

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
 - Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
 - Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
 - Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
 - Pages detached/
Pages détachées
 - Showthrough/
Transparence
 - Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
 - Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
 - Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
 - Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
 - Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE CANADIAN
Methodist Review.

[NEW SERIES.]

VOL. VII.]

JULY-AUGUST, 1895.

[No. 4.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S ATONEMENT.

A CONTRIBUTION TOWARD THE FORMULATION OF A
CONSISTENT ARMINIAN THEORY.

ARTICLE VII.

THE CONSUMMATION OF AN ETERNAL PLAN.

"HAVING made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in him unto a dispensation of the fullness of times, to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth; in him, I say, in whom also we were made a heritage, having been foreordained according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his will; to the end that we should be unto the praise of his glory, we who had before hoped in Christ."¹

A majority of Christian people and not a few of systematic theologians regard the atonement of Christ as an expedient devised to meet a contingency. We regard this as a fruitful source of misconception, confusion and error. Amid all the limitations that hem in the human intellect it is not difficult to discover that one idea runs through and dominates the entire universe—the revelation of God to His creatures. Scripture, with all its authority, confirms the testimony of the material universe to this unity of idea, and makes it absolutely universal.

1. Eph. i. 9-12 (R.V.). See also Eph. iii. 9, 10, and Col. i. 10, 20 (R.V.).

Between Nature and Revelation, as the product of one All-Perfect Mind, there is no conflict; but the deepest and truest harmony. Properly pondered, they have the same aim—indeed, at the root they are one.

If it can be shown that the redemption of man by Jesus Christ is part of an eternal plan whose scope takes in the outermost limit of creation, and affects the destiny of all races of intelligent creatures, a plan which to us seems necessary, in order that man may understand and interpret himself, his relation to God, and the revelation which God has made of himself in Nature and Providence—the ground will be cut from under many forms of scepticism, both empirical and scientific. In the unity so manifest in Revelation itself, considered in connection with the fact that it rests on events prior to the history of the human race, we have such presumptive evidence as warrants the assumption that the Divine plans are an unit. Nor are we shut up to mere inferences, for the New Testament contains many direct statements on this subject—statements whose mines of wealth remain largely unexplored. In addition to the one already quoted from the Epistle to the Ephesians, we may take the first chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians: “Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and he is before all things, and in him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him I say, whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens.” In the wide sweep of their comprehensiveness, as well as in the glow of their splendour, we regard these words of Paul as among the richest contributions he has made to our Christology. Whatever depths, unfathomable by us in our present circum-

stances, these words may contain; they clearly reveal the relation of Christ to the Eternal Father, to the entire universe of being, as well as His redemptorial relation to the human race. Further, and more to our present purpose, these inspired words warrant us in affirming that in Christ's mediatorial relation between the Father and the universe we find the basis of that other mediatorial relation by which sinful man is reconciled to God. "Whatever is said of Christ as the Creator, Disposer, and End of all things, relates to Him very mainly in His mediatorial office, and must be understood as preparatory to and included in it."¹ "On the supposition that the Son is Creator and Lord, in distinction from the Father, there is a basis laid for a remedial polity, because mediatorial relations may intervene. A place is found for them in a Person standing between the creature and the Most High, in the Divine nature, who by assuming the nature of the creature forms the meeting point between them, a daysman who can lay his hand upon them both."² If we have caught the drift of the Apostles thought, creation, providence and redemption are the complement of each other; working under the same management toward the same end; the grand issue of all being—to unite two phrases of Paul—"The purpose of the ages which God purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, to sum up all things in Christ."³

At the first glance this may seem to be the surrender of one of the central truths of our Arminian theology. To us the plan seems so evidently taught in the New Testament that if it were necessary our system of theology should be reconstructed so as to take it in. We fail, however, to see anything in the thought now before us that is antagonistic to any essential element of our Arminianism properly expounded. We are inclined to regard it as a missing link, which needs to be welded into the chain which will greatly increase at once its strength and worth. We are profoundly convinced that it is along this line that the student will find the true *rationale* of the nature and the strongest defence of the doctrine of atonement, which all Christians rightly regard as the very citadel of their faith.

1. Steward, "Mediatorial Sovereignty," Vol. II., p. 26.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

3. Eph. iii. 11 (margin of R.V.), and Eph. i. 10 (R.V.).

It is matter for gratitude, as we observe, that the trend of the best Christian intellect of the day is in the direction at which we have hinted. It would not be difficult to form a catena of eminent names, or to furnish a considerable catalogue of books that would demonstrate our affirmation. To us this is one of the most hopeful signs of the times; but we must not be satisfied with mere hints or analogies. That is the fault of Professor Drummond's exceedingly able and interesting volume on "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." For we must not allow the beauty of the Professor's style, nor the wealth of illustration with which his book abounds, to hide from us the fallacies of his logic, especially that of affixing a different meaning to terms in his conclusions to that which they have in his premises. The volume has many merits, and is most valuable; but, so far as it bears on the subject before us, it goes too far or it does not go far enough. Thankful for the help which he and others have furnished, we must press on in our investigations, until it shall have been demonstrated that God's manifestations of himself in Creation, Providence and Redemption are either dual or an unit. The cautious and profound Bishop Butler has taught us that "The natural and moral constitution and government of the world are so connected, as to make up together but one scheme; and it is highly probable that the first is formed and carried on merely in subserviency to the latter, as the vegetable world is for the animal, and organized bodies for the mind."¹ Is it not, therefore, "Safe to assume that what God purposes from eternity as the chief manifestation of His infinite perfections was forshadowed in all His works and ways? Indeed, it is incredible that God's utmost manifestations of His perfections in Redemption should be one to the evidence and illustration and support of which the universe itself rightly interpreted, would not ultimately come."²

The "Progress of Doctrine," fulminate against it who may, becomes precious to us when it is seen to contribute to clearness and comprehensiveness of view of Christ's great work for man and the whole universe of intelligent beings. We believe the

1. "Analogy," Part I, Chap. VII., p. 179, Bohn's Edition.

2. T. M. Armour's "Atonement and Law," pp. 20, 21.

day is near when man will cease to regard the work of Christ as a "Great Exception" in the method of Divine procedure. The protests of Professor Drummond on this line, following, as he does, the profound authors of "The Unseen Universe," are well taken. Redemption is not to be studied as a thing apart—"a portion cut off by an insurmountable barrier"¹ from the rest of the Divine works—but as an integral part of a vast whole, the crown and completion of all the forthputtings of the benevolence, the wisdom and the might of Jehovah; and is, therefore, as open to investigation by the human intellect as the rest of His works, and like them, governed by laws consonant with His infinite perfections.

In the introductory chapter to his great work, George Steward has shown us with singular clearness and beauty that the Divine Sovereignty is the aspect of Deity most open to man. He affirms that Self-Existence, Self-Sufficiency and Sovereignty are the leading predicates of God; and that the proper correlates of these are Creation, Providence and Government; and there is neither attribute nor operation of Deity cognizable to us which is not included under one or other of these three heads.² That of Government is the only one that directly concerns us just now; but this, like the Divine Essence, pervades the entire universe. There is neither an atom, a world or a life which is not under God's rule. The reign of divine law is absolutely universal, and always equally beneficent in its objects and ends. Hooker's oft quoted words are sublimely true: "All things in heaven and earth do her homage; the very least, as feeling her care; and the greatest, as not exempted from her power. Both angels, and men, and creatures of whatever condition, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy,"³ With this recognized fact before us, we can no more conceive of the mediation of Christ as outside of God's plan than we can conceive of a world or its inhabitants as exempt from His rule.

That the redemption of man by Jesus Christ is an integral

1. Tait and Stewart, "The Unseen Universe," pp. 89, 90.

2. See Steward's "Mediatorial Sovereignty," Vol. I., Chap. 1.

3. "Ecclesiastical Polity" (Universal Library Edition), p. 129.

part of a Divine plan, seems evident from the fact that it rests on the work of Creation, dovetails with exquisite exactness into all the minute details of Providence, is the complement of both, and necessary to the interpretation of either. We can scarcely agree to the assertion of the author of "Philosophy and Christianity," that "Creation and Redemption are two names for one fact or process." Yet we do most sincerely believe that "The conception of Redemption was a cosmical conception."¹ Creation and Redemption are two acts in the same drama, two events in the working out of one grand purpose. So intimately associated are the origin and redemption of man in the thought of the Apostle Paul in one of the passages already quoted,² that our conceptions of the one are necessarily modified by our conceptions of the other. The *pleroma*, or "fulness" of the Godhead residing in the Second Person of the Holy Trinity was for the manifestation of Deity to the creature; the reconciliation to Him, and the unification in Him of "all things upon the earth and all things in the heavens." Then, if we glance at Providence we find at work here the identical principles which in Scripture are represented as regulating Redemption—principles which in both are seen to be working towards the same ends. Of course the nature of the case requires that Creation should antedate Providence, and that Providence should antedate Redemption. Now, this identity of operation and end gives some degree of certainty to the presumption that Creation, Providence and Redemption have not only a common origin, but a common purpose. With our argument thus buttressed, we feel warranted in affirming that all the possibilities involved in the creation of intelligent and responsible beings, with all the contingencies implied in their production, were before the Divine mind from eternity. With this fact before us, it seems necessary to assume that the Divine procedure was mapped out from the beginning. Scripture certainly warrants our affirming that the mediation of Jesus Christ was a part of that plan; and further; we think that the mediation of Christ was as wide in

1. Morris' "Philosophy and Christianity," pp. 197 and 192.

2. Col. i. 15-20.

its scope—according to the words of Paul—as Creation or Providence.¹

The attitude of the Divine Being towards man after his fall shows that there is an intimate connection between his redemption and his former condition. Without in any way ascribing the authorship of sin to God, there is a sense in which the two conditions are the working out of the one purpose of the Eternal God. With all the facts simultaneously before the mind's eye, it seems to us that the rule exercised over man in his primitive condition was preparatory to that more glorious rule of which Christ's sacrificial death is the throne, and of which the Holy Ghost is the Administrator. In the passages quoted from the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians² Paul ascribes a twofold Headship to Christ; natural and redemptional. "And the first is the source and ground of the second, the second the issue and consequence of the first, its reassertion and consummation."³ If our conceptions of the meaning of the Apostle in these passages is correct, then Creation was a platform reared for the purpose of disclosing to the intelligent universe the profound wisdom of God in the redemption of man by Jesus Christ. It is somewhat remarkable that the Apostle Paul should have used the word "wisdom," and put his emphasis upon it, rather than the word "goodness."⁴ We may never be able to fathom all the mysteries of the wondrous scheme of redemption; but for every patient student there is clearness enough to justify the words of Leibnitz, that "God has the qualities of a good Governor as well as of a great Architect." And further, the words of the great Apostle of the Gentiles teach us that Christ held a mediational relation between the Father and the universe before He became the Mediator between God and man, and we do not esteem it to be the importation of an element foreign to the Apostle's thought to affirm that Christ's mediational relation to the universe was preparatory for and essential to His mediational relation between God and

1. See Col. i. 15-20 (R. V.)

2. Col. i. 15-20; Eph. i. 10; iii. 9-11 (R. V.)

3. Prof. Findley in "Pulpit Commentary," on Colossians.

4. Eph. iii. 11.

sinful man.¹ The absolute supremacy of Christ in both spheres, upon which the Apostle insists so strongly, seems to imply an unity of purpose as well as harmonious working. Alluding to the passage in the first chapter of Colossians, George Steward says, there is here "a very striking collocation; the order is first Creation, then Providence, then Atonement; by which order is intimated the introduction of the restorative element into the universe, not merely as a component of its moral perfection, but as included in the plan of its existence."²

In the creation of a being like man, the possibility of sin is necessarily implied. Freedom to do good or evil is, in all worlds, the essential condition of all created moral life. Necessity and freedom are incompatible.³ As we have in another place endeavored to show, man's moral nature implies a basis or standard of righteousness which is prior to it, and to which the consciousness of each individual makes its appeal. But man has a physical as well as a moral nature, which is intimately related to the material universe as the theatre of its moral life. Now, in the method of the Divine procedure, as unfolded alike in Nature and Revelation, the physical not only antedates the moral, but reacts upon it. This is the explanation of all physical suffering, which grows out of the transgression of moral law, and we can scarcely conceive the works of God to be so imperfect as to suppose that these physical consequences of moral lapse were introduced after the Fall; we are consequently shut up to the conclusion that they were arranged for in the original plan of creation, and are to be regarded as expressions of God's righteous indignation when sin became a fact in the history of the human race.⁴ So far, then, we see that between

1. "The Pulpit Commentary," on Colossians has some excellent remarks on this subject.

2. "The Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews," p. 64.

3. "The nature and order of all events, viewed on their Godward side, and in connection with moral beings, take their form from the fact that such moral beings are the subjects of Divine government. Now, there is one condition on which alone free moral creatures can exist and be the subjects of moral rule, and that is the possible occurrence of sin. This is the essential, unavoidable condition of moral life."—Prof. Chapman's "Symposium on Atonement," in *Homiletical Magazine*, for Dec. 1882, p. 353.

4. "We talk unwisely about the change produced in the material universe by the Fall. We must always distinguish between laws and their administration. I think it likely the laws underwent no change, only the administration was modified. We can readily imagine how very

the physical and the moral there is such a connection as indicates that both were in the mind of the Creator ere either had come into being, and this interdependence of the physical and the moral we take as evidence that they are parts of one plan.

It may be well, just here, to anticipate the objection that the views here advanced seem to make sin a necessity. We say nothing here of its origin—that is a problem yet unsolved, a mystery into which the most eagle-eyed intellect is too weak to peer.¹ To use the words of Dr. Hitchcock, "It came knocking for admission, and God's shoulder was not against the gate. For some reason, or reasons, not revealed, perhaps not revealable, God thought it best not to put His shoulder against the gate. The hateful and hated thing pushed through. Ormuzd let in Ahriman."² All with which we have to do just here is with sin as a necessity; and our answer is, that it cannot be denied that the physical is constructed so as to provide for the contingency of sin in the moral; and between sin as possible and sin as a necessity, there is a distinction it requires no great acumen to discover; and, from an Arminian standpoint, no special dialectic skill to defend. Without the possibility of sin

slight modification in the action of these laws would conduce most materially to our use and pleasure."—"Life of Rev. G. Steward," p. 144.

The remarks of Bishop Warburton on this subject are worthy of attention. He says: "The application of natural events to moral government, in the common course of Providence, connects the character of Lord and Governor of the intellectual world with that of Creator and Preserver of the Material. . . . The doctrine of the pre-established harmony—the direction of natural events to moral government—obviates all irreligious suspicions, and not only satisfies that there is but one Governor of both systems, but that both systems are governed by one scheme of Providence. . . . When He made the world, the free determination of the human will, and the necessary effects of laws physical, were so fitted and accommodated to one another, that a sincere repentance in the moral world should be sure to avert an impending desolation in the natural, not by any present alteration or suspension of its established laws, but by originally adjusting all their operations to all the foreseen circumstances of moral agency."—"Works," Vol. X., p. 8.

1. "Surely it is consistent with the goodness of God to create creatures as like himself as possible? Yet how could this be without free will? A creature without will could have but a very low capacity of happiness—merely sentient, like the animals. You say, 'But why do we share in the Fall? Why are we born with corrupt natures?' There you must put the remedy alongside the evil. Of course, the argument proves the universality of Redemption. The Day of Atonement was for *all* the people, and the shadow cannot be broader than the substance. You say: 'The trial is to hard?' Would an easier trial have had a more favorable result? Is it so in the affairs of this life? Do those most favorably circumstanced do the best? Do not men recklessly throw away health and fortune every day, and do we say when they reap the consequences that it is unjust."—"Life of Rev. G. Steward," p. 150.

2. "Eternal Atonement," p. 7. One of the most valuable volume of modern sermons that it has been our fortune to read.

man could never have existed, while sin as a fact is traceable solely to the misuse and misdirection of his own powers.

Now, when we find that the intervention of Christ harmonizes equally with man's nature and environment; that far from conflicting with the divine attributes or the divine government, as manifested in Nature and Providence, it serves to expound them; that it opens a wider rift in the clouds which hang over God's infinite perfections, enabling us to see Him in the tender and endearing aspects of His Fatherhood; we feel warranted in assuming that redemption is the completion of the divine plan foreshadowed in creation.

Should it be claimed that some of our arguments belong rather to science than to theology, our answer is, they are not for that reason to be ignored, or declared to have no value. Every conception of the universe with all its varied forms of being, except indeed the blankly atheistic, recognizes therein the reign of universal law.¹ All through the conflict of thought which has marked the centuries the greatest metaphysician of the age affirms that, "Our simple faith has preserved itself unshaken, the faith in an Eternal First Cause, who bestowed on the world of spirits living freedom for the combat on behalf of a sacred aim, and denied it to the world of things, that under a blind necessity was to be a stage for the efforts of the combatants." Further on he adds what is still more pertinent to the point before us: "Perhaps, also, it will at last appear that mechanism, as a whole, far from being antagonistic to the true tasks of intellectual life, has itself been taken as a necessary working element in the great totality of things of which only partial glimpses of separate sides are afforded to the human mind by the fluctuations of the spirit of the age."² Truth is one, and we hail it with joy wheresoever we find it; and we

1. "Whatever grows and lives, not isolated in a world of its own, but as a part of a connected actual whole by which it is influenced, whatever thus has needs and conditions of development, must, in acting and being acted upon, obey the universal laws of a cosmic economy, which, extending impartially over all that actually is, can alone afford the individual the satisfaction of his needs. Every form of mutual action necessarily involves this capacity of being reciprocally affected in the things that mutually act, and presupposes some universally binding system of law, whereby the amount and form of their reciprocal operations are determined."—Lotze's "Microcosmos," Vol. I., p. 20. See also *Ibid.*, p. 2 and p. 23 (T. & T. Clark's Edition, Edinburgh, 1885.)

2. "Microcosmos," Vol. I., pp. 25, 26.

confess it afforded us a considerable degree of satisfaction on discovering our theological investigations buttressed by such a cautious thinker and so profound a metaphysician as Herman Lotze.

The grand aim, then, of the fathomless mystery of the Incarnation and sacrifice of the Son of God is, so far as it concerns mankind, to bring it back to a loving obedience to God, uniting the individual in a blessed fellowship with the Father of all, the recovery and salvation of the human race. It is hoped that this has been made tolerably plain in the series of papers that have appeared in this REVIEW. We have here to enquire, What is its purpose in the universe? What is its relations to other orders of intelligent, responsible creatures?¹ What is

1 "It is, I believe, generally taken for granted that it was for the human race alone that Christ suffered and died; and we are then asked with an air of triumph, whether it is conceivable, or in any degree credible, that the Eternal Son of God should submit to so much indignity, and so much misery for the fallen, the wicked, the wretched inhabitants of this small globe of earth, which is as a grain of sand to a mountain; a mere speck in the universe when compared with that immensity of worlds and systems of worlds, which the sagacity of a great modern astronomer has discovered in the boundless regions of space.

"But on what ground is it concluded that the benefits of Christ's death extends no further than ourselves? As well might we suppose that the sun was placed in the firmament merely to illuminate and warm the earth that we inhabit. To the vulgar and illiterate this actually appears to be the case. But philosophers teach us better things; it enlarges our contracted views of the Divine beneficence, and brings us acquainted with other planets and other worlds which share with us the cheering influence and the vivifying warmth of that glorious luminary. Is it not then a fair analogy to conclude that the great spiritual light of the world, the fountain of life and health and joy to the soul, does not scatter his blessing over the creation with a more sparing hand? And that the Sun of Righteousness rises with healing in its wings to other orders of beings besides ourselves? Nor does this conclusion rest upon analogy alone. It is evident from Scripture itself that we are by no means the only creatures in the universe interested in the sacrifice of our Redeemer. Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 16-20.

"From intimations such as these it is highly probable that in the great work of redemption, as well as of creation, there is a vast stupendous plan of wisdom of which we cannot at present so much as conceive the whole compass and extent; and if we could assist and improve the mental as we can the corporeal sight, if we could magnify and bring nearer to us by the help of instruments, the great component parts of the spiritual as we do the vast bodies of the material world, there can be no doubt, that the resemblance and analogy would hold between them in this, as it does in many other well-known instances; and that a scene of wonders would burst upon us from the one at least equal, if not superior, to those which the united powers of astronomy and optics disclose to us in the other.

"If this train of reasoning be just (and who is there that will undertake to say, much more to prove, that it is not so?), if the redemption wrought by Christ extends to other worlds, perhaps, many others besides our own; if its virtues penetrate into heaven itself, if it gathers together ALL THINGS in Christ, who will then say then the dignity of the Agent was disproportioned to the magnitude of the work? And that it was not a scene sufficiently splendid for the Son of God himself to appear upon and to display the riches of His love, not only to the race of man, but to many other orders of intelligent beings? Upon the whole, it is certainly unpardonable in such a creature as man, to judge the system of our redemption from that very small part of it which he now sees, to reason as if we were the only persons concerned in it; and on that ground to raise cavils and objections."—Bishop Porteus, "Sermons," Vol. II., Ser. III. Similiar arguments may be found in Dr. Chalmers' "Discourses on the Christian Revelation, Viewed in Connection with the Modern Astronomy," to which the reader is referred.

its place in the unity of plan which we have seen so evidently pervades the works of God? Have the Scriptures any answer to these enquiries? Let us see.

