THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

THE

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

AN EXPONENT OF CURRENT CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

AT HOME AND ABROAD

"EXORCISE THE EVIL GENIUS OF DULNESS FROM THEOLOGY."

"HOLD TO THE WRITTEN WORD."

Vol. III.

JANUARY TO JUNE

Toronto:
BAIN AND SON

1890

LONDON: HENDERSON & SPALDING, GENERAL PRINTERS,

3 & 5, MARYLEBONE LANE, OXFORD STREET, W.

INDEX TO AUTHORS.

NAME	PAGE
Bernard, Rev. H. N.	43, 180, 319
Bourn, H. H., Esq.	262
Cherrill, Rev. A. K.	1
Cholmondeley, Rev. F. G.	205
Churchill, Major Seton	118
Crofton, Rev. C. H.	198
Garratt, Rev. S.	412
Geymonat, Professor, D.D.	122
Gloag, Rev. Paton J., D.D.	10
Gregory, Rev. J. R.	145
Hadden, C. J., Esq.	272
Hayman, Rev. H., D.D.	156
Hellier, Rev. B. (The late)	73, 239
Irving, Rev. F. F.	400
Jerdan, Rev. C.	98
Lias, Rev. J. J.	86, 361
McCann, Rev. J., D.D.	23, 308, 375
Mockridge, Rev. C. H., D.D.	421
Neil, Rev. J.	289
Rankin, Rev. E. A., B.D.	339
Sharpe, Rev. J.	231
Shindler, Rev. R.	162
Thiselton, Rev. A. C.	35
Waller, Rev. C. H.	252
Whitelaw, Rev. T., D.D.	217
Whitley, Rev. D. Gath	387

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

	PAGE
Ancient Battle-field, The Story of an	217
Apostolic Succession, What is of Faith in regard to the	86
Archdeacon Farrar's "Lives of the Fathers"	126
Bible Studies—A Neglected Son	421
Book of Common Order, or Knox's Liturgy, The	272
Christ, The Humiliation of	10
,, The Resurrection of	262
Christian Giving, Counterfeit in Church Finance and	98
Christian Secularism. No. II.	198
Christianity, Early Relations between Judaism and	339
Church and the Age, The	375
Church Finance and Christian Giving, Counterfeit in	98
Colossians, St. Paul to the	156
Counterfeit in Church Finance and Christian Giving	98

		PAGE
Current Literature :—		
A. L. O. E.	The Hartley Brothers	287
Alexander, W., D.D.	The Epistle of St. John	65
Ambrose, Rev. R. J.	Growth of Grace	356
Barrett, E. R.	The Truth about Intoxicating Drinks	358
Beet, J. A.	The Credentials of the Gospel	355
Bindley, J. H.	The Apology of Tertullian	355
Brown, R.	Demonology and Witchcraft	69
Carnelly, W.	Questions of the Bible	64
Chambers, T. W.	Moses and his Recent Critics	429
Clarke, T., M.D.	A Gauntlet to the Theologian and Scientist	284
„ „	The Fate of the Dead	284
Clifford, E.	Father Damien	430
Cook, J.	God in the Bible	143
Copinger, W. A.	A Treatise on Predestination, Election, and Grace	141
Davis, J.	An Arrow Shot at Blasphemy	71
Delitzsch, Franz, D.D.	A New Commentary on Genesis	63
Exell, Rev. J. S.	The Biblical Illustrator	67
Glover, Rev. R.	Self-Discipline	287
Gore, C.	Roman Catholic Claims	69
Howatt, Rev. J. R.	Agnostic Fallacies	214
Inglis, C.	Pegs for Preachers	431
Irving, H. & F. Marshall	The Henry Irving Shakespeare	360
Kerr, Norman, M.D.	Inebriety	357
Kinns, Rev. S.	Moses and Geology	144
Laing, S.	Problems of the Future	284
Leebody, J. R.	Religious Teaching and Modern Thought	69
Legh, Rev. E.	Platform and Pulpit Addresses on Temperance Topics	357
Luhardt, Dr. C. E.	History of Christian Ethics	432
Macleane, D.	The Coat without Seam Torn	215
Macnaughton, Rev. S.	Our Children for Christ	71
Maldonatus, J.	A Commentary on the Holy Gospels	62
Martin, H., D.D.	The Prophet Jonah	65
Mather, E. J.	Nor'ard of the Dogger	71
Mathews, Rev. W. A.	The Witness of the World to Christ	216
Meyer, F. B.	The Shepherd Psalm	70
Milligan, W., D.D.	The Book of Revelation	65
Mossman, T. W.	The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide	62
Neil, Rev. C.	The Cross and Crown Cards	288
Nemo	Pen and Pencil Sketches	287
Orelli, Dr. C. Von	The Prophecies of Isaiah	61
Parker, J., D.D.	The People's Bible. The Book of Job	67

PAGE

Current Literature *(continued)* :—

Piconio, Bernard á .....An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul 63
Rawlinson, G. .....Phœnicia 72
Raymond, Grace .....How they kept the Faith 70
Salmond, Prof., D.D. .....An Exposition of the Shorter Catechism 431
Simcox, Rev. W. H. (the late) .....The Language of the New Testament 355
Simon, D. W. .....The Redemption of Man 141
Stark, J.. .....Life's Stages 430
Tod, J. .....Protestant Episcopacy 213
Vere, Aubrey de .....Essays, chiefly Literary and Classical 429
Vincent, M. R., D.D. .....Word Studies in the New Testament 64
Williams, T. .....Political Wit and Wisdom in Our Own Time 70
Walker, Rev. N. L. .....The Church Standing of Children 431
Wenley, R. M. .....Socrates and Christ 214

How to Study the Bible 356
Paul of Tarsus 213
Pictorial Sketches from Bible Lands 431
Present Day Tracts 71
Pulpit Commentary—Peter, John, Jude 68
Reminiscences of a Literary and Clerical Life 429
Sermon Bible—Isaiah to Malachi 67
Temperance Mirror, The 358

Anglican Church Magazine, The 359
Bibliotheca Sacra 359
British Weekly Pulpit, The 67, 357
Expositor, The 66
Foreign Church Chronicle and Review 359
Homiletic Review, The 359
Preachers' Magazine, The 359

Definitions Wanted—Moral 308
,, ,, —Theological 23
Development of Natural Beauty, The 387
Discernments of Spirits 118
Early Relations between Judaism and Christianity 339
Elliott's System, The Rendering Symmetrical of 412
Evangelical Symbols, The 400
Humiliation of Christ, The 10
John, St. *See* Three Character Studies 319

PAGE
Judaism and Christianity, Early Relations between 339
"Lives of the Fathers," Archdeacon Farrar's 126
Medicine, Theology and 35
Names of Christ, The Pauline Usage of the. (An essay in Biblical Criticism)
Chap. I.—Its Uniform Principles 73
Chap. II.—Its Bearing on the Criticism of Documents 239
Natural Beauty, The Development of 387
,, Religion 145
Neglected Son, A 421
Our Lord's Temptation viewed in Relation to John vi. 205
Pauline Usage of the Names of Christ 73, 239
Paul, St. *See* Three Character Studies 43
Pentateuch, Wellhausen on the 361
Peter, St. *See* Three Character Studies 180
"Pits" of the Vale of Siddim. *See* The Site of the Cities of the Plain, &c... 289
Prophecy, Unfulfilled 252
Religion, Natural 145
Religious Thought in Italy 122
Rendering Symmetrical of Elliott's System, The 412
Resurrection of Christ, The 262
Secularism, Christian 189
Site of the Cities of the Plain, and the "Pits" of the Vale of Siddim, The... 289
Spirits, Discernment of 118
Story of an Ancient Battle-field, The 217
Symbols, The Evangelical 400
Theological Definitions Wanted 23
Theology and Medicine 35
Thomas of Celano's Great Hymn 162
Three Character Studies—St. John 319
,, ,, ,, St. Paul 43
,, ,, ,, St. Peter 180
Unfulfilled Prophecy 252
Wellhausen on the Pentateuch 361
What is of Faith in regard to the Apostolic Succession 86
What is Right 1
Why we Suffer 231

JANUARY 1890.

23

The Theological Monthly

WHAT IS RIGHT.

A LONG list of maxims might be given each of which in turn has been announced as the fundamental principle of morality, as for example, "Strive after a state free from pain," "Consider the welfare of the whole as thy own welfare," "Act according to the law of the country," "Follow the dictates of the moral sense," "Strive after perfection," "Strive after the favour and approbation of the Deity," and many more.

In the midst of this confusion modern speculation tends to seek greater certainty by an inductive method. In all times and countries some actions have been described as right, others as wrong; and we may commence our inquiry by a comparison of the actions called right, to discover what they have in common, and thus to form a scientific definition of a class. But if we succeed in this, another difficulty immediately arises. Right actions having been defined, not by their relation to the doer, but by some quality discovered in the acts themselves, we have to ask further, "Why ought I to do that which is thus defined to be right?" and this question is found quite as difficult to answer as the former. Many moralists nevertheless affirm this to be the proper order of ethical inquiry. It is said that the two questions, "What actions are right?" and "Why should A. B. do right actions?" are in reality entirely independent of each other; and the answers to the two arrived at by treating them thus independently are—(1) Those actions are right which promote the happiness of mankind; (2) The reason why A. B. should

perform such actions is that, on the whole, it appears to be the most prudent course, *i.e.*, the course which most promotes his own happiness. Whatever may be thought of the former of these answers, the latter must surely appear unsatisfactory even to those who feel logically bound to accept it. It is unsatisfactory in that it does not explain the idea of duty, but explains it away. It is an undoubted fact that the feeling of obligation and duty does exist in the minds of men, and that it is a very different feeling from that which prompts us in matters of doubt and difficulty to select the course which, on the whole, appears most prudent. But if this answer is a true one, if "I ought" merely means "it is prudent for me," then the distinction between duty and interest which seemed so solid can be nothing more than a subjective illusion.

But is the method by which these results are reached a true one? Is it a fact that the two questions, "What is right?" and "Why should I do right?" are really independent of each other? To answer this we must notice in the first place that there is a certain ambiguity in the use of the expressions involved. According to one school of moralists, "right" and "what we ought to do" mean the same thing, and on this view the question, "Why ought I to do what is right?" is exactly equivalent to the question "Why is it right?" and this may be regarded as independent of, and posterior to, the question "What is right?" But the independence of the two questions bears a different aspect on the utilitarian theory, which defines right actions as those which promote happiness. When we ask "Why should we do such actions," it is not self-evident to begin with that we ought to do them, and therefore the question is almost necessarily understood in the same sense as when we ask, "Why ought I to do any particular act"—to pay a sum of money, for example,—which tacitly includes the inquiry, "Ought I to pay it?" If no reason could be given why I ought, the natural conclusion would be that I need not pay it. In this sense the question, "Why ought I to do what is right?" is so difficult to answer that some utilitarians abandon the attempt altogether,

and say with Bentham, "If the use of the word 'ought' be allowed at all, it *ought* to be banished from the vocabulary of morals;" while others are able to give no better answer than the one already referred to, which identifies duty with prudence.

Let us see, then, whether the attempt to frame by induction the definition of right actions yields a more satisfactory result. Certain actions are (in our own time and country) admitted to be right, and we propose to examine them to see in what respect they agree, and so to define the class. Bu we are met by the initial difficulty that in other times and countries the list of actions considered right has been differently composed, and has contained some of those acts which we unhesitatingly class as wrong. How are we to meet this? The most elementary acquaintance with logic will assure us that if even a single action can be both right and wrong, then there is no common difference which distinguishes the class of right actions from the class of wrong actions. Still, we need not make too much of this difficulty. We need not conclude, as some have done, that because of this want of agreement in all times and places as to what actions are right, therefore it is impossible to find a definition of right actions by induction; for we must remember that the difficulty here met with is by no means peculiar to ethics, it meets us at the threshold of every science of classification.

If the zoologist desiring to define the class "fishes" begins by comparing a number of animals called by that name, he soon finds that no satisfactory definition can be framed to include them all. But he does not therefore say that it is impossible to define fishes inductively. He finds that a large number of the so-called fishes agree in important particulars; while others—the various kinds of shellfish to wit—differ from them entirely. Hence he defines his class according to the character of those which really resemble each other, and maintains, in defiance of popular nomenclature, that the so-called shellfish are not fish at all. Exactly the same course is open to the moralist. He finds a number of actions described as right, but to frame a true and scientific definition of right actions, it is not necessary that it should include

every one of the actions which is or ever has been so called. It will suffice if among a large number of the actions so named important common characters can be traced. Right actions being defined according to these characters, the moralist may declare that other actions which have been named right, but which do not conform to the definition, have been wrongly named. And there will be nothing to object to in this from a scientific point of view, even if the proportion of actions excluded to those admitted should be as great as that of the crustaceans and shell-bearing molluscs to the true fishes.

But how is this discrimination to be made? The inductive moralist must proceed, as the naturalist would do in like case, by a tentative process. He finds that actions called right all agree in being according to rule, while so-called wrong actions are infringements of rule. But this alone does not suffice for a definition, since it is evident that the same action may be according to one rule and contrary to another. Hence arises the necessity for a critical examination and comparison of the rules themselves. Now rules are expressed in various forms, but for purposes of comparison it is convenient to reduce them all to the same form; and every rule is capable of being expressed in a form commencing with the assertion "you ought." It may be that the Turcoman thinks it right to steal, and the Egyptian thinks it right to lie (as Mr. Herbert Spencer asserts[1]), while we think it right to be honest and speak the truth. And it may be also, as the same writer argues, that the moralist contrasting these conflicting opinions and seeking to give a reason why he accepts the latter and rejects the former, is driven to admit that his reason ultimately resolves itself into a recognition of the misery produced by stealing and lying, and the benefit resulting from honesty and truthfulness. But whatever his ultimate reason for asserting that honesty and truth-telling are properly classed, and stealing and lying improperly classed among right actions, he cannot do so without at the same time implicitly asserting

[1] *The Data of Ethics*, p. 39.

that a man ought to be honest and speak the truth, and denying that he ought to steal and lie.

Thus it appears, first, that in popular estimation to call an action right is equivalent to saying that it ought to be done; and, secondly, that if we try to frame a scientific definition of right actions, and for that purpose to amend the rough list of right actions furnished by common opinion, we cannot retain any act in the list without assenting to the proposition that it ought to be done, or remove any from the list without denying this proposition.

It appears then, that "actions which we ought to do," if not the whole, must at least be a part of the definition of right actions; and with this Mr. Herbert Spencer, whose views differ very materially from ordinary utilitarianism, would seem to be in substantial agreement when he argues[1] that the true moral reason why acts that promote happiness should be done is derived not from their extrinsic, but from their intrinsic effects; that is, from the fact that they do promote happiness.

If, then, right acts are acts that we ought to do, the next step in the inquiry will be to ask what is meant by the assertion "I ought." And first we may notice that it is used in many cases where no moral judgment is involved, but always with reference to some end expressed or implied. Thus, in speaking of a game, "You ought to check with the queen," *i.e.*, in order to win the game; and in speaking of a business, "The accounts ought to be more carefully kept," *i.e.*, in order to conduct the business more successfully. And even in speaking of immoral acts, we may say, "The thief ought to have been more quiet," *i.e.*, to avoid detection.

Thus, in reference to any particular end admitted to be desirable, an action which tends to further that end is right, or what we ought to do; but in order to define some class of action as not merely relatively, but absolutely or universally right, we require to assign some end which is absolutely and universally desirable. The utilitarian finds this end in the happiness of all, and asserts that every other proposed

[1] *The Data of Ethics*, p. 120.

standard of conduct derives its authority from this one. But if we accept the analysis on which this conclusion is founded, we still cannot regard it as final, for we have yet to consider what happiness is, and how it can be increased. One man may find happiness in that which is misery to another; and in this respect men are easily capable of change, both individually and in groups. A Roman citizen was made happy by seeing men mangled by wild beasts in the arena. There are few among us who would not be rendered unhappy by such a sight. A child may find happiness in boisterous play and neglect of work; the conditions may very probably be reversed when he grows older.

