have been the case were the afternoon of the 14th Nisan the period of the crucifixion. Our Lord expired about the ninth hour, 3 p.m., and it was from the ninth to the eleventh hour that the Paschal lambs were slain. And in his account of the Lord's Supper, St. Paul says that it was instituted " in the night on which He was betrayed." But if it occurred on the night on which the Paschal lamb was slain, would he not rather have alluded to that symbolical event ?

Historical evidence, so far as it goes, is in favour of the 14th Nisan as the day of the crucifixion. The great Easter controversy, which nearly rent the Christian Church in two, hardly bears upon the subject. But the early Fathers in general make a distinction between the institution of the Lord's Supper and the legal Passover. We have the express testimony of Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Hippolytus that our Lord was crucified on 14th Nisan. But what is most singular is that in the Jewish records, when

the subject is alluded to, our Lord's death is asserted to have occurred at this time. Thus in the Babylonian Gemara we read that Jesus was suspended on the evening of the Passover—an expression which denotes the evening when the Passover commenced, or the evening of 14th Nisan.

The opposite view, that our Lord was put to death on the day of the Passover, is accompanied with numerous difficulties that render it highly improbable. That day was a day of peculiar sanctity, on which all work was prohibited, except that connected with the preparation of food. The priests could not have arrested Christ on that day, nor have gone through the form of a judicial trial, nor would our Lord have been put to death on so sacred a day. Herod, we are informed, deferred the execution of Peter until after the Passover. "Then were the days of unleavened bread"—the Paschal feast—"intending after the Passover to bring Peter forth to the people." The chief priests had come to the resolution that Jesus should not be put to death on the feast day, "lest there should be an uproar among the people," a statement which would hardly have been recorded by the Evangelists, or at least not recorded without some explanatory remark, if the Jews had actually fallen from their resolutions and put Jesus to death on the feast day. Even in the Synoptic accounts there are indications that the day of the crucifixion was not a sacred day—as it would have been had it been the Paschal day—but a day on which work might be done. Simon the Cyrenian was coming out of the country, probably returning from the labours of the field, and Joseph of Arimathea bought fine linen for the interment of Christ. And although stress cannot be laid on these indications, yet it is extremely improbable that so sacred a day should have been desecrated and violated by the chief priests and elders in constraining Pilate much against his will to give orders for the crucifixion of Christ. We, therefore, notwithstanding the apparent contrary statements in the Synoptic Gospels, arrive at the conclusion that our Lord was put to death on the 14th Nisan, as asserted in the Gospel of John.

PATON J. GLOAG, D.D.

THE LIFE OF SAINT BERNARD

*AS ILLUSTRATED BY HIS LETTERS.*¹

If one may judge by the number of volumes and of editions advertised, "The Catholic Standard Library" ought to be a great commercial success. It testifies to an extraordinary taste for literature on the part of the English-speaking "Catholic" public, if these rather expensive and by no means popular books attain anything like a remunerative sale. The enterprise, however, shows no signs of failure. Six of its volumes, if not more, are to be devoted to St. Bernard. They will contain a translation of his entire works, and a new *Life*. At present only the first two volumes are issued, giving over one hundred pages of *Prolegomena*, and the Letters. It is a little remarkable that the more than once projected scheme of publishing in English the whole works of St. Bernard has never yet been carried out. This attempt bids fair to be successful. The edition used is, of course, that of Dom. John Mabillon, but Dr. Eales has added some careful notes. The translation appears extremely good, distinctly preferable, for instance, to that given by Mr. J. C. Morison in his *Life and Times of St. Bernard*. If the English is less elegant, its tone and phraseology more clearly reflect monastic and mediæval modes of thought and speech.

If ever man had greatness and notoriety thrust upon him, it was this same Bernard. Born in 1091, of a noble family, possessed of exceptional ability and the favour of his sovereign, a distinguished career lay at his feet. He became a monk, not with the hope of obtaining ecclesiastical power and

¹ *Life and Works of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux*. Edited by Dom. John Mabillon. Translated and Edited with Additional Notes by Samuel J. Eales, M.A., D.C.L. Vols. I., II. John Hodges, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London.

rank, but that he might lead a life of meditation, prayer, and self-discipline. His father, Tescelin Sorus, lord of Fontaines, in Burgundy, was almost the model of a Christian knight—a man whose proved courage and prowess were excelled by his piety and gentleness. He even ventured to decline a single combat with an adversary, yielding the point in dispute to his own great disadvantage, solely because he felt doubtful about the real rights of the matter. Bernard's mother exhibited the noblest type of goodness possible in her day. She neither scorned nor neglected her duties as wife and mother, yet she cultivated the virtues, as then understood, of asceticism, quietness, and meditative devotion. She was rich in charity, giving freely not only of her substance, but herself tending the sick and the needy. The wonder would have been if the son of such parents had not turned his thoughts towards religion, and had not decided to adopt the only profession in which, according to the views of the age he lived in, a man could serve God perfectly. The wonder is that, after the death of his parents, his brothers and other relatives should have placed obstacles in his way. The course he took was so natural, so thoroughly to be expected, that one cannot but be surprised at their surprise. He had tried knighthood, only to find its physical burdens intolerable, and its mental and moral influences deteriorating. He had little taste for the *rôle* of a philosophic disputant, and he had conceived an utter abhorrence of worldly honours. He was drawn strongly towards religion, and that by genuine love to God and man. With some difficulty he persuaded his two soldier brothers to join him, and they entered the tiny monastery of Citeaux, known only for its strict rule and its humbleness.

From that hour the monastery of Citeaux became celebrated, and the Cistercian order to which it belonged flourished. In 1115 Bernard, then but twenty-four years old, was appointed abbot of Clairvaux, a monastery not yet founded. It was necessary, however, for Citeaux to send forth swarms, as the parent-hive gathered to itself inconvenient crowds. So the youthful abbot and his twelve monks went forth to establish a new community. The highest ecclesiastical

preferment to which Bernard ever attained was this abbacy. There is no doubt that Bernard's heart was in his monastery. When in later life pressure of public business compelled lengthy and frequent absences from his beloved home and friends, he bemoaned his hard fate pathetically. During one of these enforced absences he writes to "his dearly beloved brethren, the monks of Clairvaux, the converts, and the novices"—

"Judge by yourselves what I am suffering. If my absence is painful to you, let no one doubt that it is far more painful to me. The loss is not equal, the burden is not the same, for you are deprived of but one individual, while I am bereft of all of you. It cannot but be that I am weighed down by as many anxieties as you are in number; I grieve for the absence of each one of you, and fear the dangers which may attack you. This double grief will not leave me until I am restored to my children. I doubt not that you feel the same for me; but then I am but one. You have but a single ground for sadness; I have many, for I am sad on account of you all. Nor is it my only trouble that I am forced to live for a time apart from you, when without you I should regard even to reign as miserable slavery, but there is added to this that I am forced to live among things which altogether disturb the tranquillity of my soul, and perhaps are little in harmony with the end of the monastic life."

And again, a year or two afterwards :—

"Lo, this is now the third time, if I mistake not, that my children have been taken from me. The babes have been too early weaned, and I am not allowed to bring up those whom I begot through the Gospel. In short, I am forced to abandon my own children and look after those of others, and I hardly know which is the more distressing, to be taken from the former, or to have to do with the latter. O good Jesu! is my whole life thus to waste away in grief, and my years in mourning? It is good for me, O Lord, rather to die than to live, only let it be amongst my brethren, those of my own household, those who are dearest to my heart. That, as all know, is sweeter and safer, and more natural. Nay, it would be a loving act to grant to me that I might be refreshed before I go away, and be no more seen. If it please my Lord that the eyes of a father, who is not worthy to be called a father, should be closed by the hands of his

sons, that they may witness his last moments, soothe his end, and raise his spirit by their loving prayers to the blissful fellowship, if you think him worthy to have his body buried with the bodies of those who are blessed because poor; if I have found favour in Thy sight, this I most earnestly ask that I may obtain by the prayers and merits of these my brethren. Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine be done. Not for my own sake do I wish for either life or death."

Another letter pathetically beseeches his diocesan superiors not to call him to their councils, but to leave him in rest and tranquillity at Clairvaux.

A deep-seated love of retirement, a profound conviction that his own spiritual interests were best served in privacy, fondness for study, a genuine interest in nature, a blessed aptitude for that meditative communion with God in which so many of the saints have found their highest satisfaction, a sorrowful but deliberate judgment that the world was so evil that it could not safely be lived in, and that the Church, so far as it came into contact with the world, was infected incurably with the same poison, combined with the spirit and belief of his age, as to things religious, to make Bernard a monk, and to intensify his original preference as the years rolled on. He shared the then current opinions as to the necessity and the methods of subjugating the body, and inflicted upon himself austerities so dangerous that his friends were constrained to protest. Deaf to their entreaties, his life was saved only by the interposition of episcopal authority. To the day of his death he suffered from "oft infirmities," yet he accomplished labours which, estimated by purely physical standards, would have taxed the energies of the most robust. The would-be recluse was more entangled with "affairs" than many an ambitious statesman. The man who strove to hide himself in obscurity grew, despite his sincere and strenuous struggles, to be the foremost personage in the civilized world.

It is not easy nowadays to account for the enormous influence exercised by Bernard of Clairvaux. The letters show a strong, self-reliant nature, whole-hearted, absolutely certain that the cause he champions and the truths he utters are of

God. Perhaps his unique position in the middle part of the Middle Ages was due to his deserved reputation for sanctity, his perfect fearlessness, his transparent honesty of purpose, and his personal magnetism. Every one who knew him loved him, and delighted to submit to his leadership. Perhaps this and his resolute singleness of aim suggests the secret of his power. Everything else, however, would have been of comparatively small avail had it not been for the universal belief that in an especial degree Bernard enjoyed the favour of heaven. For that the monastic profession was a necessity, but there needed also a solid substratum of truth. We need not shrink from acknowledging that one main factor in Bernard's greatness and fame was his real sainthood. Dr. Eales lays strong stress upon the fact that Bernard was "a monk and an ascetic." We may admit cheerfully that, in an age of violence and brute force, only in this vocation could he have performed his divinely appointed task.