In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians we read, beginning at the seventh verse: "In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace, which he made to abound towards us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in him unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth; in him I say."¹ We cannot, as some, regard the apostle as speaking here of the gathering of the Jews and Gentiles into one Church. By the "dispensation of the fulness of times," Paul evidently means the outcome of all the dispensations, Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian. By the "things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth," he not only means the material fabric and organic life, but specially different orders of intelligent beings.

In the third chapter of the same epistle, beginning at the eighth verse, we read: "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints, was this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things; to the intent that now unto the principalities and the power in the heavenly places might be made known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."² The central thought of this marvellous passage is, that Christ's redemptive work contains a manifold, literally, many-colored manifestation of the infinite wisdom of God. The words imply that by profound and protracted reflection on Christ's work the apostle had come to see its many sidedness, and that its comprehensiveness was vaster than it had seemed when his mind was first turned towards its contemplation. To employ the phraseology of

1. Eph. i. 7-11 (R.V.).

2. Eph. iii. 3-11 (R.V.).

Prof. Bruce: "The pure light of Divine wisdom revealed in the Gospel is dissolvable into many-colored rays, which together constitute a glorious spectrum presented to the admiring view of principalities and powers in heavenly places."¹ From this passage it seems evident to us that it was part of the divine plan in the redemption of man by Jesus Christ, to impress the minds of other races of intelligent beings with the excellency of His character, and in this way to ensure their voluntary allegiance for ever.

In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians we read: "For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him (Christ) should all fulness dwell: and through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens."² Bengel regards these words as referring to the reconciliation of angels to men by the death of Christ; angels being God's friends were man's enemies while he was hostile to God. But the reconciliation of which Paul speaks is not of angels to men, nor of men to angels; but of both to God. As Alford remarks, "Sinful creation are reconciled to God strictly by Christ; sinless creation is reconciled to God by a nearer relation, and a higher glorification of Him." And we may add, of this reconciliation of sinless creation to God, Jesus Christ is the sole medium; and admiration, sympathy and love are its chief instruments.

These passages, taken together, teach just this: While the angels, as holy beings, did not need the death of Christ as an atonement for sin, nevertheless His atoning death tends greatly to their benefit. God will, in the "dispensation of the fulness of times," by the death of Christ, gather into union and harmony all holy intelligences, whether angels or men, with Christ as their common Head and Lord.

The arguments for universal restoration based on these Scriptures are ruled out by the emphatic phraseology of each of the passages. It is only of "things on earth," and "things in heaven," of which the apostle here speaks. There is no

1. "The Humiliation of Christ," p. 324.

2. Col. i. 19, 20.

mention of hell here. True, it is said that "At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth."¹ But there is a marvellous difference between the mere acknowledgement of Christ's universal Sovereignty, and losing sympathy with His person, and loyalty to the laws of His kingdom. This is just the difference between all holy intelligences and the rebellious part of God's creatures. The question of Universalism, in any of its varied forms of development, finds no countenance whatever from these Scriptures, and must be decided without any reference to them. Should any of our readers object that the drift of our argument is toward the doctrine of universal salvation, we remind them that the theory of atonement on which it rests is not satisfactory but substitutionary. The penal satisfaction theory of atonement is logically destructive of its provisory character; but the substitutionary renders it needful that Christ and His work must be personally accepted before it can avail for anyone. The atonement is not the payment of a debt; but a scheme of mercy, which makes the forgiveness of sin consistent with the Divine perfections and the requirements of the law of righteousness; and is available only to the man who persistently turns from sin, and by a personal faith makes Christ his present personal Saviour. "It was necessary that free will should concur in repairing the evils it had made; hence the necessity of founding religion, not upon *sight*, which excludes all application of free will, but upon the faith which demands its extensive use."² In drawing to a close, we venture to present a few reflections suggested by this subject.

First: we infer that all moral beings stand in peril from which the atonement of Christ—by its conservative force—will effectually protect those who have passed their probationary life in the love of virtue and in loyalty to God. We deem it indisputable that all created moral agents have a period of probation. Now, we have in Scripture two striking illustrations of the peccability of pure moral beings—the case of angels and of men. Among the myriads of beings who surrounded the heavenly

1. Phil. ii. 10(R.V.).

2. Vinet, "Outlines of Theology," p. 185.

throne, a vast multitude were unfaithful to their powers and privileges. For these there is no redemption; they sinned against such light and love that there is for them no possibility of recovery. Their great gifts increased their responsibility and their peril; and now in misery commensurate with their crime, they await "the vengeance of eternal fire."¹ Adam, the head of the human race, fell from the high position in which his Maker had placed him. Absolute freedom from liability to fall belongs to God alone. Freedom of will is an essential element in all moral agents. To say that a creature is free is to admit the possibility of failure. Well has it been said that, "In finite beings freedom to do right involves freedom to do wrong, always and everywhere."²

If it be asked, May saints or angels in heaven fall into sin? It is replied that they retain their power to sin; but we must not forget that sin is not so much a matter of ability as of disposition, or of will, and such will be the influence of redemption on the minds of angels and of saved men that the will have neither disposition nor will to sin. "The pure spirits who shall have through a sufficient probation, maintained their integrity, and entered upon their reward in the very presence of God, with all about them and all within them mightily tending to strengthen all goodness, shall be, though not naturally, nor absolutely, yet in fact and in effect incapable of transgression."³

These observations prepare the way for a second reflection suggested by this subject. To accomplish the end just hinted at, it is the purpose of God, by the atonement of Christ, to gather together all holy intelligences in one kingdom. "To sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth."⁴ There are two ways of preventing the commission of sin: by lessening the power of a moral agent so that he *cannot* commit it, in which case the agent is degraded to the level of a thing; or by fortifying his motives and love of virtue so that he *will not* sin. Throughout eternity good men and angels will retain all the powers they now possess; but such

1. Jude 7.

2. "Methodist Quarterly Review," Oct. 1857, p. 589.

3. *Ibid.*

4. Eph. i. 10 (R. V.).

will be the influence of redemption on their minds and hearts as they will then see it in its profound depths and sunlit heights, that sin will not only be distasteful to them, but be utterly abhorred. Sin sent a shock through the heavenly host working ruin and death. The transgression of the hierarchies of heaven struck the first note of discord in the creation of a holy God. The obedient host stood in mute amaze as they beheld their former companions hurled from heaven's height into the dark abyss. When man, the last and noblest of God's creatures followed in the wake of the "wicked spirits in high places," there was additional cause for alarm. Sin's discordant notes had broken again the harmony of heaven. More strange to angels still would seem the assumption of human nature by the Second Person of the Godhead for the redemption of a guilty rebel race. But when the fulness of all the dispensations shall have come; when angels and men shall have been drawn together by the magnetic power of the Cross; when redemption shall have fused all God's obedient creatures into a white heat of gratitude and love; when all the depths of the wisdom and goodness of God, as seen in the Gospel, shall have welded angels and men together in one harmonious and happy whole; such will be the views of God's character it will inspire, that eternity will be spent in the adoration of a Being so wise and just, so glorious and so good.

The third reflection suggested by this subject is the great relief it affords to human reason when it comes to see that the incarnation of the Son of God and the unfathomable mystery of His death had a wider scope than this little world and its few inhabitants. This earth is but a speck in creation. Myriads of worlds lie hidden from our gaze in the depths of space. Reasoning from analogy we may suppose them to be as densely populated as our own. At any rate, we have the authority of Scripture for believing in the existence of a countless number of angels. Now, there are many devout and thoughtful men who are staggered by the amazing condescension of God in the redemption of our world by the death of His Son—at Heaven's emptying itself for such as we are, offered principally for man, as an atonement, in the ordinary sense of that word—only for

man; we here see that the death of Christ is much further reaching in its results. By a reflex influence it reaches all worlds, and is yet to become the bond and unifying power of all holy intelligences. The Sun of Righteousness which has arisen upon us with such healing in His wings is yet to reach and brighten other worlds, conserve and intensify the happiness and worship of the sinless host of heaven.¹ The stray light which the passages quoted from the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, throws on the results of Christ's mediation, reveals a breadth and height of glory which transcends all our conceptions. We are apt to look at things only in the light of our own narrow sphere, and limit all results by the bounds of our own vision; but here we see that the redemption of man by Jesus Christ is only a part of a vast and glorious scheme which shall ultimately reach and bless all the obedient creatures in the universe. These indirect benefits of the atonement, however imperfectly we may understand them, are fitted not only to enlarge our minds, but to benefit our hearts. Whatever draws us out of ourselves or the immediate sphere in which we move, helps to expand our conceptions of God and widens our sympathy with the other races His hands have made. Here we see the government of God as vast and complicated, yet we see clearly it is His purpose, by redemption, to reduce it to one unique and harmonious whole, including "all things in the heavens, and all things upon the earth." And all this appears as part of that eternal plan which the Deity has been working out since first His power was displayed in the production of intelligent creatures, namely: the unification and conservation of all holy beings. The scheme of redemption is the instrumentality God has chosen to employ in working out this beneficent end. While the immediate and direct objects of redeeming grace are sinful men, it has a comprehensive though

1. "Much of the opposition against our doctrine on the ends of the death of Christ, arises from the consideration of it as an insulated part of the general administration of God. Confining it solely to the use and benefit of man, the prodigiousness of its character constitutes a serious obstacle to belief—we feel that the expense is too mighty for the object; but regard it in the light cast upon it by Scripture as part of a plan of boundless extent and importance, the pressure is taken off from our minds, and its antecedent improbability proportionately diminished."—Rev. Joseph Gilbert, "The Christian Atonement," p. 373. Where there is also an interesting extract from Stapfes on the same subject.

indirect bearing on the entire universe of moral beings. It is designed to reconcile all things to God, and bring all holy intelligences under one system of order, harmony, and love. When the years of time shall have exhausted themselves and the cycles of eternity begin, what a jubilee awaits the sons of God! Then all sin shall be subdued and all incorrigible and impenitent sinners be shut up where they can no longer contaminate others with their vileness, or their hatred of God. Then all the good and true from every land, and world, and age, and rank shall be gathered into one, and Christ shall be "All and in all to the glory of the Father."

Finally, this subject opens to our view some satisfactory notion as to do and be in eternity. The popular notions of heaven are crude and unsatisfactory. Who can persuade himself that redeemed men can find eternal enjoyment in the popular notions of "crowns" and "psalms" and "songs." We do not undervalue these Scripture terms. They have a significance dear to the heart of every good man; they represent realities which ought to make the soul thrill with rapture; but these figures do not represent the whole of the heavenly life, nor even the chief part of it. In one of the passages quoted from the Epistle to the Ephesians there is an expression which may help us to some intelligent idea on this important and interesting subject: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."¹ Here we perceive that the redeemed Church is to be the eternal manifestation and unfolding to the heavenly host of the wisdom of the Divine purposes in the redemption of man by Jesus Christ. We have alluded to the shock to the angels caused by the introduction of sin into the universe. Reasoning, from what we know of man, is it too much to affirm that the permission of evil was a subject unfathomable even to angel minds; and if this be true of the introduction of sin, what shall we say of the recovery of man by the incarnation and death of the Son of God? We must remember they had witnessed the

1. Eph. iii. 10, 11 (R.V.).

downfall of their companions unfollowed by the appointment of a redeemer; therefore, when they saw heaven empty itself for the redemption of man, is it too much to affirm that it was a matter of wonder and amazement—had depths and heights they could neither fathom nor scale. But when “the fulness of the dispensation of the times” shall come; when they behold the final outcome of the mediatorial scheme in the glorified Church; when they look back upon the methods, and around upon the results, they will be overwhelmed alike at the wisdom and the love of God. The multitudes of redeemed men are represented in Scripture as crying, “With a loud voice, saying, Salvation unto our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.” The angels are represented as spectators of this, and moved at the sight, in response they cry, “Amen; Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might be unto our God for ever and ever, Amen.”¹ Taking these Scriptures as the basis, are we not warranted in affirming that the chief employment of heaven will consist in the study of the Divine character as exhibited in redeemed sinners? Thus the redemption of man, by Jesus Christ, secures the highest destiny of all God’s obedient creatures—the love and adoration of the Creator.

Such, then, is the plan, and such its consummation. “Unto the praise and the glory of His grace” is to be the final outcome of the mediatorship of Christ. The ultimate aim of redemption is to tune the lips of angels and of glorified men to the praise of God—to fill every heart with love, and make the universe to echo with hallelujahs to Him who died upon the tree. May we have a share in the joy and triumph of that hour.

1. Rev. vii. 10-12.

BODY AND SOUL—A THEORY.

WHAT is man? That is a large question, and calls forth many and diversified replies. Anatomy would describe him as an organized structure, a magnificent physical temple, a unique specimen of architecture, to which the wisdom and cunning of the wisest designers can add no improvement. Physiology would speak of him as a bundle of functions, an instrument of a thousand strings discoursing music of most exquisite harmony. Chemistry would call him a shovelful of earth and a pailful of water, a compound of mouldered rocks and condensed rain clouds, clustered round a mystic magnetic centre, and subject to that inevitable fiat—the laws of Nature. Hygiene would speak of him as a wonderful vitalic, vegetative machine, marked by change, growth, health, disease and death. Metaphysics would distinguish him as an accumulation of hereditary and acquired mental experiences, thought-powers and processes. Education would testify that he is a germ-seed, capable of unlimited development in one or all of his powers, and in many degrees of combination. The Bible teaches that he is the offspring of God, a living soul, extending his influence and individuality beyond the body. His mission is forever, and his life on earth must determine his future and everlasting destiny. The body is the house we live in during our earthly residence, and is composed of some fourteen chemical elements. That is to say, in a state of death. But when we take the results of the chemical analysis of a dead body, and attempt to account for the operations and effects of the living body, on the principles of inorganic chemistry, and to teach what chemical elements combine, and in what proportion, to form the several substances of the organic system, our reasoning is purely hypothetical. It assumes that the experimental elements of chemistry are the real elements of nature, and that, therefore, the chemical elements of dead bodies demonstrate the vital composition of living bodies. But this does not follow. Human science has never been able, with the same elements, to make any approach to the results of the vital processes. It may be demonstrated that human bone is composed of phosphate and carbonate of

lime, gelatin and other ingredients; but no chemist can take these ingredients and make a human bone. There is no process by which a human bone can be manufactured, except that of the vital economy of the living animal system. The vital alchemy of the living body leaves the chemist's crucible far behind in its power of analysis, and possesses the power, not only of decomposing the substances called elements, but of transmuting them into each other. All we know with certainty is that when proper substances are taken into the body they are converted into chyme, chyle and blood, and from the blood into different solids and fluids, possessing each its peculiar nature and properties. And science, truly so-called, stands with reverent heart and uncovered head and confesses that the mysterious economy by which alone in nature the human organism is produced and held in being is the work of an intelligent Creator.

"My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."—Psalms cxxxix. 15, 16.

The term soul covers man's spiritual nature, called soul, mind or spirit. The doctrine of trichotomy, which teaches that man is composed of three distinct substances, body, soul and spirit, is not sustained by Scripture; and science has no certain knowledge on this subject. Certain passages, which seem to distinguish between soul and spirit when fairly interpreted, show that there is no substantial distinction intended. Paul's prayer for the Thessalonians, that their "whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless," does not prove that body, soul and spirit are separate and distinct substances, any more than the command to love God with all the heart, and soul, and strength and mind, proves that each of these is a separate and distinct substance. Mr. Wesley, in his "Notes on 1 Thess. v. 23," speaking of soul and body, says: "These two make up the whole nature of man," and calls the spirit "the supernatural gift of God, to be found in Christians only." Soul, mind and spirit are constantly interchanged in Scripture, and designate

one and the same thing; what is predicated of the one is predicated of the other. The word *Psyche* occurs in the New Testament about one hundred and five times. It is translated "soul," fifty-eight times; "life," about forty-three times; "mind," three times; "heart" and "heartily," twice. The doctrine of trichotomy led to the old Gnostic heresy that the spirit in man is a part of the divine essence, and incapable of sin; and its acceptance to-day leads to a psychological redemption, in which the spirit is quickened into spiritual life, and the soul and body are sanctified only by a gradual process of long or short duration, in proportion as they are controlled by the spirit. Trichotomy is not in harmony with the Bible account of the creation of man.

"And the Lord God ¹formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." That is a plain, historic statement, and in the absence of any well-established scientific account of the origin of man, in conflict with it, I accept the statement as a literal and true account of the creation of the progenitor of the human race; and there is no intimation of anything but the man formed dust, and the living soul imparted by the Almighty. It is not derogatory to man to recognize a living soul in plants and animals. Plants possess a principle of life, or a germinal principle, which may be called the soul of plants. The animal soul is that which constitutes animal life, embracing sensibility and instinct, and a degree of intelligence which is capable of education of a limited and restricted character. But the human soul is a created spirit, possessed of mental, moral and religious faculties, which, in the animal creation are utterly wanting. The brain of the most intelligent animals, such as the ourang-outang and the gorilla, is inferior in quality and quantity to that of a human infant twelve months old, while the logical faculties and moral sentiments are wanting altogether. The brain of a full-grown gorilla contains from twenty to thirty cubic inches, while the uneducated African has a brain of sixty-five to seventy-five cubic inches and the Caucasian, seventy-five to one hundred and twenty-five cubic inches. Man's gift of language, his freedom of choice, his

knowledge of abstract and universal truths, and his power of progress, by which he can cable the ocean, bridge Niagara, tunnel a lake or a mountain—all these separate him as by a great gulf from the highest animals. There is only one explanation of this great gulf—man is not a higher kind of ape; he is not an animal at all, but a human being. He belongs by nature, not to the monkey order, but to the human order. His soul is rational and immortal; animal souls are irrational and mortal. "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?"—Eccle. iii. 21. The soul, spirit, mind is an immaterial, God-imparted substance, a living entity—the ego, the man inside the bodily frame, that which preserves our personal identity in spite of the constant change going on in the physical organism. The cells which compose the body are constantly breaking down and passing away, and new ones, made from the food we eat, are taking their places, so that there is not a single particle of matter in our bodies to-day that was in them ten years ago, and yet our identity is preserved even to the scars, which cannot be erased. What preserves the unity and identity of the body? It is an immaterial principle, and not a material one. The poet seems to have grasped this truth when he said:

"For of the soul the body form doth take;
For soul is form, and doth the body make."

Was the poet right when he said, "soul is form?" All orthodox Christians will agree that soul is substance, that it is an entity distinct from the body and possessed of a conscious existence when separated from it. Haeckel's view that soul or life is nothing but "a mode of motion of the molecules of the brain and nerves placed together in a complex and varied manner" will not stand the test of critical analysis. What produced the motion of the molecules of the brain so as to cause life? Does the motion precede life, and thus act as its own cause? If so, what started the motion? If life precedes the motion the whole theory breaks down, for life cannot be the effect of the motion, and at the same time precede it. If life and molecular motion started at the same moment, what started

them at the same moment? If the "complex and most varied manner" in which the molecules are placed together in the brain is the cause of their motion, and their motion the cause of life, who placed them together in such a manner? The molecular motion theory is motioned away by Prof. Ladd when he says, "The phenomena of human consciousness must be regarded as activities of some other form of *real* being, than the molecules of the brain. This real being is the mind. The so-called mental faculties are only the modes of the behaviour, in consciousness of this real being." Dr. Beal fancied that he had touched the basic stratum of life substance in the human body when he discovered, under the microscope, innumerable little bioplasts moving to and fro in nerve, muscle and fibre, busy at work weaving new tissue, or repairing the old. But, alas! for the doctor, when death took place, he found that not a single bioplast had left the body; they were all there and all dead, for they were but a part of the physical structure and had died with it. Life is not in the body, or rather it is not a part of the body; it does not inhere in the body as blue inheres in indigo. It must, as Prof. Ladd expresses it, "be regarded as activities of some other form of real being than the moving molecules of the brain;" and, we may add, the moving bioplasts of the body. Or, as Schelling expresses it, "There is an ideal within the real; a subject within the object." A man in full health grasps a trolley wire or is smitten by a fork of lightning and is dead in a moment. There is no lesion or apparent cause of death, but something has gone, and the scalpel of the anatomist searches in vain for the empty space occupied a moment ago by the spiritual substance which made that body an instrument for the expression of thought in speech and song. God has put an adamant wall around the principle of life, and said to the children of men, "Within this sacred precinct ye cannot come."

The next question which confronts us is the continuity of the soul, or the immortality of the ego. We see the body die and then we see no more mind. Does the mind or soul perish with the body, like the disconnection of the flame from the wick? The Bible answers, "no"; and science cannot contradict it; for

if the soul is a real substance, an entity distinct from the body, having an independent life and action of its own; if it has subsistence of itself, intrinsically, not derived from the body, or dependent on it, the mere fact that it ceases to vivify the body does not deprive it of its own inherent life, force and motion. Its condition is changed, but it cannot become extinct except by a direct annihilation. When the dynamo ceases its motion the light is extinguished, but the electricity is not destroyed; and when the body dies, soul expression ceases, but the soul itself remains in its own proper, invisible life, shape and form. Death is only the paralysis or destruction of the organ of expression, the organ through which the soul expresses itself during its earthly existence. Destroying the musical instrument does not destroy the musician; destroying the body does not destroy the man. The human soul is a substance, simple, indivisible, immaterial, spiritual, having subsistence and life in itself. "We are conscious of our thoughts feelings and volitions. We know that these exercises of phenomena are constantly changing, but that there is something of which they are the exercises and manifestation. That something is the self which remains unchanged, which is the same identical something, yesterday, to-day, and to-morrow. The soul is, therefore, not a mere series of acts; nor is it a form of the life of God, nor is it a mere unsubstantial force, but a real subsistence. Whatever acts is, and what is is an entity."—Dr. Charles Hodge.

