

THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

THE PROLOGUE

THE  
THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

*AN EXPONENT OF CURRENT CHRISTIAN THOUGHT*

*AT HOME AND ABROAD*

“EXORCISE THE EVIL GENIUS OF DULNESS  
FROM THEOLOGY.”

“HOLD TO THE WRITTEN WORD.”

Vol. II.

JULY TO DECEMBER

---

Toronto:  
BAIN AND SON

—  
1889

73901

LONDON: HENDERSON & SPALDING, GENERAL PRINTERS,  
3 & 5, MARLBORNE LANE, OXFORD STREET, W.

PRINTED BY  
HENDERSON & SPALDING  
3 & 5, MARLBORNE LANE, OXFORD STREET, W.

## INDEX TO AUTHORS.



NAME	PAGE	NAME	PAGE
Balgarnie, Rev. R., D.D. ....	268	Lias, Rev. J. J. ....	99
Bernstein, Rev. A. ....	349	McCann, Rev. J., D.D. ...6, 133,	217
Bourn, Rev. H. H. ....	316	Morrish, G., Esq. ....	380
Bray, Rev. E. ....	411	Naville, Edward ....	145
Brown, Principal, D.D. ....	1, 395	Reynolds, Prebendary ....	289
Calthrop, Rev. Gordon.....	307	Schwartz, Dr. J. ....	35, 129
Clarke, Rev. H. J. ....	258	Sheffield, Miss E. N. ....	42
Crofton, Rev. H. W. ....	179	Vernon, Rev. J. R. ....	112
Deane, Rev. W. J. ....	162	Waller, Rev. C. H. ....	83
Editor, The ....	229	Watts, Professor, D.D. ....	247, 398
Gloag, Rev. Paton, D.D. ....	73, 330	Weymouth, R. F., Esq., D.Lit.	118, 361
Hadden, J. C., Esq. ....	199	Whitelaw, Rev. T., D.D. ....	274
Hayman, Rev. H., D.D. ....	340	Whitley, Rev. D. Gath ....	187
Leathes, Prebendary.....	12		

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS.



	PAGE
Aorist of Recurrence in the New Testament, The .....	395
Bible and Egyptology, The.....	145
Biblical Greek, Review of Essays on.....	118
Christian Secularism.....	179
Christmas Carols .....	411
Concordances to the Scriptures, Review on .....	380
Current Literature :—	
Aitken, W. H. M. H.....	Eastertide .....
Allies, T. W.....	The Holy See, and the Wanderings of the Nations.....
Badger, Rev. W. C. ....	The Hebrew Bible and Science ...
Beet, J. A.....	A Treatise on Christian Baptism ...
Candlish, J. S., D.D. ....	Christian Doctrine of God .....
Cartheyn, Jean de .....	The Wandering Knight.....
Cave, Alfred, B.A. ....	The Inspiration of the Old Testa- ment inductively considered .....
Christanus .....	The Theological Influence of the Blessed Virgin on the Apostolic School .....
.....	67