Of the Letters, some are mere salutations interesting solely because of the hand that penned them. Others assume the dimensions and the tone of treatises. A considerable number properly deserve to be called *letters*. They are addressed to all sorts and conditions of men, to popes and kings, and other rulers in Church and State, to public bodies, to private friends, to men, and even to women, personally unknown to the writer, but whose requirement of ghostly counsel had been brought under his notice. Many urge people to undertake the monastic vows, or warn against the sin of retiring from them wholly or partially. Others complain of the conduct of heads of houses who have received monks who had left the Cistercian rule, or defend Bernard's own action in like circumstances. On this latter point not infrequently he is at a loss for a reasonable reply, as he cannot conceive it permissible for one of his monks to change his obedience; whilst he had far less scruple in accepting postulants from other orders. He is not consciously unfair, but, as his was the stricter rule, he assumed that to adopt it was at least a counsel of perfection. His expostulation with a certain monk who had obtained the Papal licence to leave his

monastery throws a curious light upon his views of the Pope's power and infallibility.

“You had then just reason to fear, and were rightly distrustful of the goodness of your cause, when, in order to still the pangs of your consciences, you tried to have recourse to the Holy See. O, vain remedy! which is nothing else than to seek girdles, like our first parents, for your ulcerated consciences, that is to hide the ill instead of curing it. We have asked and obtained (they say) the permission of the Pope. Would that you had asked not his permission, but his advice; that is to say, not that he would permit you to do it, but whether it was a thing permitted to you to do! Why, then, did you solicit his permission? Was it to render lawful that which was not so? Then you wished to do what was not lawful; but what was not lawful was evil. The intention, therefore, was evil which tended towards evil. Perhaps you would say that the wrong thing which you demanded permission to do ceased to be such if it was done by virtue of a permission. But that has been already excluded above by an irrefragable reason. For when God said, ‘*Do not despise one of these little ones who believe in Me,*’ He did not add also, Unless with permission; nor when He said, ‘*Take care not to give scandal to one of these little ones*’ (St. Matt. xviii. 6-10) did He limit it by adding, Without licence. . . . Wonderful precaution, marvellous prudence! They had already devised evil in their heart, but they were cautious not to carry it out in action, except with permission. They conceived in sorrow, but they did not bring forth iniquity until the Pope had offered his consent to that unrighteous birth. With what advantage? at least, with what lessening of the evil?”

If we acknowledge the initial principle of the essential superiority of the conventual life over all others, we must acknowledge also that Bernard's exhortations and advice show a surprising amount of Christian common sense. Now and then they have some hectic colouring; once various editors think it prudent to apologize for a disrespectful violence of language that even the saint's, “great wisdom and piety” cannot excuse; but on the whole he exhibits a “sweet reasonableness,” and perceives that other duties and claims must be weighed and may incline the balance. To an abbot who had consummated an almost typical act of Romanist

self-sacrifice, who had resigned his abbacy and become a simple monk in his own monastery, Bernard expresses grave doubts of the wisdom of the step, and proceeds to warn him against exacting or expecting greater deference than was awarded to the lowliest of his fellows. To a monk who inclined to refuse the episcopacy, although he was the fittest man for the post, Bernard points out that the truest humility is shown in submitting one's own judgment to one's superiors, that a man's noblest work is that to which God calls him, and that self-denial is quite consistent with dignity and responsibility. An enthusiastic monk, he is yet more than a monk. Usually St. Bernard is credited with the foundation of the Cistercian order and rule, a scheme which came near to revolutionizing the position and the government of monastic establishments. Hitherto, conventual houses had been isolated from each other, and therefore an easy prey to disorder and to their enemies. When high-placed ecclesiastics endeavoured to oppress them, defence was difficult, and appeal to Rome nearly useless. Under the presidency of Stephen, abbot of Citeaux (*Cistercium*), the Cistercian monasteries were now formed into a homogeneous whole, governed by one Chapter. Of all this work the letters contain scarcely a trace. Bernard approved heartily of the scheme, and assisted in its completion; but the real author of and prime mover in it appears to have been Stephen himself. But to Bernard's influence and earnestness chiefly was owing "the revival of" the ancient religious fervour in the monastic order.

Several letters, though clearly Bernard's, are written in other people's names. This is the case with the earliest letter in which Bernard intervenes in public affairs. It is superscribed as from Stephen, abbot of Citeaux. The merits of the quarrel between Louis the Fat on the one side and the Bishop of Paris on the other are somewhat obscure. At any rate, the Archbishop had placed Louis' kingdom under an interdict, and he and his suffragan of Paris had taken refuge at Citeaux. A bolder and more outspoken address than that which Bernard penned to Louis has seldom been sent from loyal subject to monarch. "Have you reflected whom you

are thus attacking?" he expostulates; and answers his own question, "Not really the Bishop of Paris, but the Lord of Paradise, a terrible God who cuts off the spirit of Princes (Ps. lxx. 12), and who has said to Bishops, He who despiseth you despiseth Me" (Luke x. 16). The victory was won, and peace all but concluded, when the Pope Honorius II. autocratically raised the interdict, thereby inflicting upon the ecclesiastical disputants material injury, and putting them into a most ridiculous position. Most men would have retired in dudgeon and disgust from a hopeless contest. But Bernard was of quite another mould. He arraigns the Pope himself:—"We have seen and repeat sad things. In the time of Honorius, the honour of the Church has been deeply wounded." (Bernard never could refrain from punning; and, to do him justice, his puns are seldom so poor as this.) Again: "The effect of your letter has been that the goods unjustly seized are more unjustly retained, and those which remain are seized day by day, and that so much more securely, as he [the King] is assured of entire impunity in retaining them. The just (as we consider) interdict of the Bishop has been raised by your order, and as the fear of displeasing you has made us suspend that which we proposed to send forth by our own authority, and by which we hoped to obtain peace, we are made in the meantime the derision of our neighbours. How long is this to be?"

In similar strains of rebuke and entreaty, he addressed other distinguished personages, and the Roman Curia itself. He was not wholly successful; but that the young abbot of a poor and little known monastery should dare to speak in such tones, and should escape punishment, and even censure, caused him to stand before the world as one of its strongest and most fearless men.

Two other principal events in Bernard's life receive scant illustration from the letters, the Council of Troyes and the composition of the rules for the order of Knight Templars, and the triumphant struggle with the rich and mighty abbey of Cluny. The service and the victory added immensely to Bernard's reputation and power.

At the death of Honorius II., 1130, began the great schism, when the Church was divided between the rival claims of Innocent II. and Anacletus II. All Roman Catholic historians now hold the former to have been the true Pontiff, the latter a usurper. The decision of the then Church went finally in the same direction. Behind this we may not go, else all technical and legal formalities seem to have been on the side of Anacletus. In other words, Roman Catholicism could prefer Innocent only by subordinating the material to the spiritual and moral, in blunt antagonism to its entire system. The election of Innocent was the revolt or protest of the party of spirituality and purity against the party of violence and worldliness. It could scarcely have succeeded without Bernard's energetic and persistent advocacy. Nothing manifests his unequalled influence more clearly than the huge importance universally attached to his adhesion to Innocent. Plainly, Bernard chose his side with reference to the personal character of the rival Popes, and his estimate of the probable effect of their respective governments of the Church. He wrote letter after letter to princes, bishops, and other persons of importance, urging them to adopt the cause of Innocent, or to remain faithful to him. Characteristically, having once espoused a cause, he can see no possible fault in it, and no possible virtue in the supporters of its opposite. He declares, "The threefold cord of the choice of the better sort, the assent of the majority, and, what is more effective yet in these matters, the witness of a pure life, commend Innocent to all, and establish him as a chief Pontiff." As a specimen of his style when writing to princes, take the following from an epistle to the Count of Poitou :—

"I ask you what goodness, or virtue, or honour do they bring forward on the part of their Pope that we should favour him? If what is commonly said of him is true, he is not fit to have the government of a single hamlet; if it is not true, it none the less is fitting that the head of the Church should be of good repute as well as of blameless life. Therefore, it is safer for you, my dear kinsman, when you acknowledge any one as universal Pope, not to depart from the common mind and agreement of the universal Church, and

to receive him that the whole monastic order and all the kings have acknowledged ; it is also more to your honour and more expedient to your salvation to receive Innocent as Pope. He appeals to his blameless life, his unblemished character, and his canonical election. His enemies have not a word to say against the two first of these ; the third was indeed found fault with, but the unprincipled men who did so have been lately caught in their falsehood by the most Christian Emperor Lothaire."

St. Bernard always writes with an air of authority of which he is partially unconscious. He is thoroughly convinced of the righteousness of his own cause, and seems to regard himself as divinely commissioned to warn, to encourage, to assert. Fervent thought clothes itself in vehement language. Often we have earnest and careful reasoning, passionate entreaty, marvellous fertility of illustration, and always frequency and aptness of quotation from the Scriptures. Perhaps nothing impresses the reader of these letters more than their reverent familiarity with the Bible. This is manifest, not merely in direct citation, but in turns of phraseology, allusions, subtil reminiscences. It is hardly too much to say that the letters are saturated with Scripture, and throughout there is the warmth and glow of a profound and intense nature.

Bernard's diffuse and rather involved style makes it difficult to give a summary of any of his longer letters to his friends. Let us take, however, Letter cvii., addressed to Thomas, Prior of Beverley. Mabillon tells us, "This Thomas had taken the vows of the Cistercian Order at Clairvaux. As he showed hesitation, Bernard urges his tardy spirit to fulfil them. . . . In this letter, Bernard sketches with a master's hand the whole scheme of salvation." The epistle begins abruptly, "What is the good of words? An ardent spirit and a strong desire cannot express themselves simply by the tongue." A good or a bad tree is known not by its leaves or flowers, but its fruit. The abbot professes himself quite indifferent to the prior's possessions. They perish with the using. Let him leave them behind him, if only himself will come to Clairvaux. Let him choose the best part, which shall not be

taken away for ever. Then, in a paragraph too long to quote and too beautiful to abridge, Bernard expatiates on the secret joys of full consecration to God, applying 1 Cor. ii. 9, "*Eye hath not seen,*" &c., to this present life with clearer spiritual perception than is displayed by many a modern commentator. He contrasts the irremediable ignorance of the world with the enlightenment of God's people; the latter being those only whom God foreknew and foreordained from all eternity. To these, and to these only, He reveals Himself: upon them, and upon them only, does the Sun of Righteousness shine. These He calls and justifies; calls by fear and justifies by love. "*The merciful goodness of the Lord endureth from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him* (Ps. ciii. 17). *From everlasting,* because of predestination; *to everlasting,* because of glorification." Therefore the consummation is assured. Bernard then describes the manner in which the sinner becomes conscious of this predestination. Gradually is he drawn into God's light; feels God's love touching and warming him; answers with love. Nothing but God's love can call forth man's.