Thus, happiness may be increased in various ways: by changing outward circumstances into conformity with the desires, or by changing the desires into conformity with circumstances, or again by changing both desires and circumstances. Which of these ways of producing happiness is the right way? Utilitarians tell us that we must take into account the remote as well as the immediate effects of an action; and some of them tell us also that we must discriminate between different kinds of pleasure or happiness, and esteem some higher and more to be desired than others. But this is not sufficient for the solution of the difficulty suggested above. We have not merely to consider future happiness and the higher kinds of happiness as ends to be sought, but we have to consider that things which at present are not pleasures at all, but are rather irksome or even painful, may become sources of happiness to ourselves and others when we have reached a higher plane of development. The problem ceases to be statical, and becomes dynamical. It cannot be solved by an exploration, however thorough, of human nature as it is; but only by forming an ideal conception of human nature as it ought to be.

This is the conclusion at which Mr. Herbert Spencer arrives as the ultimate result of his long and patient analysis. "The moral law," he says, "is the law of the perfect man."[1] And the final outcome of his system he calls "a rationalized version of the ethical principles" of the Gospel.[2]

[1] *Data of Ethics*, p. 271. [2] *Ibid*, p. 257.

That an investigation conducted with such skill and patience, starting from the most advanced tenets of modern science, and leaving the teachings of religion altogether on one side, should arrive practically at the same solution of the moral problem that Christianity affords, cannot but be a source of satisfaction to the Christian. We have always maintained that religion and science are not really opposed when the true meaning of each is seen, and we could hardly have a stronger proof of this than that here afforded. Why, on the other hand (unless from prejudice), should Mr. Herbert Spencer try so hard to minimize the resemblance between his own conclusions and those of Christianity?

After pointing out that his conception of an ideal standard in morals is latent in the beliefs of the Greek ethical writers, he continues with the strange suggestion that "in modern times, influenced by theological dogmas concerning the Fall and human sinfulness, and by a theory of obligation derived from the current creed, moralists have less frequently referred to an ideal."[1] Whether as a matter of fact modern ethical writers refer less frequently to an ideal is a point we will not now discuss, but certainly Christianity cannot be rendered responsible for the neglect of this doctrine. How can any one believe in the Fall or in human sinfulness without recognizing an ideal? "The very conception of disordered action implies a preconception of well-ordered action;[2] and the very conception of sinfulness implies the preconception of a sinless state.

Let us now review the conclusions at which we have arrived. We find that the popular voice in all times and places declares certain actions to be right, or such as ought to be done. We desire, then, to discover in what these actions agree, and then to frame a scientific definition of right actions. We find on first inquiry that the only point on which they all agree is that they are according to some rule. But we cannot accept the definition that right actions are actions according to rule, because we see that rules may contradict each other, and thus the same act may be (and sometimes is) called right

[1] *Ibid*, p. 278. [2] *Ibid*, p. 277.

according to one rule and wrong according to another. We find, however, that by far the greater number of actions called right promote happiness, or at least were supposed to do so when they were named right, and we conclude that actions which do not possess this character have been incorrectly named right. With regard to the rest we ask, "How do they promote happiness?—by gratifying present desires, or by changing present desires for better ones?" Or to put it another way, "Whose happiness do right actions tend to increase, the happiness of a man of low, sensual type, or of the fully-developed man?" And we come to the conclusion that those acts only can be called completely right which are natural to, and therefore promote the happiness of, the highest type of man, or the ideal man. While relatively, for man in a lower state, the test of rightness is not so much the promotion of present happiness as the tendency to raise the man and his happiness to a higher and ultimately to the perfect state. Thus we arrive at the definition—Right actions are the actions of a righteous man, and relatively right actions in a man who is not altogether righteous are those which tend to raise him to this ideal state. Perhaps some will object to this definition as not practically useful. It may be said, "If I want to know what I ought to do in any particular case, how will this definition help me to distinguish a right action from a wrong one?" The same objection was made by Dr. Whewell to the ordinary utilitarian definition of virtue. He argued that when a question arises, "Shall I do this or that?" we cannot possibly postpone our decision until we have traced out all the consequences of either act; and therefore a definition which makes the goodness of an action depend on its utility is useless in practice. But there is a complete answer to these objections: they arise from a quite unfounded expectation. Scientific definitions are of the utmost value for scientific understanding of the matter in hand, but they are not, and were never intended to be, useful for the practical recognition of the things defined in daily life. The definition of a reptile as "a vertebrate animal whose respiration from birth is aërial and incomplete" is perhaps the best that can be given

for scientific purposes, but it certainly could not be applied by any one at a moment's notice to distinguish a frog from a lizard. We practically distinguish objects in daily life, not by their scientific definitions, but by their secondary and derived characters. Yet we do not on this account say that definitions are useless.

There is another difficulty connected with the practical application of the proposed definition which is pointed out (and no more) by Mr. Spencer. He says the inquiry, what would be the action of the ideal man under present circumstances, is futile, for the co-existence of a perfect man and an imperfect society is impossible. If a man were absolutely just, perfectly sympathetic, entirely truthful, his mode of action must be so alien from the prevailing mode of action as to eventuate in death. The only difference discernible here between Mr. Herbert Spencer and the Christian is that whereas the philosopher says hypothetically that these things would be so, the Christian says as a matter of fact that they have been so. He asserts that an ideally perfect Man has actually appeared in an imperfect society, and was actually put to death by those who were incapable of appreciating the beauty of His character.

It does not appear, therefore, that there is much practical gain in the latest development of modern ethics, apart from religion. The theoretical conclusion as to the basis of morality is the same as that reached by the Christian, and the ideal is practically the same, but the advantages in respect of the means of realizing this ideal remain with those who can point to an actual example.

This reference to an ideal also gives an answer to the question, "Why ought I to do right?" by explaining the meaning of the word ought. That word has no application to natures regarded as invariable. The naturalist describes what an animal is; he does not say what it ought to be. But as soon as an ideal is formed, even of a plant or an animal, as by the cultivator or breeder, we say that the individual ought to conform to it. In like manner the conduct of a man ought to conform to the standard of the ideally perfect man.

A. K. CHERRILL.

HUMILIATION OF CHRIST.

PHILIPPIANS ii. 6-8.

Authorised Version.—Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

Revised Version.—Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient *even* unto death, yea, the death of the cross.

THE passage selected in this article for exposition has frequently occupied the attention of exegetes and commentators. The literature connected with it is very extensive, whether found in commentaries on the Epistle to the Philippians, in treatises on Paulinism, especially on the christology of Paul, in special monographs, or in articles in theological magazines. Nor is the reason for this extensive literature on the subject difficult to discover, as the passage is both important and difficult of interpretation. The christology, which is embodied in it, is of great importance. The views which it gives of the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, His pre-existent glory, His relation to the Godhead, His humiliation, His assumption of human nature, and, following upon that, His exaltation, are connected with the deepest mysteries of our faith, and the profoundest disclosures of Divine revelation. Nor is the passage one of great importance merely; it is also one of difficult apprehension, as indeed is very evident from the various interpretations which have been given to it by scholars of the highest repute. We have only to read the passage as given in the Authorised and in the Revised Versions to see the difference of meaning which is given to it. Not only is it one of those things in St. Paul's

Epistles which are hard to be understood; not only does it disclose mysteries beyond the sphere of human reason; but the exegesis of the passage is difficult. There are in it certain phrases and words, the exact meaning and the full force of which it is no easy task to assign.

In order to arrive at a correct understanding of these words of St. Paul, we must consider them in their connection. In the passage from which they are taken St. Paul is engaged in exhorting his Philippian converts to humility and condescension: "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." They were to cultivate meekness; to avoid all pride and exaltation and vainglory, and to take a lively interest in the welfare of others. And as an inducement to cultivate this spirit, and as an example for their imitation, he adduces the instance of the humility and condescension of their Lord and Master Jesus Christ: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." The drift of the Apostle's argument is plainly this: Imitate the example of Jesus Christ. Be of the same mind with Him. Be humble as He was humble. Although infinitely exalted as God, and dwelling in inexpressible glory, yet He abased Himself; He did not cling to the glories of His divinity, He divested Himself of them, He assumed human nature, He appeared on this earth as a man, and not only so, but He carried His humility and condescension to such an extent that He became obedient unto death, and that death the most shameful and painful of all deaths, even the death of the cross.

Every word in this passage requires careful attention. The Person spoken of is Jesus Christ. Ὅς who, that is Christ Jesus, mentioned in the preceding verse. But the

question is disputed, whether Jesus Christ is here spoken of in His pre-existent state before He became man, or in His incarnate state after He took upon Himself human nature. Those who affirm that Christ is here alluded to after He became man assert that the name Christ Jesus can only belong to Him after His incarnation; that it is the exaltation of Jesus Christ as man that is spoken of; and that only as man can His condescension and humility be proposed as an example for our imitation. We cannot imitate Christ as God; it is only His human virtues that can be copied by us. But in answer to this objection, it is replied that Jesus Christ is the Person spoken of throughout, being the subject both of the humiliation and the exaltation; the same Person who was in the form of God took upon Himself the form of a servant. And as we are called to imitate God Himself, to be holy as He is holy, and to be followers of God as dear children, so we may be called to imitate Christ in His Divine nature, and especially in that wonderful condescension which He displayed when He took upon Himself our nature. The passage describes Jesus Christ both in His pre-human and in His incarnate condition: it first states His pre-human condition as God, and then His assumption of human nature. Condescension necessarily implies a previous elevation from which the person who condescended stooped, and it is this condition of previous elevation that is first asserted: Christ was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, before He took upon Himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. The elevation must come first, and the voluntary condescension must come afterwards. The two first clauses of the passage then refer to the pre-existent Christ; and those which follow to the incarnate Christ. A precisely similar statement is made by the Apostle in his second Epistle to the Corinthians: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich."

The word ὑπάρχων rendered both in the Authorised and in the Revised Version *being*, with a note attached to the

Revised Version that the full meaning of the Greek is "being originally," is not the simple verb of existence, but a stronger term; it denotes subsistence, and hence might be more appropriately rendered, "who subsisting;" the idea of essential existence is implied in the term.

The phrase *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ* is correctly rendered *in the form of God*. The word "form" denotes shape, appearance, or outward manifestation. As applied to God the word is used somewhat anthropologically. It denotes the Divine glory or majesty. The nature of God is implied, but the phrase is not synonymous with that, because Christ could not lay aside His Divine nature, whereas He might veil the glory of His Godhead, and thus surrender for a season "the form of God." The phrase is to be contrasted with "the form of a servant;" now as Christ in the form of a servant was really man, so in the form of God He was really God. Expressions somewhat similar occur elsewhere in Scripture, and which illustrate what is meant by "the form of God." Thus in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is said of the Son that "He was the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His Person." And in the Epistle to the Colossians, St. Paul says that Christ is "the image of the invisible God," an expression almost identical with "the form of God." Compare also the passage in St. John's Gospel where the Lord says of His Father, "Ye have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape;" and in His sacerdotal prayer He says, "Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine ownself, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." By "the form of God," then, is meant that eternal glory which Christ possessed before He came into this world—the manifestation of God as seen in the works of creation and providence; for by Christ God created the world, and by Him all things consist.

The sentence which follows, rendered in our Version, "thought it not robbery to be equal with God," constitutes the great difficulty of the passage. We shall best approach it by considering first the phrase *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, to be equal with God;* or, as it is now correctly rendered in the Revised Version, "to be on an equality with God." This phrase is not

identical with "the form of God;" *that* is the glory or outward manifestation of God, which may be laid aside or concealed; but *this* is sameness with God—the possession of the Divine attributes—equality in nature and essence; it is, in short, a direct and plain assertion of Divinity which cannot be toned down or explained away. Christ counted not equality with God as a robbery of God, or a usurpation of the Divine nature. The words cannot denote that equality with God was something which Christ did not previously possess, but evidently that it was something which He did possess, and which to affirm the possession of was neither robbery of God nor a usurpation of the Divine attributes. And indeed this equality with God is already involved in the phrase "the form of God;" for He who is "the image of the invisible God" must Himself be possessed of the attributes of the Godhead.

But the great difficulty of the passage is to give the proper translation to the words ἁρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο. Different interpretations have been given. Our Authorised Version renders them, "thought it not robbery to be equal with God;" whilst the Revised Version translates them, "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God;" and in the margin there is the alternative translation, "counted it not a thing to be grasped." The following are the interpretations of some of the most eminent scholars:—"Deemed not His equality with God a matter of grasping" (Alford). "Not as a robbery did He consider the being equal with God; that is, as seizing what did not belong to Him" (Meyer). "He did not deem His being on equality with God a thing to be seized on or to grasp at" (Ellicott). "He did not treat His equality with God as a prize, a treasure to be greedily clutched and ostentatiously displayed; on the contrary, He resigned the glories of heaven" (Lightfoot). "He did not count it as a robbery, the object of an attempted robbery, to be equal with God, that is, He would not seize upon it, did not think of claiming it" (Lechler). But whatever interpretation we adopt, the words imply that His equality with God was what Christ previously possessed before He humbled Himself. Any other meaning would deprive the

words of all force. For surely if Christ did not previously possess equality with God, His assertion of it would be no instance of humility and condescension; on the contrary, for a creature to assert equality with God would be an instance of monstrous and unparalleled presumption; whereas it was an instance of amazing condescension that Christ, who was originally in the form of God and equal to God, should make Himself of no reputation, and should take upon Himself the form of a servant.

These different interpretations arrange themselves under two meanings or senses, one of which is that of the Authorised and the other that of the Revised Version. One class of interpreters give the words the meaning contained in our Authorised Version, that Christ counted not equality with God as robbery, as the appropriation of something not His own. In this sense the meaning would be that, although Christ was so highly exalted as to be in the form of God, and to regard equality with God not as robbery, but as His own Divine right, yet He humbled Himself. This magnifies the condescension of Christ by exalting the previous dignity from which He descended; it emphasises what is included in "the form of God." But at the same time it does not so well agree with what follows, "He emptied Himself;" for such a self-abasement can apply only to the first clause, "the form of God," but not to the second, "equality with God." Accordingly another class of interpreters give the clause a meaning somewhat similar to that contained in the Revised Version, that Christ counted it not a prize—or, as in the margin, a thing to be grasped—to be on an equality with God. He did not esteem the assertion of His equality with God a matter to be insisted on or a dignity to be retained. He did not display his equality with God, but on the contrary, He emptied Himself. The difference between these two meanings of the phrase is thus clearly stated by Bishop Lightfoot: "In comparing these two interpretations, it will be seen that while the former makes *οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο* a continuation and expansion of the idea already contained in *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*, He existed in the form of God, and so did not think it usurpation

to be equal with God ; the latter treats the words as involving a contrast to His idea, 'He existed in the form of God, but nevertheless did not eagerly assert His equality with God.' In short, the two interpretations of the clause are directly opposed, as the one expresses our Lord's *assertion*, the other His *cession* of the rights pertaining to His Divine majesty."

The clause, taking the words by themselves, may admit of either translation ; but the latter meaning, that of the Revised Version, is the more appropriate, being more in conformity with the argument of the Apostle, and more in accordance with the context. Christ, although in the form of God, and thus possessed of Divine attributes, yet did not insist on His Divine prerogatives, and as God manifest His eternal glory ; but He veiled all these glories : He came not in the form of God, but in the form of a servant. When Satan tempted our Lord by showing Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them ; He, by taking them, by ruling over them, would have acted the part of esteeming His equality with God a matter to be insisted on ; but, by renouncing them, He humbled Himself, and relinquished this His eternal right and privilege ; He counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God.

The Apostle, having thus stated the previous elevation of Christ, now mentions the various steps in His humiliation ; from the pre-existent Christ he proceeds to describe the incarnate Christ. *Ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, but made Himself of no reputation*, or, as more properly rendered in the Revised Version, "emptied Himself," divested Himself of the form of God, and did not assert His equality with God. It was of the form or glory of God that He emptied Himself, not of the nature of God, or of equality with God, for to divest Himself of that was an impossibility. Although God, yet He appeared not as God ; in the parallel passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians already alluded to, "Although He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor." This is the general assertion of His humiliation ; next follows the positive particulars in which it consists —"took upon Himself the form of a servant," "was made in the likeness of men," "became obedient unto death."

He who was originally in the form of God assumed the

form of a servant ; *μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, taking the form of a servant.* His emptying Himself consisted in this. The word rendered servant is in the Greek "slave," a bondservant. Christ became a servant not to man, nor to His Church, but to God. In one sense, indeed, He was the servant of men, because He gave up His life for them ; but, in reality, even in doing so He was their Lord and Master. The form of a servant is here contrasted with the form of God ; this He resigned, that He assumed.

ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, being made in the likeness of men. The word "likeness" here denotes resemblance. The Apostle does not assert that Christ was made man, but that He was made in the likeness of men ; and the reason of this is because He was not simply man, not a mere man as we are, but God in human nature, the Divine nature was combined with the human : He was God-man. So also, it is to be observed, that the words are not in the likeness of man, but in the likeness of men ; He took upon Himself human nature generally : He was the second Adam, and as such the Representative of the human race, perhaps we might even use the expression the Typical Man. The incarnation of Christ is here asserted. The whole passage finds its counterpart in the words of St. John, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," answering to the clause, "Who being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God." "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," answering to the clause, "Being made in the likeness of men."

Καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, and being found in fashion as a man. As the form of man denotes the outward manifestation or appearance of a man, so "the fashion of a man," or "the habit of a man," as the word literally signifies, denotes the state or condition of a man. Jesus Christ, when in this world, appeared in the condition of a man ; He was possessed of human feelings and human infirmities ; He entered into the state and relations of a man ; He was recognized in the world as a man ; only a few of His most intimate disciples had glimpses of His Divine nature. Compare with

this the prediction of the prophet, "He shall grow up before Him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground; He hath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see Him there is no beauty that we should desire Him. He is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from Him: He was despised and we esteemed Him not."

Then follow the various steps of His humiliation in the form of a climax, proceeding from one stage of humiliation to a lower, ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν, *He humbled Himself.* His taking upon Himself human nature was an amazing instance of humiliation; but it did not stop there; it was only the entrance upon a course of ever-increasing humiliation which terminated with His life. γενόμενος ὑπήκοος, *becoming obedient.* Having assumed the form of a servant, as such He learned obedience. The obedience here referred to is not to His parents, nor to earthly rulers, but to God. He was God's servant. μέχρι θανάτου, *even to death.* This obedience embraced the whole period of His earthly existence, and reached even to death. θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, *yea the death of the cross.* The lowest depth of His humiliation; not only death, but death in its worse form—the death of the cross; that death which was not only one of intense suffering, but of the most shameful nature—a death which was reserved for slaves and for the most abandoned criminals—a death which was declared by the law of Moses to be cursed—a death which was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness. Yet Christ submitted to this death; He endured the cross with all its shame; He carried His humiliation to the lowest depths possible; He descended from the highest dignity to the meanest and most abject abasement.

Such is the exegesis of this important and difficult passage. It may thus be paraphrased: Imitate the humility of Christ Jesus; who, before He came into this world, subsisted in the form of God, in the glory of the Father; but He did not retain to Himself that glory, nor assert His equality with God; He veiled His Godhead; instead of the form of God, He assumed the form of a servant, He took upon Himself human nature,

He was made like unto man, He appeared in this world as man, possessed of human feelings and subject to human infirmities, and as such He humbled Himself and was obedient unto God, even unto death, and that the cruel and ignominious death of the cross.

The doctrine distinctly taught us in this passage is the great doctrine of the incarnation ; and by the incarnation we mean that God took upon Himself human nature, and manifested Himself in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ ; that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, God manifest in the flesh, and that He united in His own incomprehensible Person the natures of God and man. He who was found in the fashion of a man, and suffered the death of the cross, was originally in the form of God and equal with God. And certainly the simple statement of this doctrine must impress us with a sense of its extreme mysteriousness. That the God of heaven and of earth should so far humble Himself as to assume human nature ; that Jesus of Nazareth, who traversed our world, who was a prey to human weakness, and who at length expired on the cross of Calvary, was the Son of God, yea, God incarnate, is a statement which confounds human reason, a mystery which baffles all our faculties to comprehend.

It is also to be observed that here we are taught that the Lord Jesus Christ is not two Persons ; one Person as Son of God before He came into this world, and another Person as Son of Man when He assumed human nature. It was the same Person who was from eternity in heaven in the form of God, who in time appeared on earth in the form of a servant. As Liebner, quoted by Meyer, well puts it, though in somewhat scholastic language, "Considered from a purely exegetical point of view, there is no clearer or more certain result of the interpretation of Scripture than the proposition, that the *Ego* of Jesus on earth was identical with the *Ego* which was previously in glory with the Father ; any division of the Son speaking on earth into two *Egos*, one of whom was the incarnate Lord, the other the humanly humble Jesus, is rejected by clear testimonies of Scripture, however intimate

we may seek to conceive the marriage of the two during the earthly life of Jesus."

Stupendous as this mystery of the incarnation must ever be, the mere statement of which confounds human reason, it is here undoubtedly asserted by St. Paul. Nor is this the only passage wherein St. Paul asserts his belief in the Divine-human nature of Christ. Other statements equally direct are to be found throughout his Epistles. "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever." "In Him, that is Christ, dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh." Even although in the last passage the word "God" is not supported by sufficient authority, and the reading should be, as in the Revised Version, "Who was manifest in the flesh," yet this makes no material difference, as the reference is undoubtedly to Christ, and accordingly His manifestation in the flesh is reckoned as a mystery of godliness. But it is not merely from direct assertions, such as these, that it is manifest that St. Paul believed in the divinity of Christ; this is inseparably involved in his whole doctrine. We cannot read a single Epistle of his without seeing how reverently he bows the knee to Jesus. He owns Him as his Lord, dedicates himself to His service, declares his readiness to die for Him, addresses to Him his earnest prayers, speaks of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Christ, conjoins Him with God the Father in his acts of worship, in all his Epistles invokes His grace to rest upon his converts, looks upon future happiness as consisting in being with Him, asserts that He is the Creator of the universe, announces that He shall come again as the Judge of the world, and pronounces a terrible curse upon those who refuse to bestow upon Him their supreme affection. Christ, as much as God the Father, was the object of his devotion. Paul was not merely an ardent admirer and zealous disciple, but a devout worshipper of Christ. He taught and acted upon the conviction that in Christ Jesus dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Without the slightest doubt, then, and beyond all question,

St. Paul was a believer in the divinity of Jesus Christ. We may question the truth of his opinion, but we cannot question the fact that he held such an opinion. This is the clear, unmistakable meaning of the passage under consideration. The question presses itself upon us, Whence did Paul acquire this opinion? What suggested to him the marvellous idea that the Author of the Christian religion was no mere man, but God manifest in the flesh? What account can we give of this belief? Paul did not derive it from Judaism. From Judaism he derived his bitter hatred to Christianity; and even after his conversion and admission that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah of the Jews, yet there was nothing in the opinions of the Jews at that period that would lead him to regard the Messiah as a Divine Being; they rather viewed Him as a mighty conqueror or superior legislator; a second David or a second Moses, yet human. Nor did Paul derive this doctrine from the Christians He himself positively affirms that he did not derive his views from the early Apostles or from his fellow-religionists; and indeed we find that immediately after his conversion, and before he had the opportunity of being instructed in the mysteries of the faith, he preached this very doctrine in the synagogues of Damascus: "Straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that He is the Son of God." But even if he did acquire this doctrine from the Christians, yet this only removes the answer to our inquiry a step further back; for it may still be asked, What induced the early Christians to believe that their Master, who was so recently crucified on Calvary, was the Son of God? The only human account which can be given of the origin of this opinion of St. Paul is to affirm that he was a fanatic, and that, like many other converts, he passed from one extreme to another—from the extreme of Judaism to the extreme of Christianity, from regarding Christ as an impostor to regard Him as the Son of God. But whatever Paul was, he was no fanatic: intensely zealous and awfully in earnest indeed; but his zeal and earnestness were ever under subordination to an acute judgment, and he possessed a perfect mastery over

himself: his conduct, his speeches, his discipline over his converts, the whole tenor of his masterly Epistles, render the supposition of fanaticism on the part of Paul a baseless delusion.

Whence, then, had St. Paul these views? The only satisfactory answer that can be given is that which he himself gives, that he received them from Divine revelation; that God Himself communicated them to him: "I certify to you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after men. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." And if this be so, if this be the true solution, then we have a proof that the Divinity of Christ constitutes part of the revelation of God.

We feel that we are leaving exegesis and trespassing into the field of dogmatics; but the christology of the passage and the supreme importance of the subject are our excuses. If the doctrine of Christ's divinity constitutes a part of Divine revelation, then it is our duty not to dispute, or doubt, or cavil, but simply to believe. We must submit our understandings to the teachings of infinite Wisdom. No authority whatever could cause us to believe what is contrary to our reason, whereas information from a superior intelligence, specially if that intelligence be Divine, will convince us of the truth of what is above reason. Now the doctrine of the incarnation, though far above reason, entirely out of its sphere, can never be proved to be contrary to reason. It is, indeed, an amazing mystery, but yet a mystery which may be made known, and which God has been pleased to reveal. Nor is it so removed from human reason, but that traces of it may be discerned in the speculations of men, however we may account for them; incarnations of the Divinity frequently met with in the religious systems of the heathen—faint adumbrations of the glorious reality, and which seem to indicate that there is in human nature a felt necessity that God should humble Himself to our capacities, that He should empty Himself and take upon Himself the form of a servant, and be found in fashion as a man.

PATON J. GLOAG, D.D.

DEFINITIONS WANTED—THEOLOGICAL.

SOME reader of this heading may very naturally wonder how theological definitions can be wanted, when there is already a rich abundance of them with such varied meanings that every man with any views whatever on this subject can find a definition expressive of his own special convictions. It is, however, this very exuberance of words that produces poverty of thought, at least of exact thought, because it hinders profitable interchange of views. The word theology does not at present convey any specific meaning, unless it be accompanied by an elaborate explanation. The purpose of these papers is to render such explanations unnecessary, by trying to attach so definite a significance to each leading term that every one shall be self-interpreting, and be understood alike by all who use it, whether or not they agree with the underlying thought. The more these definitions are divested of polemical matter, the more useful will they become, as a larger number of thinkers will be able to use them as a common basis for investigation. A few terms may be selected to illustrate the necessity of some such discrimination in this department of thought, as has already been done in the domain of phiiosophy.

We commence with the term

THEOLOGY,

which has been defined of old as the "doctrine of God and Divine things." This is certainly comprehensive enough, as it includes God and the entire substantial universe. Plants and animals are "Divine things," that is, they are things produced by Divinity, and so in the sense of the definition are "Divine;" for the "and" separating God from things makes the definition comprehend both. We can scarcely, however, include botany and zoology under theology. The definition becomes so wide that it is worthless. Another definition is, "the science of religion." Which means that it is a

systematic account of what men have believed and felt about things sacred to them. This, however, makes theology a doctrine of man, and not of God; but a doctrine of man cannot be a *theology*; consequently that definition ought to be abandoned. Others again make theology co-extensive with the whole teaching of Scripture, regarding God, man, and the universe. This is the general present usage, and that which supplies the title for this magazine, and for an extensive literature. Undoubtedly some such general term is required to cover the whole field, and were "theology" always employed in this wide sense it might pass muster. But it is not always so employed, as it frequently means the doctrine of God alone, in His own self-existence. And it is in this fact that the confusion originates. The etymology of the word, which is clear enough, ought to limit it to the latter application; but, on the other hand, "theology" gives a most useful adjective, "theological," which sonorously adapts itself to a great variety of nouns. The only other word that approaches it as a synonym is "divinity;" but this is not nearly so workable. For example, "Divinity Monthly" would not sound at all pleasant, and "Divine Monthly" might appear presumptuous, while "Theological Monthly" is music. But as a set off against this, we have "doctors of divinity," "schools of divinity," "systems of divinity," etc. One thing is also perfectly certain, and that is, these latter titles cannot be altered, especially the "doctors of divinity." If, therefore, we are to obtain accuracy, "theology" must give way and be limited to the doctrine of God, as God; while "divinity" will be the name for the general body of Biblical doctrine. We shall then have "nature theology"—not "natural theology," which always suggests "unnatural" theology, of which there is more than enough, but we do not wish to be always reminded of the fact. Also "Biblical theology" and "comparative theology." Each of these is definite and distinct, and conveys a meaning that cannot be objected to or misapprehended. It is perfectly true that any doctrine of God requires much antecedent knowledge of, and belief in, that which is not God, such as ourselves and nature; but these are only the means by which

we attain the end, which is God. Brushes, colours, and canvas are necessary for the artist, but they are not therefore art.

It is evident there cannot be any adequate belief in God, except as there is knowledge of self; that is, of our own faculties, and powers of thought, and reasoning. In other words, a scientific theology must be the result of a scientific

PSYCHOLOGY.

We sometimes find "anthropology" named as one department of systematic divinity; but this is manifestly an error, because anthropology includes manners and customs of men, as well as their anatomy, physiology, etc., whereas "psychology" is the science of the mental faculties and energies, and it is with these that divinity is concerned. The necessity of a correct psychology is further evidenced by the fact that as Scripture exists for man, philosophy must precede theology, and doctrine be brought to the bar of consciousness. Whatever contradicts consciousness cannot be true: it is consequently of the utmost importance that we should be able to discriminate facts of consciousness from inferences based on those facts. If, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity were so stated as to contradict our consciousness that three and one are inherently different, this contradiction would prove that statement of the doctrine to be false, at least to our present consciousness; and beyond that of course we cannot go. But if we stated that God could not send a soul to hell, because that would violate our consciousness of His love; the statement would be mistaken, as we are not conscious of the love of God at all, but only of a belief in that love and in its modes of acting.

When it is said that the doctrine of God must be brought to the bar of consciousness, it is not for a moment meant that we are to sit as judges on the acts or words of God. Our position ought to be one of profoundest reverence before any revelation we believe to be from Him. But this is the very point we wish to ascertain, whether the revelation be indeed from Him, or only the imagination of man. Whatever theory

of inspiration we hold, it is undeniable that the words of Scripture were written by man ; they are, consequently, only the mediate revelation from God ; but if we have an immediate revelation it is bound to take precedence, because in this there cannot be any mistake. That immediate revelation is found in the facts of consciousness. What is therefore meant is only this, that what we believe to be the mediate revelation from God is brought to the bar of what we know to be His immediate revelation.

Passing on, we come in the order of thought face to face with

A GREAT WANT.

God exists and man exists ; they do not, however, exist independently of each other, but in very close relation—a voluntary relation on the part of God, a necessary one on the part of man. We want a term to express this suggestive fact, one that differentiates it from all other relations. Such words as " Creator " and " creature " are too extensive, as they include all creation ; what is wanted is a name for the general doctrine of the whole inter-relationship between God and man.

Soteriology, or the doctrine of salvation, is the nearest in use at present, but it is not quite satisfactory, because this relationship involves condemnation as well as salvation. There is a condemnation that excludes salvation, as well as a condemnation within salvation, as when a saved man condemns himself for having committed the sins that are now pardoned. Still, when we remember that condemnation and salvation are both workings of the same irrevocable law," whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," the term " soteriology " might be adopted, and be defined as the doctrine of the moral relations between God and man. It is not the best conceivable term, inasmuch as it gives special prominence to the brighter aspect or result of God's moral government. Of course, it is His wish that all men should be saved ; but as, in point of fact, they are not all saved, a better term would be one whose definition should include both results, or rather the process of resultants by which both effects are produced.

This process by which the Almighty governs the moral world is

LAW AND ORDER.

In this fact of law the process differs from His government of the physical world, where order alone is found. It might, however, have been anticipated that the government of unconscious existences should not in all points be the same as the government of conscious and voluntary agents. We are, in the first place, under moral laws, which may be defined as "the commands, or wishes, of God." They are expressed by the formulæ, "Thou shalt," or "Thou shalt not." The generic term including them all is "law." The Biblical usage of this word always involves volition and consequent responsibility. Therefore, these laws, commands, or wishes, of God may be disregarded or broken. They are as lighthouses on those rocks of life that threaten shipwreck; yet the sailor may disregard their warning flashes, and steer straight into the death that foams on the sounding breakers. God may say, "Thou shalt not steal," but man may reply and say, "I shall steal;" and as God cannot trespass on the ground that He Himself, in the exercise of His infinite wisdom and love, has made sacred to human freedom, the man may steal, let the consequences be what they may. But that word "consequence," or consequent, brings into view the second method of Divine government, which is "order." This may be defined as "the Divine will or decision." Here men have no liberty; to this order there is no exception, and from it there is no appeal. He has determined that every moral antecedent, or activity, shall have a definite sequent, or result, and the universe could not sever them. We may disobey any command, but we cannot sever the disobedience from its special issue. In like manner, we cannot obey a command and be without the result of obedience. We may determine under what order we shall place ourselves, but that is all we can do. There is, for example, the order of sin which is "the soul that sinneth it shall die," which means that the sin must produce some deadly effect in the soul that sins. There is also the order of

penitence, which is "when the wicked man turneth away from the wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." The former is the order of nature, the latter is the order of grace; because the latter is a new order voluntarily added by God to the old order, so as to make salvation for transgressors possible; not by violating the old, but by supplementing it with the new. The rising of a balloon is no violation of the order of weight, so the rising of a pardoned sinner is no violation of the downward tendency of sin.