Current Literature (*continued*):—

PAGE

Crosby, Howard .....	The Bible View of the Jewish Church.....	357
Deane, H.....	Daniel, His Life and Times .....	140
Deane, Rev. W. J. ....	Abraham, His Life and Times .....	140
" " " .....	David, His Life and Times .....	140
Dickson, Rev. J. A.....	How are we saved? .....	429
Dods, Rev. M. ....	First Epistle to the Corinthians ...	429
Evans, Rev. H. H. . . . .	St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel .....	213
" " " .....	St. Paul the Author of the Acts ...	213
" " " .....	St. Paul the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of the Second Gospel .....	213
Evans, T. Rhys.....	The Council of Trent.....	71
Everard, Rev. G.....	My Master and My Friend .....	429
Fraser, Donald .....	Seven Promises Expounded .....	427
Gillow, J. ....	The Haydock Papers.....	67
Graham, Rev. T.....	The Book of the Revelation.....	428
Guinness, H. Grattan .....	Romanism and the Reformation from the Standpoint of Prophecy .....	70
Hamilton, T. ....	Our Rest Day.....	142
Hart, H. C. ....	Scripture Natural History.....	141
Heath, R. ....	The Reformation in France, from the Revocation of the Edicts of Nantes to the Incorporation of the Reformed Churches into the State .....	141
Horder, W. G. ....	Is there a Future Life? .....	428
Horton, R. F., M.A. ....	Inspiration of the Bible.....	64
Irving, H., and F. A. Marshall.....	The Works of William Shakespeare .....	288
Johnstone, J.....	The Mystery, with Scripture Proofs demolishing Criticisms of the First Edition .....	141
Kurtz, Prof. ....	Church History .....	286
Leo XIII., H.H. Pope .....	The Practice of Humility .....	67
Lewis, Rev. G.....	St. Basil the Great on the Holy Spirit .....	139
Lichtenberger, F.....	History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century.....	285
Liggins, Rev. J. ....	The Great Value and Success of Foreign Missions .....	287
Lockhart, W. ....	The Church in Scotland in the Thirteenth Century .....	286
M. M. G. ....	Our Future .....	427
Macgregor, Prof. ....	Handbooks for Bible Classes—Exodus.....	214
Macpherson, Rev. J. ....	Church History, by Professor Kurtz. .....	286
Morison, Rev. W. ....	Footprints of the Revealer .....	210



	PAGE
Current Literature ( <i>continued</i> ):—	
Anglican Church Magazine, The .....	360
Baptist Quarterly Review, The .....	72
Bibliotheca Sacra .....	72, 360
Expositor, The .....	72
Expository Times, The.....	360
Foreign Church Review, The .....	360
Homiletic Magazine, The .....	360
Homiletic Review, The .....	72
Presbyterian Review, The .....	360
Current Points at Issue .....	60, 133
David's Golden Psalm .....	268
Day of the Atonement, The .....	I
Day of the Hebrew Exodus, The .....	35
Definitions Wanted .....	217
Demoniacal Possession.....	258
Egyptology, The Bible and.....	145
Ephesians Self-interpreted, The Epistle to the.....	229
"Essays in Biblical Greek," Review of.....	118
French Versions of the Scripture, Critique on.....	361
Gleanings after Harvest .....	112
Harvest, Gleanings after .....	112
Hebrew Exodus, The Day of the .....	35
Imaginary Symposium of Modern Thinkers.....	42
Immortality .....	289
Inspiration, the Question of. Paper II. ....	247
,, Professor Momerie on.....	398
Jesus, Son of Sirach.....	349
Jewish Pseudepigraphic Writings .....	162
Justin Martyr.....	73
Luther and the Music of the Protestant Church .....	199
Man—Whence came He? .....	187
Ministry and Priesthood, New Testament Teaching respecting.....	316
Mosaic Idea of Property .....	307
Moses, the Choice of .....	274
Music of the Protestant Church, Luther and the.....	199
Nature's Alleged Criminality .....	340
Pharaoh and Date of the Exodus, Synopsis of the Argument on the .....	129
Prophecy.....	83
Pseudepigraphic Writings, Jewish .....	162
Secessions to Rome .....	99
Secularism, Christian .....	179
Synopsis of the Argument on the Pharaoh and Date of the Exodus .....	129
Testimony, On .....	12
Wisdom Justified of her Children .....	330

# The Theological Monthly

---

## THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

LEVITICUS xvi.<sup>1</sup>

THE "Higher Criticism" has discovered that the Levitical institutions, whose elaborate details fill the middle books of the Pentateuch—though they *read* as history, the history of transactions which took place, and of a complicated ritual which was set up in the wilderness of Sinai—are not history at all. You read how "the Lord commanded Moses" to do this and that, and how "Moses did as the Lord commanded him," but the Lord did nothing of the kind, and, of course, Moses did nothing. There was no separation at that time of the Levites to be subordinate assistants to the family of Aaron in the service of the sanctuary, nor until just before the close of the Babylonish captivity; of course, there was no rebellion against that arrangement on the part of Korah and his company, and that awful engulfment of them and their families in the bowels of the earth never took place, nor any budding and blossoming of Aaron's rod, in token of the sole right to the priesthood of his family, nor the deposition of that rod in or by the ark for all future time. And as for the Day of Atonement, instead of its being instituted, and in all its elaborate details set up while Israel was yet in the wil-