"Let none, therefore, doubt that he is loved who already loves. The love of God freely follows our love, which it preceded. For how can He grow weary of returning their love to those whom He loved even while they yet loved Him not? He loved them. I say yes, He loved. For as a pledge of His love thou hast the Spirit; thou hast also Jesus, the faithful Witness, and Him crucified. Oh! double proof, and that most sure, of God's love towards us. Christ dies, and deserves to be loved by us. The Spirit works, and makes Him to be loved. The One shows the reason why He is loved; the Other how He is to be loved. The One commends His own great love to us; the Other makes it ours. In the One we see the object of love; from the Other we draw the power to love. With the One, therefore, is the cause; with the Other the gift of charity. . . . Having been loved, we love; and as we love, we deserve to be loved yet more. . . . Since, then, the token of our salvation is twofold, namely, a twofold outpouring of the Blood and of the Spirit, neither can profit without the other. For the Spirit is not given except to such

as believe in the Crucified ; and faith avails not unless it works by love. But love is the gift of the Spirit."

He dwells on the necessity of the death of Christ, and of the life of the Risen Saviour, for our justification and sanctification. He indeed explains the revelation of "the eternal purpose of God concerning" the "future salvation" of any man as "the infusion of spiritual grace," whereby he is able to mortify the flesh and seek after holiness. His intense desire to trace both the origin and the process of our salvation to God causes him to recur again and again to the eternal counsel of God respecting individuals. Nevertheless, sinners are responsible for their ignorance. "Oh ! that they would be wise and understand. But except they believe, they shall not understand." Men of the world, however, are heedless. "Scale sticks close to scale, and there is no air-hole between you." Finally he exhorts Thomas to listen with his inward ear for the voice of God. "This voice sounds not in the market-place, and is not heard in public. It is a secret purpose, and seeks to be heard in secret." Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Jesus, heard it. Will not Thomas listen to it? "You call me your Abbot. I refuse not the title for obedience's sake—obedience, I say, not that I demand it, but that I render it in service to others ; even as *The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many* (Matt. xx. 28). But if you deem me worthy, receive as your fellow-disciple him whom you choose for your master ; for we have both one Master—Christ ; and so let Him be the end of this letter, Who is *The end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth*" (Rom. x. 4).

The letter contains forty-three direct citations from the Bible, and numerous references and allusions besides.

It is no part of my purpose to criticize St. Bernard's theology. It is essentially unsystematic. Protestants might find serious fault with its theory of justification. A strict exegesis would condemn several of his interpretations and applications of texts. But no one can doubt that the root of the matter is in him. His religion is no mere intellectual belief, but "heartfelt experience." Not only is the man sincere to the

very depths of his soul, but his trust and love are fixed upon Christ. Of the Popish doctrine of merit there is the merest vestige; of appeal to the Virgin or the saints not one sign.

Two letters on theological subjects demand a few lines. An unknown correspondent asks him, "Why the Church has decreed a festival to the Maccabees alone of all the righteous under the ancient law?" He decides that the reason is because the Maccabees died in sheer perseverance in their faith, and not because they censured others. He defends the action of the Church in granting a festival only to those martyrs who lived and died after Christ, inasmuch as only they were received immediately into Christ's presence. But the character of the Maccabees' martyrdom rendered it a just exception. Yet all the martyrs will obtain the martyr's crown.

One other epistle discusses the then new Festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. Bernard will submit himself to the Holy See; but no new festival should be instituted without the Pope's distinct direction. He proceeds to argue the subject with admirable reverence and freedom. To him the doctrine, now authorized by infallibility itself, appears dangerous and absurd. The Virgin, he holds, was sanctified from the womb, as John the Baptist. Probably she was holy before birth by the special operation of the Holy Ghost. But if immaculate conception was necessary to this holiness, the reasoning applies "to each of her parents, then to her grandparents, and then to their parents, and so on *ad infinitum*," until we shall be compelled to deny that even Adam begat a son in his own likeness; or else you must detract from the honour of both the Virgin and her Son, and assume that the Virgin's mother was a virgin and conceived by the Holy Ghost, for which there is no Biblical warrant.

Bernard's shrewd common sense seldom forsakes him when he is left to his own meditations. He was not overwilling to listen to reason from the lips of others, but he had a rare power of seizing the central points of a case laid before him, and of perceiving the logical consequences of an admitted principle.

J. ROBINSON GREGORY.

(To be concluded).

DEFINITIONS WANTED— ECCLESIASTICAL.

MANY years ago we saw a company of bees about to swarm, and thinking in our juvenile wisdom that they did not know their own business, and were about to swarm in an inconvenient spot, we ventured to disturb them. A long time has passed since then, yet we remember the stinging incident as distinctly as though it had happened but yesterday. It is sincerely to be hoped that this article will not be a repetition of the experiment. Were it an attempt to prove some parties in our Church of England true in matters ecclesiastical, and others false, the worst might be anticipated; for ecclesiastics can sting, and that severely; but as polemics will be avoided, and the paper be merely a very innocent one on definitions, in which facts will be described as fairly as possible, and in which nothing will be set down in malice, it is to be hoped the writer may escape unhurt.

The term Ecclesiastical may be made to cover a very large area of thought, but as our area of paper is very small, the definitions will be, for the most part, limited to the names of parties within the Church of England—names which have developed outside Councils and Decrees, and which are indefinitely used and but vaguely understood. This vagueness, however, very frequently leads to great unfairness, and men are called by names they would themselves repudiate. How many clerics who perhaps abhor Romanism have been called "Romanists," only because they have worn the surplice when preaching, or have liked a somewhat ornate service. This is manifestly unjust to the persons so named, because it is not true; and is injurious to those who so speak, because it hides from them beauties of character that otherwise would be known and appreciated.

This great difficulty meets us on the threshold—that these different parties blend into each other so gradually that it is

hard to tell where one ends and another begins ; as in the solar spectrum we cannot tell exactly where we pass from red into orange, or from orange into yellow. When we wish to investigate any one colour, we consequently select its centre, and there study the phenomena. So with these ecclesiastics, we must select the point of fullest development, and find there the materials for our definitions.

The term that first claims our attention, not only because it lies at one extreme of the series, but also because it is the oldest and simplest, is

THE EVANGELICAL OR LOW CHURCHMAN.

The good tidings of pardon through faith in Christ alone form the alpha and omega of his teaching. Christ, and Him crucified, is the keynote of his every song. No means of access to the Father but by Him ; penitence, conversion, sanctification, justification, being the transitional states ever to be found in the change from darkness to light. This conviction of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, being essentially the work of the Holy Spirit, the conversion of the Christless is his first consideration, and therefore the usual human agency in that conversion is accorded a place of highest honour. A man cannot make any progress heavenward until his footsteps are in the right path. How is he to be persuaded to take the first step in the right direction ? Will a sacrament alone do it ? The Evangelical says, "No." The Holy Communion is a very blessed thing when there is communion, but that sacrament will not produce communion. It was not intended to do so. But there is something that was designed for this purpose, and that is preaching, whether publicly to a congregation, or privately in friendly intercourse between man and man. Consequently preaching is, in this work, assigned a chief place.

This was taught by St. Paul himself when he said, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." More than once he stated, "Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles." Again, when writing to the Romans, how strong are his words,

“For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent? As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things.” But preaching means an appeal to the individual conscience for the purpose of arousing individual convictions. It is only in logical sequence, therefore, that the Evangelical should maintain the immediate and individual responsibility of every one to God for his belief and life. The Bible alone is his rule of faith as interpreted in the intelligent exercise of private judgment. He gladly uses all helps that have been given to him by devout scholars, but the ultimate decision rests with himself.

The Evangelical is thankful for men who devote themselves to the work of the ministry; but he acknowledges no priest but Christ, and no present altar. He is also thankful for the house of God where Christians can meet for common praise and common prayer; grateful, too, beyond power of expression, for the sacrament of the Holy Communion, and all the help it gives to those who rightly receive it. But the work done by the Church is to him so small as compared with the work done by Christ that it will scarcely bear comparison, and so he is called “Low Churchman.” Rightly so-called; but only Low Churchman when the Church is compared with Christ. His conception of the Church is low when contrasted with his adoration of the Church’s Lord; but when not in comparison, he considers his fidelity to his Church is not surpassed by any other section of men within its pale, or his true reverence for it less than theirs. Most gladly does he acknowledge the real presence of Christ at the Table of the Lord, but just as gladly does he affirm that He may be as really and potentially present at any place and at any time.

“Where’er we seek Thee Thou art found,
And every spot is hallowed ground.”

The true Evangelical would express his standpoint in the

words of the great Apostle, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand; and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Whether we believe in Evangelicalism or not, there is in it a simplicity, a harmony, a unity, that must commend it, at least, to minds with scientific culture; and so he may be defined as *The Christocentric Individualist Churchman*. The nearest to the Low Churchman is

THE HIGH CHURCHMAN.

The terms "Low" and "High" seem to imply contradictories, but in this case they do not, for while in Churchism the two may be, and are, far apart, in essential Christian doctrine they are closely allied. In faithful allegiance to Christ, in firm reliance on the efficacy of the Atonement, and in humble trust on His mercy, the typical High Churchman is sound to the core. When the *Essays and Reviews* were published, both joined in a united denunciation; and again, when Dr. Temple was made Bishop of Exeter they vied with each other who should protest most strongly. Formerly the Low Churchman was Calvinistic, and the High was Arminian; but that distinction is now being toned down, as it is an undoubted fact that the extremes in these doctrines are disappearing, and both parties are meeting in a free, yet honest, interpretation of Article xvii; which is moderation itself when compared with the Calvinism of the Westminster Confession. Doctrinally, therefore, it may safely be affirmed that the High and the Low Churchman are both Christocentric, both sweeping their theological circumference round Christ as the centre.