> "But in these cases,
> We still have judgment here, that we but teach
> Bloody instructions, which being taught, return
> To plague the inventor; this even-handed justice
> Commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice
> To our own lips."

We have now to consider

SIN AND EVIL.

We do not want any definition of sin, because St. John defines it most clearly as "lawlessness." This is better than calling it a "transgression of the law," for an honest man may be a sinner even with respect to his honesty. He may be honest because honesty is the best policy, in which case he will receive the result of an honesty that is lawless, or is in its motive outside the wish of God. He cares not for God, but only for himself; he does not transgress the command, but he does disregard it, and thus becomes "lawless." He, on the other hand, who is honest because it is the wish of the Father whom he loves, will inherit another and higher result. By accepting this definition one very important fact is emphasized, that obeying a command of God is lawless, or sinful, in so far as God is not recognised in the obedience. It is, in fact, not obedience to God, but for some other reason. It may seem rather a hard thing to say that one may be generous, amiable, sterling, and yet in these very things be sinful. It ought to be remembered, that in saying this, no word of censure is meant to be

applied to these estimable qualities, but only to the sad fact that God is not in all his thoughts. If there be a God, it must be acknowledged that this is wrong.

Nor need there be much difficulty about the definition of evil, however vaguely the word is frequently used. It is "the result or order of sin;" its synonym is "injury." Our Creator has determined that in every department of life lawlessness shall result in hurt. It is so in bodily matters: if we disregard His wish regarding health we shall become diseased; if we disregard His wishes about prudence, and jump out of a balloon, we shall learn the result on our arrival at the ground, if we are alive. In like manner, if we become lawless in soul life, effects must follow, and these effects are soul injuries of some kind, which are therefore called "evil." It is the inherent, self-acting, punishment of sin. A person lies—that is the sin; he lowers his character by doing it—that is the evil. One person injures another—that is sin; in doing this he injures himself still more—that is evil. No moral government could be possible otherwise. But from this indisputable fact there issue three other facts, which are not popularly accepted; one is that

GOD IS THE AUTHOR OF EVIL.

Basil and Augustine notwithstanding; if evil be the result of sin, it is because He in love wills it to be so. His hatred of the sin that afflicts His children is so great, that by suffering He would save them from sinning. A loving father would try to keep sin from recrossing his threshold by becoming the source of suffering to any one of his children who sinned.

But though God be necessarily the Author of the sequent of sin, it is the sinner who calls this sequent into activity. Had man not sinned, earth would not have known evil. The Author of nature has determined that a finger thrust into the fire shall be burned; but it is the thruster of the finger into the fire who makes the determination effective. Consequently, while evil is God's decision, it is man's production. Great confusion is sometimes produced

by the very careless way in which the words sin and evil are used as convertible terms. This is most perplexing in Dr. Muller's work on the *Christian Doctrine of Sin.* The words are perpetually interchanged as though they had exactly the same meaning. He seems to use guilt in the sense in which evil is here employed, as when he says, "Guilt is the recoil of sin upon him who commits it, but the force of the recoil depends on the tension of the energy from which it first sprang" (Urwick's translation). We frequently read of "the origin of evil," "the problem of evil," etc., when it is sin that is meant. Sin bears the same relation to evil that a spark does to the explosion of gunpowder. As sin and evil are inseparable, it is quite natural that they should be sometimes regarded as the same. This confusion is facilitated by the double part played by the word. Double parts are frequently misleading. Evil is sometimes a noun and sometimes an adjective. To say that sin is evil would be perfectly correct, if we mean it as an adjective, as it is used in the Nineteenth Article; but it would not be correct to say that sin is evil, if we mean the latter as a noun. As a noun, "sin" is not "evil." This is quite in harmony with the Bible usage of the words translated sin, trespass, iniquity, evil, etc. Dr. Muller, with some inconsistency, states that while the New Testament uses ἁμαρτία as the general term for any kind of transgression of the Divine command, πονηρός refers to evil character, and even natural evil, as in Eph. v. 16; vi. 16. About παράβασις there cannot be any doubt.

The second resulting thought is that

EVIL IS GOOD.

This may sound strange at first; but if we say instead that "injury is good," the matter becomes simpler. Physical pain is the salvation of the physical body; without pain we should kill ourselves without knowing it. In the same way, as we have seen, the injury inflicted on the soul by itself is a warning and preventive against greater injury. If this order come from God it must be good, and there is no difficulty in seeing how great the blessing, that we cannot sin without suffering.

The next point to be clearly apprehended is that

FOR EVIL THERE IS NO FORGIVENESS.

Many divines are careless in this matter, and teach that when a sinner repents in Christian mode, God forgives him all the past, and he is, in consequence, as though he had never sinned at all. A very little consideration will show that this is inherently impossible. If evil mean "injury," no one can forgive an injury. A man may wish to strike another; in making the attempt he breaks his arm. That other can forgive the intention, but he cannot forgive the broken arm: the doctor must look to that. The former life cannot be undone; it is there, a fact to all eternity. A new life may be commenced, but the former life still lies behind; and it may cost the forgiven sinner many a weary struggle before the wrong habits of past years are compelled to give place to new and better modes of life. "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." But what pain may be in that cleansing, only those can know who have undergone the process. Were this a paper on practical divinity, much might be said on this point, but as it is not, enough has been said to explain and justify the definitions given of sin and evil.

It is our Father's will that the man who had voluntarily taken moral poison into his system should have an antidote offered him; and also His wish that he should accept and use it. This antidote is found in

THE ATONEMENT,

Which is sometimes defined as "The means of the reconciliation of God and man;" but this is inexact and insufficient. In searching for a definition we must put to one side all imagined reasons for the necessity of an atonement, all fancies regarding the way in which the death of Christ made possible the pardon of the sinner, about all which we know very little, and confine ourselves to the ascertained and revealed fact which is that "The atonement is God's remedy for guilt and evil in man."

The next word in this process of salvation that demands our very careful scrutiny is

JUSTIFICATION.

The Eleventh Article belongs rather to the region of dogmatics than that of definition. It leaves us in the dark about the meaning of the word "accounted," and it is here the difficulty is found. Some seem to think it means that God regards the pardoned sinner as innocent, or in other words, acquits him. But as the sinner remains a sinner, though a pardoned one, this is impossible. There are no fictions in the dealings between God and man, but only dread realities. Nor can it mean to make righteous, for that is the special function of the Holy Spirit in sanctification. There need not be much misunderstanding in the matter, because, in the first place, the New Testament usage of "account," or "reckon" (λογίζομαι), is perfectly clear; it always refers to a reality. For example, "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness." Abraham's belief in God was splendidly right, and therefore it was so accounted. In the next place, the facts of the case, which are simple, supply the definition. A sinner, we shall suppose, becomes convinced of his sinfulness, and wishes to obtain pardon. He accepts the offer of salvation by Christ; he goes to God pleading alone the promises made to him through Christ. In doing this he is surely just or right: it is the right attitude for him at the time, and God affirms his rightness by forgiving him. When he kneels to God in penitence, pleading only the work of Christ, he is in fact doing that which is lawful and right, and so saves his soul alive. Whatever his sins may have been in other respects, he is doing as he ought to do now, and therefore God accepts and pardons him for his faith in Christ, and not for his own works or deserving. Consequently "justification by faith is, God accepting a man as just when he is just."

There are many other terms employed in soteriology that

one would like to linger at, but as space forbids, we hurry on to the final issue, which is

HEAVEN OR HELL.

And what are they? So contradictory are the many replies, and so varied the definitions, it would appear almost hopeless to attempt one that shall cover all the facts of the case, and be accepted by every one who believes in a hell and a heaven. It certainly would be impossible if God were lawless, acting arbitrarily, and sending one soul to hell simply because He willed to do so, and another to heaven for the same want of reason. But as God has revealed Himself as a God of order in everything He does, despair is here misplaced. We have therefore, only to state the moral order of life, and the problem is solved. That order, as we have seen, is that sin produces evil, obedience produces benefit. Let us consider the facts of hell first, as they are the simplest and most painful; and in doing this the case will be considered only of those who have heard of Christ in this life. Well, a man does that which he believes he ought not to do, and so becomes guilty before God. He continues this course through life, and dies in the same state—a sinner disregarding God. He lives reaping the harvest of what he has sown, for he could not reap any other; as he lives, so he dies, reaping the harvest of what he has sown; and he lives beyond the grave his continued life, under the same order. What can be simpler in thought or truer in fact than this? He has sown lawlessness with all its consequences, and he reaps the same. But while we reap what we sow, we reap more than we sow: we may sow the wind, but we reap the whirlwind. We may, therefore, define hell as "the necessary and possibly intensifying result of unforgiven sin." Definition is not concerned with the duration of this state, but only with its inherent conditions. And, if this definition be correct, it involves the doctrine that there are as many hells as there are individuals there. No two persons have the same degree of guilt in sin, and consequently the unforgiveness is not of the same degree in any two cases. All that will be in hell will not be hellish.

There will be there the soul result of many a noble deed, many a generous gift, many a Godlike aspiration, many a Christly thought: dare any man in these days deny that in numbers of Christless lives these things have been found, although, as we have seen, they may have been lawless? God forbid that one word were here said to lessen the dread effects of rejecting so great salvation; but it is time the infidel-producing caricatures of a mediæval hell were banished, and the light of Gospel truth allowed to shine instead.

If hell be the necessary result of unforgiven sin, then it would appear as though heaven must be the necessary result of forgiven sin. This, however, does not follow, for while hell is a necessary result alone, heaven is a necessary result, with a gift added. This may be in perfect accordance with both the love and the justice of God. In His mercy He leaves sin to work its own work, adding nothing to it, but in His love He gives repentence its own inherent results, and crowns it with untold glories as well. Heaven may therefore be defined as "the necessary result of forgiven sin, with all gifts that are added graciously by God." These are words that, although they may cost years of thought, are easily written; but how largely the mighty subjects grow before us; in their contemplation how little do we feel, and in their utterance how stammering is our tongue. Definitions! How necessary are they, and how futile! We require them when taking the froth from the billow's crest, and handing it to our brother; but the gems of ocean are not there. We may define and describe the soap bubble to our boy in language that is most accurate; but in thinking it out we may spend our life, and not know it then. But God and His ways are more than a bubble. When, therefore, our minds must cry "halt" so early, and our hearts can go so far, let us give the heart precedence; and though our mental differences be never so far apart, remembering that there is one God and Father of all, above all, through all, in all, we may love as brethren; for now abideth these three—faith, hope, charity—but the greatest of these is charity.

JAS. MCCANN, D.D.

THEOLOGY AND MEDICINE.

THEIR POINTS OF ALLIANCE.

In old time the Doges of Venice were wont to cast a ring into the sea as a symbol of marriage between their fair city of marble and the beautiful Adriatic.

It was an alliance of love. Venice on all sides served the sea, the sea on all sides served Venice.

It seems that some such symbol might characterise theology and medicine, and a ring of the purest gold (presented by the wise men in Bethlehem, bestudded with the richest jasper and precious rubies of Calvary) tell that by incarnation the God-man would sanctify wholly our tripartite nature.

We see this *consecrated union*, whether we look first at the Mosaic economy ; or, secondly, at the time of our Lord ; or, thirdly, at Apostolic days ; or, fourthly, at the earlier centuries of Church history ; or, fifthly, at the Reformation period ; or, sixthly, at more recent times.

We have seen the silver moon like a stately ship on a clear night sailing through the upper depth of blue, accompanied by some lovely planet acting as a pioneer or pilot, and we have known that the light and beauty of both were the reflection of the orb of day. So, too, as we contemplate theology and medicine we see that they have in their sacred progress many things in common, and not the least that they both reflect the glory of the Sun of Righteousness until the full day shall dawn and shadows flee.

I.—Look we first at the Mosaic economy. Note the careful directions for the physical well-being of Israel. The Priests and Levites were constituted officers of health.

(*a*) Observe the particular directions respecting the character and cleanliness of dwellings.

(*b*) All that is said about pure air and ventilation.

(*c*) The minute injunctions about food, drinking, &c

(*d*) The attention to clothing.

(*e*) The importance given to personal cleanliness, frequent ablutions, &c.

(*f*) Directions respecting work, exercise, &c. (begun even in Eden, Gen. ii. 15).

(*g*) The express directions concerning rest and recreation for all the sons of toil, as the weekly Sabbath, the sabbatical year, the year of jubilee, and frequent sabbaths and holydays besides, *all* hygienic to the body as well as helpful and healthful to the soul.

(*h*) See the exceedingly wise rules respecting the insulation of infectious diseases, the laws of quarantine, the scrupulous enactments respecting the dead.

(*i*) Then again, the important sanitary laws about sewerage, and the covering of refuse, and the burning away from the camp of all unused animal matter.

It is not too much to say that myriads of lives have been lost by neglecting the simple laws of hygiene laid down in the Pentateuch.

Macaulay says that in London, in 1685, which was not a sickly year, one in every twenty persons died, whilst now on an average the annual mortality is only about one in forty. This improvement is owing to a better acquaintance with the laws of health, but a vast deal remains to be remedied. If we look at only four preventable diseases, scarlatina, measles, whooping-cough, small-pox, these carry off about six hundred thousand every ten years. If the wise health-rules of Moses were strictly observed, contagious and infectious diseases might in time be stamped out.

There is a valuable homily in the Apocrypha bearing on the appreciation in which medical skill should be held.

"Honour a physician with the honour due unto him, for the uses which ye may have of him, for the Lord hath created him. For of the Most High cometh healing, and he shall receive honour of the King. The Lord hath created medicines, and he that is wise will not abhor them. Was not the water made sweet with wood that the virtue thereof might be known? . . . . My son, in thy sickness be not negligent, but pray unto the Lord, and He will make thee

whole. . . . . Then give place to the physician, for the Lord hath created him ; let him not go from thee, for thou hast need of him. There is a time when in their hands there is good success. For they shall also pray unto the Lord that He would prosper that which they give for ease and remedy to prolong life " (Eccles. iii. 8).

II.—We turn, in the second place, to the time of our blessed Lord. There we clearly see the intimate union of theology and medicine consecrated by the adorable God-man. Now He is preaching the kingdom, and now He is giving sight to the blind. Now He is revealing profound truths to Nicodemus, and now He is healing the sick of the palsy. Now He is telling the Samaritan woman of the water of life, and now He is cleansing a loathsome leper. Now He is in transfiguration glory conversing with Moses and Elias, and now He is at the foot of the mount healing the epileptic. Now He is discoursing on the great verities of God, and now He is in the chamber of death taking Jairus' little girl by the hand, " Talitha cumi." Now He is in the temple teaching, and now He is at Bethesda's pool healing in a moment the man who had waited for the angel of opportunity thirty-and-eight years. Now He is on the way to the cross as our blessed Sin-Bearer, and now by the way He heals the wounded servant of the high priest. Thus throughout the Great Biography we are shown Christ's care for the body as well as the soul, and sometimes both in one brief narrative, as when He said to the paralytic, " Thy sins be forgiven thee : arise and walk." And so the passion flower of Calvary entwines about the tree of life that its leaves are for the healing of the nations whatever the nations' wounds may be.

Carlyle has said that he " who puts his hand on a human body touches a piece of heaven," and when we recall the Apostolic words, " Know ye not that your bodies are the temple of God ? " we see how sacred the body is. Our gracious Redeemer by incarnation has written His blessed Name in our earthly family register, and by His death has inscribed His disciples' names in His heavenly Book of Life. There is then abundant reason why theology and medicine should be

in hallowed alliance. When Christ would give proof of His mission to save souls, the attesting proof He pointed to was His healing the bodily diseases of men. In a twofold sense was the Sun of Righteousness risen with healing in His wings, To body and soul Christ showed Himself Jehovah Rophi.

III.—Look now at Apostolic times. Remember, that when our Lord sent forth the Twelve and the Seventy, His injunction was "Heal the sick," and the historian says He gave them power to heal.