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Day of Atonement* (Lev. xvi). With an Appendix, on the chief errors recently current on The Atonement. By William Kelly. Crown 8vo, pp. 176 (Walters). 1889.

derness, this was probably what received the last touches of Ezra's pen in the construction of the *new* Pentateuch, which he brought with him from Babylon, to set up for the first time in the new temple.

This is not the place to discuss these novelties. But it is safe to say that one ounce of good common sense is worth a ton of such results of this "Higher Criticism." Even as a literary question, the most practised pen would fail to so write what is *not* history—lengthening it out and filling it with a number of small details—as to make it read to everybody for ages as real history, including scholarly students of it, both Jewish and Christian, until this nineteenth century of ours. But besides, even if it is admitted that more or less of the Pentateuch, "as we now have it," existed ages before the Babylonish exile, the problem was to interweave the new matter in such a way as to make it dovetail with the old, and conceal the joining till now. Such an achievement, we may safely say, was impossible.

We have been led into this strain by the volume before us on the Day of Atonement. It consists of five lectures; and being delivered in succession to probably the same audience, there is naturally some repetition in them, though in varied forms, while a number of incidental topics are introduced on which the lecturer gives forth his own views—views on which Christians may reasonably differ, as some of us do differ from Mr. Kelly. But the one thing to which we wish to call attention in this paper is the rare clearness with which the volume brings out the rich Gospel principles that underlie this central institution of the whole Jewish ritual, and especially certain vital features of it which we have not seen elsewhere so well pointed out.

The two great words of the Bible are SIN and SALVATION, and the knowledge of the one is indispensable to the right appreciation of the other. But how to make men feel, especially at that early age of the world, that there was anything very wrong in their life and character needing to be changed, anything very criminal in the sight of a holy and jealous God

—that was the difficulty, but it had to be done, and done to a people newly out of Egypt, with all its corrupting and debasing tendencies, while they lay encamped for a year in the broad plateau of the Sinaitic mountains. It had to be done in a rudimental form, and by a system of symbolic ordinances and an elaborate sacrificial ritual. The fundamental principle of this was that “the wages of sin is death,” and, as follows from this, if sin was to be pardoned and the sinner reconciled to God, the sin must be confessed, a substitute to die for him be provided, and its blood be shed for him to make atonement. All this was accordingly carried out: of course, it was only an external *performance*; “for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin.” It “sanctified to the purifying of the flesh”—nothing more. How far devout Israelites felt the insufficiency of this to purge the conscience we are left to conjecture.

But one thing the grand ceremonial of the Day of Atonement *might* do for the partial relief of the conscience; it enabled the Israelite to know how he stood with God at a given stage of his life. Once a year his account with God was *squared*, and he was *quits*, so to speak. “The books” for the past year were solemnly *crossed*, and a clean page opened for the following one. And as this was the most solemn transaction of Israel’s whole religious life, it was fitting that the ritual of it should be grand and specific in all its details.

The very first thing done is perhaps the most affecting. The high priest, being himself but a poor sinful man, could as such make no atonement for other sinners. Atonement, therefore, for himself had first to be made. A bullock was killed for a sin-offering, and Aaron, taking some of its blood in a basin, carried it into the sanctuary, and drawing aside the thick gorgeous veil that concealed the holiest of all, he went in with the blood, and sprinkled it with his finger seven times in front of the mercy-seat, as his warrant to approach it, and seven times upon the mercy-seat, in token of God’s satisfaction with the atonement made, whereupon the glory of the Lord broke forth, covering the mercy-seat, and Aaron now returned

a high priest "without spot," qualified to represent the great High Priest yet to come, and typically atone for the people.