It is in matters ecclesiastical that the divergence becomes marked. But the task of further definition becomes somewhat difficult in face of the fact that there are so many species, and even individual varieties, in the genus High Churchman. He of to-day is not the same as he of fifty years ago; then he was very high and very dry; fond of good livings and good living; upholder of Church and State, merely

because the State was Churchy, and the Church was Stately. Providentially that order of stagnation has passed away, and the High Churchman of to-day is not excelled by any one in devotion to his parochial duties, and an earnest desire to be faithful to the extent of his responsibilities. He, however, claims more for the clerical office than does the Evangelical. The Hierarchy is affirmed to possess, in virtue of its being a hierarchy, greater powers than are possessed by other men, though the nature of these powers is not stated. The decisions of Church Councils are regarded as binding, simply because they issue from such a source. Of course, all would regard with veneration the united thought of venerable, godly, and learned men; but our friend goes much farther than that. The official function holds a very high place in his estimation. At baptism every child is believed to be regenerated, though there is no unity about the meaning of the word. In the sacrament of the Holy Communion some change is supposed to take place in the elements, though the nature of that change is never explained. "Dissent" is denounced as schism, though no definition of Dissent is vouchsafed. There is, consequently, about his position a haziness that makes it difficult to exactly describe him, still he may safely be defined, so far as a Christocentric Ecclesiastic.

He is also æsthetic in his tastes, cultivating the imagination in the order of worship, and attributing a great value to the sensuous in service. We are told by him that "architectural splendour, soothing, inspiring music, dresses, and ceremonial of all kinds, combine to impress upon a congregation the validity of our belief in the unseen world. These things come to the aid of the poor, stricken, struggling soul, as it seeks to keep up the fight with its own perverse, unspiritual stupidities, and with the distracting and demoralizing visible world around it. This operation of external beauty upon the imagination is not, of course, the same thing as the exercise of devotion; but the help which it brings towards the exercise of devotion is in the highest degree important and real. It brings the soul, so to say, into an atmosphere in which it can breathe freely; it predisposes the thoughts to

actual prayer; it produces a frame of mind in which faith can more easily pour itself out in hearty and intelligent aspirations towards the source of all spiritual life." The Evangelical claims for himself a certain amount of æstheticism, as all men of culture and taste must; he grants that it has a place and a value in worship, but he holds that emotion is not conviction, and that though the sensuous may predispose for the moment to prayer, it may not culminate in real prayer, or produce truer spirituality of character; and so he uses it but sparingly, and altogether declines to go as far as his more æsthetic brother. Taking, therefore, these three points into consideration, we are convinced the High Churchman will agree with us when we define him as a *Christocentric Ecclesiastic Æsthetic Churchman*.

We now approach a very different character, one certainly where there is no vagueness of claim, no indecision of pretension; one who knows his mind and boldly speaks it. That is

THE SACERDOTALIST.

His claim is that when ordained a priest he was invested with the ability to work miracles, at least of one sort; that he was made not only a *Sacerdos*, but endowed with supernatural powers. As this mighty gift is wholly independent of culture or character, but proceeds from the laying on of episcopal hands, apostolical succession follows as a logical necessity. This is the basis of the whole sacerdotal structure, and if that should be swept away, all the building must go with it. It is not our present purpose to discuss the value of these claims, but merely to state them as fairly as possible. The Sacerdotalist claims to be a sacrificing priest. The following questions were asked at the Ritual Commission:—2608, "Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?—Yes." 2609, "In fact, *sacerdos*, a sacrificing priest?—Distinctly so." 26011, "Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?—Yes." It is elsewhere written, "It is necessary that the sacrifice should be continually offered, to obtain remission for sins continually committed." What this means it would be difficult to discover, but the claim will not be denied by any

of this school. The great miracle of his official life is performed when continuing this sacrifice, at the moment he consecrates the bread or wine in the sacrament of the Holy Communion. He affirms that by using the words of consecration he produces something which was not there before, and which effect could not be produced by other than a priest. It is important to ascertain what this something is, or what is the exact character of the effect produced. The Anglican Sacerdotalist does not claim to produce the same effect as the Roman, but one much more wondrous still. The Roman teaches transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of the elements into the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ. The Anglican professes that he does not change the substance of the elements, these remain still bread and wine; but he produces within these substances a real bodily Christ, in consubstantiation with them. The greater wonder in this miracle is that the Roman has something to work on, but the Anglican has nothing. His miracle involves, first, a creation of matter and spirit, and, secondly, a moulding of these into a real Christ. We would not do the Anglican an injustice, but this is the only view that can be deduced from his writings. He uses the strongest possible language with reference to it. In the "Little Prayer Book" we read, "Receive, O eternal Father, this offering, which is now only bread and wine; but will soon, by a miracle of Thy grace, become the true body and blood of Thine only Son." Numberless quotations might be given where words are used exactly similar to those in which a Romanist would describe transubstantiation. This miracle is in strongest contrast to those performed by Christ, for they were conspicuous to all, evident to the senses of all; but this is invisible and unprovable. It is said to be a mystery, but a mystery is an unexplained fact; and it is evidence of fact that cannot in this case be supplied. The term "mystery" is consequently inapplicable. We do not think contradiction is possible, or even desired, to the definition of a Sacerdotalist as *one who believes in the power of the priest to work an invisible, unprovable, and un-Christlike miracle, in the sacrifice of the Mass.*

Closely allied with him is

THE RITUALIST.

Ritualism must be carefully distinguished from ritual, inasmuch as ritual is found in all departments of life, but no one would dream of calling it ritualism as, for example, bending the knee in prayer. It must also be distinguished from æstheticism, because this does not inculcate any special doctrine, whereas the ritual of ritualism has one object specially in view, and that is to teach doctrine by symbolism. In the Ritual Commission the question was asked—2978, “You do not contend, then, for any æsthetic purpose, but strictly for a doctrinal purpose?—Decidedly. The æsthetic purpose forms an accident afterwards, but is not the object.” The doctrine to be thus taught is sacerdotalism. There cannot be any difficulty, therefore, in the definition of a ritualist. He is *one who teaches sacerdotalism by symbolism*. It might be added, and “who believes that ‘no public worship is really deserving of its name unless it be histrionic’”! We think, however, that the former alone is sufficient for our purpose.

The history of the rise and development of “Puseyism,” or “Tractarianism,” necessary for a definition of them would be interesting, as it would illustrate the varieties of emotional intelligence, show how conviction was moulded by inherited temperament, and demonstrate that accidents of the day carve into fresh forms principles that are eternal. But at present it is not necessary, as these stages have been lost in other developments which have come under our notice. It is also here impossible, as it would far exceed the space at our disposal.

The appearance of that cloudy volume called *Lux Mundi* necessitates some notice of the new party called

THE NEO-RITUALIST.

Strange that a book should be edited and partly written by the head of Pusey House, containing teaching that Dr. Pusey would have indignantly repudiated, as indignantly as it has been denounced by Archdeacon Denison and Canon Liddon.

The article of excitement is by Mr. Gore, editor of the volume, and Principal of Pusey House! His result would be to shake belief in the inspiration and truth of Scripture; but if Scripture be untrue, what becomes of Sacerdotalism and Ritualism? The Neo-Ritualist may, consequently, be defined as *the Ritualist without reason for his ritualism.*

THE BROAD CHURCHMAN.

In a Church numbering so many clergy as the Church of England, we must expect to find every variety of mental mood that may honestly be found in a Christian denomination. There are some who are sceptically inclined, and who would be found in the ranks of agnosticism, were it not that they are conscious of spiritual wants, which negations never can supply. These may be regarded as the extreme left wing of the party. Indeed, they consider themselves in this light, and appear to be a little doubtful about their honesty in remaining in the Church, at least as clergy. They think, however, that the extension of the terms of Subscription to the Articles enables them to remain where they are. Others, while admiring the "spiritual freedom" of the Low Church, consider that it places too much emphasis on faith, and rests too exclusively on authority—that of Scripture. Many approve the moderate importance attached by the High Church to forms and ceremonies; for, as Mr. Haweis says, "they need such outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace." Indeed, he goes so far as to state that the Broad Church are those who "love the High Church," and who also "love the Low Church." The love, however, is deficient both in extension and intension, as it extends only to those two points, and is not very hot even there. Others, again, while approving of some of the æstheticism of the Ritualist, smile contemptuously at what they term his "millinery," and consider his special doctrines as rank superstition.

On certain points, however, they are all more or less agreed, and it is this agreement that constitutes them a party. Their principles first found united expression in the

Essays and Reviews, a volume that, as we have said, in its day caused no slight commotion, and for once joined High Churchmen and Low Churchmen against the common foe. They claim to have given the Church a "New Reformation," or a "New Theology," not by destroying the old, but by reforming it; preserving what is true, and discarding all that had grown out of date. The Broad Churchman acknowledges that man must have not only a religion, but also a theology; but this theology must be the outcome of reason rather than of revelation. He affirms that this claim has been practically conceded by the Evangelical in his appeal to the Scriptures, for he states that "An appeal to the Scriptures, explain it as we may, is an appeal to reason. It throws men back at once upon questions concerning the authenticity, history, authority, and interpretation of the Scriptures. The inquiry at every step implies the supremacy of reason." Being a Churchman, however, and not a rationalist, he does not maintain that reason is sufficient of itself to discover all truth. He says, "There are limits to reason; it does not claim for itself the ability to measure the whole breadth and reach of truth." This necessitates a revelation from the mind of God to the mind of man. But this revelation is not that which is understood by other sections of the Church, "It is not a communication of a system or a scheme, but a living and direct unfolding of the Divine mind—'an eternal growth in our knowledge of the eternal life.'" Faith, reason, and revelation having been assigned their respective positions; literary criticism, historic criticism, and science criticism are brought to bear on the written Word, till so many flaws are supposed to be discovered that the demand is made for an expurgated Bible; and also that "the praying and the preaching of the Anglican Church should be brought into harmony with nineteenth century thought and feeling." It has been imagined by some that such teaching would be subversive of the existence of dogma in the Church. Mr. Page Roberts, however, is very wrath at being thought anti-dogmatic, and shows very truly that no party could be without dogma, which is simply the formal statement of something held

to be positively true. Mr. Haweis tells us that "nothing in the way of dogma comes amiss to the Broad Church; they are positively hungry for it." We are somewhat startled to read that "the Broad Church declare, with one far-reaching and sweeping acceptance, the value and necessity of holding tight every dogma that the Church has ever taught." To understand this unexpected breadth we must remember that dogma consists of two parts—a sound and a thing signified. The sound is the name of the dogma, and the thing signified is the underlying doctrine. It is the name the Broad Churchman clings to, and not the doctrine. The idea is that every dogma contains a basis of truth. The ages, as they develop in thought, understand this basis differently, and while they retain the old term they give to it perpetually changing meanings. The illustration chosen by Mr. Haweis in the *Contemporary Review* for June is "Infallibility." He says, "Give a Broad Churchman even the doctrine of infallibility of the Pope, and he will be delighted to handle it sympathetically and tenderly. He will tell you that this apparently monstrous dogma was as nearly true as any could be when the most enlightened Christian Church was the Roman Church, and the Pope in Council, as its representative, summed up the verdict of the most enlightened Christian conscience. The ideal verdict of the enlightened Christian conscience in every age is the nearest approach to infallibility we shall ever get on this earth." There are two thoughts here important to note, one is that doctrine is only an approximation to the truth; and the other is that on this earth the mind can never know actual truth. Scarcely a pleasant prospect for our friends. As the Unitarian talks of his "Church of the Messiah," so the disciple of this school speaks with all reverence of the Incarnation; but Dr. Munger tells us in his *Freedom of Faith* that the Incarnation now means "not a mere physical event, for that has entered into many religions, but the entrance into the world through a person of a moulding and redeeming force in humanity—the central and broadest fact in theology." Nearly every doctrine of the Church is "re-stated" in a similar way, so that a Low Churchman and a Broad Church-

man talking together would use the same dogmatic words, but with meanings very far apart.