This may bring us back to the question suggested by the poet's expression, "For soul is form, and doth the body make." Is the soul form? for our thought is now of a disembodied soul; a soul from the death of the body to the resurrection, when out of the gross matter of the "natural body" will be raised the "spiritual body," "fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself." Perhaps not one in ten of the people who believe in conscious immortality after the death of the body have any definite conception of the soul as separated from the body. Has it form, and shape, and size? Can it speak, and hear, and see? Is there anything by which we can

recognize our friends when we meet them in the spirit world? Is the soul in that world without conditions, locality, form, and shape—a vague, intangible puff of air, a mere detached memory? We cannot conceive of a soul, an entity, an ego of intelligence, without location of some kind. It must be somewhere, and, if conscious of location it must be conscious of its own alterity, its otherness of an objective universe. And if it must have location, why not have all other substantial qualities? When Paul says “Not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life”; some expositors apply the words to a provision which God has made for His people, and which the apostle calls, “An house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.”¹ Others imagine that the words refer to some celestial vehicle with which the soul is invested after its dismissal from the body, and until the morning of the resurrection; while a third opinion refers the words to the resurrected body given back to the soul at the judgment day. All of these views suggest great difficulties. They contemplate provisions made for the souls of the righteous dead, but speak of no provisions for the souls of the unrighteous dead. They provoke the question: If celestial vehicles are made for souls between death and the resurrection, what becomes of these vehicles when the resurrected body is given back to its kindred soul? And if no such vehicles are provided, what is our conception of a disembodied soul? It is not extravagant to say that with all our wisdom and practical knowledge, with all our science and theology, not one in ten has any definite, thinkable conception of the appearance of a disembodied soul. Nor is it here pretended that science and theology can arrive at an absolute certainty on this question. With becoming humility, therefore, we may suggest theories if they are not alike repugnant to science, theology, and common-sense. Nearly twenty years ago a devout scientific writer took the position that the soul, which is an entity, a real substance, although intangible to our physical senses, is an exact counterpart of the body which it now inhabits, and could we see with spiritual eyes as the inhabitants of the spirit world do, the separated soul would

stand out a transparent manikin, with every outline of the body it once inhabited, a perfect representation of the bodily form, as a manikin of the arteries, veins, and nerves would stand out, could they alone be lifted from the body without disturbing their relative positions.

There is nothing in science to controvert such a theory, especially when the *Electrical Review* declares that "electricity is a *microbe* and it will be discovered, and the discovery will make electricity the queen of nature's forces." Nor do we see anything in Scripture to controvert it; but, on the other hand, much to confirm it. Dives knew Lazarus, and prayed in audible voice to Abraham, and Abraham replied to his petition. John "saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God," and heard their appeal to God to vindicate His justice in the punishment of their persecutors. Peter says, "I think it meet as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance, knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle." The tabernacle, or bodily frame, was not Peter, but Peter dwelt in the bodily frame, and was going to move out of it. Paul speaks of the "inner men," and declares that "though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." When the "inner man" steps out of the bodily frame he retains his manhood, selfhood and identity. Our hymnology abounds with this teaching, and represents the souls of departed saints in a state of conscious existence, singing the praise of God and enjoying the beauty and rapture of the celestial world. But how is a soul to see without eyes, hear without ears, and sing without a mouth? In our effort to avoid materialism we have denied to the soul form, size, and shape, because these are properties of matter; but we must not confound the soul with its attributes, such as love, joy, grief, and argue that because size, form and shape are not applicable to the attributes of the soul, therefore, the soul itself is without size, form and shape. The metaphysical argument that love, joy, grief, etc., are neither round, nor square, nor hexagonal, and consequently we cannot predicate form and shape of the soul, will not hold water. It is not logical to infer that because an attribute of the soul is without

form and shape, the soul itself is formless, having no shape, could our eyes be illuminated to see it. It were just as logical to say that because the density or fusibility of a piece of iron has neither form nor shape, the iron itself is without size, form, or appearance. Neither the properties nor the motions of substances are entitative, but are merely the names given to the conditions and actions of substances, and not the names applied to the substances themselves. Love, joy, grief, etc., are only properties of the soul and have no entitative existence.

In his "Lectures on Biology," Joseph Cook offers the following argument in favor of the immortality of the soul: "As the dissolution of the eye does not destroy the light, the external agent which acts upon it; and as the dissolution of the ear does not destroy the pulsations of the air, the external agent which acts upon it; so the dissolution of the brain does not destroy the soul, the external agent which sets it in motion." The argument seems to be severely logical and conclusive, but a reply may be made in this fashion: Though the dissolution of the eye does not destroy the external light, yet it does destroy the power of seeing, and of what use is light when the sense of seeing is obliterated? And though the dissolution of the ear does not destroy external sounds, yet it does destroy the power of hearing, and of what use is sound when the sense of hearing is obliterated? And though the dissolution of the brain does not destroy the soul, the agent that sets it in motion, yet it does destroy the power of thinking and feeling, and of what use is the soul when thought and feeling are obliterated? But if we agree with Professor Drummond that "the soul is a living organism," and with Paul that it is the "inner man," then this inner man has eyes, ears, and brain of his own; not composed of matter, but of an incorporeal substance, intangible to our physical vision, but not to the vision of disembodied souls. Nay, more, the eyes of the soul are the means by which the physical eyes see, and its ears the means by which the physical ears hear, and its brain the means by which the physical brain thinks. When death ensues the outward man can neither see, hear, nor think, though his physical eyes, ears and brain remain intact, and may be as perfect in every part of their corporeal

structure as when the man was living, but the inner man has departed and left the tenement vacant.

The soul can hear and see now without the aid of physical eyes and ears. And this cannot be explained on the principle of memory, for inventors have figured out new machines—such as were never seen before by mortal eyes—when the physical eyes were shut, or when the physical senses were locked up in the embrace of slumber. So with music. The composer lies on his back in the darkness of night, with not a sound to disturb the stillness; his thoughts are busy with his art, when suddenly he sees a music sheet, with bars and notes; he touches the keys of the organ or piano, and feels the fingers of his soul tremble under the touch as truly as if his physical fingers touched the veritable ivories, and he leaps from his bed and goes to the piano and plays the new piece from memory, and then writes it down, lest he should forget it. What is this but the action of the soul without the aid of physical organs? And when all the physical organs are dead, the soul with its organs of thought, sight, hearing and speech, passes out of the bodily frame an exact counterpart of "the earthly house of its tabernacle;" the same essential entitative being that it was on earth, and is so recognized by its friends in the spirit world. It can clasp hands, it can sing, it can play on a harp, it can welcome its friends when they pass within the veil, and it can come back to earth at God's permission on messages of love, or mercy, or sympathy.

This view of the soul is at once in accord with the doctrine of the recognition of friends after death, which is so precious to all who have loved ones gone before, and a bulwark against the materialism of the age which would make death the end of life. If soul is substance what is to hinder it having form any more than the body has form? Spiritual forms and features would be no more unnatural than physical forms and features. The cause of form is one of the unknowables; but the idea of souls passing off into space like a puff of empty nothingness, without form or shape, still existing, but nowhere in particular, is about equivalent to annihilation. When the Bible fathers spoke about "giving up the ghost," and when the apostles spoke

about "putting off this tabernacle," and "departing to be with Christ," they knew what they were talking about. Eternal objects were not ideals nor delusions. They esteemed them as much more real than earthly objects. The age is now enquiring, "Is life worth living?" Surely not in itself. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable." The foetal life is not worth living except as a successful preparation for this outward life, and this outward life is not worth living except as a preparation for a future and eternal life. All the material pleasures which the greatest riches afford do not make the soul happy in the years of maturity and experience. The ungodly and idle rich, surrounded by luxury and with the pleasures of both hemispheres at their command, die of moral starvation. Sated with sensuous and secular pleasures, their last days are tortured with undefinable longings and a spiritual void worse than disaster or bodily pain. A man's breath will soon exhaust the fresh air in his room. He needs the great blue dome of heaven for a healthful supply, and in like manner, when left to his own resources, he soon exhausts his finite moral nature. He needs the illimitable supply of the Holy Spirit to nourish his soul. Man in himself is exhaustible and needs something inexhaustible, and that something is the fulness of God in the soul here and now, and an assured faith that personal existence is continuous, without any break, at the death of the body. Let us be assured of this and we will live more rationally and happily; we will worship mammon less and cultivate sound morals more, and with our cup of blessing always full the gates of death will vanish and our path to eternity will be lined with roses, and we will march on, brave in life and fearless in death.

" And when our latest breath
Shall rend the veil in twain,
By death we shall escape from death
And life eternal gain."

Montreal.

W. J. HUNTER.

PROGRESSIVE REVELATION—A REVIEW.

THIS review of "Progressive Revelation," which appeared in the March-April number, is made to call needed attention to an article, the ability of which does not appear to have fully guaranteed its safety.

The text of Scripture quoted (p. 116, ¶ 1, end) as asserting the doctrine of Progressive Revelation is taken from Mark iv. 28, "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." But the relation of text where it stands is to the growth of the Kingdom of God, and no mention is made of the Divine Message, which is one means of that growth. We may believe in the progressive character of Revelation; but this is not a thought to be exaggerated, as would be the case if the metaphor of the Great Teacher were rigidly applied. The figure must not be so applied, however, as it is not meant to be employed as describing the method of Revelation.

The inconsistency of the two expressions, "the law, or uniform method of growth," and "This law . . . is both an effect and a cause," we may assume to be an unintentional slip. We do not, of course, speak of a "method" as being a "cause," but, rather, the manner of a cause's working.

The writer, proceeding further, very soon introduces us to this statement, "In fact, the advancement and conditions of the age must make both room and demand for the revelation before it will be given. A revelation given otherwise, even if possible, would be poor economy. But no religious or moral truth could be grasped by a Hebrew which was utterly unrelated to what he himself was." The words, "utterly unrelated," are to be understood, I take it, in the light of the first sentence of the quotation, and not literally. The truth revealed to the Jews must have been occasioned and measured by their conditions and advancement as well as adapted to them. Is it, then, a fact that the revelation made to any age is limited "by the advancement and conditions of the age?" If this be the stand taken, it does not harmonize with the declarations of both the Old and New Testament. Let us examine some of the utterances of Scripture related to this

subject. Deut. xxix. 29 implies some things which had been given, but not revealed so as to be understood. Psa. cxix. 18, 19 implies the same. Isaiah xxix. 9-14, whatever be the particular application of the passage, appears to mean that revelation had been made, but not comprehended by those to whom it was sent. Isaiah vi. 9, 10, broadly interpreted, contradicts the position of the writer whose article we are noticing. It does not help matters to say that these and similar adducible passages speak of a message which was not understood, because they who read or heard were unwilling to understand; that is, their need of the revelation was a burning need but they refused that which would have relieved it. The text of the passages declares that there was inability to understand; and an assertion that, the need of the message being present, the ability to understand them was a matter of choice is an exegetical addition to the simple meaning of the expressions used concerning the comprehensibility or incomprehensibility of the revelations.

A cardinal text, by inference urging moderation in any advocacy of a theory of Progressive Revelation, is that in 1 Pet. i. 9-12, where it is said that the inspired media of revelation themselves did not grasp fully its farthest import and relations. This Scripture, with such others as are found in Rom. xvi. 25, 26, 2 Cor. iii. 13-15, Luke xxiv. 27, 45, and in Paul's and Peter's sermons in the Acts of the Apostles, teach that, while Scripture had its bearing on the age in which it was written or given forth, it, nevertheless, had a residual meaning that was not clear, and was not meant to be clear, to the contemporary generation. The universality of the Bible as a revelation and its adaptability to human need through the changing circumstances of many centuries are strongly presumptive against any limiting of revelation by "the advancement and conditions of the age" in which it is issued. It suits our needs and conditions, and suited likewise those of the ancient people of God—but it is limited by neither. The majestic intention that the Bible should be the world's book to the end of time—an intention gloriously confirmed by the historical results accomplished through the instrumentality of

the book—is also presumptive evidence against a limitation like that described.

The parables of Jesus were never meant to be gauged by the "advancement and conditions" of his age. They are simpler in form than any preceding illustrative teaching. They are as full in meaning as any later revelation. Perhaps, one might say, rather, if they are to be produced or occasioned solely by the "advancement and conditions" of any age, it would be by those of an age where morals and intellect alike were perfect among the teachers, and the old crying evil still existed among the taught. Such a world there will never be. That is, no causes will ever be present adequate to effect such sublime results as these parables according to any process of natural evolution. Be they produced in their own time or 1,900 years afterward, they would have been produced, notwithstanding human progress, with but indifferent variations in their accidental form, and none in the degree or kind of their essential truth. They were needed in the time in which they were revealed as they would have been, if given in any subsequent age; and their being given is far more a matter of the advancement and condition of mankind in general, than of mankind in any particular race or age. Finally, at this point, what can be said of the "advancement and condition of the age" and a book like the Apocalypse?

There is in these days an unnecessary talking about "economy" in the exercise of divine energy. Every person, I think, will agree that only one who finds a use for everything would say that "economy" had been a rule of Revelation. The great, good God does a great many things without any perceptible regard to economy, and we may be very thankful that such is the case. It is this very disregard of the "least expenditure" principle that gives us the abundance of beauty and joy which teems in the Bible and in the world, and lends the splendor or the sweetness to our poor human life.

The pushing of the philosophical principle that knowledge supposes a relation between the mind knowing and the object known into this argument for the progressiveness of revelation is not needed. Anything which the infinite Intelligence would

choose to reveal to men, by the fact of its being the product of mind, would be, at least, apprehensible by mind. And, if the writer of the article means to say that all truths revealed by God to men must accord with the intentions of the human mind, the same answer may be made; for this is, really, the former position slightly varied in the form.

It is said by the author of the article that every particular feature of revelation had to have its anticipation in the human mind, before it was formally given forth by God. This does not appear to accord with the facts. The resurrection of the body, the existence and agency of angels, the triune existence of God, the incarnation, the fact of supernatural revelation, the fact of miracles are, with other things which might be named, beyond all the possibilities of human conception, apart from special suggestions from without. And, in however elementary a form introduced, these truths would be new conceptions in the human mind. It seems futile to urge "mental science" and its laws in the face of doctrines and facts such as these just mentioned. We cannot imagine any clear, or approximately clear, idea on any one of these subjects without a revelation. It is true that everything to be known requires to be revealed to the mind of him who is to know it. But our contention is, that without special revelation some of the doctrines and facts of our faith are quite out of the reach of men. We hold, too, that God's objective revelation of these doctrines and facts does not wait on the ability of men to conceive the revelation, but often goes before and leaves men to struggle for ages with giant mysteries, the reasonableness of which is, as a distinct fact perceived because they issue from a Mind—they are the appeal of Mind to mind. The tremendous struggle of the human mind with the revelation of God is a means of larger life and civilization. It is but little true that the revelation is the product of a great racial or national struggle in long dead centuries. It is, also, but little true that the revelation has been measured by the needs of contemporaneous generations. In each of these views there is a little truth; but the great truth appears to me to be that, in the infinite sweep of Omniscience, the divine Father of the race gave revelations to

old Jews and old Christians which suited them immediately, and bear not less admirably and, because of progressive *apprehension* of the truth, much more fully and clearly upon all human lives down to the closing scenes of the redemptive era.

We must always be fearful of reducing God's manner of revealing soteriological truth to a merely natural method. The great Revealer was most divinely natural; but, in His perfect harmony with nature, He was still peerless and infinite. Revelation is most divinely harmonious with the human mind and every other work of God; but the beauty of heaven is in its face, and its voice is that of One who speaks as many waters speak. I do not question for a moment that the witness of the Holy Ghost, both at Pentecost and now, was, and is, in a perfect accord with the parts of nature to which He relates Himself; but not natural as the wind is natural—rather more akin to the Voice at our Lord's baptism, or on the Hermon mount of glory. The Revealer, the Revelation, the witnessing Spirit are in harmony with Nature, but are emphatically supernatural. The Voice is that which we understand; but we know that "never man so spake."

The writer speaks of man as being constituted for revelation, and argues as if only what man was created for could be revealed to him. But redemption is the burden of Biblical revelation. Was man created for redemption? Was it meant that man should be redeemed when he was created, or only when he sinned? We hold the latter view. Prof. G. D. Herron and many able theologians with him and before him, either virtually or expressly, hold the former. Be it said, however, that no theory of "redemption anticipated in the purpose of creation" can ever be successful in its theodicy, because of the involved approach to Augustinian views. We do not think much can be argued from the constitution of man beyond the capacity for revelation. It hints nothing as to a redemptive revelation or the manner of its coming. Man's sinful condition, not his constitution, might, *a priori*, suggest something as to the kind of revelation which we actually possess, and his degradation and ignorance might suggest something as to the way in which

God would naturally send the message; but, if so, the sinful condition is infra-creational and not supra-creational; and we can easily leave the constitutional nature of man out of the question when seeking limits for a revelation which assumes in advance man's constitution, and then proceeds according to man's need. In other words, while the human constitution is a prerequisite of revelation, it does not furnish the principle according to which the message is given. The specific method and substance of the message are determined rather by the sinful condition of mankind.

Quotations from Professor Drummond, such as when things "are unknown we call them divine," are surely trifling. The tendency to "rationalize" or "naturalize" is just as irrational as that which Professor Drummond attacks. There is Divine action in the world. It is reasonable, but not natural in the sense that it can be explained by laws whose action is accessible to human minds. It is distinctly transcendent, as far as the ordinary course of nature is concerned; and men, looking at the stupendous energy, the magnificent efficiency and the blessed outcome connected with these things, are justified in saying, "We understand only this much; our explanations will carry us no further, but what we know is sufficient cause that we should declare this not natural but Divine."

The illustration from Professor George Fisher is so improbable as to be weak for the purpose for which it is used. If the case could be actual, the natural course for the grown man would be to carefully treasure up the father's early letters to him, but still regard himself as having but little to gain of practical advantage from the words addressed to him in childhood. In fact, as he grew older in his manhood he would become more and more removed from the possibility of receiving such help as he formerly received from all or any of these affectionate messages. Is there an analogy between this and the Bible of either the Old or New Testament? Is there any part of the moral or spiritual revelation of the Bible which men have been or are growing out of? The assumption of that which is so often assumed, namely, that the New Testament is a book of principles, while the Old Testament is one of precept;

the former a book of obedience from inward impulsion of love, the latter one of obedience from constraint or restraint, is much exaggerated. It is said by the writer that the childhood of the Jewish nation was the time when they yielded obedience under precept, and that in the time of our Lord they were prepared for different teaching. But even those who hold most strongly to the theory of moral and religious evolution as applied to the Jews say, as they must say, that never was obedience under precept so fully the rule in any former age of Jewish history as about the time when our Lord began His teaching ministry. It is only necessary to point to the references in the New Testament to show how little the Jewish auditors of the Gospel preaching in New Testament times were prepared for a Gospel such as that which was offered them. "The advancement and conditions" which did not call forth the Gospel of the New Testament, but which favored its reception, were, for the most part, as everyone knows, outside of Palestinian Judaism. To judge of the religious capacity of the older Hebrew nation, it is necessary to make a study of the expression of religious experience found in the Old Testament. The language of the devotional books of the Old Testament abounds in expressions of emotion in religion, and shows not only a keen appreciation of the great Jewish idea of righteousness, but also of the tender virtues of forbearance, forgiveness and mercy. The precepts of the Law as touching the slaves and the poor, the orphan and the widow, the stranger and the neighbor, are a beautiful relief to whatever is dark and hard to understand in the Old Testament.

It will be very difficult for the author of the article to prove from the Old Testament fairly interpreted all that he claims as to the treatment of women. Compare the following passages: Genesis ii. 18-24, iii. 16, Exodus xxi. 22-25, xxii. 16, 17, Numbers v. 11-31, xxx. 6-16, Deut. xxi. 10-17, xxiv. 1-4, 5. Take also the picture of the unfaithful wife in the book of Hosea, and of the virtuous wife in the passage, Prov. xxxi. 10-31. There is one passage in Genesis xxxi. 14-16 which speaks of the wives as property. But as the wives in this case are Rachel and Leah, and as all know the circumstances under which Jacob

acquired them as wives, we must not be in too great haste to urge hardship or commercial bargaining even here.

As to the law of divorce, it is found in but one place in the Old Testament (Deut. xxiv. 1-4), and, if my knowledge of that passage does not greatly mislead me, it implies a very strong reason for the action of divorce. "When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his sight, *because he hath found some uncleanness in her.*" The word "uncleanness" implies, as far as I can make out, a sexual fault and blameworthiness attaching thereto. That the fault was equal to adultery we cannot easily say, for the law of adultery as stated in Leviticus ordered the penalty of death for both the adulterer and the adulteress. We are not at liberty, however, in the light of the Mosaic law, which is the official utterance on the subject, to regard the Old Testament as being lax as compared with the New in the matter of divorce.

As to the right of revenge for blood, a comparison of the passages—Exodus xxi. 12-14, Numbers xxxv. 10-34, Deut. xix. 1-13, Joshua xx. 1-9—will show the Jewish attitude toward the shedding of human blood. Outside of this we may go, but it is more just to confine ourselves to these representative and authoritative utterances. A small pamphlet, recently issued in this country, gives some interesting information as to this subject of the right of revenge, and satisfies me that the REVIEW writer's position is too severe on the attitude of the ancient Jews toward the man-slayer.