This brings us to the rich teaching of the *two goats*. Since no single type could sufficiently set forth both the *work* of Christ and the *effect* of the work, the plan adopted is that of a compound or dual type. While the *slain* goat represents the method of atonement, "for without the shedding of blood there is no remission," the *scape-goat* (as its name imports) expresses the complete removal of the sinner's guilt. We have another of these dual types in the ceremony of the cleansing of the leper (Lev. xiv.). Two birds were taken, one of which was killed in an earthen vessel over running water. A bunch of hyssop, bound by a scarlet thread to a piece of cedar-wood, was then along with the living bird dipped in the blood of the slain bird, and the leper being sprinkled seven times with the dripping blood of the slain bird, and so pronounced clean, the living bird was let fly away (see Psa. li. 7).

Returning to the two goats for the people, Aaron first "presented" them both before the Lord at the door of the tent of meeting,<sup>1</sup> in token of His approval of them for the intended purpose, and then cast lots upon them, one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat; and having again "presented" (R.V.) the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, he offered him for a sin-offering (ver. 9). Till this was done the people's account with a holy God could not be settled, and the goat of "dismissal" could not be dismissed; for "it is the blood that maketh atonement." Here Mr. Kelly writes admirably:

"The goat on which Jehovah's lot fell was beyond question to meet the exigencies of Jehovah's character. For this reason we find that the blood had always to be brought, not before men that needed

---

<sup>1</sup> This is one of the best improvements of the R.V. It was not "the tabernacle of the congregation" (A.V.), or where the people came together, but the tent where Jehovah met with His people. See Exod. xxv. 22, "And there *will I meet with thee.*" (It is the same word; one the verb, the other the noun.)

its atoning virtue, but to God, where He is. The same truth substantially appears on the paschal night. When the first Passover was instituted, the blood was put, not within the door, but without. That precious blood was not for man to look on, in order to extract comfort from his sight of it. Comfort, indeed, he was perfectly entitled to draw from it, but not by *his* looking at it. The blood was expressly and only outside the door; the Israelitish family was to be as expressly within. 'When I see the blood, I will pass over,' said the Lord. So the true, deep, and all-important aspect of propitiation is ever that the blood is offered *to God*. No doubt it is for man; but the essential truth is that it is put before God. Faith, therefore, acts upon His estimate of the blood, not on man's. This is so true that when the goat which was for Jehovah's lot comes forward, and the high priest deals with it, we have in this the foundation of all for Israel; not a word is said of laying his hands on *its* head, or of confessing Israel's sins. It is not affirmed that he did not—the Jews say that he did; but we need not mind what old Jewish tradition says, any more than what men may say to-day. In Scripture we have our lesson, and thus we have it from God, and thank God for it. . . . The absence of confession over the first goat is no less marked (than its presence in the case of the second), however quick man is to interpolate it. There was the most abject confession over the second goat, but not a word of the sort as to the first. Doubtless the reason is similar. Confession is where man's sins are in full view. . . . But there is and must be a deeper thing—that God's justice and honour be secured by atonement. . . . Man, though the object of compassion to the uttermost, here disappears. Christ, the Sin-bearer, is alone before God" (pp. 39-41).

This awful *aloneness* of the high priest with God in the holiest of all, when transacting for the people before the mercy-seat, with the blood of atonement on his fingers, is expressed with sublime significance in ver. 17: "*And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting when he goeth in to make atonement in the holy place, until he come out and have made atonement.*"

Coming next to the scape-goat, its teaching will be found as rich as it is varied. The very first thing said would be stumbling did we not remember the dual character of the type. "The goat on which the lot fell to be the scape-goat

shall be presented alive to make atonement over him,<sup>1</sup> to let him go<sup>2</sup> for a scape-goat into the wilderness" (ver. 10). This living goat could *itself* make no atonement, for "it is the blood that maketh atonement." But the atonement made by the slain goat passed over in its efficacy to the living goat, giving warrant for its liberation and dismissal.