How long the gift of healing was vouchsafed we cannot say, but whilst it was a beneficent power in the Church it could only be used with what one may call a holy economy, hence we find St. Paul's friend Trophimus "left at Miletum sick," and his fellow-worker Epaphroditus lingering between life and death without a miracle put forth to save him. As far as possible the science of surgery and medicine was to be the glad handmaid of the missionary Church, hence very expressively comes in the plural pronoun "*we*" in much of the later history of St. Paul. *We* took ship—*we* sailed into Italy—*we* came to Rome. Yes, there was the tried Apostle with a suffering body and many a scar—with a thorn in the flesh, and with much weariness and weakness. And there, too, was Luke, the beloved physician, a true yoke fellow, high in culture, rich in sympathy, deep in acquaintance with medicine, consecrating his gifts to the furtherance of Christ's cause. Never were the soul's concerns and the body's concerns more beautifully linked. In this way we seem to get again Jacob's glorious vision, and angels ascending and descending.

Or take another view. St. James, in his general Epistle, directs the sick to send for the elders of the Church that they might pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord, and then this promise is given, "The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up. And if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Bodily disease, in Apostolic times, at least, was often disciplinary. There was often a direct connection between some presumptuous sin and a physical ailment. We see in

1 Cor. xi. St. Paul speaks of three ill-effects of coming to the Lord's table unworthily: (1) bodily weakness; (2) sickness; (3) death. We refer to these in the Church of England in fencing the holy table, but I may mention that the Church of Ireland omits them, as they were believed sometimes to make those sad whom God had not made sad. This disciplinary dealing is strikingly put by the Apostle when he speaks of delivering Hymenæus and Alexander to Satan. This was obviously for their soul's benefit. Many, therefore, and *close* were the links which bound theology and medicine in Apostolic times.

IV.—Turning now to the early centuries of Church history, the beneficence of the Church manifested itself, as soon as circumstances admitted, in the care of the sick and needy. It was the special province of the deacons and deaconesses to attend to the sick (so Justin Martyr), and this they did without being deterred by any fear of infection. A notable example was seen in the conduct of the Christians at Alexandria during the great plague there in the time of the Emperor Gallienus, A.D. 260-268.

The most complete hospital of which we have any ancient record was built by Basil the Great, near Cæsarea, in Pontus. Gregory of Nazianzus described it as the "treasure house of godliness, in which disease is investigated and sympathy proved." St. Chrysostom founded many hospitals. Placilla, the wife of Theodosius the Great, devoted herself much to the care of the sick. Samson, of Constantinople, devoted himself to the care of hospitals. He persuaded the Emperor Justinian to give up his palace for an asylum for the sick and suffering.

It may be mentioned that in the Arabic canons of Nicea, the bishop was expressly bound to institute hospitals. Jerome founded a hospital for the reception of the sick in Bethlehem. Finding his money inadequate, he sold his remaining property to complete it. Fabiola, a friend of Jerome, founded a hospital at Rome.

We read of their existence in Gaul, at the beginning of the 6th century. The fifth Council of Orleans, A.D. 549,

makes special provision for the hospital, enjoining Bishop Sacerdos "to take care that active and God-fearing superintendents be always appointed."

In Victor's account of the Vandal persecution we find that Deogratias, Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 455, provided two hospitals for the suffering. The houses of the African bishops and clergy also served for the reception of the sick. Augustine exercised constant care for the sick and afflicted.

The establishment of hospitals in the northern countries in the 8th and 9th centuries is due to the Irish missionaries. They were called "Hospitalia Scotorum."[1]

V.—We come now to the Reformation period.

In England the College of Physicians dates its existence from the efforts of Thomas Linacre, clerk in orders under Henry VIII. 1518, previous to which time the medical profession was under the direction of the Church. The practitioner was licensed by the Bishop, and received not a few of his laws from his hands.

The statutes bearing on the practice of medicine in England throw some light on the connection of medicine with the ecclesiastical institutions of the country. There is the enactment in Henry VIII.'s reign, "That no person within the city of London, nor within seven miles of the same, take upon him to exercise or occupy as a physician or surgeon except he be first examined, approved, and admitted by the Bishop of London, or by the Dean of St. Paul's for the time being, aided by four doctors of physic or persons expert in surgery." Then later on we recall how Bishop Ridley preached before Edward VI., and stirred the heart of the young king to remember the alliance of theology and medicine. St. Bartholomew's Hospital and St. Thomas's were amongst the results of the Bishop's counsel.

Very rich in practical sympathy was that period of the Church's rejuvenescence. Many a heart was taught to say, "Praise the Lord, who healeth all thy diseases, who redeemeth thy life from destruction, and crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies."

[1] Vide *Smith's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.*

VI.—We may now glance at more recent times.

We should note that until a late period the Faculty of Medicine in the University of Paris was under ecclesiastical law, and whilst in many ways the science of Medicine has admitted that she cannot say to the Religion of Christ, "I have no need of thee," the Church of God has also had to acknowledge that she could never say to the science of Medicine, "I have no need of thee." Look, by way of illustration, to the establishment of the East India Company's power. It came about thus: In the year 1636 one of the princesses of the Imperial family had been dreadfully burnt, and a messenger was sent to Surat to desire the assistance of one of the English surgeons there. Gabriel Boughton proceeded forthwith to Delhi and performed the cure. On the minister of the great Mogul asking him what his master could do for him to manifest his gratitude for so important a service, Boughton answered with patriotism, "Let my nation trade with yours." "Be it so," was the reply. Accordingly a portion of the coast was marked out for the resort of English ships, and all duties were compromised for a small sum of money. So did the civilisation of India begin, and so the way was opened for the evangelisation of two hundred millions of immortal beings since subjected to the control of the British power.

But in a more direct manner has the art of medicine been the handmaid of the Church, when, especially in recent times, missionaries have had a knowledge of the healing art. In China, Persia, India, and Africa it may be asserted that some of the most useful workers have been medical missionaries. Now happily not only are our great societies beginning to recognise the healing art as the handmaid of the Church, but organisations are formed for the express purpose of medical missions.

I have not space to recapitulate, but I think the rapid survey of periods reaching over thousands of years shows a normal and hallowed alliance between theology and medicine, and teaches us four valuable lessons.

The *first* is this: Clergymen can often aid physicians

by making themselves well acquainted with the laws of hygiene and doing what they can to instruct their poorer parishioners on the subject.

The *second* is this: The medical man can often aid the clergyman. He can judiciously warn against the sin of King Asa, who, in turning to the physicians, left God out of his thoughts. And here let me say we have great reason to rejoice that there are so many eminent physicians and surgeons who are whole-hearted in their loyalty to Him who came to bear our sicknesses. The proverb "Optimus inter medicos ad Gehennam," which once had unquestioned currency in the learned world, is quite untrue.

The *third* lesson is this: The head of the medical profession is Christ.

The *fourth* is this: Missionary work abroad, and often evangelistic work in large parishes at home, can be greatly advanced by a hallowed blending of the functions of the two professions. As professions they are distinct, and neither can supplant the other, but in many cases they can reflect lustre on each other by united action in the cause of Him who came to destroy the works of the devil. They can take up with advantage to each other the consecrated "*we*" of St. Luke in the time of the storm, when the billows were high and the ship was driven with the fierce euroclydon, and no sun nor stars appeared, and all was dark and perilous. Clerical and medical functions so far interrelate that the clergyman and the physician may well labour shoulder to shoulder and kneel side by side, for theirs is one blessed fraternity, in which, like Joseph in Egypt, they can aid in saving much people alive. And working together assiduously and unitedly now, loving to tell stricken hearts of the tree, which, when cut down, was for the healing of Marah, they may look forward to the glorious rest which is coming when they shall strike their harps together before the King in His beauty in that land where the inhabitant shall not say, "I am sick"—that land where the King shall say, "*I was sick*, and ye visited Me."

A. C. THISELTON.

THREE CHARACTER-STUDIES.

I.—ST. PAUL.

THE interest attaching to men whose acts or thoughts have largely influenced the world's history is perennial. How many histories, how many biographies, how many memoirs, have been published concerning the first Napoleon! Yet much of his work has perished. The universal Empire of which he dreamed has faded away like a vision of the night. What remains is rather the result of his age, and of the Revolution of which he was the son and heir, than his own proper work. For the most part, thought is more enduring than action. Plato has modified the world more than Charlemagne; and, regarding Him from the human standpoint only, the Lord Jesus Christ has influenced the course of politics and modified the evolution of society more than all the warriors and philosophers who ever fought or wrote.

In St. Paul we have a combination of thought with action. To his active work, under God, Europe owes the Christianity which lies at the root of her civilisation. From city to city, from country to country, he travelled with energy indomitable. On the sea coast of Syria, and in the highlands of Asia Minor, his voice was heard proclaiming the new religion. In the busy marts of the bimarine Corinth, among the fastidious philosophers of idle Athens, amidst the rude soldiery of the Roman Colonia, he stood the undaunted preacher of righteousness through the name of Christ. Still pursuing his onward course, he is found preaching in Italy. He may have penetrated, perhaps, to distant Spain; and an unreliable tradition would have us believe that he even attained to the far-off coasts of Britain.

And during all this period his thought is as busy as his physical action is unceasing. In a series of familiar letters he flings upon the world burning words which will stir men's hearts, and exercise men's intellects, as long as the world itself shall last. The deep moral problems which had occupied the

minds of the philosophers of classical Greece, which had been disputed in the garden of the Academy, which formed the basis of the teaching of Zeno, are dealt with in a new form, and illumined by a higher wisdom, in the Epistle to the Romans. Questions, which the schools had never dreamed of but brought to light by the revelation of Jesus Christ, form the very foundation of the civilisation of Europe, and are discussed in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Practical questions, which still have their bearing upon the conduct of life, are argued out in the Epistles to the Corinthians. So profound and far-reaching was this active man's thought, that the saying of a learned student of Platonism may be accepted as strictly true: Plato was the seed, illumined truly by that Spirit which lighteth every man who is born into the world; St. Paul, taught by the teaching of Christ, and filled by His Spirit in a mode differing from that in which ordinary men are inspired, was the blossom of the seed—a blossom which, as time rolled on, should fill the world with the Divine fruit of perfect knowledge.

Perhaps a preliminary word should be said concerning the authenticity of St. Paul's Epistles. For the purpose of this essay we accept as genuine all the Epistles which are usually received as Pauline, except that to the Hebrews. Baur acknowledges the Romans, Galatians, and 1 and 2 Corinthians. Hilgenfeld admits 1 Thessalonians, Philemon, and Philippians. It may be cited as a curious instance of irresponsible criticism that Davidson objects to 2 Thessalonians as sometimes un-Pauline, and sometimes too Pauline; on which we may remark that it is difficult to understand how any one can receive 1 Thessalonians and reject 2 Thessalonians; in addition to which the reader may be reminded that no books stand higher in the New Testament as regard external attestation than these two Epistles. The Colossians is rejected by the rationalistic school mainly on account of the supposed gnostic expressions which it contains. Those who ascribe Colossians and Ephesians to different authors cannot agree which is the original and which the imitation. Holtzman himself cannot decide upon the

priority of these two Epistles. We may add that Rénan, though he has doubts about the Ephesians, receives all, except the Pastoral Epistles, as the genuine productions of St. Paul's pen. Hostile critics reject the Pastoral Epistles on the ground that no place can be found for them within the history recorded in the Acts ; but as these same critics have decided that the Book of the Acts is a conglomerate composition worked up by some forger who (in an inexplicable manner) had obtained the "we" portions of that treatise, the objection does not appear to carry much weight. It may be noticed, as another curiosity of criticism, that Reuss accepts the second Epistle to Timothy, while he rejects the first. With regard to the Hebrews, many orthodox critics decline to receive it as Pauline. Our own opinion is that it was written by one of St. Paul's intimate associates—a man thoroughly imbued with Pauline ideas and Pauline modes of thought ; but without laying any stress on this opinion, the acceptance of this book would influence so strongly the estimate formed of St. Paul's character, that we think it best to exclude it so far as this essay is concerned.

The birthplace of Paul was Tarsus. Tarsus, the chief city of Cilicia, was a place of considerable importance. It was made a free city by Augustus, and was a noted emporium of commerce. But a matter of far greater moment to note in connection with St. Paul is that Tarsus was one of those towns which had come under the influence of the Hellenistic culture diffused throughout Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor, by the Ptolemys and Seleucids. Tarsus had a school of repute. A change had come over these Hellenistic schools. Whereas formerly, in the classical age, physical and æsthetical perfection were the objects specially aimed at ; in later times more attention and study was devoted to mental and moral problems. The teaching of Zeno, the aim of whose philosophy was to order the practical life of man, had an effect almost incalculable on Greek life and thought, and the influence of his teaching was paramount in nearly all the Hellenistic schools. This was specially the case at Tarsus. Its teachers were strongly imbued with the doctrines of stoicism. The

father of Chrysippus was a native of Tarsus, and Athenodorus, the tutor of Augustus, resided there, and may possibly have come into contact with the youthful Paul. How far Paul—a Hebrew of the Hebrews—came under the influence of the pervading thought is doubtful. But Hellenism was in the air, and the strictest and most conservative of the Jews, dwelling in these Grecized cities, could not but catch something of the spirit that was abroad. The quotations from Aratus and others are the only direct points of contact of St. Paul with heathen literature. There are three of these quotations:

"We are also his offspring" (Acts xvii. 28).
"Evil communications corrupt good manners" (1 Cor. xv. 33).
"The Cretans are always liars" [evil beasts, slow bellies] (Tit. i. 12).

Although it has often been said that a chance quotation from Greek poets no more shows a real acquaintance with these poets than citing a stock phrase from Shakespeare proves a knowledge of the Elizabethan bard, it should be remembered that St. Paul does not make a chance quotation. On Mars Hill he makes his appeal to the "own" poets of his audience; he quotes deliberately; and he uses of design the plural number. The actual quotation is from the *Phenomena* of Aratus; but Cleanthes has the same line, with the change of a single word, in his hymn to Zeus. Both Aratus and Cleanthes belong to the Hellenistic—not the Hellenic—period; Aratus was a native of Cilicia, Cleanthes of Assos in Troas; and both were stoics. There is some difficulty about the other two quotations. The first—"evil communications corrupt good manners"—is probably from the *Thais* of Meander, a native of Athens, a graceful writer of the new comedy, and a friend and disciples of Epicurus. The third—"the Cretans are always liars"—is from a hymn of Callimachus, an Alexandrian Hellenist; or possibly the whole line may be from Epimenides, who flourished 600 B.C., and therefore belongs to the pre-classical age of Greece.

If the veil could only be lifted from Paul's early life! Questions, always possessing the greatest interest have had

their interest redoubled since modern science has taught us the laws of descent and heredity. Who was Paul's father? What was his character, his disposition, his training, his profession or trade? What kind of woman was Paul's mother? Was it from her, as popular opinion is inclined to think, that St. Paul derived his force of will and character; or was it from his father, as Mr. Galton would have us believe, that he inherited his mental greatness? Had he brothers? These are questions we cannot answer. There is only one morsel of information given us. We learn incidentally that he had a sister; but then the veil lifted for a moment falls, and of that sister we are told nothing. She existed; she was married; she had a son. We are inclined to think with Mr. Galton that Paul was his father's son, and owed to him more than he gained from his mother. For of female influence during his youth there is not a trace. Had St. Paul been blessed with a mother whose love had left a deep impression on his heart, had he learned to look upon her with the reverence and veneration with which some sons look upon their mothers, although the fact might not have been told us, there would have been traces and indications by which the fact might have been inferred. And similarly, if a sister's loving devotion had gathered round his early life, there would have been little traits—some word let drop—from which it might have been gathered. But it is not so. When we remember what a noble man St. Paul was, it strikes us with astonishment that, in this respect most unlike his Master, he could think and write of women in the disparaging way he did. There are many formal salutations in the Epistles to women; but I can find only one trace of any feeling of affection or kindness, and that is when St. Paul, greeting Rufus and his mother, adds, calling to mind doubtless the remembrance of many a thoughtful act, "and mine."