The author's treatment of the Jewish conception of God shows the tendency displayed throughout his article to maintain the thesis, even at unnecessary cost. In doing so he has, without intention, done injustice to many facts. God's revelation of himself to the patriarchs was an exceedingly attractive revelation, as, for example, to Abraham and Joseph. The declaration of His name to Moses is not less gracious. While, to the good in the whole line of the Israelitish history, there is a disclosure of the divine relation to them such as is utterly without any such quality as "hard, steely brilliance." The pictures of divine care and guardianship in the Psalms are

surpassingly beautiful, while those in Isaiah are in truth "a glory which excelleth." Compare Isaiah xl. 11, 27-31, xli.-xliii., lviii. 61-63, and many other, almost if not quite as striking, Scriptures.

In conclusion, progress in revelation there is, but not such as can be measured by any principle of human or natural action. And, as compared with progress in interpretation of revelation, the progress in revelation itself is small. In the ages of the past the light of God was dim, not because the light was not there, but because men's minds had not been fully trained to apprehend it, and because they had not a heritage of traditional interpretation, the accumulated light of ages, at their service, as we have. To us the revelation is more expanded because we know more about the revelation, and our hope is that progress of this kind—in the understanding of the truth—there will be until the old weary wheels of the world stand still, and, perhaps, even beyond that in the great Eternal Peace.

Heidelberg, Germany.

WALTER M. PATTON.

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST REGARDING THE OLD
TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES IS IRRECONCILABLE
WITH THE THEORIES OF RADICAL
HIGHER CRITICS.

I. *The Theories of Radical Higher Critics regarding the Old Testament.* According to these, we are asked to believe that the Old Testament is to a very large extent made up of books that were smuggled into the collection by artifice and fraud; of books deliberately forged, and that found their way into the canon by virtue of a false impression as to their authorship, and of books so largely interpolated and changed by partisan writers that the original meaning and intent are often buried up in the mass of unauthentic and misleading additions.

And this, without any exaggeration, is the outcome of the speculations of that particular critical school which to-day professes to be the only truly scientific one!

The Pentateuch and Joshua are regarded as almost wholly

made up of myth, legend and fiction, and very largely of forged productions brought into currency by fraud. Only a few scraps of trustworthy traditions are thought to be discoverable.

In Judges, Samuel and Kings is found more *historical* matter, particularly those parts which apparently favor the critical theory! But these books are all supposed to be so largely "worked over" by later writers for partisan purposes that, as a whole, they cannot be relied on.

As to the Books of Chronicles, though they contain some truth, the history is so thoroughly soaked with the priestliness of the author that they are practically of no value.

Ruth and Esther are interesting stories, with no ascertainable foundation in fact. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah are more trustworthy, but in representing the ceremonial law introduced by these men as Mosaic, they have to be corrected according to the critical hypotheses.

The poetical and prophetic books also are regarded with considerable respect, though, like the cruel persecutors of old, they will have Isaiah "sawn asunder."

But the Psalms, contrary to previous views held by critics, are mostly or altogether relegated to a late post-exilic period. This is done without the slightest historical evidence, in opposition, indeed, to all the evidence attainable, particularly to the superscriptions in the Septuagint, which take us back to a period contemporaneous with that in which the Psalms are supposed to have been composed. So that here, too, we are asked to believe in a very extensive falsification of history, and a falsification which must in a very large degree have been consciously and deliberately perpetrated.

The prophetic books, with few exceptions, are left comparatively undisturbed by the majority of even the advanced critics. But some radical critics, especially in France, have reached the conclusion that these books, too, are all post-exilic! How soon this hypothesis will be trumpeted as a "result" of the Higher Criticism cannot yet be said.

Such, in general terms, is the Old Testament as it is pictured to us by the radical critics of the present day. And whatever else may be said about this representation, it must be said of it

that it does not agree with the view evidently entertained by Christ and His immediate disciples. Books known to have such an origin and such a character as the radical critics ascribe to a large part of the Old Testament could not have been spoken of with such reverence as Christ always expressed towards those Scriptures.

II. *Are we Justified in Designating the Views of the Radical Higher Critics as mere Theories?* We think we are. Let us note some of the more prominent assumptions they make, and on which their theoretical structure is evidently based.

1. *They assume the truth of natural evolutionism in the extreme sense of progressive growth, or changes wrought by "resident force" in the thing in which the evolution takes place.* Dr. G. H. Schodde says of the radical higher criticism that "the whole hypothesis is really not criticism of the biblical records at all, but only the false reconstruction of biblical history to harmonize and suit the all-dominant idea of evolution, with its vulgar and godless naturalism!" Growth and development we admit, but evolutionism, in the sense of the critics, we deny. The growth and development in which we believe are perfectly consistent with divine revelation. We do not believe in a mere natural evolution as held by agnostics and atheists, but we do believe in divine revelation as held by good men in all ages. There is a divine evolution, of which a divine revelation is a result. . . .

2. *As Evolutionists they assume, in accordance with their peculiar theories, that the Pentateuch, and some other books of the Old Testament, could not have been written as early as they are generally reputed to have been, because men were not sufficiently evolved intellectually and morally to produce such writings.* Such ideas of God and morality and religion as are found in the books usually ascribed to Moses did not exist among men when Moses is said to have lived, but were the products of some six or eight or ten centuries later; and that "these ideas were projected backwards (?) to the times of Moses, and that all, or nearly all, the history in the Pentateuch, and in some other books of the Old Testament, was not real history at all, but 'idealized history'! That is, in plain language, merely

fictitious stories, not having 'a word of truth in them.'"—*Wellhausen.*

3. *They also assume that writing was unknown, or but little known and little used in Palestine until shortly before the Babylonish Exile.—B. B., 721-606.* Now, the ascertained results of Oriental research entirely disprove this assumption. The inscriptions of Egypt and Assyria have been deciphered, and the lost history of the ancient East has been largely reconstructed in consequence; and those inscriptions prove that the reading and writing of books were centuries older than the classical age of Greece; that ages before the time of Moses, or even of Abraham, libraries existed where scribes and readers were constantly at work, while literary intercourse was carried on from the banks of the Euphrates to those of the Nile. Modern Oriental research has not corroborated every historical statement in the Old Testament, any more than classical archæology has corroborated every statement found in the Greek literature. What it has done, however, has been to show that the extreme scepticism of modern criticism is not justified; that the materials on which the history of Israel have been based may, and probably do, go back to an early date, and that much which the Higher Criticism has declared mythical and impossible was both possible and true!

4. *They assume that the belief in a personal God, or in the existence of supernatural agents and forces in the universe, is unreasonable and unscientific.* And yet reasonable and scholarly men of all ages find it much less difficult to believe that a personal God has created this glorious universe than that it was all evolved from impersonal atoms, incapable of seeing, hearing, planning, willing, or even thinking, while the universe is so evidently the result of thought and of a designing mind, infinitely wise. The existence of a personal God has been amply and frequently proved.

5. *Assuming the non-existence of a personal God, they necessarily assume that no special revelation (such as the Bible, with its miracles and prophecies, claims to be) could have been made.* In other words, the radical critics reject the supernatural in all its relations to the history of both the Old Testa-

ment and the New. So they come to the study of the Bible with prejudices and "presuppositions which entirely disqualify them to be impartial judges in the case."

6. *They claim that many of the so-called miracles may be explained ("explained away") on natural principles. And those they fail to dispose of in that way they pronounce "pious frauds," not having "a word of truth in them."*

7. *The critics also assume that there was a bitter and continuous conflict between the schools of the prophets and of the priesthood; and that persistent efforts were made by the priests and Levites to secure the supremacy in the Jewish nation, especially in the later periods of its history. While the fact is, we find prophets denouncing priests more frequently than they do priests; and sometimes prophets were also priests, and sometimes priests were also prophets.*

8. *The Radical Higher Critics have also contended that the Linguistic Features and Literary Style of "the Books of Moses," and other Books of the Old Testament, prove a much later origin than is generally ascribed to them. Literary candor compels us to admit that the weakness of the objections drawn from the linguistic features and literary style of the Old Testament has been conceded even by higher critics themselves. A recent writer says, "At this point there has been a change of front, if not a complete backdown!"*

What was formerly regarded by the critics as the earliest of the components of the Pentateuch is now, by the prevailing school of critics, made the latest. And the linguistic features have not been considered a barrier to either view!

Dr. Isaac M. Wise (a learned Jewish Rabbi, and President of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati), one of the best Hebrew scholars in America, if not in the world, says that "their assumed differences of diction, which critics say distinguish Deuteronomy and characterize it as a work of later origin than the former books of the Torah, is imaginary only! The critics," he declares, "possess no reliable standard by which to fix the age of any portion in the ancient classical Hebrew!" This last sentence goes like a swift javelin to the heart of the whole matter. Great pretensions must fall before it. Classi-

fiers of "Archaisms," and similar "antiques" found in the Hebrew text, and the discoverers of "modern phrases," must find their vocation gone and useless. There is "no reliable standard" by which they can work.

Thus the attempts to father the theory of "pious fraud" upon the Old Testament writers have utterly failed. Professor Davison assures us that their attempts in this respect have been "altogether without success."

9. *The critics tacitly grant that the Traditional View (as it is called by them) of the Old Testament was the view of Christ and of His Apostles.*

10. *But they also assume that Christ was aware of the Fictitious Character of much of the Old Testament writings, and that He did not correct the errors prevalent regarding the same, but actually sanctioned them.* In other words, Christ was himself a radical higher critic, but was not sufficiently honest to declare His real views on the subject! It took nineteen centuries of the Christian age to evolve men sufficiently honest to declare the truth in regard to the Old Testament Scriptures!

It seems that Christ, according to the critics, had the light, "the true light," on this subject nineteen hundred years ago. But He cruelly (may we not say?) suffered the world to grope its way along the dark and dangerous "highways and by-ways" of natural evolution, until at last Wellhausen, Kuenen, William Robertson Smith and their companions in criticism, arose "amid the encircling gloom," and, with benevolence and honesty superior to Christ's, said, "Let there be light, and there was"—what? "And there was" evolved and published what has been appropriately denominated "the crazy-quilt theory" of the Old Testament writings!

11. *Another section of the Radical Critics, revolting at the blasphemy of attributing conscious imposture to Christ, assumes that he was really ignorant of the true state of the case, and naturally adopted and proclaimed the popular view of the Old Testament Scriptures.* That is, He was so ignorant of those Scriptures as to propagate, unwittingly, erroneous ideas concerning them, according to the theories of

modern critics, who assume to know a great deal more on this subject than Christ himself!

III. *Let us now proceed to examine the Views of Christ regarding the Old Testament writings, and to compare His Views with the Theories of Modern Radical Critics.*

1. In a general way, we may say that it is evident Christ rooted himself and His religion in the Old Testament. By that He himself elected to stand or fall. "They (the Old Testament Scriptures) are they that testify of me." That there is a vital and profoundly important relation, or connection, between the Old Testament and the New is conceded by the higher critics themselves. Dr. William Robertson Smith, perhaps the ablest critical writer in the English-speaking world, makes this statement in the preface to his celebrated work on "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church": The great value of historical criticism is that it makes the Old Testament more real to us. Christianity can never separate itself from its historical basis on the religion of Israel. The revelation of God in Christ cannot be divorced from the earlier revelation on which our Lord built," p. 7.

Dr. Dewart observes that, "The relation of the Old Testament to the New is as the blossom to the fruit, as the foundation to the complete structure, as the hope-inspiring promise to the joy-giving fulfilment."

The prophecies of the Old Testament invest the New Testament with a divine sanction, because they show the Christian dispensation to be the outcome of God's purpose. The fulfilments of the New Testament vindicate the supernatural origin of the Old Testament revelation, and reflect back upon it the light of the glory of the latter days.

It has been pertinently said: "The Bible can never be rightly studied unless the two Testaments are comprehended in their unity and harmony. If the Old Testament is in the New in fulfilment, the New Testament is in the Old in promise." All through the New Testament it is assumed that the religious teaching of the Old Testament was supernaturally revealed and of divine authority.

Any theories, therefore, that would reduce the Old Testa-

ment Scriptures to a mere natural outgrowth of the religious life of the people of Israel, would contradict and disparage the authority of the New Testament. ("Jesus the Messiah," p. 18.)

Dr. G. P. Fisher asserts that "Christians hold to the obvious historical fact that the Old Dispensation stands in an organic relation to the new," and that "the literature of the Bible is to be differentiated from all other literature as being pervaded by another spirit, which is due to the fact that it is produced on the plane of Revelation." ("The Christian Religion.")

Canon Liddon says: "For Christians it will be enough to know that our Lord Jesus Christ has set the seal of His inflexible sanction on the whole of the Old Testament. He found the Hebrew canon just as we have it in our hands to-day, and He treated it as an authority which was above discussion. Nay more, He went out of His way, if we may reverently speak thus, to sanction not a few portions of it which our modern scepticism too eagerly rejects."

When he would warn His hearers against the danger of spiritual relapse, He bade them "remember Lot's wife."

When he would point out how worldly engagements may blind the soul to coming judgment, He reminds them how "men ate and drank, married and were given in marriage until the day when Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all."

When He would put His finger on a fact in past Jewish history, which, by its admitted reality, would warrant belief in His coming resurrection, He points to Jonah, "three days and three nights in the whale's belly."

When, standing on the Mount of Olives with the Holy City at His feet, He would quote a prophecy, the fulfilment of which would mark for His followers that its impending doom had at last arrived, He desires them to "flee to the mountains," when they "shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, standing in the holy place."

Are we to suppose that in these and other references to the Old Testament, our Lord was only using what are called *ad hominem* arguments, or talking down to the level of popular ignorance, which He did not himself share.

Not to point out the inconsistency of this supposition with His character as a perfectly sincere religious teacher, it may be observed that in the Sermon on the Mount He carefully marks off those features of the popular Jewish religion which He rejects, in a manner which makes it certain that had He not Himself believed in the historic truth of the events and the persons to which He thus refers, He must have said so!

But did He then share a popular belief which our higher knowledge has shown to be popular ignorance, and was He mistaken as to the worth of those Scriptures to which He so often and so confidently appealed?

There are those who profess to bear the Christian name, and who do not shrink from saying as much as this. But they will find it difficult to persuade mankind that, if He could be mistaken on a matter of such strictly religious importance as this, He can be safely trusted about anything else.

"Yes, the trustworthiness of the Lord Jesus Christ is thus involved in this question. And if we believe that He is 'the true light of the world,' we shall resolutely close our ears against any suggestions of the falsehood of the Hebrew Scriptures which have received the stamp of His divine authority." ("The Divinity of Our Lord.")

2. Christ frequently taught that He was bringing about the fulfilment of "the law and the prophets." He evidently had clearly in mind the fact of a certain historical preparation for His coming, along which Israel had been divinely led, and on the basis of that history He avowedly stood. He spoke frequently of a necessity constraining Him to act in fulfilment of the prophecies:

"But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" (Matt. xxvi. 54.)

"The Son of Man indeed goeth, as it is written of him." (Mark xiv. 21.)

"Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scripture, And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." (Luke xxiv. 45, 46.)

We are certainly not to understand these passages in the

sense of His playing a "role," but in the sense that the Old Testament had already laid the foundation on which He was to build.

He plainly assumed, not only that the Old Testament was a divine revelation, but that the history of Israel, recorded in it, was the divine preparation for Him, so that the truthfulness of His testimony and of its teaching were most intimately connected.

These facts show that the relation which Christ consciously bore to the Old Testament did not lie on the surface of His teaching, but belonged to its very substance. It cannot be regarded as an accident of His position, nor as due merely to a natural impulse, to state truth in forms suited to His hearers. It was part of His "self-consciousness." He represents himself as organically related to the preceding revelation, and as realizing the original ideal of Israel. (John i. 49 and 51.) He conceived that revelation to be the historical preparation for Him. In so doing He assumed the Old Testament to be historically, as well as doctrinally, true. His relation to it was so fundamental to His testimony to himself that it would appear impossible to pronounce the one true and the other false.

In the light of this fundamental position, which He claimed with reference to the earlier revelation, we are to read the specific allusions which Christ made to the Old Testament itself. These may be summarized under a few heads:

1. *He assumed historical statements made in the Old Testament to be true.* "Honor thy father and thy mother." (Exodus xx. 12.) Jesus quoted this as a command of God—"For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and thy mother," etc. (Matt. xv. 4.)

His opponents, the Pharisees, asked Him at one time, "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement?" (Referring to Deut. xxiv. 1.) What a fine opportunity had Christ to inform them that Moses never wrote the Book of Deuteronomy! But instead of that, "He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." (Matt. xix. 8.) Christ assumes here the Mosaic origin of

Deuteronomy. He assumes the account of the brazen serpent, in Numbers xxi. 6-9 to be strictly historical, and He declares plainly that it was "lifted up by 'Moses' in the wilderness."

The Book of Leviticus—chap. xii. 3—contains the law of circumcision. Christ declares (John vii. 22, 23) that "Moses gave unto you circumcision," . . . and calls it "the law of Moses."

In John v. 45, 46, He asserts that "Moses wrote of" Him. (See references for instances.)

"The blood of righteous Abel" was actually shed, as stated in Genesis. (Matt. xxiii. 35.)

"David did eat the shewbread." (1 Sam. xxi. 3-6.) "What David did." (Matt. xii. 3.)

Under parabolic form He outlines Israel's history (Matt. xxi. 33), besides references to "Sodom and Gomorrah," "the Queen of Sheba," Noah, Abraham, Lot, Jonah and other places and persons, that the radical critics regard as purely fictitious. These references cannot be reasonably explained, except on the supposition that He regarded the sacred narratives as veritable history.

2. Christ cited the Old Testament as "Scripture," or with the formula regularly used in quoting sacred words: "It is written." To the devil, "He" (Jesus) "answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (Deut. viii. 3; Matt. iv. 4.) And observe, the devil did not reply, "That is written in a forged book, and is entirely fictitious," which it is if the radical critics are correct! The devil appears to be less audacious than some modern biblical critics.

With what respect and confidence "his Satanic majesty" quoted Psalm xci. as the Word of God! "It is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee," etc. He did not question for a moment that he was quoting a divine promise, though he made a misapplication of it.

"Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." (Deut. vi. 16.) Thus, Christ recognizes Deuteronomy as the authoritative Word of God. To it He appealed, and we think He knew a great deal more about

it than modern critics. Again, quoting from Deuteronomy (Matt. iv. 10.), Jesus dealt Satan that blow with "the sword of the Spirit" which sent him discomfited from the field. "For it is written. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." (Deut. vi. 13, etc.) When the Sadducees quoted Deut. xxv. 5 in their encounter with Christ, He tells them plainly that they "err, not knowing the scriptures;" and in the same controversy Christ declares Exodus iii. 6-18 to have been spoken "by God."

He also speaks of the Old Testament as "The Scriptures" in many other places: Matt. xxvi. 54; John v. 39, vii. 38, x. 35, etc. Frequently He uses the formula, in referring to, and quoting from the Old Testament, "It is written." Being "written" in the Old Testament Scriptures settled the matter with Him. There was no appeal from that standard; see Mark xiv. 21, 27; Luke iv. 4, 8, 12, 21; xix. 46, etc. No one will deny that by these expressions divine authority was attributed to the Old Testament. The statement (John x. 35) in which He assumed that He and His opponents valued the authority of the Old Testament alike—"The scripture cannot be broken"—is a particularly formal acknowledgment of their complete inspiration.

3. *More than once Christ quoted passages as inspired by God, simply because they were contained in the Old Testament Scriptures.* Compare Matt. xix. 4, 5, and Gen. ii. 24; Mark xii. 36, and Psa. cx. 1, 2.

4. *He appealed to particular Old Testament writers by name.* See Matt. xiii. 14 and Isa. vi. 9—"The prophecy of Isaiah;" Mark vii. 6—"Isaiah prophesied of you," Isa. xxix. 13; Matt. xxiv. 15—"Daniel the prophet," Dan. ix. 27; xi. 31; xii. 11. "Have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him?" (Mark xii. 26 and Ex. iii. 6.) Christ certainly believed that Moses was called of God to be the deliverer, leader and lawgiver of His ancient people, as narrated in Exodus and other books of the Pentateuch. The intelligent Christian knows that the radical higher critics pronounce this whole account "idealized history," *i.e.*, a mere fiction, written some six or eight centuries after the time of Moses!

5. *"The Book of Psalms" is ascribed by Christ to "David,"*

“David himself” (not somebody else, as Cheyne asserts) “saith in the Book of Psalms.” (Luke xx. 42 and Psa. cx. 1.)

6. And finally, Christ spoke of the Old Testament as a whole in phrases which show that its compass and principal divisions were the same then as now. “On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.” (Matt. xxii. 40.) “And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.” (Luke xxiv. 27.)

We know that the Hebrews divided the Old Testament into three parts: (1) “The Law,” comprising the five books of Moses; (2) “The Prophets,” comprising the books of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets; (3) “The Scriptures.” Under this title were placed:

(a) The Psalms, Proverbs, Job.

(b) Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther.

(c) Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, 1 and 2 Chronicles.

If, then, “Christ found the Hebrew canon just as we have it in our hands to-day,” as Canon Liddon asserts, it is impossible to resist the inference that Christ expressly taught both the inspired authority and the historical truthfulness of the Old Testament.