Can we from this necessarily narrow examination define the member of this section of the Church? One point is clear from the outset, that reason is given the supremacy over all else. He is therefore a rationalist. He believes in the fundamental dogmas of the Church, though not in the sense generally understood at present by the Church; he believes that "the doctrine of the Church of England, as there set forth [in the Articles], to be agreeable to the Word of God." This makes him a Churchman. He also believes in a Christ; if not the Christ of other Churchmen, yet a Christ far above all other men; and thus he is so far a Christian. He hopes to attain salvation much as the Buddhist hopes to attain Nirvana. He draws this theological circumference round reason as a centre. Everything found in that circumference must be a radiation from this point. In that circle he finds Christ, and he grants that He is the most important fact discovered there; the one greatest being to Whom the hopes of the world point. We consequently cannot be far astray in defining *the Broad Churchman as a Rationalist Christian Churchman.*

We might imagine that because of such diversities of thought the different parties in the Church of England would fly off at a tangent, like the shattered fragments of a revolving stone. And so they would, but for the fact that they are bound together by the strong iron band of the Book of Common Prayer. The importance of this honoured volume as a bond of unity it would be difficult to exaggerate. Another point that ought not to be overlooked is that while these sections may be intellectually widely severed, in Christ-emotion they are very near. For the members of all seem to vie with each other in the devout and loving tenderness with which they each speak of the Master. Of one and all, therefore, surely we may be permitted to say with one whose orthodoxy cannot be questioned, "Peace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

JAS. McCANN, D.D.

RELIGIOUS LIFE IN SWITZERLAND.

IN this paper we consider the strange state of things which arises in religious Swiss Protestant circles owing, in no small degree, to the peculiar relation which exists between Church and State. At the onset it may be well to mention that the most salient elaboration of cantonal ecclesiastical laws is in the administration of official theological faculties, which are in German Switzerland connected with the three Universities of Basle, Berne, and Zurich.

The separation of Church and State in reality is in the Federal domain. The Confederation has neither an educational department nor an ecclesiastical budget. It gives, in this respect, a *carte blanche* to the cantons, and has limited itself to settling for the federal constitution the principle that no one can be forced to pay contributions to any other body than that to which he himself is attached; but several cantons have been led, by the noisy arrival and rapid progression of new doctrines, to reform their legislations, as well in religious as in educational matters, in the spirit of indifference or doctrinal neutrality. In such reforms the alliance of the *réformiste* and *mitoyen* parties has, over and over again, brought crushing defeats on the *positif* party.

The cantons, amongst others, of Basle, Berne, Neuchâtel, and Geneva, have successively, during the last twenty years, overturned the principle of the unity of doctrine which had up till then, more or less, governed the organization of their national Protestant Churches, and instituted absolute and unlimited freedom of doctrine in their pulpits. The common suffrage is, in every Protestant parish of the cantons which I have just mentioned, the arbitrary power to choose the pastor, and the only necessary qualification of a candidate is to be the holder of a *diplôme de license* or *baccalauréat* granted by a recognized theological faculty. Whilst on a short visit to Basle some years ago, I was present at the election of a pastor, which was to take place in one of the churches of the

place. Though only half filled during the service which preceded the election, the building was at the appointed time thronged by hundreds of electors, partly drawn from the neighbouring public-houses; and their votes carried the day for the *réformiste* candidate. Since that time this has frequently happened. The voting portion of the nation being the real governing body of the Church, the synods and other local ecclesiastical authorities, started or maintained by the rural laws, are reduced to play the part of purely administrative bodies, exclusively charged with the surveillance of the material execution of the *rôle* of charges of the ecclesiastical functionaries, and to officially instal the pastors elected for six years, but all control is refused them over the views of the latter. The will of a majority of one vote in a parish, which has at the same time political votes, confers on every doctrine, from the most moderate to the most extreme, the legal and equal right to be propounded in Christian pulpits, and to the pastor who is elected the unlimited liberty of speech during the time of his remaining in office, even were he to deny the existence of God and blaspheme against Jesus Christ. In fact, the church at Basle now has a pastor bolder than the rest, who does not scruple to take for his text a passage from a German classic. It would only be in a case where an official pastor were to dare to attack in the pulpit the constituted authorities in the State and the visible heads of the Church, or have committed a grave breach in the exercise of his functions, or have caused a *scandale de mœurs*, that the law could take action against him. In the canton of Berne in particular each of the three parties run to seize a corner of the cloth, and the Church of Jesus Christ resembles a butterfly, over whose legs and wings three children are squabbling. Under this government, which some one has with reason called *l'oppression alternante*, conflicts spring up unceasingly between the ecclesiastical authorities and the evangelical authorities cut off from the religious privileges to which they think they have a right. The only resolution that is left to those who have not decided to set up an independent church, is to establish parallel services to those in the national Church.

But the most zealous to contest the right with them, and to prevent them from exercising it under the pretext of its being likely to cause dissension, are the representatives of so-called liberalism and freethought, and suddenly changed for the occasion from victims of orthodox intolerance into authorities and clerics of the first water. It is necessary to say that in German Switzerland the name of a sectarian has, to a friend or an enemy, exceptional weight.

Nowhere was this kind of tyranny exercised with more cynicism than in the Canton of Thurgau about twelve years ago. The liberal Synod, once assured of its position, and not content to see its opinion represented in almost every pulpit in the cantons, suddenly forbade the reading of the Apostles' Creed in public worship.

The venerable pastor of the parish of Emmishofen, Mons. le doyen (dean) Stiegel, whose conscience forced him to oppose this strange decision, was deposed by the Synod, and he found himself forced to establish, with those of his parishioners who remained faithful to him, a free church, which, though quite isolated in this district, has, if I am not mistaken, overcome all obstacles up till this hour.

In the whole country the most formidable stronghold of freethought is the Faculty of Theology, when it is placed, as is the case at Basle, Zurich, Berne, Lausanne, Neuchâtel, and Geneva, under the exclusive and arbitrary control of the government of the country, of which the choice is neither by the votes of the Church, nor even those of a university or academic Council. The Faculties of German Switzerland belong to the reformist party.

However, the governments of Berne and Zurich have seen the necessity—if not in the interests of the *positif* party, at least in the interests of the institution itself—of not consulting merely their own wishes in the last appointment of professors, and satisfying the adversary by the concession of at least one or two pulpits. The evangelical tendency has thus been mixed in with others like the salt in the soup—in every respect a very good ingredient.

Some years ago, when on a visit to Zurich, I had the

curiosity to go to hear some lessons in the Faculty of Theology. I found myself forming a quarter of the audience when Volkmann was lecturing, and a third when Biedermann was—two masters of European fame.

I do not know of any place in the world which is so rich in Faculties of Theology as Protestant French Switzerland, which numbers six to a population of 500,000 persons. Each of the three Cantons of Vaud, Neuchâtel, and Geneva has two schools—an official and an independent one. The independent school of Geneva, founded by Merle d'Aubigné and Gausson, professes ecclesiastical neutrality. The independent school of Lausanne is attached to the Free Church of the Canton of Vaud concerning its general tendency, being entirely maintained by contributions and by a special fund. Thirdly, the independent Faculty of Neuchâtel, on the contrary, is entirely dependent on the Evangelical Church of Neuchâtel, independently of the State. The National Theological Faculty of Geneva is entirely bound to the more or less extreme left, and it has just adopted a measure well suited to the traditions of the reformist party which we lately mentioned, in any case dishonourable on account of its liberalism; that measure is, that having two years belonged to an independent faculty will not count more than one year in an official faculty. Apparently the scholars trained by Mons. Godet are *à priori* not so much thought of as those of MM. Bouvin and Cougnard. It is, in fact, an axiom with certain *middle* parties, the only true guarantee of a thorough scientific education is the government stamp, that a church ought not to have anything to do with the carrying on of schools founded and maintained by themselves; and that seven members of a democratic government can appoint a Professor of Theology, without perhaps being able themselves to give a definition of theology itself.

The audacity of the reformist party has made violent attacks during the last few years on the institution founded by Jesus Christ to draw a line of demarcation between His kingdom and unreserved humanity—*i.e.*, Baptism. One of the organs of this party had already seriously disputed as to

whether they should replace the water in baptism by a wreath of flowers, but in the end decided in favour of the *statu quo* as being the most democratic. A question connected with baptism and confirmation has just now acquired in German Switzerland under the same influence a surprising reality, and has contributed to many official debates whether the pastor ought to have power to admit to confirmation or confession of baptism a candidate who had not received baptism? Well, this question, which offends grammar and common sense and dogma, has been decided in the affirmative in the Canton of Zurich by one vote of the political authority.