But did this dismissal take place forthwith, with no active recognition of the people's interest in it? That would have been to teach (in symbol) the doctrine of "universal pardon." For preaching that doctrine, that remarkable man, John Macleod Campbell, minister of the parish of Row, Dumbartonshire, was deposed by the general assembly of the Church of Scotland, in the year 1831.<sup>3</sup> And the late Mr. Maurice, on whom Mr. Campbell made a deep impression, expresses this doctrine nakedly in his writings; but it is most unscriptural. Christ, by His death, did indeed make full atonement for sin in its totality, as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," for "The bread which I will give (said He Himself) is My flesh, for the life of the world." But according to the clear teaching of the New Testament, it is not until the sinner sets his own seal to this method of reconciliation—until he identifies himself with his provided Substitute, by

" Laying his sins on Jesus,  
The spotless Lamb of God,  
Who bears them all, and frees us  
From the accursèd load"—

that he is actually set free as a pardoned man.

Now this is what is so expressly set forth in the ceremonial

<sup>1</sup> So the margin of the R.V. The phrase (אָפֿן) means "upon" or "over"; and even in the A.V., as well as the R.V., it is rendered "over" in ver. 21.

<sup>2</sup> The italic "*and* (to let him go)" of the A.V. is a mistake of the sense. The meaning is, "to make atonement *in order to* let him go" free.

<sup>3</sup> But from some personal knowledge of the man, and some familiarity with his teaching, the present writer can say with confidence that, though refusing with unhappy persistence to use any other *language* than what certainly taught that doctrine, he never held that any man was personally pardoned till he believed.

of the scape-goat: "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the *iniquities* of the children of Israel, and all their *transgressions*, together with<sup>1</sup> all their *sins*, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away," &c. (ver. 21).

There is a significance in the three words which we have here italicised, on which, because it is almost entirely overlooked, we must pause to point out. The forgiveness of sin, in the language of these three words for it, is announced in the Old Testament at three successive stages of its revelation. First, as a great *fact*, that Jehovah, the God of Israel, is a *sin-pardoning* God (Ex. xxxiv.): "The Lord descended in the cloud, and the Lord passed by before him (Moses), and proclaimed [His name]. The LORD, the LORD, a God full of compassion . . . forgiving *iniquity*, and *transgression*, and *sin*" (vers. 6, 7). Next, picking up these three words, we have the *method* of this pardon, by atoning blood, in the ceremonial before us. Aaron, laying both his hands upon the head of the live goat, confesses over him the guilt of the people in these three forms of it, and "*puts it*" upon the goat, or conveys their guilt from the guilty ones to the guiltless substitute. But as this was a mere form, and no reality, we have thirdly, the Great Reality grandly predicted, still in language of these three significant words, in Dan. ix. 24: "Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people to finish *transgression*, and to make an end of *sins*, and to make reconciliation for *iniquity*, and to bring in EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint a most holy place."<sup>2</sup>

Before leaving these three noteworthy words, one cannot but think that the man after God's own heart, who after his mournful fall must have felt how much he needed to put his finger on them in his pleadings for pardon, seems to have

<sup>1</sup> So the preposition (ע) should, we think, be rendered—better than "and" (A.V.) and "even" (R.V.)

<sup>2</sup> רדש הרדשים (as in Exod. xxvi. 33, that is, as we venture to think, not to anoint Him to whom the prediction refers, but precisely what is expressed in Heb. x. 19, to give "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus.")

actually done so, both in his great penitential Psalm (li.) and in the thanksgiving Psalm (xxxii.), which he wrote after obtaining what he had pleaded for. "Have mercy upon me, O God: according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies, blot out my *transgressions*. Wash me thoroughly from mine *iniquity*, and cleanse me from my *sin*. For I acknowledge my *transgressions*, and my *sin* is ever before me." Though "the Lord had put away his sin," (as Nathan the prophet had been sent to tell him, 2 Sam. xii. 13), he could not rest in the mere assurance of that; he wanted "the *joy* of God's salvation," and cries to have it "restored" to him (ver. 12). Well, he got it restored; and in the fulness of his heart, writing Psa. xxxii., he breaks forth at once, "Blessed is the man whose *transgression* is forgiven, whose *sin* is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not *iniquity*"—as if those three words had taken possession of him.