“Faith in Christ’s authority forbids us to believe that the Old Testament consists largely or predominantly of the writings of men who deliberately distorted and falsified history, forged codes of law, and succeeded by cunning trickery in imposing upon the Jews, as of divine origin and authority, what otherwise could never have gained acceptance at all. A collection of books, consisting in great part of such productions, cannot possibly be regarded as entitled to any peculiar respect. Still less can they be held up as of inspired authority. But Christ and the New Testament writers do speak of them as of divine authority. Therefore the opposing critical view must be abandoned, or else Christ, as a religious teacher, must be deemed untrustworthy.”—*Dr. Mead*. This is the short and simple argument which cannot be invalidated by smooth words, and which, we believe, in the long run, in spite of all mystifications,

will commend itself to the plain common-sense of Christian men.

Whatever Jesus believed about the Old Testament, all real believers in Him must believe. We shall be found right in the end if we "think thoughts of His thinking, and proclaim the everlasting words of the Eternal Word!"

Windsor, Ont., 1895.

JOHN REYNOLDS.

Sermonic.

THE MINISTRY OF PAIN.

Hebrews ii. 10: "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

DISORDER is a foe to progress, and it is man's divine work to restore order out of the disarrangement of things. Order is a friend to man as well as heaven's first and best law. The harmonious arrangement of things begets liberty of action, and peace of mind, a truth the housewife knows and practices, greatly to the sorrow of childish hearts. The beauty of the heavens and the grandeur of the landscape depend upon the harmony of their several parts. The variety of the altitudes of nature is pleasing to the eye, far removed from the sameness of the works of finite minds, for order is often misnamed a monotonous arrangement, whereas it is a law of infinite altitudes, producing joy to the trained and untrained intellects of men. Poetic culture says that God made the country, and man made the town. The beauty of art is founded on the harmonious principles of nature and life. The ignorance, injustice and sinfulness of men have introduced elements antagonistic to the laws of God, and disorder has usurped the place of harmony in the divine arrangement of things. It is man's duty to destroy this sinful state of things, and to bring back the old orderly condition by the aid of that wisdom which is of God.

Within this wise arrangement in the world, nothing exists except by God's appointment or permission. He has made

man free, and he will not interfere with the liberty of the individual. Sin is therefore permitted because God is just, and the employment of his power in its destruction would be an infringement of the divine rights of man. He has placed within the reach of man the means of destroying sin in harmony with the laws which he has made for the government of the world. It belongs not to man to limit the liberty of his fellows by withholding from them their social rights, lest the use of these might increase their influence for good. Obedience to the divine teaching enforces the right of free speech and the liberty of the press. God is just in all his dealings with his creatures, and he cannot do anything wrong. Whatever is unjust for any man to do, cannot be just in God.

The design of God towards His creatures, in their creation, and in all His after relations with them, is their perfection. Nothing short of that can belong to anything which God has brought into existence. Man was not made to sin, and afterward to be destroyed. Perfection is the end of creation. There is nothing totally destroyed in all his kingdom. Apparent destruction is only a method of transformation, so that greater productiveness and harmony may exist. The present condition of things is only the germ-condition, the higher life and fruitfulness is found after the translation to the new condition, with another environment. The death of this world state is but the awakening into life, as in the death of the grain of wheat, an awakening into the same likeness, but of greater intensity and longer duration. The iron ore cast into the furnace may seem to be lost to the inexperienced observer, but separated from the impure mass in which it was extracted from the ground it comes, fused anew, but in a different relation. From one furnace to another it is removed, subjected to other stages of transformation, never destroyed, but becoming purer, until we hold in our hand a piece of beautiful polished steel. This is the same metal which was taken from the soil, but how different is the substance when robbed of its impurity in the process of transformation. The perfection of man is the result of stages of purification, nothing that is essential being destroyed, only the impurities which have been brought into his nature

being removed until, finally, with another likeness, he is found in the eternal land. The diseases which afflict our bodies have in them a divine element in their diversity and dissimilarity. The fact of man's free agency is suggestive of the uncertainty and irregularity of disease. Order and definiteness in the diseases which come to man, bringing in their train no relief and no assurance of recovery despite our efforts to conquer them and regain a healthy condition of body and mind, would be destructive of the freedom which has been allowed to the noblest creature which divine wisdom has made.

With the firm conviction of this design, and believing in the wisdom and love of the Creator, we are met on the threshold of life with many things which seem antagonistic to this belief. The conflicts of life, the suffering of body, mind and soul which are endured by men and women—those peculiar and uncomfortable sensations which afflict body and mind, cast a shadow over the lives of some, who fail to see beyond the clouds, and grasp the hidden meaning of this strange tale. Pain is not a desirable thing, and it is not pleasant, and yet there are some relations of life in which pain should be sought because of the compensations which follow. Unto many, however, it is a mystery, a problem, which cannot be solved. Homes and hearts are saddened because the meaning of the mystery is not found. Life is unto such a shadow, for they walk under a cloud, and their natures partake of the despondency which belongs to little children sitting alone in the darkness. Some of life's sorrows we cannot understand, because we are children in knowledge, but there is a wise purpose in these things, and they are all for the welfare of man.

Many cannot understand the relation of pain to perfection. Sufferings seem to be more of a punishment than a blessing. The true and higher meaning of pain, disease, conflict and suffering in its numerous forms is that of the thunder shower upon the parched ground. It is a means of blessing, "if only rightly viewed and wisely accepted." The Master-Teacher said, "Blessed are they that mourn." "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you." He not only taught the blessedness of tribulation and suffering, but he led the way,

enduring temptation, the revilings of men, becoming "perfect through sufferings."

"The Man of Nazareth, the best of men
That e'er wore earth about Him, was a sufferer :
A soft, meek, patient, humble, tranquil spirit ;
The first true gentleman that ever breathed."

The teaching of God in nature and revelation reveals to us the blessedness of suffering. The struggles of life introduce us to higher state of bliss. Disease has another end than that of death. It is not a destruction of vitality alone, for there dwells within it a saving tendency. There resides in it a provision for repair that the handiwork of the Creator may not wear out, else life would be unto us a burden. When once we can recognize this as God's messenger to help us in maintaining body, intellect and soul in a proper condition for performing our work, and to keep us from speedy dissolution in the destruction of our powers, we can rejoice in the wisdom and love of God in caring so tenderly for us. The law of true living is one of self-sacrifice. Ceaseless striving leads to greater bliss.

The work of pain, when looked at from a human standpoint, seems to be irreconcilable with the character of God. Looking upon the poor man tossed upon his bed of pain, the anguish of the mother at the loss of her darling child, whom she has watched over tenderly and incessantly, as she contrasts her own condition with that of others, blest in her estimation with the comforts and joys of happy children, our hearts are deeply touched and we sympathize with them. When we see great and good men suffering from bodily infirmities and diseases of various kinds, the mental anguish of the student, the restless nights and weary days of the young and innocent, and the loneliness of the sick-room, we sometimes fail to read the lesson of divine love. The bereaved heart weeps alone, and we stand aside unable to utter a word of consolation, mingling our tears with those of the afflicted. There are gentle hearts who can see nothing in these trials but the chastisement of an angry God, and they cry out in the shadow of the mystery, "Why

should we suffer in this way? What have we done?" Weary and faint, they sit down and weep.

All this, however, is a work of God, permitted in accordance with his just laws. He is wise, loving, sympathetic and just. He cannot delight in human suffering, and he does not send any sorrow in an arbitrary manner. There is some wise purpose in all this for human hearts and lives. The man with a broken arm is treated by the kind-hearted physician in accordance with his knowledge of the principles of surgery. He takes the hand which lies in the sling and is uninjured, and bends it backward and forward from the wrist, and the fingers also. The man groans with pain; the surgeon shows in his countenance mutual suffering, but that pain is the prelude to the salvation of the hand. Were he to spare the man the agony of this exercise, the use of the hand would be partially destroyed. It is not pleasant, but it is safe. The way to this salvation is through suffering. The pathway to bliss is by the pain of a cross. God is not a silent onlooker of man's sorrows. He enters into our life, and he suffers with us as the mother partakes of the trials of her children, Where there is no pain there is death, but the feeling of anguish is an evidence of life. The patient woman, pacing up and down the room enduring the agony of a felon in the hand, is induced to allow the surgeon to apply the lance. A wound is made and she cries with pain. A few days pass by and the lance is applied again; but there is no suffering, and the surgeon is alarmed. Death has set in; the bones of the finger are useless, and amputation is necessary or the hand will be lost. suffering is often a minister of love and of life. We fail to see its meaning oftentimes, yet the lesson is there for us to read, and if now we cannot spell the letters of this wonderful message, we yet shall see the handwriting of our Father and be able to thank Him for His mercy and love.

There are few, if any, exempt from suffering in life. The wonderful complexity of the mechanism of our bodies is so great that it is, indeed, strange that we live at all. All men are subject to the laws of God. Even Christ was subject unto law and suffered in the flesh. Shall any, then, refuse to become

partakers of the sufferings, and lose the blessings which flow from them? There are none absolutely perfect, and therefore all men need to enjoy the blessings of pain. Some of the world's greatest thinkers have been the greatest sufferers, and out of the crucible they have come purified, a blessing unto many, and strong in the power of truth possessed. Saintry workers have been fitted for eminent service, having trodden the wine-press. The compensation of climbing the mountain amid cold and snow has been the vision of a lifetime.

There is a purpose in pain. The service of suffering is elevating. Pain and sorrow in themselves are not spiritual, and instead of good there may be evil. Instead of the perfection which is the legitimate offspring of suffering, there is despondency, rebellion against God, brooding over the ills of life, and a weary, anxious longing to get away from the duties of the day. The soul becomes sour and embittered against men, disappointed and mortified because they have not had ease and luxury. There are others who have accepted the trials of life as an evidence of the wisdom and care of the divine Father and obedient to the lesson of his love, they have trodden the thorny path feeling as keenly as any the pains of persecution and the agonies of physical suffering, they have yet rejoiced in the revelations which have come to them as the beautiful, shining star on a dark night. Sorrow has been made unto them a means of sanctification. Pain is given as a warning against the violation of nature's laws, and an incentive to greater care. It comes as an agent informing of the presence of danger and injury. The sorrow of man's heart reveals his capacity for supernatural refreshment.

Pain is protective, preserving the body for the work of life. Our very existence depends upon our sensibility to suffering. If pain did not teach the child that fire burned, it would be consumed. If there was no warning voice given to the dyspeptic, no unpleasant sensation following the gash of the knife, nothing to tell us that there was decay going on, or injury done to some of the members of our bodies, we should work on until we were destroyed, and the work of life not completed. Pain is the sentinel to warn us of danger, a mes-

senger of salvation for our bodies, preserving us from losing our limbs and continuing our work until we had to cease from weakness, ending in death. Pain in the foot tells us that there is something wrong in that member of the body, which must be attended to at once. The laws of nature are the expression of divine wisdom. Restless nights and unpleasant dreams are nature's warning voices sent to save us from being confirmed invalids while in the springtime of life. Physical weakness is nature's demand for rest. The wisdom and love of God are seen in the laws which relate to the health of individuals. Families which have succeeded each other in the same house for years have been stricken down with sickness and death, until men have believed that it was in popular language a haunted house. The earnest student of sanitation, with a strong belief in the divine laws which regulate the health of individuals and communities, has examined the house and its surroundings, and has discovered the cause of the disease and death in the poisonous water of the well, arising from defective drainage. We cannot ignore the laws of God and then mourn because we have suffered in consequence.

Physical pain is often wedded to mental strength. Schiller and Handel produced some of their greatest works while suffering from bodily pain. Sometimes the intellect is quickened through the suffering of the body. Literature, science and art have been indebted to oppression and suffering for some of their greatest works. Anxiety, which is pain of mind, is remedial, showing that there is something wrong, for a continued state of distress is not the true condition of life. Distress of mind points to some defect, injury or weakness which must be restored to its true state. The resort to stimulants is an attempt to deaden the pain, which enables a man in an enfeebled state to continue his work, when there should be rest for the tired brain, and if the use is continued to such an extent that there is no cessation from toil, there is speedy and final destruction. Rest may restore the jaded brain, but the stimulating power is creating an undue and false excitement, which places it beyond the hope of recovery. There is love expressed in the institution of disease, for we are thereby given time to think of

eternal things. If sudden death were the rule and not the exception, men would carry a burden which would become almost unbearable, a dread of that which was inevitable ever following them in their happiest moments and deterring them from undertaking many important things in life.

The sufferings which are common to man produce a consciousness of the frailty of our natures, so that we shall not overtask them, and they cause us to depend upon the strong arm of Omnipotence to sustain and guide in the performance of the duties of life. Divine wisdom and love are seen in the uncertain duration of disease. Time is given to think upon eternal matters, and hope dawns upon the soul with a hope of recovery. If there was a definite termination of disease, so that men should never be sick but once, and that unto death, how hopeless would be man's condition, leading an immoral life, hardened in sin, and unblest by the hallowed influences of a sick-room! If there were only one kind of disease, and that were to attack men at a certain period of their lives, and always to prove fatal, we should be cursed with the deliberate postponement of matters of eternal moment unto the souls of men. Disease is not alone a road to death, destroying the vitality of the body and intellect; but it is saving, a means of blessing for this life, ensuring us periods of rest and development, and a means of preparation for the work of this life and for that of the after-life. The finer feelings of human nature are drawn out in these stages of suffering. The storm strengthens the oak, and the fragrantcy of the flowers is strongest after the darkness and chill of the night; so are the strongest souls produced by suffering and the sweetness of many characters increased by the trials which are a part of their lives. Have we not seen the mellow spirit wedded to the weak body, and those who have been racked the longest, tossed and buffeted with many hard and painful things, have become beautiful and strong. Through the tears of sorrow and the pathway of martyrdom the gate of heaven has been opened unto many souls. There are troubled hearts mourning because of the chastisements which have come unto them from the hand and heart of a loving Father, failing to see that there is an evidence of their blessed relationship unto God

in the very sorrows which have been their portion. Here is a kind-hearted father who sees two boys guilty of the boyish practice of breaking windows. He takes hold of one of the lads and inflicts upon him severe punishment, but he does not touch the other lad, who is equally guilty. Why does he punish the one and not the other? Because he has a claim of relationship and interest in the one and not in the other, for the one punished is his own son. Does he punish him because he delights to do so, or because he is angry? Not on account of either of these things. He is looking ahead twenty or twenty-five years, and he knows that unless he cares for his son and corrects him he may bring sorrow to his home, and the whole of his after-life be a curse instead of a blessing to himself and his fellows. He therefore punishes him in the light of his future and because he loves him. Have we then forgotten the exhortation of the apostle, "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons: for what son is he whom the Father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." God is wise and loving in the treatment of his creatures, and the education which we are now undergoing is not only for the present, but for the eternal life. We are being trained for the manhood stage of existence in eternity. The sufferings of life are not only helpful to us spiritually, but we are brought into communion with others, and sympathy for those in distress is engendered. When we contrast our condition with that of others gratitude springs up in the heart, because our burdens

are not greater than we can bear. There is an outflow of goodness which touches men and women, begetting in them sympathy, gentleness and love. A means of doing good is placed within their reach, and they are blest.

Pain has a lesson for us : to obey the laws of nature, accepting the teaching of God, revealing the love and tender care of our Father, and we learn to trust him, who is kind and just. Suffering becomes a duty when we have broken any law of God. Not the Nirvana of Buddhism is the cherished rest of pious souls, for the ministry of suffering is a blessed service, whose compensations we cannot afford to lose. The highest blessings flow from endurance. There is a gain in suffering which is not found in oblivion. Suicide is an escape from present suffering, but service is better than destruction. There is a joy in suffering with others, and there is a duty. The pain endured by men and women may cause us to suffer ; but better far the mutual pain than the selfish escape from it by standing aloof from their sorrows ; and so in the mutual endurance, the self-sacrifice, there is joy, and greater blessedness comes to the souls of those who live to uplift their fellows than in the nurture of the spiritual life in isolation and selfishness. How wise is the Father who cares for us. We can trust Him, with the assurance that we shall see yet more clearly the guiding hand and intellect, and with larger knowledge we shall be able to repose in divine wisdom and justice, and peacefully follow Him who doeth all things well.

Port Arthur, Ont.

JOHN MACLEAN.

OUTLINE STUDY OF THE LIFE OF THE CHRIST.

V.—THE THIRTY YEARS OF PRIVATE LIFE—FROM BIRTH TO BAPTISM (*Continued*).

3. Christ's Life in Nazareth. Luke ii. 40-52 (Matt. xiii. 54-58; Mark vi. 1-5; Luke iv. 16; John i. 46; vii. 5).

(a) Childhood of Jesus—Twelve Silent Years. Luke ii. 40.

(b) Visit to Jerusalem—Twelve Years Old. Luke ii. 41.

(c) Youth of Jesus—Eighteen Silent Years. Luke ii. 51.

This brief account of the early life of Christ may be synthetically arranged, so as to manifest the character of parents and child :

“The child Jesus grew¹ physically and became a vigorous boy, filling himself with wisdom, the grace of God penetrating His very being. He was ever obedient to His parents, as illustrated by the temple incident at His first Passover, when twelve years of age. He shows perfect devotion to God, a recognition of the unique relationship of God as His Father, and a sense of His own special mission; also an intelligence for His age that astonishes the learned doctors in the temple. His interest in the temple, the Feast, and other things pertaining to religion, leads Him to seek explanations from the Rabbis, at whose feet He sits getting information by conversation with them. His parents, who had started on the return journey, when they missed Him began searching for Him, when they found Him on the third day. They were amazed to find Him thus engaged, but His mother's reproach brings forth the spontaneous answer: ‘Why did ye seek me? You should have known that I must be in my father's house?’ which shows a dawning consciousness of His exceptional filial relationship to God. He willingly went home with them and spontaneously and deliberately submitted Himself to them, until the time came for His entering upon His public work. He grew in stature physically, in wisdom intellectually and morally, and in favor with God and men spiritually.

“His parents manifest an habitual regard for the Mosaic law, by a yearly attendance at the Passover in Jerusalem. They show a concern for His training by taking Him with them to the Feast at the proper age. They exhibit great confidence in and ordinary parental control over Him, as shown by leaving Him to himself to return home with the general company of children, and by their acts and words at His seeming disobedience. They were surprised to find Him in the temple so occupied, and did not understand His answer to His mother's rebuke, though she continued to think much about ‘all these sayings.’”

The private life of Jesus must be studied as the basis of His public ministry. In the teaching, living and working of His active three years, we must see the influence, discipline, habits, and principles of the previous thirty. The manifested public ministry is the matured product of the obscure, private life. His habits of prayer, principle of self-sacrifice, spirit of love, works of mercy, control of self, knowledge of Scripture, care for others and all other characteristics that made Him pre-eminent were practised during those years of retirement. We must conceive of Him as being actuated then by the one continual, controlling motive of an unalterable desire to do His Father's will. In this fact lies hidden the cause of what He afterwards became. The reasons why Jesus should have spent so many years in the privacy of common life relate partly to himself and partly to us. This period of growth and discipline was required for the perfecting of His human nature. It would not have been really our human nature if it could have attained its full development in any other way. He could not have been "in all things" a sufficient and sympathetic Saviour, if He had displayed His wisdom and power from infancy, or appeared on earth as a full-grown man, without the experiences of life; or if He had not endured the common privations and sorrows of life, as well as those peculiar to himself, He could not have had any real, personal conception of what it is to live an actual, human life if He had not lived it (see Heb. ii. 10-18; iv. 15). If the Son of God, as a human being, needed the discipline of daily life in order to the perfection of His character and fitness for His work, how patient ought we to be under life's trials.

Jesus was not an abnormal being, an artificial or mechanical product, but a growth after the habit and fashion of our race. This phase in His life and existence should be kept constantly in view as a part of the one truly normal appearance of the one sinless man. His manhood developed out of a youth which had beneath it boyhood, childhood and infancy. He could say, "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child; now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things." The perfect man could become per-

fect in no other way; anything else would have been a monstrosity, like us in form, but unlike us in things essential and distinctive. The growth of Jesus must, then, be considered natural; strictly so alike in its physical, intellectual and ethical aspects. His manhood is real only as it remains manhood realized within the limits necessary to man. Yet we must keep in mind that circumstances did not make Him. Of the thousands living in His own land and time, under the same conditions, not one could be compared with Jesus, and none other became the Christ. The reason must be found in the Divine person.

If we hold to the reality of His manhood we must not shrink from the study of the development of His life from a purely human standpoint. We must consider the boy Jesus, cast in the same mould as all the other children of men, with the single exception that the principle of sin was altogether absent from His soul, because of His unique origin. We cannot conceive His growth apart from the scenes and influences amid and under which it went on. We must endeavor to collect these into a picture and think of the quiet, domestic, secluded life at Nazareth. Consider Nazareth, its physical environment and village life, the home, its artizan fare and parental influence. His education under the parental roof and in the synagogue school, His study and mastery of the Hebrew Scriptures, His attendance on the synagogue services and the Passover feasts, His contact with Galilean social and religious life, His touch with human nature through His business life and occupation, His appreciation of earthly things and human relations, his habits of meditation and prayer, His impress by the liberal, brusque, active life of Galilee, His freedom from the ecclesiastical partizan life of Jerusalem and Judæa, His relations with His brothers in the family home, His discipline of toil when working at His trade, His responsibilities as guardian and bread-winner of the family at Joseph's death, His preservation from the evil influences of Pharisaical piety and the chilling sophistry of rabbinical science, His impressions from a pious Jewish mother, and His constant communion with God.