From Tarsus Paul went to Jerusalem, to be under the instruction of the famous Rabbi, Gamaliel. As bearing upon the culture of St. Paul, it is of great interest to inquire, How far Hellenism had penetrated the intellectual life of Judæa? Some have maintained that the Pharisees and Sadducees

were sects based on later Greek philosophy; the one springing from stoicism, the other founded upon the teaching of Epicurus. Such a notion, however, may be dismissed. The Pharisees had nothing in common with Zeno, or any other Greek sage. But Greek culture had penetrated deeply into Syria, and had left its mark on Palestine. A gymnasium had been established in Jerusalem. The Apocryphal books show a gradual increase of Hellenistic influences. The second and third books of the Maccabees were written in the Greek language. The book of Wisdom comes from the pen of a man whose mind was saturated with the teaching of the Greek schools, and it shows strong traces of Platonism. And not only had Greek thought and Greek language invaded Jewish literature, but the Greek tongue had penetrated all ranks and conditions of men, so that the common people understood and spoke it.

Had the quiet leavening of Hellenism been allowed to take its own course, it is not impossible that the National Semitic type, which has so largely influenced the literature and politics of the western world, and which is visible to this day in the stubborn character of the modern Jews, might have been merged in an effete and mongrel civilisation. But, happily for the world, the violence and ruthlessness of Antiochus Epiphanes put a sudden stop to this national growth, and aroused among the Jews an enthusiasm for their religion, and their ancient modes of thought, which was irresistible. The wars of the Maccabees prevented the absorption of the Jews of Palestine into the prevailing Grecicism which affected Alexandria and Asia; and henceforth the influence of Hellenism on Jewish life and culture, although by no means wholly obliterated, was exercised in an indirect, and almost unconscious manner.

So it was, we think, with Paul. Sitting at the feet of Gamaliel—a doctor who probably hated the Greek thought which was yet pervading his atmosphere—Paul was brought up a Hebrew of the Hebrews; and notwithstanding, all the while he was in his own despite being continually influenced by the philosophies—Platonic, Stoical, Epicurean

—which were all about him, and which were to fit him, when God's time came, to be the great Apostle of the Gentile world.

Antioch was the home of Paul's manhood. It was to Antioch that he betook himself when, after his sojourn in Arabia, he left Jerusalem. It was from Antioch that he and Barnabas were sent forth, when by God's command they were separated to bear the Gospel to the Gentiles. It was to Antioch that they returned after their missionary tour. Antioch was founded by Seleucus. Although it could not compare in intellectual brilliancy with Alexandria, it was yet drawn into the circle of Hellenism, and so adopted a mode of culture essentially Greek, differing thus far from Asian and Semitic thought. Only it should be noticed, that, as after the departure of the Greeks from Alexandria through the violence of Ptolemy Physcon (Energetes II.), the Jews increased in importance in that city, and produced a Græco-Jewish (neo-Platonic) literature in Antioch, during the time of the late, Maccabees, Jewish influence became more dominant; and, although unfortunately there is no Antiochene literature to throw light upon the subject, we must believe that a philosophical movement took place among the Syrian Jews similar to that of which Philo is the representative in Egypt. If St. Paul came under the influence of Hellenism at Tarsus, this would be still more the case at Antioch.

It was, undoubtedly, this unconscious influence which caused him in after life, when writing letters to his converts, to introduce, in no technical sense, those technical words which have so sorely exercised the critics of Germany. The terms ages, thrones, principalities, powers, fulness, wisdom, light, and such like expressions, were ready to his hand; and he used them in no Gnostic or Platonic sense, but because they expressed in the most perfect manner the thought to which he would give utterance. God's mystery had been kept secret through the ages; in heaven among the angelic host were different orders and degrees, and what words could define them better than thrones and principalities and powers; most truly in Christ did all the fulness of the Godhead dwell, and

neither St. Paul nor St. John needed to be philosophers or gnostics to perceive that the light of Christ was opposed to the darkness of this world. Thus did God make use of the Greek learning, as He made use of the Greek tongue which had overspread Palestine, the shores of the Mediterranean, and the cities of Asia Minor, to make His servants thoroughly furnished for the work He designed they should accomplish.

There is another factor in St. Paul's intellectual training which must not be lost sight of, insomuch as it has left a permanent mark both upon his life and teaching. This is Rabbinism. Rabbinism represents the reaction of the Jewish mind to Hellenism. It is to Rabbinism, and not to any system of Greek philosophy, that we are to look for the origin of the later Jewish sects; Pharisaism, especially, is to be traced to this popular form of religionism. And Pharisaism was the religion of St. Paul. The religion of Christ Himself, and His service, was scarcely strong enough to cast out the old leaven. It was St. Paul's boast that he was a Pharisee both by birth and education. He likes to remember that his father belonged to the popular sect, and that he was himself brought up at Jerusalem, sitting at the feet of Gamaliel, one of the chief Rabbis of the Pharisaical schools.

But leaving these external influences, let us pass on to consider St. Paul in his own personal character. Among the noble men who have adorned the world St. Paul stands forth the noblest. The leading trait in his character, as in that of all the men who have done the work of the world, was power. Of a force of will which was almost irresistible, he possessed a strength of character like a rock. Power is stamped upon every action of which we have the record, and power is imprinted on every line he wrote. In his many journeyings, St. Paul was brought into contact with all sorts and conditions of men. Savages in the wild highlands of Asia; roughs in the purlieus of Greek cities; philosophers in academic Athens; noble women who learned the worship of the one God —all alike were subdued by the force of his character.

He dominated his fellow-workers, he crushed his foes, he made even Roman magistrates subservient to his will. Withal, he was generous and magnanimous. To his ease or comfort he never gave a thought. There was nothing small about the man, still less was there anything mean about him. If every interest and every consideration was to be sacrificed to his work, at least nothing was to be preserved for self. Self, in the sense of personal advantage, or personal gain, or personal well-being, lay outside his calculations. And this unselfishness had its reward. His friends loved him with a most ardent devotion; his colleagues gave him the pre-eminence without being conscious that they did so; his disciples and younger followers looked up to him with an admiration which could see neither fault nor flaw; and, like many men of strong individuality, he returned the affection of these young men with a love as ardent as their own. They are his sons, his own dear children, the companions of his labours, the sharers of his work, his beloved physician. Again, like all great men, he understood how to ward off opposition. The idea of any real difference between St. Peter and St. Paul is the figment of Baur's brain. Such a difference might easily have arisen—a personal, not a doctrinal, difference. But St. Paul grasped the situation. There was hardly room in one field of action for the special chosen Apostle of Christ, the chief by the Apostolic college, and himself. Paul was quick to see this. He put an end to any possibility of opposition or schism by dividing the world between them. Peter was to be the Apostle of the Church of the Circumcision; Paul was to be the Apostle of the Gentiles.

St. Paul had enemies. Of course he had enemies. Did ever a man perform good and noble work without creating enemies and opposition? Even the Lord Jesus Christ, whose every act and word was perfect, stirred up animosity and hatred against Himself. The light shined in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not, and, comprehending not, hated. Doubtless St. Paul was not always conciliatory; he did not always strive to turn away wrath, but met hostility with hardness. He was not perfect as his Lord had been perfect;

yet it was his work rather than himself which lay at the root of the opposition and enmity of his adversaries.

That St. Paul should have had the defects, as well as the qualities, of a strong and noble nature was almost a matter of necessity. He was at times arrogant and overbearing. He was defiant. His proud spirit could ill brook opposition. He was self-willed. If there was a difference of judgment, it was not St. Paul who gave way. If a dispute arose, it was not St. Paul who had to yield. He clung to his own opinion; and though that opinion was usually right, it might sometimes have been asserted with less vehemence. He showed small consideration for the thoughts and feelings of others when they ran counter to his own. Once, at least, he failed in generosity. I do not care to inquire whether Barnabas was right in wishing that John Mark should be the companion of their second missionary tour. It is quite possible that he was led astray by the natural feeling of affection for his nephew. But as we read the story, it is impossible to prevent a feeling of sorrow that some arrangement could not have been arrived at between these two close companions. Paul owed much to his tried and early friend. It would have been more in accordance with the Master's spirit if the friendship of these good men had not been broken, and if the Author of the Acts of the Apostles could have omitted from his history the sad sentence which tells us that "the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder one from the other."

Physically the great Apostle of the Gentiles was a small man, and of diminutive stature. A hint is given in the change of name on his arrival at Cyprus. But the matter is put beyond doubt by the behaviour of the people at Lystra. They called Barnabas Jupiter, but Paul—the chief speaker—they likened to Mercurius, the little God of eloquence. His bodily presence—it was his enemies who said it—was weak. He was probably of dark complexion, with dark hair and eyes, and, judging from the portraits of great men generally, we should imagine his nose to have been aquiline, and of somewhat large proportions. As it has often been remarked,

there are numerous indications given that the sudden shock and blaze of light which struck him down on the way to Damascus left permanent traces on his frame. He was restored to sight after his three days' blindness, but his eyes were afterwards weak. When Ananias commanded him to be smitten, those about him were shocked at the vehemence of his answer; and in his apology he pleaded as an excuse that he had not recognised the High Priest in his judge: "I wist not, brethren, that he was the High Priest; for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." In writing to the Galatians, and reminding them of the ardent affection they bore him, he says, "I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes and have given them to me." He always made use of an amanuensis to assist him in writing his Epistles, except on one occasion, when, carried away by his earnest desire to bring back the converts who were most dear to him to the purity of the faith, he wrote to the Church of Galatia with his own hand, drawing their attention to the fact, and by a single word calling to their minds the thorn in the flesh he had to carry: "Ye see in how large letters I have written to you with my own hand." Conybeare and Howson, in their *Life and Letters of St. Paul*, give a very touching illustration of Paul's weak eyesight. They had occasion to write to Neander. The reply came in the neat, flowing hand of a secretary. But a postscript was added, in which in large rugged characters the saintly old man begged them to excuse the letter not being written "with his own hand," on account of his failing sight. It was not the sight only that was affected. St. Paul's whole bodily frame underwent a shock which seems to have induced a kind of partial paralysis, causing an ungainly gait and a slight stuttering of speech. It was on this account that he found it necessary in his later travels to have St. Luke—the beloved physician—as his constant companion. "Only Luke is with me," he writes to Timothy. Again he writes to his Galatians—a Celtic race much given to mocking laughter—"My temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected, but received me as an angel of

God"; and in another place, "Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the Gospel unto you." The Italian artists of the Renaissance did not study to be technically correct in their representations. They painted golden-haired virgins with blue eyes. And so Raphael, in his magnificent picture of Paul preaching on Mars' Hill at Athens, delineates the man quite other than he was. When the painter represented the Apostle tall of stature and of commanding presence, he painted him as he was mentally, not as he was physically. Doubtless to some burly Corinthian worker in iron, or to a porter of herculean proportions, the bodily presence of St. Paul might have appeared weak. To those who could understand true greatness, there could have been nothing weak about that noble nature, whose giant intellect to-day dominates the world. And although now and again, through physical infirmity, the utterance of his words might have been indistinct, none who listened to those winged words could have thought his speech contemptible. If Felix, who learned afterwards to tremble at his reasoning, was inclined to think slightingly of him, or if King Agrippa shrugged his shoulders carelessly, was it not because the Roman governor despised Jews and Jewish superstitions alike; and the king, in his pride of position, was blind to see anything beautiful or great in a religion springing from the common people, and founded on the death of a Galilean peasant?

Paul would not have been the great man he was had there not been a deep strain of pathos in his nature. He was ready to dare and to die. It was not an idle boast when he wrote that he counted not his life dear to him in comparison with the fulfilment of his life's work. He could face pain and disgrace unflinchingly. The Jewish stripes, the Roman scourging, the lawless stoning by the wild mob of Lycaonians, the terrible hardships of constant travel, the hunger he had to suffer, the thirst he endured—these things did not move him. With lacerated back and feet strained in the stocks, his very prayer takes the form of thanksgiving. He can look with calmness on the infuriated rabble of Jerusalem, shrieking for his blood,

even though the remembrance of other days, when that same rabble—he himself consenting—stoned the first martyr, rushes across his mind. Among the despairing crew of shipwrecked men he almost alone is not perturbed. Even as he stands before Nero's dread tribunal he does not lose his courage, but tells how God stood by him and strengthened him. Yet this strong man is full of kindly affection, and longs for human love. He is not self-contained as was Elijah, but fellowship and words of kindness are a necessity to him. He quarrelled, as alas! the best will quarrel, with Barnabas, yet the tie between the two men was strong, and its severance must have caused deep pain. His companions are the very apple of his eye. He could bear with their weaknesses; he could overlook in their weaknesses what he would not have tolerated for a moment in himself. Their small wants were not beneath his care. He could break off in a treatise upon the duties of a bishop in the Church of Christ, in order to recommend the use of a little wine for health's sake. What unbounded love for his converts shines out through his letters! The pathos crops up in every line. They are "his dearly beloved, and longed for;" they are his "little children of whom he travailed in birth;" they are his "hope," his "joy," his "crown of rejoicing;" he has them "in his heart;" he is "affectionately desirous" of them; he exhorts and comforts every one of them, "as a father doth his children." He prays for them unceasingly; he remembers without ceasing their "work of faith and labour of love;" he has "great desire" to see their face. Timothy is "his dearly beloved son" of whose tears he is mindful, and whom he is greatly desiring to see that he may be filled with joy. What joy comes over the man's heart as he acknowledges the present which his Philippians have sent him! The gift in itself was nothing—he knew how to suffer want—but the loving thought, of which the gift was the token, that is welcomed with a joy almost tremulous in its intensity. Or take that scene at Miletus, which St. Luke has drawn in such vivid colours. How they clung round his neck; how, as the custom was in those days, they kissed; how their tears fell as they

spoke the last farewell words; and how they sorrowed most of all as they thought they should see his face no more! Or once more: have not his strong words of comfort gone home to every mourner's heart, as standing by the grave of their loved and lost, they have remembered that, not as those without hope need they sorrow, because they believe, that as "Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him?"

There is, however, a very marked difference in the tone of the several Epistles. This, we think, brings out the natural loving character of the man into especial prominence. The Romans were personally strangers to him; the Epistle to the Ephesians was probably an encyclical letter; in writing to the Colossians he wrote to those who had not seen his face in the flesh. In such Epistles there could not be any great expression of affection. The Corinthians were his own converts. He had worked among them, and had himself won them to Christ. But what a difference there is between the letters he wrote to Corinth and those he wrote to the Galatians, the Thessalonians, or the Philippians! The difference is not very difficult of explanation. The Galatians were Celts, warm-hearted, affectionate, impulsive as the modern Celts are to this day, and their affection to the Apostle was boundless. The Thessalonians were not altogether unlike them; while Philippi —a Roman Colonia—would have a mixed population of Roman soldiers, Macedonians, and Asiatics, who had migrated and settled there. But the Corinthians were Greeks proper, intellectual, argumentative, didactic, lost to the sense of moral beauty through their admiration of physical beauty, coldly sensuous, immoral from training and habit rather than from warmth of temperament or passion. We need not wonder that there was no great outburst of affection towards such a people. And, besides, free as he was from vanity—that curse of all little souls—St. Paul, like other men, must have found it difficult to forgive their sneers at his personal peculiarities, his diminutive stature, his physical weaknesses, his sometime difficulty of utterance. The same difference of tone is noticeable in comparing the Epistles to Timothy with that to

Titus. Many passages, scattered throughout the two addressed to himself and in other of the Pauline letters, show how much nearer to Paul's heart was the somewhat weak Timothy, who had again and again to be reminded that the servant of Christ must endure hardness, than the stronger and more self-reliant Titus.

A modern psychologist has no difficulty in fixing St. Paul's temperament. It would be a mixed temperament, compounded of the bilious-nervous with a certain admixture of the sanguine. He was essentially, in the modern acceptation of the word, a nervous man, *i.e.*, a man of highly wrought, and almost diseased, nerves. We all know how sceptical critics have seized upon this trait in Paul's character, in order to make out that he was an hysterical enthusiast who saw visions and dreamed dreams, and whose whole life and career was founded upon a trick of an excitable imagination. It was his peculiar condition of the nerves, they say, which led him to transform a sudden storm of blinding lightning into the appearance of the risen Christ; the same nervous temperament induced him to believe that the knowledge of the facts of the life of Christ, which he had half unconsciously acquired from different sources, was a direct revelation from heaven; a nervous fancy accounts for his assertion that he had been caught up into Paradise, and had there heard words unutterable; and again it was this same enthusiasm, which, causing him to believe that God's angel had appeared to him, gave him power at the time of the shipwreck off Malta to dominate both crew and soldiers, and so save the lives of all. But notwithstanding his nervous temperament, there was nothing hysterical about St. Paul. He was staid and sober-minded, alike in judgment and in action. His nervousness (the term is used in its technical sense) made him the noble man he was. It created a combination of qualities, each acting and reacting upon the other, and thus produced a man nearly perfect in strength of character, determination of will, and power of action, tempered by a disposition deeply affectionate. Possessed of less highly strung nerves, his intellectual acumen, united with his sense of power, would have caused

him to be hard almost to brutality. As it was, he could be hard, and almost brutal, upon occasion: "I would that they which unsettle you would even cut themselves off" (R.V. see marginal reading). His nervous temperament was the salvation of his character.