The Swiss *réformiste* and *mitoyen* parties, who have never since they sprang into existence done so much as move a little finger in the direction of missions to the heathen, have suddenly been roused to jealousy by the orthodox missionary societies, and have recognized the necessity of giving to the world the long-expected proof to their being capable of doing as much, and even more. They, in due concert with their *co-religionists* in Germany, formed a society some three or four years ago, which has taken the slightly pretentious and manifestly usurped title of the *Société générale des Missions*: collections have been made with regular organization; and missionaries have even been sent to foreign parts. The promoters of the *Société générale des Missions*, who state that the orthodox missions, such as that at Basle, have only succeeded with savages, have announced they will devote themselves to civilized heathen nations, such as the Hindus and Japanese. They have begun upon the latter nation, and one good point of the *Société générale des Missions* is that their first account sheet showed a balance.

The rivalry of the positive and reformist parties is much less acute in French than in German Switzerland, which may be gathered from the fact that the Free Church of Vaud, Neuchâtel, and of Geneva, are charged with representing and realizing the principle of unity of doctrine abandoned by the National Church, even in Vaud, which has preserved a certain discipline in the matter of doctrine. The

foundation of the Independent Church in the Canton of Neuchâtel in 1873, which was the result of the ecclesiastical law carried by the legislative authorities, with the avowed aim of opening pulpits to all doctrines, has had an effect entirely contrary to all anticipations, namely, that of preventing the invasion of rationalism in the National Church itself. The beginners and authors of the so-called liberal movement—the cantonal government—have been the first to stop the progress of rationalism in the official Church from the fear of favouring the progress of the Independent Church.

Thus the door which seemed to have been thrown open to freethought, has been speedily shut by those who began the enterprise.

The struggle of parties in the domain of religious thought possesses a somewhat different character in German and in French Switzerland. In the former it is carried on in great measure in the National Church itself, as a struggle between *positifs*, *mitoyens*, and *réformistes*, and is entirely doctrinal. In the latter, in the Cantons of Vaud and Neuchâtel especially, the ecclesiastical question generally governs the doctrinal question, Christians who agree at heart are often to be found in opposite camps. Thus the often excessive ecclesiastical conservatism of Christians in German Switzerland, in one part or the other, and the promptitude of those in French Switzerland to believe in new ecclesiastical organizations, have each their advantages and perils.

I do not think that I should be unjust in saying that it is in the three Protestant Cantons of French Switzerland that Christian piety, since the revival in the beginning of the century, has exercised the most general, if not the strongest influence, and that practical piety is most widely spread.

Jesus has said, "I came not to send peace, but a sword;" and the symptom of life, wherever you meet with it, is diversity, and often even eccentricity. One cannot hide from oneself the fact that the religious atmosphere of French Switzerland, in particular, has been, during the last ten years, charged with electricity. Most strange doctrines and principles, most irregular seed, provided they have come from England,

America, or Australia, are sure to meet in the Cantons of Vaud, Neuchâtel, and Geneva—a well-tilled soil ready to propagate them. One religious movement follows another, and each makes many converts without losing them at the next occasion.

The movement of faith-healing, the ministry of women and the like, have shaken their imaginations, and even some excellent Christians always allow themselves to be carried away by the last one. They would say of each new appearance in the religious world, "*Novus rerum nascitur ordo*," and forget all the knowledge previously acquired and the experiences which they have gained, and innocently imagine every time that they pass for the first time from darkness into light. This extraordinary excitement of mind allows them to be turned by every wind of doctrine; and I might add that this disordered state of mind has seriously threatened the prosperity and the existence of even the most firmly-established churches. Ecclesiastical scepticism has followed in the track of these new prophets. I know a church adopting these views which dated from fifty years back, and had gloriously passed through the most critical times, but which collapsed through these new doctrines. The evangelical or *positif* party has, however, organs common to both parts of Switzerland, and one must not infer that the Christians in German and French Switzerland have nothing to do with each other. *L'Union évangélique Suisse* is a society founded in 1871, which counts representatives in all the Protestant cantons, whose aim it is to defend the cause of the Gospel in the midst of the national churches, coming to the rescue of the evangelical minorities.

Every year deputations from all the German and French cantons meet at Baden in Aargau in the month of May, and report on the religious state of the various districts from which they come, and make plans for renewing the struggle against the common adversary—unbelief. Among the many religious journals that are published in Switzerland, I will mention the two most important periodical reviews, which represent the *positif* belief, *The Kirchenfreund*, which is pub-

lished at Basle, and is the organ of the *positif* faction of the different national churches of German Switzerland, and the *Chrétien évangélique*, the organ of the Free Church of the Canton of Vaud. There exist also in Switzerland two theological reviews, but neither of them represents any one doctrine, being open to the discussion of all opinions. In German Switzerland the *Theologische Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz*, edited by Mons. Meili, fellow of the University of Zurich, and in French Switzerland the *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, edited by MM. Vulleumier, Dendiren et Ashé, professors of Theology at Lausanne—the two first in the National Faculty, and the third in the Independent Faculty.

Lastly, an institution which has just celebrated its jubilee, and which has rendered great services to numbers of different Swiss clergymen, is the *Société des pasteurs Suisses*, which assembles every year in one of the Protestant capitals of Switzerland to hold two meetings there, the first of which is devoted to a question of theoretical theology, and the second to a practical question. The discussion at each is opened by a person, announced some months before, who receives during the year works to aid him from all sections. The *Société des pasteurs Suisses* has no particular confession, but allows all opinions. The person before mentioned is always neutral, and will equally represent the Right and the Left; and these meetings have the great advantage of giving us the opportunity of seeing and hearing the adversaries of our opinions, whom but for that we should only have known by reading their papers in a journal. A banquet ends each day, and I cannot help saying that that is the most questionable part of the whole affair. The discussions have been warm, and even bitter, but the vessel has survived the tempest.

We have more than once made the remark that the majority of the assembly has been won over to the evangelical party, when the assembly is held at Geneva, Lausanne, or Neuchâtel, but the opinion of the Left prevails when it is held in German Switzerland, and above all when it is in East Switzerland.

A. GRETILLAT.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Commentaries. In two compact volumes Mr. Reith has given a compendious *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John* (1). These volumes form a section of the Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students, edited by Prof. Dods and Dr. Alexander Whyte; and they appear to us to be excellently suited for their purpose. The notes are full and complete, and critical enough for the ordinary student, and the matter is so arranged as to be admirably available for the teacher or even the preacher. Difficulties are not avoided, even if they are not always solved, which is, perhaps, as much as we can expect. Mr. Reith has evidently read widely and pondered deeply, and the result will be found most useful. There is an excellent introduction, containing a life of St. John, and a capital account of the evidences for the authenticity of the Gospel, and of its scope and purpose. The analysis of it is admirably done.

Prof. Orelli's *Commentary on Jeremiah* (2) is, as might be expected, a scholarly work, which will amply sustain, if it does not advance the learned Author's reputation, and Mr. Banks has given a good and readable translation. The introduction contains eight sections, dealing with the prophet's name and descent, his times, labours and characteristics, the contents and forms of his prophecy, the relation of the Hebrew to the Alexandrine Text, and the available literature on the subject. Jeremiah's special mission was to warn his nation of judgment, and the reason of the judgment was the terrible sin with which the people were burdened. This sin is specifically denounced, the accusation running like a dark line through the whole book. Jeremiah freely uses symbols in visions, words, and actions; his strength lies chiefly in speech, and his words are charged with all the force of a personality penetrated by the Spirit of the Lord. The style is not so terse as that of Isaiah, or so bold as that of Amos or Hosea; but it is broad, lucid, and uniform. Even where he repeats his own oracles, as is not seldom the case, it is generally done with slight variations. Turning to the Professor's remarks on the famous passage in the seventh chapter, we find that they are on the side of the older explanations. "This passage," he says, "forms a main argument against the pre-exilian origin of the detailed Pentateuchal law of sacrifice, the so-called Priest codex, since Jeremiah knows no

Mosaic sacrificial laws (Hitzig, Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, *et al.*). But, so understood, this saying would seem very strange, even apart from that codex." And he proceeds to show that Jeremiah's chief care was not for receiving of sacrifices, but for an obedient people; and the antithesis in verse 23 cannot mean that "this word" is the only one that God uttered on Mount Sinai, but is rather a general maxim expanded by further commands which, according to Deut. v. 30, were given by Moses. The whole argument is weighty and worth careful consideration. After each section of text and notes, there is an "exposition," which will be found most helpful in understanding the prophet's drift.

The Seven Churches of Asia, (3) or the Seven Golden Candlesticks, is one of the Bible Class Primers, edited by Prof. Salmond. It is the work of the Author of *The Spanish Brothers*, and was originally written for Young Women's Christian Associations. The little volume contains a simple commentary on the first three chapters of the Apocalypse, together with some remarks on the "one complete and glorified Church" spoken of in Rev. xxi. 9-27. The *motif* of the book is the growth and glorification of the Church of Christ, and of the duties and privileges of the members thereof. It is very well suited to its purpose, and in the hands of a careful teacher will be certainly beneficial.

A Teacher's Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew (4) presents several features not ordinarily found in such works. It is well calculated to serve its specific purpose; the notes are arranged in a clear and logical manner; and contain a good deal of information which will be useful not only to teachers of Sunday scholars, and Bible classes, but to preachers of all degrees. We heartily commend this volume, and hope it will be succeeded by others of like value, on the rest of the New Testament.

The Rev. Robert A. Watson has furnished a Commentary on *Judges and Ruth* (5), which forms an instalment of the Expositor's Bible, edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicol. It answers well to its expressed purpose, it shows how an expositor may suitably deal with those two books of the Old Testament. Mr. Watson is not very critical, and it is not necessary he should be. His pages are very pleasant reading, and there are references therein to all sorts of things which even remotely illustrate or may be illustrated from the books which form the text of his disquisitions. The various chapters will supply ample food for thought, which may find expression in

sermons, which with such help can hardly fail to be interesting and instructive.

The two remaining volumes of the *Biblical Illustrator on St. Luke's Gospel* (6) are before us. Like their predecessors they are full of information, gathered with the greatest industry from all sorts of sources; and while they are extremely well calculated to assist the preacher in the preparation of sermons, they will also be eminently useful in enabling any ordinary reader to understand the Evangelist's narrative. Every verse is commented on, and there are detailed discussions of a multitude of subjects which come before the reader. Among these we may mention, the design and nature of parables, the universality of God's connection with men and men with God; the work of the Christian ministry; the certainty of the resurrection; the need of the Spirit and His work, &c. There are illustrative quotations both of prose and poetry; and indeed in these volumes the student of the Scriptures has all the advantages of a specially arranged encyclopædia. But they lack an index; and the type is too small and insufficiently leaded.