This brings us back to Aaron's confession of the iniquities, transgressions, and sins of the people over the head of the typical substitute, and the transference of them thereby from the sinners to it.

But this raises a deep question, reaching down to the deepest depths of Christ's soul-exercise: "In what capacity did Aaron typify Christ in confessing the people's sins over the head of the scape-goat?" In the double capacity of the *Sin-confessor*, because he was the *Sin-bearer*. From the very nature of the case the one involves the other. Did "the Lord" indeed "lay on Christ the iniquity of us all?" Was He who "knew no sin made sin for us?" and did He, as such, "bear our sins in His own body on the tree?" If so, He must have been conscious they were on Him, that *in deed* He was held and dealt with as the Guilty One. It is painful to *write* and to *realise* this as the actual condition of Him who but an hour or two before His death could say, "The prince of this world cometh, and *hath nothing in me.*" But infinitely harder it must have been for Him to feel and know it to be true. When we try to see sin as He saw it—in all its hatefulness, in all its damnableness—and how "Himself without sin," yet in the Divine reckoning it was *His*, and

therefore He must be "made a *curse* for us," we can get a faint glimpse into the exercise of that holy soul of His about it when "entering into His closet, and shutting His door, "He would pour out His soul into His ear who "seeth in secret," owning in profound reverential submission the righteousness of all that He was enduring and had still to endure. Yes, He was the great Sin-bearer; and it would do us good, methinks, if we could spend a while over what we can see into that heart-exercise of His when, in great waves of feeling, the sense of sin *upon* Him would almost overwhelm Him. We should then understand better that "strong crying and tears" to "Him who was able to save Him from death," and "was heard," though otherwise than He at first prayed, "that the cup might pass from Him if it were possible"—because it was not possible.

An ancestor of the present writer—banished, or obliged to fly, to Holland during the persecuting time of Charles II., but who after the glorious revolution of 1688 returned and spent the rest of his days ministering to the Presbyterians who settled in London—this sainted man must have had some insight into these experiences of his Lord when in the Preface to a little book of his he says of Him, in language which is as music, "He filled the silent night with His crying, and watered the earth with His tears, more precious than the dew of Hermon, or any moisture that ever fell on God's earth since the creation, next unto His own blood."

But the Cross was the crisis. During those three hours of darkness which hung over it, and "about the ninth hour," which was the hour of the evening sacrifice, then it was that He was made to feel the uttermost of the "curse" that "He was made for us." And what was that? *Desertion of God.* Till then, as would seem, this was unknown to Him. For it wrung from Him a cry as strange as the thing itself, not the cry of His "beloved Son" to a Father who "heard Him always," but of the Son of *Man* to His God. And it is a challenge from conscious innocence to the righteous Judge of the human heart—"My God, my God, why hast *Thou* forsaken *Me*?" That is a cry which will never be heard in the

place of the lost. For those who are there know too well why *they* are forsaken, and how hopelessly so. Nay, even the holiest on earth dare not utter it (though sometimes they "speak unadvisedly with their lips") in their seasons of darkness and felt distance from God. For it is their grief and shame that they bring it upon themselves. One only could so challenge Heaven. But it was just a momentary *taste* of what sin's uttermost desert is, and He behoved to feel it, that the next moment He might be able placidly to say, "Father (no more "My God") into Thy hands I commend My Spirit," and having said this, with an exultant shout, cry, "FINISHED!" and give up the ghost.

O what vast issues did that one word (Τετέλεσται or כָּלָה) carry in its bosom, and He took it all in! A poor feeble expression, but for the time sufficient expression, of what was in that word "Finished," was the sending away, to be seen no more, of the sin-laden scape-goat. But even we who can spell it out by degrees shall never be able to exhaust it. And if you want to spell it out more and more clearly, even with your New Testament light, we advise you to read it, and read it again, in the whole details of the Day of Atonement. And don't say It is you that put it there. We don't. For he who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, he read it there, and you, with his guidance, will find it there too.