Some, on very slender grounds, have supposed that St. Paul had been married, and was a widower. The hypothesis rests upon two doubtful "ifs." A doubtful passage seems to imply that he actually voted in the Jewish Sanhedrim, and therefore was a member of that body. "When they were put to death I gave my vote against them." Then we are told that all the members of the Jewish Council were obliged to be married men. Had he been married, and had he lost his wife by death, a man of St. Paul's fine moral sentiments could never have written, that he would that all men were like himself. St. Paul's dislike of marriage was constitutional. It was not that he eschewed marriage (as did Origen) because being without a wife left him more free and untrammelled in his work for Christ. He lays it down as a principle, that it is better to marry than to be consumed with the desire for marriage. St. Paul does not seem to have understood the thought, which is so beautifully expressed in our marriage service, that the union of man and woman is for the mutual society, help, and comfort that the one ought to have for the other; nor, notwithstanding his magnificent simile in the Ephesians, does he give marriage a higher place than that other reason which he brings forward in the Corinthians, and which the same service, not so beautifully, repeats.

The crown of St. Paul was the Gospel which he preached. What Charlemagne was among statesmen, what Julius Cæsar and Napoleon were among soldiers, that was St. Paul among missionaries. His energy was unbounded, his courage dauntless, his zeal limitless, his ardour indomitable. The work he effected was simply marvellous. Alone and unaided he carried the Cross of Christ through Asia Minor, Syria, Europe. He had instruments, as all great great men have instruments; but the work was his. He made his instruments, or chose them, or utilized them when he recognized their adaptation for

his purpose. But the founding of the Churches was his work, his own proper work. He passed through the highlands of Anatolia, which modern events have made familiar to us. He won converts and built up a Church among the wild race, who two centuries before had come from Gaul, and carried dismay into Greece and Asia. It was his preaching, which, commencing in the school of Tyrannus, culminated in the Church of Ephesus, and that band of sister Churches along the coast of the Ægean Sea. The little gathering by the waterside at Philippi extended and grew, until the house of Lydia and the family of the Roman gaoler became a Christian community. In Thessaly his success was equal to what it was in Macedonia. The sailors, and dock-labourers, and warehousemen, of mercantile Corinth, rough and uncouth as they were, received the Gospel at his hands, and became a temple of living stones in which Christ could dwell. Only Athens, disputing about vain systems of philosophy and clinging to the wisdom of this world, listened with mocking scorn as the Apostle unfolded the mystery of the unknown God ignorantly worshipped, and remained without a Church within its boundaries. Even as a prisoner, the voice of the intrepid missionary was heard in the proud imperial city, where riches alone were held in admiration, and luxurious living was the one thing which seemed desirable. Although not the founder of the Church in Rome, the name of Paul will be indissolubly linked with the capital of the ancient world as long as the Epistle to the Romans shall endure. Whether he actually carried out his purpose and went to Spain is doubtful; whether he crossed the narrow sea dividing Gaul from our own land is much more than doubtful; but that by the close of the first century the name of Christ was worshipped from Asia to the boundaries of the known world, was, under God, the work of one man—Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

Hitherto we have regarded St. Paul from one side only. We have studied the man—strong in intellect, firm in will. But there is another side to this study. This man, proud among the proudest of his peers, is humbler than the humblest

before his God. He is great for God's service, but not by his own might, nor by his own power. He works more than all the Apostles; yet it is not he who works, but God who works in him. This strong man can do all things; but he does them all through Christ, who strengthens him. Never was man more animated by the love of Christ than St. Paul; and this love was all the stronger and more powerful because it was not so much a personal sentiment, or an individual feeling, as a principle. It was the constraining power of the man's life. It was never lost sight of; never put in the background; never for a moment forgotten; and it proved itself in action. It made him strong for work, able for endurance, bravely patient. It differed from the impulsive love of St. Peter, though that was very real; it differed from the calm, pure light of St. John's love, though that was true as Christ Himself. While it was the corner-stone on which all his work was built, it was an intense source of joy to St. Paul. Nothing can separate him from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus the Lord. To him to live is Christ. He is crucified with Christ; he lives not, but Christ liveth in him; and the life he lives in the flesh he lives by faith in the Son of God, who loved him and gave Himself for him. He has one source of glory—the Cross of Christ. He has one hope—to attain to the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. He has one desire—to depart and be with Christ, which is far better. All is as loss to him that he may know the excellency of Christ, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings. Without his trust in Christ, he would be of all men the most miserable; and he sums up the one thought whence all the motives of his life have sprung, and the one principle which has ruled every spoken word and every acted deed, when he prays for his converts at Ephesus that Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith; that they, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.

H. N. BERNARD.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Commentaries. I. Critical.

The Prophecies of Isaiah (1), expounded by Dr. C. von Orelli, and translated by the Rev. J.S. Banks, forms Vol. xxxviii. of the new series of Clark's Foreign Theological Library. In the Introduction, the life, the age, the book, and the prophecies of Isaiah are considered, and the more important works quoted in the exposition are put down in detail. Then follow a translation and concurrent notes, which are learned and suggestive, and after each section an exposition in which the line of the prophet's thought is brought out. Prof. Orelli accepts as a fact the double authorship of the book, and supports this view with many strong arguments. We do not see that this view, if quite established, will in any wise detract from the value of the prophecies, although it is not the view held by the Son of Sirach, and many modern commentators. The translator tells us that he has derived the greatest possible help from Canon Cheyne's work on Isaiah and from Prof. Delitzsch's Commentary; so that in this volume we have the results of the latest criticism on the Evangelical prophet, and are furnished with a most valuable help to the understanding of these prophecies. We could wish the Index to be fuller and more complete; but probably the student will do well to make an index for himself. Prof. Orelli's remarks on the Virgin (Isa. vii. 14) are noticeable; the translation of Isa. ix. 4-7 seems crude, but the remarks on the four pairs of words, expressing what Immanuel would prove Himself to be, are judicious. Isa. xxv., like chap. xii., the Professor calls an "enhanced echo of a song on the sea-shore," and he compares it with Exod. xv. The arrangement of the various denunciatory predictions, and the marshalling of the book in sections, will be a great help to the clear understanding of it. Prof. Orelli makes chaps. xxxvi.-xxxix. to be an appendix to the first part of the book, the work of the first Isaiah. With regard to the second part, he adopts the view which F. Rückert first propounded in 1831, that it is divided into three parts—chaps. xl.-xlviii., which, speaking from the Christian standpoint, celebrates the rule of God the Father, and the coming of His kingdom; chaps. xlix.-lvii., in which the seer is absorbed in the sufferings of the Holy and Just One, which will be the salvation of many, and to himself the path of glory; or, in other words, it is the atoning work of the Son of God presented in Old Testament guise; and in chaps. lviii.-lxxi. the work of the Holy Spirit is depicted in the cleansed and glorified and blissful state of the Church of the future. No one can rise from the perusal of Prof. Orelli's work without a deeper knowledge of the prophecies of Isaiah, and a sense of admiration for the learning and care shown in this valuable exposition of them.

We expect that a large circle of readers will welcome the translations of the three great commentators which are now issuing from the office of Mr. Hodges. First and most important in many ways is the *Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide upon the Four Gospels* (2), which has been translated, and is edited, by the Rev. T. W. Mossman. It is published in parts at a small price, as well as in volumes, and is extremely well printed. The work of Cornelius à Lapide is well known to most scholars and divines, but to those who have not yet made acquaintance with it we can recommend this edition for its carefulness and general accuracy. Students will soon find out the author's bias, but they need not follow him wherever he leads; and it will not be difficult to put aside his Romanistic teaching, and find instruction from the stores of learning which he has collected. Cornelius à Lapide brought to the task he undertook a vast amount of patristic learning, and he seems at times to think nothing too trivial to be set down. His "analogical," "tropological," and "anagogical" treatment of various passages is often amusing and always instructive. And he does not fail to give his opinion without hesitation when the occasion demands it. For example, in Matt. iii. 12, he says "for unquenchable the Greek has ἀσβέστῳ, *unextinguished, eternal.* Hence a stone which always burns is called *asbestus*. The fire of hell is ἄσβεστος, inextinguishable, not only because it cannot be quenched, but because it does not consume the wicked whom it burns; nay, it excruciates them living and feeling with endless torments. The error of Origen is here condemned, who thought that the pains of hell would not be eternal, but after the completion of the great cycle of Plato would come to an end." Cornelius à Lapide does not avoid difficulties, nor slur them over; his learning is at times curious, but always deep; and no one can study his work without gaining a better insight into the meaning of the Gospels. The Preface contains valuable essays on the excellence and majesty of the Gospels; on their number, order, agreement, and discrepancies; on the various versions, and the titles prefixed. The text given is that of the Authorised Version in small type, and the notes follow the several chapters verse by verse.

A Commentary on the Holy Gospels (3), by John Maldonatus, is the next on this list. It is translated and edited by G. J. Davie. The first volume contains St. Matthew's Gospel, chaps. i. to xiv. Maldonatus is described as being "one of the most learned theologians, and one of the finest geniuses of his age. He was gifted with admirable quickness of wit, and great subtlety and penetration, and indefatigable diligence in study, by which he made himself master of the Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, and other Eastern languages, to which he added a profound knowledge of the Greek and Latin fathers and historians of the Church." One main purpose of his Commentary apparently was to expose what he considered to be the errors of Calvin; but without entering into any controversy, there is

a good deal that is valuable and suggestive in the work of Maldonatus. In the Preface he says "that modern heretics are offended, and regard us with holy horror, because we say that the Evangelists and other sacred writers derive their authority from the Church, as if we were putting the Church before God. They do not understand, acute as they think themselves, that we say that the Church gives authority to Scripture, because she declares that it was given and dictated by God. Why do they not blame those who say that royal letters have their authority from the chancellor who affixes the seal to them, as if they set the servant above the lord?" Maldonatus only claims that the Church sets the seal on the Scriptures, which are Divine in their origin. His Preface also contains answers to such questions as—why the Evangelists wrote? what language they wrote in? their number and the titles? And then in the body of the work the text is given broken up into very small parts, with the notes on each part following; these notes abound with references to the fathers, and are always learned and very often suggestive to the student. He is sometimes cutting and severe, but such was the temper of the times; and those of his opponents "who considered him an evil speaker, maledicentissimus Maldonatus," have not been able to refrain from praise of his strength of mind and great erudition.

Mr. Hodges' next venture is a translation by Mr. A. H. Prichard of *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul by Bernardine à Piconio.* (4) Henri Bernardine de Picquigny published his commentary under the sanction of the Theologians of the Capuchin order and of the Faculty of Theology of the Sorbonne at Paris. It appeared first in 1703, and, like the two preceding works, will be by many appreciated in an English dress. The student will have frequent reminders that the author of this work was a Roman Catholic, but that need not prevent his gathering much that is useful. The volume before us contains the Epistle to the Romans and the first Epistle to the Corinthians. The text is given in sections, with notes following; the translation does not appear to be either that of the Authorised or Revised Versions entirely; the notes are given in good readable English. After each chapter there is what is called a "Corollary of Piety" which emphasizes the chief point or points of the chapter. A good sermon could often be made from these Corollaries of Piety. Like the two preceding works, this is admirably printed.

The second volume of Dr. Franz Delitzsch's *Commentary on Genesis* (5) is a worthy successor of the first which we reviewed some time ago. It is needless to say that Dr. Delitzsch's notes are learned and suggestive. It is indeed a scholarly work, which students of Biblical knowledge will be glad to have by them. His remarks on Circumcision as compared with Baptism will be read with interest; and so will that on the Divine names as revealed to various generations and conditions of mankind; but in truth it is difficult to particularise where all is so good, and we can thoroughly commend the

way in which Miss Taylor has performed her work of translation and the manner in which the publishers have turned the book out.

The second volume of *Word Studies in the New Testament* (6), by Dr. Vincent, includes the writings of St. John, and forms a handsome volume of notes which will be extremely useful towards aiding students to a proper understanding of that part of the Bible. In the Introduction we are furnished with a short and careful life of St. John, an account of the Gospel which bears his name, together with its relation to the Synoptic Gospels; then follows a dissertation on the Epistles and the Apocalypse, and also a short essay on the style and diction of the Evangelist. The notes show extensive reading and good scholarship. Dr. Vincent often refers to Dr. Westcott, and points out the instances in whch the Revised Translation differs from the Authorised Version. Some of the articles are very good indeed, *e.g.*, that on the Logos and the Hidden Manna. After the first Epistle is an exhaustive excursus on 1 John iii. 19-22. Altogether this volume is a distinctly valuable addition to Biblical research and elucidation, and we are happy to recommend it to any who desire help in understanding the Scriptures.

Dr. S. G. Green has written a good preface to Mr. Carnelley's book on the *Questions of the Bible* (8). The body of the work is simply taken up with the questions in the Bible, printed in thick type and accompanied with so much of the context as will serve to announce them. At the end are tables showing the number of questions in each chapter, both of the Old and New Testaments, there being a total of 929 chapters and 2,274 questions in the one, and 260 chapters and 1,024 questions in the other. Mr. Carnelley also tells us that Zephaniah is the only book in the Old Testament without a question; Leviticus contains only two questions; the Gospel of St. John contains most questions on the average; and 1 Cor. chap. ix. has the most questions of any chapter. There are in the Bible 736 chapters with questions and 453 without. Mr. Carnelley's is a curious book, and possibly not without use, though it is difficult to say just what the use is.

(1) *The Prophecies of Isaiah.* Expounded by Dr. C. von Orelli. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1889. Price 10s. 6d.

(2) *The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide.* Translated by Thomas W. Mossman. Second Edition. London: John Hodges. 1887, &c.

(3) *A Commentary on the Holy Gospels.* By John Maldonatus. London: John Hodges. 1888.

(4) *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul.* By B. à Piconio. Translated and Edited from the original Latin by A. H. Prichard, B.A., Merton College, Oxford. London: John Hodges, 1888.

(5) A new *Commentary on Genesis.* By Franz Delitzsch, D.D. Translated by Sophia Taylor. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889.

(6) *Word Studies in the New Testament.* Vol. II. By Marvin R. Vincent, D.D. London: J. Nisbet & Co. Price 16s.

(7) *Questions of the Bible.* Compiled by W. Carnelley. London: T. Fisher Unwin. Price 7s. 6d.

Commentaries. 2. Homiletic.

In setting forth the *Character and Mission of the Prophet Jonah* (1), Dr. Martin has produced a valuable expository commentary on the prophet's life, his work, and his book. The commentary, as the author admits, owes a good deal to Calvin, and something to Dr. Fairbairn, but Dr. Martin's own personality is abundantly evident too; and the preacher and the ordinary reader will find in the volume much that will assist them. Dr. Martin exerts himself to set Jonah in a favourable light, and it is quite possible that the prophet's timidity in the outset and his anger at the end of his mission have somewhat darkened his character, and obscured what he did well and successfully. Dr. Martin's volume will be found to contain valuable remarks on a variety of subjects more or less germane to the matter in hand, *e.g.*, whether and how far unenlightened reason can furnish man with a religion; the characteristics of an ambassador for Christ; the working of faith, &c. The chapter on Jonah as a type is well worth study, and the chapters on the New Testament commentaries about Jonah are thoughtful and suggestive. Dr. Martin's work is a valuable contribution to the hermeneutics on the minor prophets, and deserves to be widely read and deeply pondered.