The Servant of the Lord (7) is an attempt by Dr. Forbes to prove that the whole of the book of Isaiah is by one and the same author. We do not suppose that the arguments here used will have much effect on the opinion of those learned men who have declared themselves on the other side; nor can we say what effect they may have on those who are doubtful on the subject; but the book is worth consideration, and it forms in some ways a useful commentary. The analysis of the latter part of the prophecy is excellent, and the symmetry of the last twenty-seven chapters is well brought out. Added to the main portion of the work is a suggestive essay on the "Immanuel prophecy." The style of the author is remarkably fresh and vigorous, considering that he is almost as old as the present century.

In *Joshua: His Life and Times* (8) the story of that famous man is told in an interesting and instructive manner. The author incorporates with the Biblical narrative whatever information he has been able to collect from commentaries such as Dillman's and Maclear's. He has paid attention to the geography of the settlement of the Israelites in the Promised Land, and altogether has furnished a well connected history of that period. Mr. Deane is strictly orthodox in his views and therefore in such passages as that wherein the Battle of Beth-horon is related, though he notices the explanations of Renan

and others, he does so to differ from them and to maintain the older opinion. This book is a fitting companion to the others of the useful "Men of the Bible" series.

The Lives and Times of the Kings of Israel and Judah (9) is another volume of the "Men of the Bible" Series of Handbooks. In it Mr. Rawlinson weaves an impressive story out of the various Biblical accounts, together with such information as the discoveries in Assyria, Babylonia, Phœnicia, and Moab can furnish. We can well imagine that any one wishing to have a clear idea of the course of events from the time of Rehoboam to the Captivity, can attain his desires very easily by reading this book. Mr. Rawlinson does not enter upon the question of chronology very much; and the best explanation he is able to furnish of the destruction of the Assyrian army before Jerusalem in the time of Hezekiah, is that furnished by Byron. By no means the least useful part of this work is the light thrown upon the times by the utterances of the prophets, which helps to elucidate these writings as well as the history with which they are connected. If, as we hope, these works make their readers turn to their Bibles with fresh zest and clearer intelligence, they will be useful indeed. This book will be found very useful for general reading, but more especially as a means of preparation for Scripture examination. For this latter purpose we know no equal.

Under the title *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (10) the Clarendon Press is issuing texts, documents, and extracts, chiefly from MSS. in the Bodleian and other Oxford libraries, and thus doing a very useful work. Part III. of the Semitic Series is before us, consisting of a Commentary on Daniel by Jepheth Ibu Ali the Karaites, which is edited and translated by D. S. Margoliouth. The Preface contains an account of Abu Ali Jepheth, and there is also a list of MSS. of the Commentary on Daniel. The Commentary itself is well translated, and is an interesting work which many will like to read. Jepheth's account of the casting of the holy children into the fiery furnace, and of Daniel's accusers into the lions' den, is very quaint. The sixty-two weeks he makes to be the continuance of the second Temple till the coming of *Titus the Sinner*. The 2,300 evenings and mornings are 1,150 days; the 1,290 and 1,335 days are also in his view simple days, and not years; and he cites many commentators to show that their calculations were false. He holds the doctrine of the eternal duration of punishment, and finishes his work by a devout prayer to God to pardon any slips or errors therein. The Arabic

text is printed at the end of the volume, and there is a glossary following it. The whole volume is a fine specimen of printing, and it will, we trust, find a worthy place on many a learned man's bookshelves.

From the same Press comes also the first part of the *Gospel of St. Matthew* (11) according to the Vulgate Original. This is a monumental work in which the labours of Dr. J. Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury, and H. J. White, are set forth with elaborate care. It is eminently a work of scholars for scholars, and learned men must be hard to please if they are not satisfied with this splendid specimen of learned care and matchless typography.

The tenth volume of the *Expositor* (12) is adorned with a well-executed portrait of Dr. Marcus Dods, and there is an appreciative article upon this famous theologian, by Prof. H. Drummond. The volume is, as usual, excellently edited, and contains many notable essays by well-known divines. Prof. Cheyne continues his *Studies in Practical Exegesis*, which are learned and interesting, conceived in a reverent spirit, and full of striking ideas beautifully expressed. The Professor, however, though he often denies the usually received notion of the authorship of the Psalms he comments upon, does not always give the reasons for his opinions. We do not know why any theory should be simply assumed to be either right or wrong. Dr. Bruce's remarks on the Epistle to the Hebrews are very good. Principal Brown has two excellent articles on the Apocalypse; Dr. Chadwick discusses the character of Judas Iscariot and Wellhausen's History of Israel. Prof. Milligan has two suggestive sections on the Ministerial Priesthood and the Apostle John; and the Rev. T. G. Selby supplies an article on Heredity. There are also essays by Prof. Beet, Dr. Elmslie, Dr. Godet, Dr. Jessop, Dr. King, Prof. Plummer, and others, which make up a volume of more than ordinary interest.

He Whom God Remembers (13) is a volume of addresses on the Book of Zechariah. They must have been deeply interesting to those who heard them delivered, and they are published in the hope that they will be profitable to a wider public. In this reasonable hope we can join, for Mr. Whitfield has commented on the various sections of these prophecies with a good deal of acumen, and in a deeply devotional spirit. The addresses are of varying lengths, and touch on a variety of topics which are uppermost in our own times, e.g., gambling, unbelief, Buddhism, immorality, senseless luxury, &c.

They are not so much learned as practical, and the volume may be commended to any who desire a book for profitable reading and quiet meditation.

The Baptized on Behalf of the Dead (14) is an attempt to elucidate an obscure and disputed passage of Scripture, and we can thoroughly appreciate Mr. Macfie's intention, though we could wish that his pamphlet itself were rather more lucid. It very rightly insists upon the Scriptural importance of baptism, and touches on several points well worth more detailed thought. Mr. Macfie, if we understand him aright, holds the opinion that the dead are simply the disciples whom death had overtaken, and to be baptized for the dead is to take the vows which they maintained in their life time. The Church goes on though the members pass away from their earthly career. This opinion is maintained as against that of Dr. Marcus Dods, De Wette, Meyer, Stanley, Alford, Henrici, Beet, and others who explain the passage as implying a vicarious baptism on behalf of those who would have been baptized had they lived. There is a good deal in the pamphlet worth consideration, but it would be all the better for revision.

- (1) *St. John's Gospel, with Introduction and Notes.* By Rev. George Reith, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Two parts. Price 2s. each part.
- (2) *The Prophecies of Jeremiah.* Expounded by Dr. C. Von Orelli; translated by Rev. J. S. Banks. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1889. Price 10s. 6d.
- (3) *The Seven Churches of Asia, or the Seven Golden Candlesticks.* By the Author of *The Spanish Brothers.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Price 1s.
- (4) *A Teacher's Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew.* By Richard Glover; Minister of Tyndale Chapel, Bristol. London: Sunday School Union. 1889.
- (5) *Judges and Ruth.* By the Rev. Robert A. Watson, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889. Price 7s. 6d.
- (6) *The Biblical Illustrator.* St. Luke, vol. ii., iii. By the Rev. J. Exell, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 7s. 6d. per vol.
- (7) *The Servant of the Lord.* By John Forbes, D.D., LL.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1890. Price 5s.
- (8) *Joshua: His Life and Times.* By William J. Deane, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. Price 2s. 6d.
- (9) *The Lives and Times of the Kings of Israel and Judah.* By George Rawlinson, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. Price 2s. 6d.
- (10) *Anecdota Oxoniensia.* Semitic Series, Vol. i., Part iii. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel. By Jephthah Abu Ali the Karaite. Edited and translated by D. S. Margoliouth, M.A. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1889. Price 21s.
- (11) *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Latine Fasciculus Primus, Evangelium Secundum Mattheum.* Oxonii: e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1889. Price 12s. 6d.
- (12) *The Expositor.* Third Series. Vol. X. Edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889. Price 7s. 6d.
- (13) *He Whom God Remembers.* Addresses on the Book of the Prophet Zechariah. By Rev. F. Whitfield, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1890. Price 5s.
- (14) *The Baptized on Behalf of the Dead—Who?* By R. A. Macfie, F.R.S.E. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1890. Price 6d.

Dogmatics. *The Kingdom of God* (1) is a volume containing the result of Dr. Bruce's studies with respect to Christ's teaching in the Synoptical Gospels. The Author is thoroughly imbued with the latest German opinion concerning the matter, and his work is learned and thoughtful and interesting. In many ways it is a striking treatise, and yet it leaves a sense of vacancy and incompleteness when one has read it. It purports to be an exposition of the modern Christward tendency of theology, and yet it only hints at our Lord's Divinity. His manhood is strongly set forth, but his Godhead goes away into the almost invisible distance; His miracles are but slightly treated; and while His parables are enlarged upon, His discourses and sayings are but sparingly mentioned. Dr. Bruce tells us that the "task of an apologist is desperate if he is supposed to be the advocate of the *status quo* in theology." So he leaves that, and explains his ideas of the need and the formation of a new creed and a fresh catechism; and yet in his opinion the *new primer* must not be the work of any Church, Assembly, or Committee. The work must be done "in the first place by some individual Christian man, who has seen with open face the beauty of Jesus, and on whose heart it lies as a burden to show to others what he has himself seen, and to whom has been given the rare power to present spiritual truth in the poetic, naïve, simple, yet not shallow way that wins children. And this man will not come from among those who make a saviour of Church, or creed, or sacrament. Completely emancipated from ecclesiasticism and dogmatism and sacramentarianism, he will have but one absorbing care and passion—to make the young know and love Jesus Christ." One can well believe that St. John's Gospel was written with the immediate purpose of setting forth that which the Synoptical Gospels did not make absolutely clear, and if Dr. Bruce and others would read that Gospel with the Synoptics, and let its spirit influence their ideas, such work as *The Kingdom of God* would be far more complete and infinitely more valuable; and no one can possibly hope to perform the task that Dr. Bruce desires to see accomplished, who is not himself imbued with the spirit of the Apostle of love.