The personality developed under these varied influences and

agencies, presents us a character unlike anything that has been realized in the world. His, the only manhood that has a perfect youth. He was the ideal young man, so pure and white was His youthful life that in all the criticisms of after years no word of scandal could be raked up against Him. His character was the same in kind in His private life that it was during His public ministry, "Holy, guileless, undefiled, separate from sinners." So long as this perfect, sinless life did not come in conflict with the customs, pleasures, opinions, prejudices or sins of men He was not opposed by them; and so absolutely true and original was the type of manhood created by him that the verdict of the world is "If man is ever to be perfect, he must be as Jesus was." But His environment, instruction, training, and all other influences combined will not account for the development of His character. His is the simple unfolding of a harmonious and perfect character contained in the germ of childhood, the portrait of which as given in the Gospels would, without the reality before him, have required a supernatural artist. We must regard the nature of Christ as "truly" God, "perfectly" man, "indivisibly" God-man, "distinctly" God and man. He has a normal, natural, human growth in every respect, and the genuine experiences of a real man in the development of pure goodness except as to personal sin.

The only recorded glimpses we have of this preparatory stage of his existence are given us in Luke ii. 40-52, with side-lights in Matthew xiii. 54-58; Mark vi. 1-5; Luke iv. 16; John i. 46; vii. 5. The narrative of His childhood is given in *v.* 40, with which compare Luke i. 80, noting any difference in the account of the growth of the two boys; and that of His youth in *v.* 52, from which note the threefold development of body, soul and spirit. Give attention to the expression, "filled with wisdom," literally "becoming filled," meaning "filling himself." It implies intellectual and moral development, and that He had to exert himself to secure it. We may obtain some idea as to how He filled himself with wisdom from 2 Timothy iii. 14, 15; Deuteronomy iv. 9; vi. 7; xi. 19; Psalm xlviii. 3-6; Genesis xviii. 19. Also notice that Jesus, who knew no sin, was a subject of the "grace of God." From which learn that grace is

not unmerited favor but the natural exercise of the loving kindness and inherent good-will of God. Its bestowment is the operation of its inmost nature upon the heart of all who will receive it. Study the word "advanced" as applied to His physical, intellectual, moral and religious development. Compare the description of His "advancement" with what is said of Samuel (1 Samuel ii. 26). Such growth is the true standard of popularity. It secures the favor of man by retaining the favor of God. "Favor with God and man" is a right combination, the perfect equilibrium that produces the perfect man.

Another glimpse at the development of this young man is found in *v.* 51, in the words, "was subject unto them." This submission was involved in His incarnation. Having submitted to be born of Mary, it was necessary that He should bow to parental commands. What a perfect pattern is this child for every child and young person, the harmonious blending of healthy growth, mental discipline, and moral and religious development, and these always in the right relation to each other. There was a well-balanced development of intellect, heart, and will, so that His spirit in constant communication with the Divine Spirit was so strengthened as to be able to direct His willing soul which, in turn, was thus enabled to control His body. The real man in germ, the personality of Christ in making, is revealed to us in *vs.* 41 to 50. At the age of six He had entered upon His school life, and spent four years in the study of the Scriptures. From ten to fifteen the Jewish child was instructed in the traditional law, and at the age of twelve become a "son of the law." Having attained this age, His parents take Him to Jerusalem for His first Passover. Think of the emotions that stirred the child's heart as He travelled over the historic ground from Nazareth to Jerusalem. Conceive the emotions that took possession of His soul as He saw the temple, the priests, the sacrifices, the people, and partook of the paschal meal for the first time. Is it not an eminently natural and truthful incident that He became to the learned Rabbis a great interrogation point? It is not the wisdom of the questions and answers that reveals the boy that

foreshadows the man, but His spontaneous answer to His mother's rebuke. A significant crisis had come in His life, God had been revealed to Him in a new relationship. The emphasis in His response must be placed upon "My Father's," though doubtless at that time it had not to Him the same meaning that it did afterwards, or was it the expression of a consciousness of His eternal relation to God. Though He may have been told by His parents of the events connected with His birth, it is a new expression which astonishes them. Is His, "My Father," to be put in contrast with His mother's, "thy father;" with the emphasis on "my," implying thereby the consciousness of an exceptional, significant relationship to God? Is there not also implied in His answer the first awaking of a strong irresistible impulse to a Divine mission and the declaration of an entire devotion to His Father's house and affairs?

Montreal, Que.

A. M. PHILLIPS, B.D.

Synopses of Important Articles.

"The Present Standing of the Synoptic Problem in Germany." H. H. Wendt, in *The New World* for June. During the last decades the investigation of the synoptic problem in Germany has taken no turn which can be called entirely new and epoch-making. Nevertheless, we may say that a very important advance in the comprehension of the synoptic problem has gradually been accomplished. The conviction has become confirmed and widespread that the impartial, scientific, historical-critical investigation of the Biblical writings in general, and so of the synoptic evangelists, has justified its value. To-day the effort everywhere in Protestant Germany is to confirm the unique significance of the Bible for Christian faith and Christian doctrine, through such conceptions of the revelation it witnesses and contains as presumes the natural, historically-conditioned and psychologically mediated origin of the scriptures after the analogy of other human compositions. To-day, Protestant theologians in Germany, of all tendencies, agree in recognizing that the peculiar literary relationship of the first three Gospels must be explained scientifically by the circumstances and the natural origin of these documents. The hypothesis hardly finds an advocate to-day that a primitive gospel formed a common source from which, directly or indirectly, our first three gospels flowed. But the notion is firmly held by nearly all the critics that, in explaining the synoptic problem, we have to reckon with an older apostolic document, which has not come down to us. In like manner, only few hold that the entire relationship of our synoptic gospels is explained by the hypothesis that an oral, evangelical tradition, essentially fixed in its formal expression, but with manifold modifications in detail, was spread abroad, and was afterwards given a documentary shape in our three gospels. Yet this truth lies at the foundation of this theory, that the oral evangelical tradition played a part in the origination of our synoptic gospels. The composition of the gospels is not to be explained by saying that the evangelists, in part, made use of one or more written sources, and, in part, made additions or changes, following their own fancy, or a certain tendency. Rather, the significant factor of oral tradition is always to be considered, which offered to each evangelist peculiar matter and a special interpretation of the written source. It is now generally recognized by the theologians who occupy themselves with the synoptic problem that we must assume a direct knowledge of our synoptic gospels by the other two. Is it, then, the Gospel of Matthew, or is it, much more probably, the Gospel of Mark, which, as the oldest, lay at the foundation of the other two? This is the great controversial point which has been discussed repeatedly down to the present. The progressive scientific inquiry of the last decades has steadily confirmed the conclusion that neither Baur's notion of the priority of the Gospel of Matthew nor his view of the "tendency" party character of the synoptic gospels is correct. In this very conclusion, in Wendt's judgment, may be noted the most important advance which recent labor spent on the synoptic problem has brought about.

"A Prophet of Criticism." By Ian Maclaren, in the *British Weekly*, May 23rd. This is a letter addressed to "Dear Newlyte," who has been giving his simple congregation the benefits of the Higher Criticism, correcting their errors in regard to the authorship of the Book of Proverbs, the composition of the Pentateuch, the date of the Book of Daniel, and the like. The result has been unsatisfactory to Newlyte,

who has received, on an average, six letters a day from aggrieved members of his congregation, lamenting his fall. A visit from a benevolent-looking man, well-known in the city as honorable, able and modest, one who has brought great credit on the Christian name, awakens Newlyte's indignation. The Prophet of Criticism does not hesitate to treat this liberal member of his congregation with insolence, and more than hint to him that he is a Philistine and bourgeois to the backbone. Ian Maclaren entreats Newlyte to endure plainness of speech, and not to protest that no one has a right to dictate what he is to preach, and that he will not sell his conscience for gold. The parallel between himself and Galileo is a little hackneyed and entirely out of correspondence. He will not be persecuted or put out of the Church if he insists on re-editing the Old Testament; but the worthy man whom he insulted in his study will quietly slip away to some place where the drone of the Hexateuch is not heard. His congregation may become small, not because the people are afraid of the light, but because his sermons are so tiresome. It will not be Newlyte who will know the pangs of martyrdom, but his congregation. Ian Maclaren's next paragraph must be quoted in full: "My heart grew very tender in the end to the old saints in your church, who do not write nasty letters or talk against you, who love and pray for you. They have inherited certain ideas about the form of the Bible which may be inaccurate—and there you and I might agree—but which they cannot now exchange, and you set yourself to explode them every second Sunday for the space of a year. Worship in St. Origen's is like living in the Riviera during the earthquake season; you never know what wall in your villa will crack next, and it gets on the nerves. The twenty-third Psalm used to be a green pasture, but now you have turned it into an opportunity for drawing a parallel between David and Robin Hood, with the view of showing the improbability of the Book of Psalms coming from a bandit. The very name of Isaiah makes the pews to tremble, for you began with two prophets, and now no one can calculate the number of anonymous writers that have gone to complete the book. And I think you yourself felt afterwards that it was a mistake to take the fifty-third of Isaiah for a sermon on Good Friday, and discuss the identity of the servant of the Lord for forty minutes, with only a casual reference to Christ. One may not be an obscurantist, and yet be a little weary of this pedantry." These are not the words of a narrow conservative. No one who has read Mr. Watson's (Ian Maclaren's) writings will suppose this. They are the words of a wise man who would guard preachers, who are critics at third-hand, from the fatal error of departing from the duty of the hour by turning the pulpit into a place for retailing the theories of the newer criticism, instead of feeding the flock of Christ.

"Our Lord's Teaching on Prayer." Rev. Prof. W. Garden Blaikie, D.D., LL.D. (*The Thinker* for June.) On no subject connected with the spiritual life is our Lord's doctrine more full, varied or emphatic than prayer. (1) His own practice teaches this duty. Prayer was an habitual exercise with Him. For what purpose did He pray? It is no answer to say that He prayed merely as an example to us. If that had been all it could have been no example, inasmuch as it would have been prayer in quite different circumstances from ours. We are to remember that when He took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, Jesus emptied Himself and became dependent on the Father for all that was needed for the due control of His spirit, for the constant exercise of body and loving affections, and for the fulfilment of the mighty work given Him to do. Apart from the sense of personal sin, Jesus was familiar with the whole round of experience that shows our

feebleness and creates in us the feeling of dependence. Examining the recorded instances of prayer by Christ, we find that several of these were essentially, if not formally, thanksgivings. We also find Him engaging in direct supplication for others and for himself. With reference to himself, the most important and instructive of all His prayers was that in Gethsemane. It is the prayer of One on whom a load is descending too fearful to be borne, and who instinctively cries for deliverance with an earnestness that touches the most callous. It is a repeated, earnest prayer, always qualified with the condition, "If it be possible." But the petition is denied, but denied with an implied provision which is really better than the thing asked for. He gets a view of God which strengthens Him to endure. He is enabled to accept that will as better than His own. His soul returns unto its rest, or becomes tranquil and content. (2) The Lord teaches the duty of prayer by means of direct commands and exhortations. "Ask, and it shall be given you." The Fatherhood of God receives a prominent place in Christ's illustrations of prayer. "If ye then, being evil," etc. One of the great ends of prayer is to encourage and exercise the filial spirit on the part of men toward God. Prayer is not needed to give God information, neither is of value in awakening divine pity or love; nor is it to change the divine purpose. But God deems it right that in prayer His children should show their sense of dependence on Him and their full trust in his Fatherly love. It is not the mere act of prayer that God rewards, but rather the spirit of prayer, that spirit of trust which gratifies a parent's heart. In His farewell discourse (John xiv. 13, 14, and xvi. 23-27) Jesus assures His disciples touching the efficacy of prayer, and instructs them to present their petitions in His name. When appealed to on the ground of what His Son has done, alike for the salvation of men and the honor of God, the Father cannot but have profound regard to the request. There is a tendency on the part of some to ask blessings of God on the general ground of His goodness, and without regard to the fact that our sins have forfeited all claim to His goodness. Such prayers can have but little avail. Christ's doctrine is opposed to prayer offered to or in the name of the Virgin, or saints, or angels. While other forms may not be wrong, His teaching gives us the rule of prayer to the Father, through the Son, and in reliance on the inward help of the Holy Spirit. (3) Our Lord's parables illustrate the duty and efficacy of prayer—*e.g.*, Luke xi. 5-8; Luke xviii. 1-8; Luke xviii. 9-14. The first two parables inculcate the value of importunity. The third (that of the Pharisee and the publican) is not designed so much to enforce the duty, as to illustrate the spirit of prayer. (4) The great pattern prayer forms an essential part of our Lord's doctrine on this subject. Its opening words afford an obvious illustration of the filial attitude and spirit in which we ought to draw near to God. "Our Father, which art in heaven." The relative place of the two great subjects of supplication, God's glory and man's good, is indicated. Further, we observe the combination of the temporal and the spiritual in the part that bears on the good of man. A single petition, without variation or amplification, is offered on behalf of daily or necessary bread; while the petitions that deal with man as a sinner are more in number and fuller in scope. But what most impresses us in the structure of the whole prayer is its wonderful combination of brevity and comprehensiveness, and of its simplicity and profundity. What a genius it must have been, if we may use such a phrase, that in six short lines gave the Church a prayer which, in every age and every country of the world, has been found to express, in the simplest possible language, the profoundest desires of every exercised heart! Let any intelligent and spiritual man try to sound the depths of these petitions, and he will find it impossible. However much matter he

may think of them as containing, he gets glimpses of untold applications beyond, and he has the profound conviction that nothing more than the fulfilment of these petitions is needed to turn earth into heaven, and bring to pass the glory of the latter day.

"Future Life in the Pentateuch." By the Rev. Thomas Stoughton Potwin, in *The Bibliotheca Sacra* for July. It is conceded that the moral and religious discipline of the Hebrews was not based directly on sanctions drawn from the life after death. But we shall make a great mistake if we infer from this the absence of opinions and expectations for the coming state. Interpreters of the Old Testament have not generally denied that the Pentateuch contains intimations of the immortality of man, but their conclusions have, almost without exception, been vitiated by their understanding of Sheol. They put everything under its shadow, and a dreadful shadow it is. The indirect evidence in favor of the position that the Hebrews believed in a future life is first considered. It is found largely in the fact that the earliest literature of the East reveals the conception of a blessed life in the spirit world with ancestors, as common to Oriental nations. The Hebrews were encompassed by these conceptions on every side, and the Tel-el-Armarna tablets, unearthed in Egypt, have proved that literary communication between Babylonia, Palestine, and Egypt was an everyday occurrence in this early time. Hence the theology of none of these Eastern countries could have remained unknown in the others. The presumption is strongly in favor of the belief that the Hebrews held to the doctrine of future existence.

Turning to the direct evidence, we find that the Hebrews were taught that man "became a living soul" by the breath of God, being thus created in the image of God and partaking of the nature of the spiritual and eternal God. The case of Enoch is cited. His method of closing life was designed as a reward; but they cannot have imagined for a moment that God dropped him, for a reward, into an under world of shadows and gloom. The accounts of the deaths of Moses and Aaron are related to that of Enoch. Nothing about their death suggests a falling into darkness, "where no experience of communion with God is possible." "Thou shalt go to thy fathers *in peace*," is part of the covenant which the Most High makes with Abraham. It is impossible, without violence, to interpret these words of a death clouded with uncertainty and gloom as to the future. The Hebrews must have believed in a "heaven" with their fathers who had kept their covenant with God. The inspired language which indicates this is the phrase used of the patriarchs, "was gathered unto his people." These words are specifically distinguished from death. Thus of Abraham, "Then Abraham gave up the ghost and died, *and was gathered unto his people*." (Gen. xxv. 8). So of Isaac, and Jacob, and Aaron. Here we have the future life in the society of ancestors, which was the common expectation of primitive Oriental peoples. What we call "heaven" was to them *life with God and their fathers*. The article concludes with an examination into the meaning of Sheol. Having examined the six occasions of its use in the Pentateuch, the judgment is reached that Sheol, in all these passages, stands for the mournful side of death and the grave as the negation of life, its joyousness and blessing, including the coming to one's end in peace. It is precisely similar to our own language of death and the grave when looked at from this negative point of view which, however, is never thought of as implying any doubt of the happy future of the spirit. It leaves us at full liberty to believe all the evidence that happy hopes for the future existed with mournful views of death, precisely as the two sets of ideas have co-existed under the Christian

system. The development, moreover, in later Jewish literature, of a more distinct doctrine of a future life, and the words of Christ himself, imply such views in the early days, as we have supposed. So that there seems to be ground for the belief that the home of the fathers, in the keeping of their covenant god, was the heaven of the Hebrews.

The Metaphysical Magazine, devoted to Occult, Philosophic and Scientific Research, is edited by Leander Edmund Whipple and J. Emery McLean, and is issued monthly by the Metaphysical Publishing Company, 503 Fifth Avenue, New York. It is ably edited, well printed on good paper, and makes a highly respectable appearance. Its well written articles show that their writers have something to say and that they know how to say it. Of course, orthodox readers will not expect to find in it an echo of their opinions. The title page, which has been quoted pretty fully, should be sufficient to prevent them from indulging any such expectation; but anyone who desires to know what some people in the churches and a great many outside of them are thinking on questions of high import, will find very much in it to interest him. We agree fully with the *New York Evening Post*, that "One notes with pleasure the way in which what may be called extra-academic philosophy and extra-ecclesiastic religion gradually put on less eccentric forms;" and that "this magazine promises to be a great improvement, in this way, on its predecessors."

In the May number—which, by the way, is the one which has found its way to our table—the leading article, which is by J. Elizabeth Hotchkiss, M.A., Ph.D., is devoted to the discussion of "The New Psychology," the following extract may be sufficient to indicate at once the style and the position of the writer:

"In the perfect man there must be an accurate balance of mind and heart. The intellect is a cold and unfeeling master; the heart, unless held in check by the control of the will, is often carried away by the force of its own emotion. Intellect and feeling must act and react upon each other. What is sentiment to the unbalanced mind? And as for reason without faith, 'Atheists are as dull who cannot guess God's presence out of sight.'

"In briefly recounting the stages of scientific growth, we begin with ignorance, away back in the early ages when science was unknown. Then, in the field of religion came mythology, a picturesque anticipation of the world's Divinity. There were gods in the wind and in the streams. Man worshipped the sun and the moon, even the cow and the sacred ibis, and then degenerated into the worship of the golden calf. Then followed, after Christianity was established, the worship of woman, which continued through the Middle Ages. The religious idea is even more elevated to-day, and now the God *in* man is the New Creed. Hardly recognized yet, it is true; but the idea is one that will cause a tremendous advance, not only in science, but in religion. It has a close bearing upon psychology, for it shifts the attitude of all science from the exoteric to the esoteric point of view, and brings out the grandeur of man himself, as a god in nature, an expression of the divine thought, possessing, like his Maker, the power of creation.

"We may likewise follow the development of psychology. There was at first ignorance, then came mysticism, then followed speculation, and now we have reached the plain of experiment and verification that leads to exact science. Each process in its turn has been merely a working method for the development of the human race, and with this evolution of science and religion there has been a psychological evolution of man himself."

It would be easy to criticise here, but the quotation is not made for the purpose of criticism, but as an indication of the direction which the thought of a considerable, and probably a growing, class of thinkers is taking. A reaction from the materialism of the past generation has set in. The revolt against the science which takes no account of the soul of man is complete. The pendulum may, indeed, swing too far in the opposite direction, but the movement is along the right line. If the world is ever to have a perfect system of science, it must account for what is *in*, as well as for what is *without* the mind. Even the occult, so far as it is verifiable matter of human experience, must not be overlooked. Danger, no doubt, besets the new departure, as it has every step taken in human progress from the beginning; the unskilfulness and waywardness of those who use the new method will lead to many absurd conclusions. But if the method itself be correct, it may be trusted to correct these aberrations in due time. In the mean time the duty of Christians may be expressed in three words—"Watch and pray."

The following passage in the article immediately following the one from which the above quotation is made, which deals with the subject of "Intuition and Divination," has an important bearing on this subject:

"We may not heed the imputations of deception and credulity which have often been cast upon this whole subject. If there are counterfeits, we may be very certain that there is a genuine original. There is no wrong that is other than a perversion of the right. The critic, as well as the sceptic, is generally inferior to the person or subject that he employs himself upon, and his candour may often be questioned. The fact is apt to be overlooked that the very capacity to imagine the existence of extraordinary powers is itself evidence that they may exist. Even the gibe of "superstition" is met by the fact that the term properly and legitimately denotes the faculty and perception of what is superior. The bat may seem to have very good reason for repudiating the sunlight as beyond the knowing, and may accordingly circumscribe his belief and enquiries to his own night and twilight; but true souls, while discarding hallucinations and morbid hankerings after marvels, and employing caution in their exploration of all subjects that fall within the scope of their understanding, will always be ready to know what is beyond.

"The interior world has not been hidden from us by impenetrable darkness; the Supreme Being has not left himself without a witness. Because we are not able, with our cups, to measure the liquid contents of the ocean, or to take its dimensions, it does not follow that the ocean is altogether beyond our knowing. We view it from its shores; we sail upon its bosom and are refreshed by the showers which its emanations supply; we know that bays and inlets are its members, and that countless rivers flow into its embrace. So, too, in an analogous way, we know God. The finite does not comprehend the infinite; but by our own existence, by the operations of the universe around us, by the ever-watchful Providence that cares for us, even when seemingly unmindful of our welfare, by the impartial and unerring justice which is everywhere within and above us, we perceive His working; and also by the higher intuition which carries the mind from the external into close and intimate communication with the interior of things. The ideal truth, transcending all invention, is the goal of every right endeavor. To possess it is to be free, in the genuine sense of that term. All other liberty is superficial and factitious.