Bishop Alexander has furnished an attractive contribution to the Expositor's Bible in the volume which contains his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John* (2). The text is given in five versions, and under the various sections are discourses upon the most important topics, followed by exegetic notes. This commentary is not so learned as Dr. Westcott's, to which the author expresses himself indebted, or as Dr. Jelf's; but in many ways it is as useful, and in some ways more useful, than these; while it is more critical than the well-known work of Dr. Morgan. The discourses are eloquent and brilliant, and the student, the expositor, and the general reader will each in turn be delighted and instructed by them. Dr. Alexander includes in his purview the widest range of topics—Evolution and the Salvation Army, the Sacraments and the devotion of Father Damien—and all are treated with a delicate discernment born of ripe and generous judgment. We could have wished that the sections of the text had been numbered, and the book would be greatly improved by an index. This we hope to see added in another edition, which we should think will be speedily called for.

The next volume in this series is a *Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (3), by Dr. Milligan, in which he tells us his aim has been rather to catch the general import and object of the Revelation of

St. John considered as a whole. He has therefore treated the book in sections and paragraphs rather than verse by verse. Whether or not this method is the better of the two will be settled possibly by the bias of the reader or student; but at any rate it is not good for a commentator to make up his mind to a certain view first, and then use his efforts to make the book commented upon square with his opinions. Dr. Milligan takes a very broad view of the Apocalypse, and explains everything simply from the moral standpoint. The Epistles are pictures of the Church in its various historical phases; there is nothing in the whole Apocalypse either very special or quite personal. This seems to be Dr. Milligan's view, which he supports with a good deal of skill, but he constantly varies from the great body of commentators. Even with regard to the number 666, in chap. xiii., Dr. Milligan does not explain that of any particular person, but of a "potency of evil than which there can be none greater, and a direfulness of fate than which there can be none worse." He says "the *number* is important, and not the name." Nero, Domitian, or any other persecutor may be a type of the beast, but the "whole strain of the chapter forbids the supposition that the meaning of the name is exhausted in any individual." Dr. Milligan claims a very high place for his method of exposition; he does, however, expect his principles will be generally accepted, though he thinks that if they are rejected there is "only one conclusion possible—that the Apocalypse, however interesting as a literary memorial of the early Christian age, must be regarded as a merely human production, and not entitled to a place in the canon of Scripture." As the learned author while saying this strives to vindicate the authority of the Apocalypse, he assumes the highest possible importance for his endeavour.

The ninth volume of the *Expositor* (4) now before us is in many ways a commendable production. Amongst the contributors will be found many of the foremost names in the realm of theology. Prof. Bruce discourses on several parts of the Epistle to the Hebrews; Dr. Chadwick on the Apostles; Prof. Driver on the Double Text of Jeremiah; and Prof. Ramsay on Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia. The Rev. F. Rendal gives what he considers to be the Scriptural Idea of Priesthood; the Rev. G. Selby criticises the opinions of Prof. Huxley on the Gadarene Swine; Dr. Delitzsch defends his Hebrew New Testament; and Canon Farrar furnishes a new exegesis of the last nine chapters of Ezekiel. And these by no means exhaust a volume which clearly shows the course of present thought, and tells the movements of that circle of scholars whose aim is the clearer understanding and development of the meaning of Holy Scripture. We may not always agree with their conclusions, but we can heartily appreciate their endeavours. It is illustrated with a portrait of Prof. Cheyne, by H. Manesse.

The first volume of the *Biblical Illustrator with regard to the Gospel of St. Luke* (5) takes us as far as the end of the 7th chapter, and is a mine of material whence preachers and teachers can gather substance for lessons and sermons. He must be hard to please, or a very "full" man indeed, who cannot here find something to assist him in preparing for his task. We suppose that an index of subjects will finally appear, and that will be an immense assistance to the use of the book. But, however, every verse seems to be duly commented upon and illustrated with remarks mostly to the point, oftentimes striking, sometimes original, and often amusing. Extracts are given from Dr. Pusey and Dr. Parker, C. Kingsley and Dr. Vinke, Dr. Dale and Mr. Spurgeon, and hosts of others; so it is clear that the *Illustrator* is constructed without any bias, but with the clear intention of bringing the best to bear on all points.

The British Weekly Pulpit (6) is a companion to the *British Weekly Journal;* but whether the first volume now under notice is a half-yearly or yearly one does not clearly appear. The Editor says that in this magazine he will endeavour to study freshness and variety. There are brief articles by various authors, and complete sermons by such distinguished preachers as Bishop Alexander, Dr. Dale, George Macdonald, Dr. Dykes, Mr. Berry, Dr. Maclaren, the Rev. John Mc Neill, Mr. Spurgeon, and many others. So the reader can here compare the styles of all sorts of pulpit orators; and the preacher, if need be, can find numerous models of pulpit eloquence. There are also prayers by many of these eminent ministers. We suppose that a place can be found for the *Weekly Pulpit*, although it seems to us that the number of such publications "has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished."

The fourth volume of the *Sermon Bible* (7) contains homiletic comments on the Prophetical Books, and concludes the series as far as the Old Testament is concerned. The notes are carefully chosen from a wide circle of authors, and references are given to a still wider circle. This volume, like its predecessors, forms a very serviceable assistance to preachers and teachers, and in cases where a short exposition of Scripture forms a part of domestic devotion, many of the homiletic sections will be found suitable and instructive. The publishers are to be commended also for the printing and get-up of the work.

The Book of Job forms the eleventh volume of the *People's Bible* (8). In a recent note to an American periodical, Dr. Parker calls the *People's Bible* his life work, and points out that it is the only *spoken* commentary with which he is acquainted. He says that it is "not elaborately composed with a view to literary display, nor a pulpit portmanteau into which a man may put all kinds of odds and ends principally belonging to other people; it is a repertory of pastoral comment in which the broadest truths are earnestly applied to the daily experience of Christian life." Dr. Parker uses strong

language with regard to what he calls official priests, whom he evidently does not wish to rank himself among, nor to assist in their endeavours. The book is a *People's Bible*, mainly if not solely. As it will no doubt be a benefit to anybody to read the Book of Job carefully, it will be a greater benefit still to understand it, and Dr. Parker's volume, though it does not evince much learning or critical skill, may still be helpful in showing a wayfaring man how not to err. The "handfuls of purpose" in this volume do not strike us as being as good as usual; but then it can hardly be expected even of Dr. Parker that he should *totus, teres, atque rotundus* at all times and on all subjects.

This volume (9) contains the Catholic Epistles except the Epistle of St. James, and will prove one of the most welcome in the series. Of a first-class character there are remarkably few helps to the Catholic Epistles readily available to the student or preacher. We have, therefore, studied the present volume with peculiar interest and special care; and can with full confidence and real pleasure assert that it supplies a long-felt and often-expressed want. It would have been difficult to have found three more competent hands to write notes at once of a scholarly as well as of a popular style than the Vicar of Northallerton, the Master of University College, Durham, and the Professor of Theology, Free Church College, Aberdeen. We think each of these had the right task assigned to him, namely, to the Rev. B. C. Caffin, the Petrine Epistles, to Dr. Plummer, the Johannian Epistles, and to Dr. Salmon, St. Jude. The homilies are furnished by Dr. Maclaren, Professor Thompson, U. R. Thomas, R. Finlayson, Professor T. Crosbery, and other practised preachers. To those who through stress of time or want of analytical skill resort to such helps, these sermonic productions will be a welcome "find."

(1) *The Prophet Jonah.* By Hugh Martin, D.D. Third Edition. Edinburgh: James Gemmell. 1889.

(2) *The Epistles of St. John.* Twenty Discourses, with Greek Text. Comparative Versions and Notes. By William Alexander, D.D., D.C.L. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889. Price 7s. 6d.

(3) *The Book of Revelation.* By W. Milligan, D.D. Second Thousand. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889. Price 7s. 6d.

(4) *The Expositor.* Vol. ix. Third Series. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Price 7s. 6d.

(5) *The Biblical Illustrator.* St. Luke. Vol. i. By Rev. J. S. Exell, M.A. London: J. Nisbet & Co. Price 7s. 6d.

(6) *The British Weekly Pulpit.* Vol. i. London: *British Weekly* Office. 1889. Price 6s.

(7) *The Sermon Bible.* Isaiah to Malachi. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889. Price 7s. 6d.

(8) *The People's Bible.* Vol. xi. The Book of Job. By J. Parker, D.D. London: Hazell, Watson & Viney, Limited. 1889. Price 8s.

(9) *The Pulpit Commentary.* Peter, John, Jude. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. Price 16s.

Miscellaneous. *Religious Teaching and Modern Thought* (1) is a little volume containing two lectures or addresses given to the students of Magee College, Londonderry, by Professor Leebody. The first lecture is entitled "The Quest for a Creed," in which the Professor traverses the statements of Messrs. Huxley, Cotter Morrison, and others, that Christianity has had its day and is passing away. He maintains that the religion of the New Testament should be taught, and that nothing more is needed or likely to be a substitute for it. He points out three distinct methods of presenting Christianity—the Ritualistic, in which are classed the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches and the High Church section of the Anglican Church; the Rationalistic, to which belong the Protestant Churches of Germany and the Broad Church section of the Anglican Church; and the Evangelical, which is followed by the Presbyterian Churches of America, Scotland, and Ireland, Methodist Churches in general, and the Low Church body in the English Church. Professor Leebody allows each to have merits not possessed by the others, but gives the palm to the Evangelical method. The second lecture is on "The Methods of Instruction," in which he argues that teaching may be very useful even if everything about the subject-matter is not clearly understood; that methods of stating truth may alter though the truth does not; that the personal character of the teacher goes for very much; that preaching is never likely to lose its efficiency if it be thoughtful and earnest, but that in his public utterances the preacher should rather seek to fill men's minds with truth than to directly combat error. The little work is well worth reading and thinking about.

Demonology (2) under its modern aspect of spiritualism is considered by Mr. Brown with a great deal of learning and skill. He evidently believes in the claims of spiritualists *et hoc genus omne*, but maintains that the spirits dealt with are really evil spirits who take this method of deceiving people. We cannot go with Mr. Brown in all his conclusions, but the matter is worth study, and his work will be a help to any who take an interest in the matter.

Roman Catholic Claims, (3) its author says, was written for persons who accept, or are disposed to accept, the Catholic position; and is addressed to Catholic-minded persons in the Church of England, or Churches in communion with her, who find themselves attacked from the side of Rome, and hear it denied that it is possible to be Catholics without being Roman Catholics. Mr. Gore states the Roman claims

very fairly and with sufficient fulness for his purpose, and he shows with much clearness how unsubstantial they are. The work should be a "Dissuasive from Popery," and we therefore recommend it, though we are sorry to find that the Reformation is characterised as somewhat of a schismatic movement. Query: what would England be now had there been no Reformation, and if that had not been as thorough as it was? Mr. Gore concludes that though there is "much to be regretted and reformed in the teaching of the Anglican Church of the present day, yet there is no even unauthorized practice of the English Church he would not as soon be responsible for as the withdrawal of the chalice from the laity." Mariolatry and the undue exaltation of the Pope he also strenuously condemns. Mr. Gore believes that the imperfections in the Church do not prevent her fulfilling her true function, and he is quite sure that the Anglican Church is a true branch of the Church Catholic.

How They Kept the Faith (4) is a thrilling story of Huguenot faithfulness and constancy. The faith, as represented in the person and conduct of Réné Chevalier, is somewhat severe and sombre, yet the book is full of characters of great attraction by their sweetness and gentleness. This charming tale is one which may well be put into the hands of young persons of either sex, for the lessons it contains are such as all young people ought to learn; and such terrible episodes in Christian history ought not to be forgotten, although we hope and trust that never under any circumstances will it be possible for such things to recur.

The Shepherd Psalm (5) is the title of a little work on the 23rd Psalm, by the Rev. F. B. Meyer. It is intended for the use of sick and infirm people and for private reading. It is full of good thoughts well expressed, and will be very useful for the purpose designed. It is prettily got up.

To those who are contented with a very moderate amount of amusement, *Political Wit and Humour* (6) may suffice to while away an hour, which might be worse spent than in reading this work. The contents are culled from the speeches of a number of leading politicians, past and present, but it requires some wit to see the humour, and some good humour to appreciate the wit. The compiler regrets he has not been able to give more space to Mr. Labouchere, which will be a matter for regret, or otherwise, as the case may be.

An Arrow Shot at Blasphemy (7), by Mr. James Davis, seems to us hardly calculated to hit the mark; it is so feathered with heated zeal that it will consume itself in its flight. The blasphemy is that which Mr. Davis considers to be the outcome of the doctrine of Apostolical succession. His ideas with regard to the meaning of the Lord's Prayer and other matters are peculiar. The little book looks as if it were printed at home, and displays a good many errors in spelling.

Our Children for Christ (8) is a plea for infant Church membership, a defence of infant baptism as practised by affusion. Mr. MacNaughton treats the matter historically; gives reasons from the nature of the case, and cites the authority of the fathers and the Apostolic constitutions. Then follow a discussion on the mode of baptism and an examination of various texts which treat of the subject. The work has reached a third edition, and is a very useful little manual to have at hand to give to any one who has any doubts in this important matter.

Nor'ard of the Dogger (9) is an entertaining account of a great, useful, and successful work initiated and carried on amongst the North Sea fishermen, under the direction of Mr. E. J. Mather. The secondary title is "Deep-Sea Trials and Gospel Triumphs," and of both we have here a very comforting record. The book, too, not only shows how the interest of the public has been enlisted, but also how the prayerful efforts of those most actively engaged in it have been rewarded. The brave men who go through such dangers to supply us with food certainly deserved that something should be done for them, and we are very happy to find that what has been done is so much appreciated by them. The volume is nicely illustrated and well got up every way.

In the tenth volume of *Present Day Tracts* (10) we are presented with six essays on the subjects of Christian Evidence, Doctrine, and Morals; all excellent in their various ways. It is claimed for the volume that "it will be found to yield to none of its predecessors in the interest, value, and importance of its contents;" and we think the claim is justified. We wish the volume may be widely known and carefully considered, for we are sure that each essay will be found both interesting and usefully instructive. Dr. Conder deals with the moral difficulties of the Old Testament, and Mr. Girdlestone takes up the subject of the Age and Trustworthiness of the Old Testament Scriptures; Dr. Blaikie discourses delightfully about the Scriptural

Ideal of Family Life; and Mr. Kaufman treats of Socialism. Dr. Stoughton's tract on the Unity of Faith is conceived in the best spirit, and is most hopeful; and at the outset of the volume is a capital treatise on the Authenticity of St. Paul's four principal Epistles, ending up with a summary of what is called St. Paul's Gospel gathered from them. This volume bears date April, 1889.

Phœnicia (11) is the eighteenth volume of the Story of the Nations series, and in it Professor Rawlinson records the history of that ancient country with all the additions that modern research has been able to make. It is an interesting and instructive volume. Interesting as showing the rise and prowess of one of the foremost, if not the most prominent, nations of ancient times; interesting as showing how much the human race, or at any rate the European nations, are indebted to this energetic people; and instructive as showing how easily a great commercial community which spends its energies simply in the accumulation of wealth and the cultivation of those delights which wealth and commerce can collect, may fall a prey to its enemies. There is a good deal in the history of Tyre and Sidon which finds a representation in modern London life; and as we have the history of those cities before us, we shall be foolish if we do not take heed to the lessons it conveys. The volume is profusely illustrated, and the chapter on the alphabet and the Phœnician writing is extremely interesting.

(1) *Religious Teaching and Modern Thoaght.* By J. R. Leebody, M.A. London: Henry Frowde. 1889.

(2) *Demonology and Witchcraft.* By Robert Brown. London: John F. Shaw & Co.

(3) *Roman Catholic Claims.* By Charles Gore, M.A. Second Edition. London: Rivingtons. 1889.

(4) *How They Kept the Faith.* By Grace Raymond. London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson & Sons.

(5) *The Shepherd Psalm.* By F. B. Meyer, B.A. London: Morgan & Scott. Price 1s. and 1s. 6d.

(6) *Political Wit and Wisdom in Our Own Times.* Collected and Edited by T. Williams. London: Field & Tuer. 1889. Price 1s.

(7) *An Arrow Shot at Blasphemy.* By James Davis. London John Kensit. 1889.

(8) *Our Children for Christ.* By the Rev. Samuel MacNaughton, M.A. Third Edition. Edinburgh: James Gemmell. 1889.

(9) *Nor'ard of the Dogger.* E. J. Mather. Nisbet & Co. 1888. Price 4s. 6d.

(10) *Present Day Tracts*, vol. x. Religious Tract Society.

(11) *Phœnicia.* By George Rawlinson, M.A. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1889. Price 5s.

Henderson & Spalding, Printers, Marylebone Lane, London, W.