The Way (2) is a treatise in which the author sets forth his ideas on the nature and means of revelation. In the preface Mr. Weir tells us that "many things contribute to the belief that a new era of enlightenment concerning Revelation is dawning in the human consciousness. . . . Already the judgment of man is discriminating

between Scripture and Revelation, or between the Bible and the Word of God. Reason and faith are becoming more closely coordinated; nature and the supernatural more accurately discriminated; truth more generally revered for its own sake as the means whereby belief becomes knowledge. When faith is merged in sight, men no longer argue questions of belief; they state positively, yet simply, the ground of their convictions; affirming the truth, not as an abstract speculation, but as a practical experience. *The Way* is an allegorical treatment of the Bible which leaves much to be desired; when anybody gets up above the region of fact into the domain of fancy he may go great lengths in various directions, and while the wax of his wings will hold, he may think he is safe; but we imagine that a fall will come about sooner or later. While we are ready to give Mr. Weir credit for the best intentions in his endeavour, we cannot praise the outcome of it. The result will probably be to undo the faith of some, and to build up that of none; and this we say, while we are ready to admit that the book contains a good deal of what is thoughtful and admirable.

The Gospel of Divine Humanity (3) is described as a reconsideration of Christian doctrine in the light of a central principle, that principle being the "idea of Humanity in its unitary aspect as the Body of God." The task of bringing the doctrines of Christianity into harmony with modern ways of thinking may be a laudable one, but it is evidently a very difficult thing to do with anything like success. We cannot say that the author of this book is triumphant in his endeavour. He is evidently an original thinker, and he is a forcible writer, though his style is short and sharp, not to say jerky. Much of what he has to say is worth reading, but it does not leave behind it any abiding satisfaction. The fundamental doctrines of the Gospel are in many cases watered down so as to be barely recognizable; and we fail to see how any one's faith is likely to be sustained by this treatise, much less can we understand how the doubts of others may be dissolved, and the unbelievers brought to a confession of the faith. The author truly says that "the one thing needful to deprive intellectual scepticism and unbelief of their necessity, and thus of their existence, is the presentation of Christianity in its integrity as an evangel for every man in every possible condition of life and progress—a system of truth perfect in reasonableness and worthy of all acceptance as a spiritual and moral power for the

regeneration of the individual, of society, and of the world ;" but we believe this is best to be done by setting forth the whole Gospel plainly, purely, and simply and scripturally, and not by fixing on some arbitrary idea, however central we may suppose it to be, and making everything subsidiary to it. The author's exposition of Faith and of Prayer, and his illustration of the Atonement, are certainly new ; and so are the words *nowhen*, *creedal*, and *finited*, which we see now for the first time so far as we can remember.

Vox Dei (4) is the title of a work in which Mr. Redford traces the Doctrine of the Spirit as it is set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. He very properly says that the great demand of the present time is for *materials* wherewith to build up solid structures of faith. "There must be Truths which hold up all the spiritual edifice of thought and life ;" and the doctrine of the Spirit is one of these fundamental dogmas. Its importance no reasonable person can doubt, and we cannot but rejoice that it is being brought into something like the prominence it ought to have. As Mr. Redford truly says, "truths which are ignored soon come to be doubted. Practical religion grows feeble when it is supported upon nothing but sentiments or external activities ;" and therefore "if Christianity is, in the future, to be victorious in the world and beautiful in the peacefulness and order of the inner life, we must not be afraid to speak to one another the wisdom of God." No one can possibly peruse this volume without having their ideas of the doctrine of the Spirit quickened and broadened. The author takes the whole canon of Scripture and shows how the doctrine grew from age to age ; and he also points out how, even in the centuries which elapsed between the last prophet of the Old Testament and the beginning of the New Testament, the doctrine was held and taught, though not so clearly. We can commend this work because the author draws his conclusions from Scripture rather than that he reads conclusions into Scripture ; its tone is reverent, and there are in the book many side-lights upon points of theological discussion and diversity.

In *Israel my Glory* (5) the founder and director of the Mildmay Mission to the Jews, gives his reasons for the interest he takes in the matter and some of his methods of working. From Scripture, Mr. Wilkinson draws the conclusion that the Jews will be brought back to Palestine which he enlarges to the extent of 300,000 square

miles ; and that they will be settled there again even before they are converted to Christianity. On the authority of Dr. A. Grant, he identifies the "lost ten tribes" with the Nestorians of Assyria, which is a tract of country lying N.E. of Nineveh ; S.E. of Lake Van ; W. of Lake Oroomiah. We need hardly add that Mr. Wilkinson is a Millenarian. The book is evidently the work of a very earnest and godly minded preacher and teacher of the Gospel ; we are glad to find so much success has been already attained in mission work among the Jews ; and cordially hope that such enthusiasm as Mr. Wilkinson shows may enlist many like minded men in the great task, and that their efforts may be abundantly blessed.

The Perfection of Man by Charity (6) is a treatise written mainly for religious persons—persons, that is, belonging to religious houses or convents—though "it is hoped at the same time, that the general principles and plan of the work may be acceptable to Ecclesiastics generally, and Pastors of souls more especially." It is not therefore intended as a book for general reading, though of course the practice of charity should be as important for the laity as for the clergy, for those in the world as well as those in "religion." It goes without saying almost that we cannot recommend it, even for Ecclesiastics. Notwithstanding, the author's ideas on obedience, chastity, and poverty are worth reading in these days when brotherhoods and vows, dispensable or otherwise, are in the air. The author, of course, strongly advocates the worship of the Virgin Mary. On page 359 is a curious diagram with a large heart in the centre, as the source of charity. We had rather see the Cross of Christ which is at once the pattern and the incentive of love to all true followers of Christ.

(1) *The Kingdom of God.* By A. Balmain Bruce, D.D. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 1889. Price 7s. 6d.

(2) *The Way.* By John F. Weir, M.A., N.A. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. Price 6s. 6d.

(3) *The Gospel of Divine Humanity.* 2nd Edition. London : Elliot Stock. 1889.

(4) *Vox Dei : The Doctrine of the Spirit.* By R. A. Redford, M.A., LL.B. London : J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 6s.

(5) *Israel my Glory.* Israel's Mission and Missions to Israel. By John Wilkinson. London : Mildmay Mission to the Jews Bible and Tract Dépôt. 1889. Price 7s. 6d.

(6) *The Perfection of Man by Charity.* By R. Buckler, O.P. London : Burns & Oates, Limited.

Miscellaneous. *The Hymn Lover* (1) is a very pleasant book upon a very charming subject. Everybody loves hymns more or less; and therefore we expect that a wide circle of readers will be glad to have Mr. Horder's account of the Rise and Growth of English Hymnody. The author says "he is not acquainted with a single book which even attempts to give a connected view of the whole subject, in such a way as to serve as an introduction to the study of Hymnody." Therefore this work fills a void. It contains twenty chapters, treating in succession of the hymns of other religions, of the Old and the New Testament, and of the early Church. Then follows an account of mediæval hymns, metrical psalms, and early English hymns; and so on down to the present day. There are chapters, too, about German hymns, and French hymns, and American hymns, and children's hymns. There is a discussion of hymn alterations, concluding with an account of what the author calls the New Era in Hymnody. He seems not to have a very high estimate of Lord Selborne's Book of Praise; but prefers Mr. Palgrave's collection. There is a bibliography of the subject, an index of names, and another of first lines. It is a tolerably complete account on the whole, and the author judges very fairly of the productions of the various hymn writers, no matter what their creed or nationality may be. He tells us that hymns are always weakened or spoiled by being made theological, they ought to be rather *religious* than dogmatic, and those are the finest productions which contain simply the essence of the matter clothed in appropriate words. The work displays a vast amount of research, and forms a valuable contribution to the elucidation of a subject in which so many people of all classes and conditions take a lively interest.

In *Great Thoughts* (2) we get many plums of wisdom and sweets of poetry, served up with a crust of fiction, and ornamented with many delicate pictures, and several inferior prints and portraits. The whole is a sort of mince-pie, which will doubtless be pleasant to many palates, though it will pall on the appetites of some, and serve to impair the digestion of more. If such works lead their readers to the fuller study of our great authors, it is well; if they do not do that, we think they will not serve any very good purpose.

From *The Key to Theosophy* (3), which, we suppose, is the latest authoritative statements of the principles of that sect, we learn that the Theosophical Society was formed at New York, November 17th, 1875. "It is a society of an absolutely unsectarian character, whose work should be amicably prosecuted by the learned of all races in a spirit of unselfish devotion to the research of truth, and with the

purpose of disseminating it impartially." It has for its objects, to form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour. To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literatures, religions, and sciences. And there is a third object—pursued by a portion only of the members of the Society—viz., the investigation of the unexplained laws of nature, and the psychical powers of man. The headquarters are at Adyar, a suburb of Madras. We understand that there used to be an entrance fee and a yearly subscription, but that these are now discontinued. The Society is supported by voluntary contributions, together with the interest accruing from past investments. *The Key to Theosophy* is in the form of question and answer, and from this catechism we find that theosophy is not a religion, that the motto of the Society is, "There is no religion higher than truth," and its design is to reconcile all religious sects and nations under a common system of ethics, based on eternal verities. It claims to be the old wisdom underlying all religions and all worships. But it seems mostly imbued with Buddhism. The Atonement is denied as a pernicious doctrine; the Inspiration of Holy Scriptures is explained away, and the Incarnation is said to be a sort of metempsychosis. Prayer is condemned as useless, if not wicked, and improvement is made entirely to depend upon meditation and good works. The Theosophists do not agree with spiritualists, but they advocate the notion of astral bodies and spiritual affinities. The "key" seems to say that Christianity, and, indeed, most other religions, are waning, and that therefore the grand future is for Theosophy, which will "gradually leaven and permeate the great mass of thinking and intelligent people with its large-minded and noble ideas of religion, duty, and philanthropy. Slowly but surely it will burst asunder the iron fetters of creeds and dogmas, of social and caste prejudices; it will break down racial and national antipathies and barriers, and will open the way to the practical realization of the brotherhood of all men." If the Theosophical Society survives and lives true to its mission, to its original impulses through the next hundred years, "tell me," says the author, "if I go too far in asserting that earth will be a heaven in the twenty-first century in comparison with what it is now!" Let us hope it may, but we are tolerably sure it will not be through Theosophy; which in all probability will, ere that, have vanished into vacuity.

(1) *The Hymn Lover*. By W. Garrett Horder. London: J. Curwen & Sons, Warwick Lane, E.C.

(2) *Great Thoughts from Master Minds*. 1889. London: A. W. Hall, 132, Fleet Street.

(3) *The Key to Theosophy*. By H. P. Blavatsky. London: The Theosophical Publishing Company, Limited. 1889. Price 21s.