"As man grows older he will take on new relations with the universe. There has always been an eagerness with individuals to supplement the faculties with which they were endowed. They are not content, like the Carib Indians, simply to note what is within common observation, and not

to seek anything further. Even the ladder of Jacob, however high it might rise in the air, would have no significance for them except its top were to reach heaven, so that the angels may come down and go up upon it.

"Man, as to his spiritual quality, is the emanation of divinity, and as a soul and personality his destiny is that of evolution. The operation of evolution is to bring into the character and active life the principles and faculties which have been implanted. The human soul, as it becomes developed into higher conditions, exercises the powers and qualities which it derived from the divine source, and from this enlarging of its faculties becomes more and more recipient of illumination."

It will be seen that Dr. Wilder, the writer of this article, entertains high hopes in respect to the future of the human race. Human progress, according to his conception of it, is not to be looked for merely in the achievements of man in fields external to himself; but also and especially in the development of the powers and properties of his own being. His notion is that much that has lain fallow in man is to be cultivated and made fruitful, and that elements of his being which have hitherto been merely rudimentary are to be so developed as to virtually constitute new faculties. And he is not alone in holding this view. It is a common opinion among those who engaged in the field of psychical research that there are latent in all of us powers and properties of which most of us have never dreamed. And though we, as Christians, do not look for all this advance as the result of natural evolution, but rather as the result of the operation of divine grace, we can hardly look for less than those who ignore this supreme factor in the progress of the race; and while our main dependence is in the power which comes from above, we cannot be indifferent to any of the subsidiary forces that may be made to operate in the same direction and toward the same end.

The Methodist Review (M. E. Church, South) seems to us to grow better and better. The May-June number is rich in biography. Bishop Hargrove contributes an interesting sketch of Chancellor Landon C. Garland, of Vanderbilt University. From this we take the liberty to make the following extracts:

"By way of emphasizing the positiveness of his religious character, I would remind you that when he became a Methodist, Methodism was, sure enough, Christianity in earnest. It was not then a popular religion in the high circles. Its members were mainly of the poor and unlettered classes, and they were derided by that fastidious and ambitious class which is ready to make merchandise and social respectability even out of their religion. There were few cultured young men of his day who were Methodists. It is easy to see that his ecclesiastical relations rested on principle, and were not influenced, much less controlled, by mere intellectual and social affinities. . . . His Methodism meant that he was in the Church to receive all its benefits, and to multiply them as far as possible for others. In all its means of grace he participated, and in all its work he had a part. What a joy he found especially in the simple, pure, preached Gospel! His very soul feasted on this rich, sweet, strong food. At every returning interval it was manna from heaven to his hungry soul. He cared nothing for the tinsel with which some misguided preachers attempt to adorn and make attractive the divine message. To him it was worse than trash, an offence, a disgusting incumbrance. The affectation of rhetorical finish, of elocutionary flourishes, of classical ornamentation, and of elaborate exhibitions of human learning in the pulpit aroused all the repulsion of his indignant soul. He loved an earnest messenger, oblivious of himself, but full of the

urgency, importance and magnitude of his message. I well remember his admiration of such a preacher—a man innocent of all human erudition, scarcely able to read intelligibly the sacred text, but a devout, modest, humble minister of Christ, whose tongue took fire of the Holy Ghost—when, with beaming face, he talked to the people of the trials and triumphs, the conflicts and conquests, the hopes and fruitions of a godly life. None received greater profit and pleasure than he did from ministrations of this sort, however unpretentious and humble the preacher.”

In this respect, Chancellor Garland resembled another great educationist and prince of men, who had his home among us in this city until the Lord took him to himself a few years ago. Every word that Bishop Hargrove has said of Chancellor Garland is true of Dr. Egerton Ryerson. In his estimation it was the unction which made the preacher; and the humblest of these messengers of grace, whatever defects he might have in other respects, if he only came to the pulpit filled with the Spirit, and presented his message with simplicity, humility, and fervor, never failed to find an attentive, sympathetic, and thoroughly appreciative hearer in him. It is true, he believed most heartily in an educated ministry, and did what he could to furnish such a ministry for the Church; and if the preacher was endowed with the gift of eloquent speech, no one rejoiced more heartily than he did; but he valued neither talents nor learning in the pulpit, except in so far as they enabled the preacher to bring with perennial freshness from the treasury of God things new and old, and to present them to his hearers with a simplicity that would enable the humblest of them, including the little children, to understand.

It is not easy to quote from Bishop Fitzgerald's tribute to the memory of his brother in the episcopate, Bishop Kavanaugh, without quoting too much. Once begin and it is not easy to stop. Take this pen-picture of the subject of the sketch:

“When Methodism is grafted upon Irish stock we may look for sanctified wit or sanctified pugnacity, and usually grace abounding is demanded to keep the wit and the pugnacity within proper bounds. Bishop Kavanaugh was as full of wit and humor as a ripened California orange is full of juice; but if he ever, in his merriest moods, offended against genuine courtesy or true refinement, I have never heard it. Pugnacity or combativeness he had; his chest, neck, and back head might have been those of a prize fighter, but the religion of love made him a child of God, and he loved all men. The elements in his nature that might have developed into extra combativeness on the natural plain, under the reign of grace made him a mighty man of God, and a leader in the militant Church. His Celtic extraction exhibited itself in his ruddy complexion and sanguine temperament. . . . He was one of a group of great men. Though differing from them all in his genius and personality, he shared with the foremost of them in the love and esteem of the Church while they were all living. In the perspective he does not dwindle in comparison. In his declamatory bursts he was scarcely inferior to that princely pulpit orator, Henry B. Bascom. In steel-linked logic, William A. Smith, the corypheus of the great debate in the forties, did not excel him. In the coruscation of a wit that was spontaneous and sparkling, with never a trace of acidity, a humor that was irresistibly contagious, but never coarse, he might be ranked with McFerrin or Richardson. In his pathos he touched the cords of the heart with a power as subduing as that of the massive yet tender A. L. P. Green. In lucidity of statement he might at times be ranked with Bishop McTyeire, whose brain powers and Saxon-English were second to no man of his day or ours. If he did not always equal Bishop Pierce in the brilliancy of his rhetoric—for on this line his efforts were unequal—his

flight was as lofty and his wing as tireless in the sweep of his sanctified imagination. If he had not so many angles or gnarled spots in his composition as Lorenzo Dow, Peter Cartwright, or Moses Brock, his individuality was not less marked. A personality more ample, benignant and unique has not risen among us than that of Hubbard H. Kavanaugh— orphan boy, type-setter in a printing office, circuit rider, station preacher, presiding elder, editor, superintendent of public instruction, bishop—everybody's friend, and pater-familias of the vast Methodist family from the Big Sandy, in Kentucky, to the Golden Gate, in California."

These lengthy quotations are made for the sake of the great and good men to whom they refer, and the great Church to which they belonged, in which the readers of the CANADIAN METHODIST REVIEW take such a lively interest. Neither the Chancellor nor the Bishop was entirely unknown to the Methodists of this country. The latter was the messenger of his Church who brought its fraternal greetings to the General Conference of the Methodist Church here in 1886, and his memory is still like ointment poured forth.

There are many other things in this number from which it would be a pleasure to quote, did space permit. That exquisite piece of work, "Prince Colaptes and His Biographers," by Maurice Thompson, which bears the *imprimatur* of the poet, the naturalist, and the enthusiastic lover of birds, and, indeed, of every living thing on every page, is well deserving of special notice. "A comparative Study of Methodist Theology," by O. E. Brown, M.A., B.D., in which Watson, Pope and Miley, their "methods," their "sources," and their treatment of the leading doctrines and our faith, are brought together and compared, will amply repay a careful perusal. To the Methodist theological student who has not the time or opportunity to make this comparison for himself, and to such as are doing this, but who feel the need of some skilful guide to direct them in the operation, this article will prove most helpful. The article on "Some Phases of Contemporary Fiction," is scarcely less important. If it be true, as seems to be indicated by the reports of the circulating libraries, that seventy-five per cent. of the matter read by English-speaking people is comprised in works of fiction, surely it is a matter of no small importance that we should know what the general character of these works is, and the prevailing trend of their teaching. The Editor's own article on "The Making of Methodism: Studies in the Genesis of Institutions," deserves to be carefully read by every student of Methodist history.

In the May number of the *Arena* there is an article from the pen of John D. McPherson, on "Renan's Life of Jesus; Its Value as History," which deserved an earlier notice. It is written from the "Liberal," not from the orthodox, stand-point; the orthodox reader will not therefore be able to see eye to eye at all times with the writer; but the conclusion to which he comes on the main point in his discussion of the subject is, on this account, none the less important. The readers of Renan's romance will remember that the argument of the book is—as it is well summarized by the writer of the article in question—"that Jesus at first, and in Galilee, sought only to free the national religion from the incrustations of senseless observances and narrow interpretations with which, in the course of the ages, tradition and principally Pharisaic tradition, had overlaid it; that He was enthusiastically received in Galilee, and there taught successfully; that He then went to Jerusalem, was there looked on coldly, made no disciples, and, indeed, was treated with contempt; that keenly feeling the disdain of the proud Heirosolymites, He returned to Galilee a changed man—changed in His temper and in His purposes. He was no longer a Reformer but a Revolutionist. He determined not to improve the popular religion, but to destroy it. His disciples enthusiastically seconded His

aims, and imposed on Him a character without which He could not have succeeded. They hailed Him as the Messiah and the Son of David, and forged a genealogy and invented a legend to support these pretensions. Jesus yielded to an influence which He could have hardly resisted had He wished. He became a thaumaturgus against His inclination, indeed, and acted a character and adopted a tone which could not be sustained more than a few months, and which involved Him in such difficulties that He was satisfied, if not glad, when death came, to restore Him his divine liberty, and release Him from the fatal necessities of a position which each day became more exacting and more difficult to sustain."

In other words, Renan represents Jesus as a conscious impostor, acting and speaking falsehood, representing himself, and allowing His disciples to represent Him, as being what He was not, and as doing what He did not, and thus weaving around himself a network of evil influences, which became every day more intolerable, and from which He welcomed death as the only possible deliverance—and all this while He was seeking to establish a pure religion. And Renan not only asserts this, but he defends it. He sees nothing wrong or incongruous in the cause of truth and righteousness being promoted by falsehood and fraud. His theory of history conforms to this monstrous conception of the fitness of things. The facts are trifles, and the writer should not be too seriously hampered by them. "To make the great souls of the past live again," he says, "some share of divination and conjecture must be permitted. The secret laws of life, of the progress of organic products, of the melting of minute distinctions, ought to be consulted at each moment; for what is required to be reproduced is not the material circumstances, which it is impossible to verify, but the very soul of history; what must be sought is not the petty certainty about trifles, it is the correctness of the general sentiment, the truthfulness of the general coloring."

Mr. McPherson dissents utterly from this view of history, and especially of biography; and he rejects with indignation the conclusions to which it has led the great Frenchman. He says: "It is truly shocking to reflect that this atrocious doctrine is upheld as justified by the example of Jesus, and in a book delightful to read, scattered in cheap editions in hundreds of thousands of Christian homes; and the exalted terms in which he speaks of Jesus will have no tendency to counteract the poison, but, indeed, to increase its effect. It must destroy all our faith in goodness if we can believe that He, who was 'the common honor of all who share the common humanity,' 'the incomparable man to whom the universal conscience has decreed the title of the Son of God,'—that this exalted personage was a conscious impostor, who contorted His limbs in simulated struggles, and uttered feigned groans to impress the imagination of the vulgar; and that though His conscience lost its purity, and he became degraded to the level of the inhabitants of the dull and impure city, yet He accomplished His purpose, 'He laid the eternal foundation-stone of a true religion. . . . He founded the worship of all ages of all lands; that which all elevated souls will practice until the end of time.' . . ."

"Jesus, in the supreme moment, when He stood in the shadow of the Cross, declared that he had come into the world for the one purpose of bearing witness to the Truth, and to many readers it will seem that Renan, in representing all His life as one protracted falsehood, has violated that one of his own canons which requires a truthful narrative to be harmonious throughout. But had this been suggested to Mr. Renan, he would doubtless have answered that this final declaration of Jesus was also false, and that we should admire the heroism which inspired Him, at such a moment, thus to complete the lifelong falsehood which He had designed as the eternal foundation-stone of true religion."

Editorial Reviews of Books and Periodicals.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Philosophy of Mind: An Essay in the Metaphysics of Psychology. By GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD, Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 8vo, pp. 414. Price, \$3.50. For first use in Colleges, \$2.40. Toronto: William Briggs.

The volume before us is deserving of more than a passing notice. Professor Ladd is a veteran writer. He has done more than any other author on the American continent to keep the subject of psychology before the public, and to furnish his readers with the latest and best results in a field that within the last ten years has multiplied books without stint. No fewer than six volumes on psychology and philosophy have come from his pen, and all of these are standard productions.

Professor Ladd has not simply spun theories from his own brain. He has kept pace with the fullest and latest researches of the subject in the contributory departments of physiology and biology, and is, both in the old world and the new, a recognized authority on physiological psychology. He has not been carried away by the materialistic tendencies on the one hand, nor has he given undue prominence to the *a priori* and metaphysical on the other. Mental action is, doubtless, something more than the movement of the merely physical, while it in turn is conditioned and influenced by a physical organization. To study the phenomena, weigh the evidence, and draw conclusions concerning facts so different and yet so related, is no easy undertaking. In the main, to do this is the task the author has set himself to accomplish.

It will not be uninteresting to know to what extent the new psychology has modified the old-time conceptions of the spirituality and reality of mind. Is there warrant for the two sets of terms, "Mind and Body," "Materialism and Spiritualism," "Monism and Dualism"? Can all phenomena be ultimately reduced to unity and be labelled, "Power," "Force," "The Unknowable," or some term that will stand for that mysterious something with two sets of properties, and which so obstinately refuses to give a final and decisive revelation of itself?

What is reality? What is knowledge? Can the study of psychology be pursued without any metaphysical assumptions? Is there any difference in this regard between psychology and the physical sciences? Is not the subject-matter of the one as much an assumption as that of the other? If only the highest credentials can be accepted where a question of ontology is involved, what credential is higher than *self-consciousness*? Existence aware of itself carries its warrant from no delegated authority, and is no conclusion obtained by mediate inference. It is immediate and direct, and in the history of thought has found but few to question its claims. If it would be absurd to hold a scientific discussion concerning the characteristics of the non-existent and call this science, would it not be even more absurd to challenge the existence of the scientist himself? An ontological hypothesis underlies all thought equally with all physical science, and metaphysical assumptions are no more an intrusion in psychology than in physics. Says the author: "It is enough now to affirm that the modern physical sciences are very far indeed from being capable of exhibiting themselves systematically as stripped of all metaphysics. On the contrary, the most stupendous metaphysical assumptions and implications are woven

into this structure throughout. Instead of being *mere* formulas for stating uniform sequences among phenomena, they are descriptions and explanations of experiences which appeal at every step to invisible and mysterious entities, to hidden and abstruse forces, to transactions that are assumed to take place among beings whose existence and modes of behavior can never become, in any sense of the words, immediate data of sensuous knowledge."

The efforts of several representative writers on psychology, who try to get along without any metaphysical hypothesis, are passed under review, but only to show that every step they have taken involves and implies the assumptions with which they are trying to dispense. The conclusion upon this point is put in the following italicized utterance: "A scientific psychology which explains known psychic facts by a strict correlation of them with known cerebral facts—both classes of facts being understood alike as mere phenomena without any metaphysics whatever—not only never has been established, but from the very nature of the case it never can be established." This position, it seems to us, is invulnerable.

The next important question is, "In what relation does scientific psychology stand to the philosophy of mind (the science to the metaphysics of mental phenomena)?" This question involves three subordinate questions, namely:

1. What is psychology? After an interesting discussion, carried through several pages, the following conclusion is reached: "The final aim of psychology is to understand the nature and development, in all its relations to other beings, of that unique kind of being which we call the Soul or Mind."

2. The second question is, What is philosophy? The restless activity of mind within the historic era, as well as in the life of each individual, can furnish an answer. In all the special divisions that have characterized human research, the aim has been to reach a higher unity. In some way they have all been regarded as the "broken lights" of some central unity; and as in ancient times each road led towards Rome, so each several science is but a part of eternal truth. Science, as Herbert Spencer has said, is only the "partial unification" of knowledge, and the complete unification he calls philosophy. "Toward this goal reflective thinking ever strives, though never with more than a partial success. It is this which constitutes the final aim of reason as it is expressed in all the current systems of philosophy." It is not for any of us to speak slightly of such an effort, for, to a greater or less degree, it is the one great theme or problem of every man. In brief, "philosophy seeks a unitary conception of the real world that shall be freed, as far as possible, from internal contradictions and based upon all the facts of nature and of human life."

3. "What is that relation between psychology and philosophy which grows out of the very nature of both?" In "The Later Pantheism" Tennyson has said,

"Dark is the world to thee: thyself art the reason why."

But for psychical phenomena there would be no philosophy. Man is both the riddle of the universe and its key. For the lower orders of life there are no hard problems to solve and no relations to unify. These come with the birth of mind. Our ceaseless activity is the unrest of a rational spirit struggling to *adjust itself* to everything within and without us. "It is in the effort to explain ourselves to ourselves that we most intelligently and persistently demand some explanation of the world of things and of other minds." We seek to obtain a philosophy of nature in order to the possession of a philosophy of mind. It is not that we simply analyze an individual

thing, or by a process of introspection note the passing phenomena of our own consciousness. We must study the sciences that tell us *about* things, and we must look from the inner consciousness of self to the broader field of life and history, where other beings like ourselves have given a fuller and richer expression of man and of the problems we are struggling to solve. "In particular, the problems of philosophy all emerge and force themselves upon the mind in the attempt thoroughly to comprehend and satisfactorily to solve the problems of a scientific psychology; and the attempts, along the different main lines of research in psychology, to deal scientifically with its problems all lead up to the place where this science hands these same problems over to philosophy."

Under the heading "Philosophy of Mind," the author includes "a certain class of problems which psychological science hands over to philosophy for a more thorough examination, and for a solution, if solution can be found." These problems relate to the Self, not as known immediately to itself, but as scientifically known in its relations to the bodily organism. Among these problems we will specify a few, and give the author's conclusions without detailing in full the arguments by which they have been reached.

THE CONCEPT OF MIND.

When we talk of "our own mind," or of other people "having minds," what do we mean? We speak of "our home," "their home," etc. Is there a difference in the meaning of the same term as applied to "mind" and to "home"? In this connection the author corrects two or three misleading fallacies that have prevailed.

1. It is a great mistake to suppose that the whole of any mental phenomena is described or explained when the mere "content" of consciousness has been analyzed. This is the perennial sin of the empirical psychologist. *Function* is even more important than *content*, inasmuch as it gives us more of an insight into the nature and activity of mind. "All consciousness and every phenomenon of consciousness makes the demand to be considered as a form of functioning, and not as mere differentiation of content." Kant has permanently established the synthetic activity of the mind, and to disregard its spontaneity and discriminating character is to miss its most important feature.

2. Another fallacy is made regarding the nature of conception. The empiricist identifies conception with envisagement. This is a great mistake even with the most material existences. If envisagement were all, there would be no apprehension of the *inner* differences by which one thing is distinguished from another. Difference in bulk and figure would constitute the only distinctions between objects. In the same way the empiricist tries to envisage a pure "statical self" as object over against its states of consciousness, and in his failure to find the desired "entity" pronounces against the mind's reality. "Conception is only a complex form of mental functioning; it is always a process involving a succession of psychoses related to each other under laws of the life of ideation and of thought." We realize what anything is by what it does, and this is equally true of mind. To explain psychical phenomena we form our conception of the agent whose activities are revealed in consciousness; but it is a mistake to suppose that this Self or Ego is "a pure and changeless Being—a sort of statical and abstract object for its own self-contemplation."

3. A third fallacy relates to a false or inadequate view of knowledge. Knowledge is a psychical fact, whether it be knowledge of self or of anything else. Still further, "to be an object of knowledge is to be known as real." "The object of *knowledge* cannot be presentatively, or representatively, or inferentially, brought into consciousness, cannot exist at all as

mental object, without implicating the reality of that which is thus objectively known." And "when the object of knowledge is the so-called Self, or Mind, or Ego, its fundamental characteristics, as object constituted and known by the knowing process, are in no respect changed." In conclusion, "The philosophy of mind simply expounds the theory of what the soul is on the basis of what the soul appears to itself to be." The criticism and correction of these three fallacies give a definite idea of the author's "Concept of Mind."

THE REALITY OF MIND.

What is reality? What are we to understand by "being real"? The question is interwoven with a theory of knowledge, and in this regard the Mind, as the subject under consideration, is not to be treated differently from any other. Of phenomena, simply as phenomena, there is and can be no knowledge. "Knowledge and reality can never be considered apart. 'Knowledge' that does not involve the correlate of reality, that is not of reality as its object, is not *knowledge*. 'Reality' considered as apart from all terms and all possibility of knowledge, reality that is not known or conceived of as knowledge, is for us no *reality*." When we have fully thought out what we mean by reality, our conception must express itself in some such form as the following: "Every real being is known as a self-active subject of states, standing in manifold relations to other beings, and maintaining its right to be called real by acting and being acted upon—only, however, in obedience to certain laws (or uniform modes of its behavior as such a being and no other)." Reality and activity approaching uniformity are inseparable.

Turning now to Mind, and to self-consciousness as its realization, we find that it may be expressed in the three propositions, "I am," "I was," and "I have meanwhile been."

"I AM."

Self-consciousness is responsible and sufficient for the reality that I know myself here and now to be. To deny the reality of the Self is to deny the possibility of all knowledge. If not I, who or what is it that knows? Remove the ontological aspect of Self, and regard it as mere phenomenon, and then the other member in the relation is equally unreal. Tear out the ontological postulate in relation to Self in the simplest act of knowledge, and not only do we lose the real being of our own mind, but we lose all being and all knowledge at once. History affords numerous illustrations of the correctness of this position. Agnosticism has its tap-root in misconceptions upon this point; and much of modern thought but reproduces Hume in his sceptical attitude towards the Self, and consequently towards all knowledge.

"I WAS."

"I was" is, however, a proposition which is made with scarcely less confidence, and certainly with no less frequency, than the proposition "I am." Clear and vivid memory-knowledge approaches the original knowledge of self-consciousness. Let it be noticed that memory is involved in the simplest judgment whatever. It is implied in the declared relation between any subject and predicate. Even the judgment "I am" is not an exception. It is equally involved in all inferential processes between two or more judgments. The ontological significance of memory is thus plain and unmistakable. "To remember recognitively *is* to have knowledge of the being in the past of the subject of the act of memory." The immediate knowledge of Self in the act of self-consciousness is the knowledge of my "here-and-now-being." Memory is the knowledge of my own experience as involving my "then-and-there-being."

"I HAVE MEANWHILE BEEN."

This is a proposition resting upon different grounds from the other two. It involves the complex activities in the stream: of consciousness, and the mysterious accompaniment of rational convictions. "I remember that I was" is involved in it again and again. Still there are *gaps* over which the acts of recognitive memory cannot carry us. Memory cannot extend to swoons, or dreamless sleep, or to any form of unconsciousness. The faculty of *thought* only is equal to the demand.

But *gaps* do not belong to the stream of self-consciousness alone. They characterize all external objects to which change and motion belong; and the process by which the *gaps* so occasioned are bridged is exactly similar to that in connection with the Self. In both cases the process is from the "it was" to the "it is," and in both cases it is the rational function of thought that connects and identifies the one with the other. "In brief, without this function of reflective thinking to supplement perception and memory, *science* is wholly impossible; and without the ontological assumption which goes with it, what is called science is nothing but the dreamer's well-ordered dream."

In biological evolution, pre-eminently, thought and imagination bridge the gaps too numerous to mention. As a science it "consists almost wholly in a debatable system of arranging abstract thoughts." It has few stepping-stones in memory, and has frail standing indeed compared with that which the plain man finds when he affirms the continuous reality of his own soul's existence. It is thus easily seen that the proposition "I have meanwhile been," is not only equally defensible with that of material objects, but that in certain important respects its claim to our assent is very much superior.

The discussion thus far may be summarized, at least in a preliminary way, as follows: "The peculiar, the only intelligible and indubitable reality which belongs to Mind is its being for itself, by actual functioning of self-consciousness, of recognitive memory, and of thought." *As Mind* I cease to exist when I cease from the functions and activities of Mind. My reality and my consciousness of my reality are perpetually constituted by the living processes of my Mind. "To be self-conscious, and to think of the Self as having, actually or possibly, been self-conscious—this is really to be, as Minds are."

In commencing this article, intended to be but a "book notice" a trifle longer than ordinary, we purposed bringing some other points under review, but we have already exceeded our limits. Among these we might mention "The Consciousness of Identity," "The Unity of Mind," "Origin and Permanence of Mind," and "Place of Man's Mind in Nature." These, with several others, are fully and ably discussed by the author. Some of them we may use as the text for a future article. The volume is characterized by clearness of conception, strength of argument, fulness of information upon the latest results in psychological research, and is exceedingly discriminating and logical in its conclusions. It will make an admirable text-book, and should be a standard authority upon the important questions with which it deals.

Victoria University, Toronto.

E. I. BADGLEY.

We would have liked to have paid more attention to our old friend the *Atlantic Monthly* than our present space will permit. It has our undiminished regard and appreciation, and we should have been pleased, were our columns less crowded, to have quoted some of the good things.

The Higher Critics Criticised. A Study of the Pentateuch for Popular Reading. Being an inquiry into the age of the so-called books of Moses, with an introductory examination of Dr. Kuenen's "Religion of Israel." By RUFUS P. STEBBINS, D.D.; with preliminary chapters on "The Higher Criticism," and an Appendix concerning "The Wonderful Law," by H. L. Hastings, Editor of *The Christian*. \$1.75. Boston, U.S.A. : Scriptural Tract Repository.

The lengthy title-page indicates the scope and design of this volume. The introduction, which treats of the Higher Criticism, consists of eighty-four closely-printed pages, and is from the pen of the Editor of *The Christian*, who, in addition to an article on Higher Criticism in general, writes of "Jesus of Nazareth as a Higher Critic," and of "The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Authorship." This is followed by Dr. Stebbins' contribution, which consists of a review of Kuenen's "Religion of Israel," and of "A Study of the Pentateuch." Kuenen's work was published in 1874-5, and Dr. Stebbins' criticism is a reprint, with slight and unessential modifications, of articles published in 1879-80. The major part of the book before us consists of "A Study of the Pentateuch," in which Dr. Stebbins contends for the early date and Mosaic authorship of the first five books of the Bible. He offers external evidences of his position, grouping these under four general divisions: I. Christ to Malachi; II. Malachi to Captivity; III. Captivity to David; IV. David to Moses. Under the head of Internal Evidence, the author treats of antiquity of style, contents and structure, undesigned coincidences, minutes of details, chasms in history, etc.; insisting, in conclusion, that a rejection of the traditional belief involves us in far more serious difficulties than the rejection of the theories which the newer criticism has to offer. The work closes with an appendix on "The Wonderful Law," in which Mr. Hastings defends the Pentateuch against the often repeated charges of infidelity regarding its morality, the cruelty and injustice of Mosaic legislation, and the like.

It is not pretended that this book is meant for scholars. It is designed to instruct the popular reader. As it is almost certain, from its character, to fall mainly into the hands of those who will only read one side of the subject, regret may be expressed that the book does not deal somewhat more fairly with the subject of Higher Criticism. It has been pointed out so often that Higher Criticism is simply a method of investigation; that there are Higher Critics and Higher Critics, and that there is no reason, in the nature of things, why this newer criticism should not serve the purposes of conservative orthodoxy; that it becomes difficult to excuse the sweeping and unqualified statements in which the Editor of *The Christian* sometimes indulges. Quite oblivious of the fact that Dr. Stebbins' is employing the tools of the newer criticism, Mr. Hastings permits himself to pen a statement such as this: "The Higher Critics despise and discredit prophecy." Nothing is gained by writing of some of "these learned critics" as "smoke-dried and beer-sodden," who "handle the oracles of God with little reverence, and instead of trembling at His words, which shall judge them at the last day, seem to have no more respect for the messages of those whom God has set over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant, than they have for an erotic song of a licentious pagan poet, or legend of heathen mythology." This would be "vigorous" writing in a third-class political paper, but is too painful a reminder of the art of abusing the plaintiff's attorney to be welcome in a work designed to instruct the people in reference to the Holy Scriptures. The book will do something to quiet the fears of those who imagine that we are about to suffer

the loss of the Bible through the attacks of the newer critics. It contains much wholesome reading, but will prove no permanent contribution to the discussion now in progress as to the date and authorship of the Pentateuch.
S. P. R.

Wealth and Waste: The Principles of Political Economy in their Application to the Present Problems of Labor, Law and the Liquor Traffic.
By ALPHONSO A. HOPKINS, Ph.D. Cloth, 12mo, 286 pp. \$1. New York, London, and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

This book will doubtless prove itself one of the most notable contributions to the literature of Reform. The author has been during many years among the best known lecturers and writers throughout the North and South. He seeks to apply the accepted principles of Political Economy, as to production and wealth, consumption and waste, without violence to the logic of accepted economists or to the politics of confessed partisans, while insisting that both economists and partisans shall admit the logic which they cannot refute. The leading topics considered in the volume are Economy and Labor; Wealth and its Distribution; Consumption and Waste; Relation and Duty of Authority; Harmony of Social Forces; and Political Ways and Means. The most important sub-topics comprehended by these, include The Relation of Ethics and Economy, and of Economy and Labor; Want and Work; Cause of Hard Times; Labor's Purpose and Product; The Laborer's Character and Condition; Partnership of Labor and Capital; Intelligence and Wealth; The Relation of Industries; Labour's Loss from Liquor; The Problem of Distribution; Wages and Waste; Unproductive Consumption; Wages and Want; Losing Human Investments; Moral Rights and Legal Limitations; The States Attitude; The Genesis and Logic of License; Sources and Nature of Taxation; The Supreme Function of Citizenship; Organized Moral Forces; Logic of Local Option; Harmonization of Forces; The Inspiration of Strikes; Law and Popular Morality; Politics and Moral Questions; Parties and Issues; Suffrage and the Frauds Upon It; Contributions to the Commonwealth, etc. Many other sub-topics are treated.

The ablest economists are quoted from, as to definition and statement with regard to economic principles, and their own propositions are projected, along their own logical lines, against the Liquor Traffic as a foe to Labor, a parasite upon legitimate industries, and an element in the State which all the teachings of Political Economy demand shall be eliminated.

This book is designed for popular reading, and also as a text-book for use in the higher institutions of learning, to fill a place no book has heretofore sought to occupy—it is a book both for scholars, and students, and plain laboring men, with clear concise definitions and practical illustrations for all these classes. It is a study for every reformer for its treatment of the fundamental principles underlying Political Science.

A Revised Theology. By the Rev. GEORGE JAMIESON, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Montreal: Wm. Drysdale & Co. Toronto: William Briggs.

This is an attempt at a modern reconstruction of Christian Theology which will, we think, give satisfaction to very few. It deals with the three fundamental doctrines of the Trinity, Creation and the Fall and the Atonement, and follows these with two chapters of a practical character. The first attempt is to construct the doctrine of the Trinity from a metaphysical analysis of the necessary postulates of that fundamental being from which all things have originated. The result is, first personality, then duality; but the third person of the Trinity virtually disappears by identification with the second. Next we have a similar attempt to recon-

struct the doctrine of the Creation, the nature and the fall of man and the origin of sin. The result is a Manichean view, which makes sin arise almost of necessity from the animal nature of man when he is raised to the position of knowing God and being placed in probational responsibility. The view of the Atonement is a peculiar mystic conception growing out of this view of sin. The ideas of guilt and expiation disappear. The necessity for the atonement arises out of the constitution of our nature and not out of the moral government of God. Christ needed the atonement on His own account, and this atonement is nothing more or less than the sacrifice of the lower or fleshly nature for the sake of the higher or spiritual. Christ makes atonement by beginning in His own person the work which we must each of us carry into effect for ourselves as His followers under His headship. It is needless to say that there is some truth in all this theory, but equally needless to add that it is but a fragment of truth which, when set forth as the whole, becomes the most serious error. One of the most objectionable features of the book is its method of dealing with Scripture. The work is itself a demonstration of the necessity for the modern scientific exegesis and biblical theology. Here is a theory fundamentally defective in every great doctrine. Scraps of Scripture are taken here and there to support it. They are given an ideal meaning such as might be possible to the words when taken out of their context and historical connexion, and so are used to serve the purpose of theory. In opposition to all such methods, whether used to bolster orthodoxy or heterodoxy, whether in support of novel heresies or popular traditional views, the Church must utter her protest, and claim: 1st, that every passage of Scripture be interpreted strictly in the sense in which it was used by the writer and understood by his readers; 2nd, that the induction of the whole teaching of Scripture be made on each fundamental doctrine, and that in the historical order; *i.e.*, the order of its gradual revelation in the providence of God. Adherence to these principles will save us from the vagaries of speculation on the one hand and the rant of dogmatism on the other.

The Story of Bohemia. By FRANCES GREGOR. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. New York: Hunt & Eaton. 12mo, cloth, 486 pages. Illustrated. Post-paid, \$1.75. Toronto: William Briggs.

The "Story of Bohemia" will find welcome with the scholar as the only history of this remarkable people in the English language. But it will also find popular welcome, not only because it is written in popular style, but because it records one long chapter in the great struggle of the common people for freedom from the abuses of ecclesiastical and civil authority. But to the Christian student these pages will have special interest. Here he will find what probably many have overlooked—that the seeds of reformation, which were ultimately to bear such splendid fruitage all over Western Europe, found lodgment in the soil of liberty-loving Bohemia a full century before Luther's day. John Wickliffe's writings found way to Prague. The dean of its great university, one John Huss, found them so in accord with the Holy Scriptures, that in spite of their condemnation by Pope and bishops, he accepted and openly defended them. The story of his martyrdom, and of the uprising of little Bohemia in the teeth of Catholic Europe, to avenge the cruel treachery of the Romish hierarchy, and the long war which followed, are graphically portrayed. The book brings the history up to the present time. Several illustrations of pivotal historic events, and portraits of historic leaders, adorn the pages:

How Canada is Governed: A short account of its Executive, Legislative, Judicial and Municipal Institutions, with an Historical Outline of their Origin and Development, with numerous illustrations. By J. G. BOURINOT, C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L., D.L., Clerk of the Canadian House of Commons, author of a Manual of Constitutional History, Parliamentary Practice and Procedure in Canada, and other works on the Government and Constitution of the Dominion. Toronto: Copp, Clark Co., (Limited). Octavo, pp. 344.

Dr. Bourinot is, perhaps, the highest living authority on the subjects treated in this volume; and the subjects themselves are of such importance that no subject or citizen in the Dominion can afford to be ignorant of them. It is lamentable that so many who, as voters, help to shape the policy and control the destiny of Canada, know so little of its constitution and political growth; of the relation which its various parts sustain to one another, and that the whole sustains to the mother country; and of the Dominion Government, the governments of the various provinces, and the municipal system of these—in a word, of all the various and complex machinery by which the public business of the country is carried on. All this is presented in a lucid and interesting manner in this book. A matter of great interest at this moment is the School government of the Provinces, to which Dr. Bourinot has devoted a part of this work. The Government of the North-West Territories is also fully expounded; and the work concludes with an interesting essay on "The Duties and Responsibilities of Canadian Citizens." The British North American Act forms an appropriate appendix to the whole, and with the map and illustrations adds greatly to the value of a book that ought to be in every Canadian home.

Christian Evidences. By EZEKIEL GILMAN ROBINSON, D.D., LL.D., late President of Brown University. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co. 1895. Toronto: William Briggs. Price, \$1.50.

This is a brief, but valuable, contribution to the evidences of Christianity. The author has a vigorous, earnest and effective way of putting an argument, and evidently speaks from a deep religious experience of the truths he undertakes to defend. The work suffers from the fact that the accomplished author did not live to complete it and give it the final touch of his facile pen. The treatise is divided into three parts: I. The evidences specially relied on by Jesus and His apostles. II. Original evidences which are still available. III. Evidences from past and present achievements of Christianity. These are again subdivided into chapters, briefly and tersely massing the facts in support of the main positions. Emphasis is put upon the "Self-evidencing Power of Truth," constituting an appeal to consciousness "as audibly and unmistakably divine as when it called Adam to a consciousness of his sin." In relation to miracles, the resurrection of Jesus, "the last and the climax of the series," "must be specially emphasized, and is specially available as evidence to-day." The theft, swoon, vision, telegram and gradual growth theories are briefly examined, and are followed by seven strong reasons for accepting the resurrection as historical. This is followed by evidence from prophecy and from Christian experience. In Part III. we have seven chapters dealing with the historical and practical aspects of the question. The preparation for the Saviour's advent by the Jews, the Greeks and the Romans, is clearly and beautifully presented. The divine origin of Christianity, as seen in three of its inherent qualities—"Its Self-recuperative Power," "Its Power of Self-development," and "Expansiveness of the Spirit of Christianity"—is shown by the fact that "these are the qualities not of an artificial scheme of religion,

nor of a religion that the religious instincts of mankind are sufficient to account for, but of a living organism animated and directed by an indwelling and a self-conscious intelligence." The brevity, clearness and strength of the book admirably adapt it for Sabbath School and Bible classes and League and Endeavor work. We have seldom read anything more helpful, inspiring and satisfactory.

The Psalmist and the Scientist; or, Modern Value of the Religious Sentiment. By GEORGE MATHESON, M.A., D.D., author of "Can the Old Faith Live with the New?" "Spiritual Development of St. Paul," "The Distinguishing Messages of the Old Religions," "Sacred Sands," etc. 12mo, pp. 332. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. Toronto: William Briggs. Price, \$2.10.

Dr. Matheson's works are so well known that it is scarcely necessary to dwell upon their literary style and general characteristics. He is one of those writers who never leaves the reader in doubt respecting his meaning. He has always something important to say, and he has the art of saying it in a way that is at once intelligible and interesting. His manner of dealing even with abstruse and difficult questions is marked by a lucidity, vigor and gracefulness which leaves little to be desired, and which makes it a pleasure to read what he has written. The fact that the book under review, though it was only published a few months ago, has already reached a third edition is itself sufficient proof of the favor with which it has been received by the theological and religious world. It is, of course, controversial, but its temper is so admirable that it has more of the characteristics of an irenicism than of a polemic. It does not ignore the fact that the religious sentiment of mankind and the modern conception of Nature are in apparent conflict; but it maintains that the former of these is too deeply rooted in human nature, forms an element of the being of man too original and indestructible, to be ignored or set aside. This, in short, is the thought which is wrought out in this volume. It will be seen that the work belongs to the domain of natural, rather than of biblical theology. The psalmist is simply taken as the representative of the religious sentiment, while the scientist represents the modern conception of Nature, or, perhaps more properly, the sense perceptions and the logical faculty by which this conception has been evolved. It is by these elements of our being that we are put in communication with the universe, without which it would be to us as if we were not; and though these proceed in different ways from one another—the one seeing and knowing, the other investigating and concluding—the former is no less trustworthy than the latter, and is not therefore to be ignored or set aside, or to be outgrown or superannuated.

Christ and His Friends: A Series of Revival Sermons. By Rev. LEWIS ALBERT BANKS, Pastor of Hanson Place M. E. Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., author of "The People's Christ," "White Slaves," "Revival Quiver," "Common Folk's Religion," "The Honeycombs of Life," "The Heavenly Trade Winds," etc. Octavo, pp. 382. New York and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company. Price, \$1.50.

The author of this volume, as will be seen by the title-page, is not unknown to the public. His fecund mind is relieving itself ever and anon of its burden by the publication of books. He has already produced quite a little library. This, which is the latest, is probably the best of his works. It treats in an interesting way thirty-one "themes" selected from the Gospel according to St. John, the discourses being, as the author tells us in his preface, composed and delivered during an earnest campaign. It is

evident, however, that they were from the first intended for publication, and that this fact had quite as much to do in determining their form and character as the immediate effect which was aimed at in their delivery. They are quite as well adapted for reading as for hearing; and as the blessing of God seems to have attended their use in the pulpit, there does not seem to be any good reason to doubt that they will carry a blessing with them wherever they may be read. They scarcely come up, however, to our idea of revival preaching. The preacher who is to be an immediate and mighty instrument in the awakening and conversion of sinners must be a prophet of God, a man of divine intuition and convictions, who sees the truth with open vision and feels it like fire in his bones. Such a one, hearing the Word at the mouth of God and warning the people from Him, will speak as one having authority, commending himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. It is not by the "discussion" of "themes" selected in view of authorship that either a dead soul or a dead community is to be called back to life. These things are not written in disparagement of this book, which has much to commend it, but in discouragement of the composition of essays or discussions of themes by ministers in view of publication in books, and relying upon them as the instruments in the awakening and conversion of souls.

The Religions of the World. By G. M. GRANT, D.D., Principal of Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. 16mo, pp. 137. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company. Toronto: William Briggs. Price, 20c.

Landmarks of Church History. By HENRY COWAN, D.D., Professor of Church History in the University of Aberdeen. 16mo, pp. 154. Same publishers. Price, 20c.

We have had occasion more than once to call attention to this admirable series of theological and religious primers published in Scotland, and republished in America, for use in the Sabbath School and the home. What has been said of other books in the series is, in the strictest sense, true of those which are now on our table. In the former of them we recognize the work of an old friend, whose name is a guarantee of the judgment and care with which it has been prepared. The latter is no less admirable, so far as it goes. Messrs. Randolph & Company are doing good service to the cause of religion by the republication of this useful series and by the attractive manner in which they are gotten up.

The Preacher's Assistant. Frank J. Boyer, Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa. \$1 per year. The Nos. for March and April are full of interesting and suggestive articles. We look into the faces of the lamented dead, as they appear in the frontispiece—the Rev. A. J. Gordon, D.D., and the Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D.D.—and feel that the earth is poorer for their absence; yet we rejoice that though God buries his workmen He carries on his work.

The Chautauquan. Dr. Theodore L. Flood, Editor, Meadville, Pa. \$2 per year. In the "Required Reading" for March and April, is a discriminating article on "Queen Victoria and Her Children." The Sunday readings in these numbers are excellent. A timely article is "The Bicycle; its Pleasures and Perils."

The Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ, April, 1895. This number is specially practical, as well as marked by ability. "Unused Forces in the Churches," "The Liquor Traffic," "Missions," "Money," and "The Criminal Classes" are the principal topics discussed.