We could have wished to quote some striking passages from Mr. Kelly's book, on different features of the Day of Atonement. But the space yet remaining to us will be better occupied with an extract from the Appendix. After a learned note in No. I., on the scape-goat (for Mr. Kelly is a scholar and widely read) upon the word *Asazel* (needlessly, as we think, retained in the Revised Version), we have in No. II. the following, on "Modern Views, subversive of the Atonement," speculations which "work banefully against the truth and to the injury of souls." (Having spoken of those Socinian views of the death of Christ as an example of love, or a fidelity which stopped not short of martyrdom, he goes on thus):—

"But beyond these in appearance is the scheme that, as our Lord

ever went about doing good in grace and mercy, so His sufferings were endured up to death as a perfect reconciliation of God to man. So Mr. Maurice on 'Sacrifice,' who regards the Son of God as the ideal man, the true root and eternal antitype of humanity. But this is no more than philosophising on Christ. As it obliterates the guilt and ruin of fallen man, so it accounts in no true sense or Divine way for the sufferings of Christ at the hand of God. Guilt on the one hand is ignored, and God the Judge of sin on the other. Hence the infinite work of Christ is viewed merely on the side of love and self-sacrifice, not at all in the light of His suffering once for sins that He might bring the believer to God. Thus the Cross is viewed in its most superficial aspect. The judgment of God therein is wholly absent from the theory, no less than the deliverance and new state of the believer, as identified with Christ risen from the dead and seated at God's right hand in heaven.

"It is true that Christ felt the sins of men with that anguish which only a perfectly pure and holy one could feel the sins of others, along with perfect grace towards themselves in His heart. But sympathy is not what is wanted with sins, or even with sinners as such. Suffering for sins can alone avail, and that by One who is adequate to meet God in all His holy feeling and righteous dealing about sin. Sinners need a sufficient Saviour and a divinely acceptable salvation.

"Again, union does not mean Christ becoming partaker of man's nature, though this was essential to save souls. The faithful now are united by and in the Spirit to Him glorified on High. The union of mankind as such with Christ is a destructive fiction."

In this paper we have dealt with the Atonement on Old Testament lines, under the veil of ceremonial institutions and significant symbols. But to Christians the veil is so thin, that they are apt to wonder how Old Testament saints did not see through it. The Churches that make this doctrine paramount in their preaching and their literature will live; the Churches, though called orthodox, in whose pulpits and representative literature this doctrine is not found, or is but a dissolving view, have in them the dry rot, the seeds of death.

DAVID BROWN.

## ON TESTIMONY.

WE have lately been reminded that the whole question of allegiance to or rejection of the Christian faith is simply one of the value of testimony. It is implied, for example, that no amount of testimony can make certain things credible which science on the ground of experience has pronounced to be impossible. If, therefore, these things—such, for instance, as our Lord's treatment of the Gadarene demoniacs—are an essential part of the Christian faith, it must be given up, and with it so much deference to the Gospel narrative as has hitherto sufficed to secure our belief in various matters which can hardly fail to include the feeding of the five thousand, the raising of Lazarus, and our Lord's own resurrection from the dead. So far as these things depend upon the testimony of the evangelists, they depend upon the *value* of that testimony. If the testimony can be invalidated, our belief in these things must go, unless it can be shown that they depend also upon other considerations unaffected by any distrust of testimony. It may be well, therefore, to investigate the nature of testimony generally, and that of the Christian testimony in particular, because if there is really any reason to discredit the Christian testimony, as so many persons in the present day assume and affirm, there can be no advantage in continuing to accept it. If it is really unsound it had better be given up, for there can be no merit in believing a lie; and above all things we must bear in mind that the tenacity of our own belief can in no way compensate for deficiency in the truth of that which we believe.

What, then, is testimony? It is the witness that is given by A, B, or C to that of which D would not otherwise have knowledge. It is the ground on which action of the most important kind, involving the sacrifice of life and liberty, is constantly taken. In one form or other it is the only means we have of enlarging our knowledge, so far as it does not depend upon

our own experience and observation, and in many cases we are dependent upon the testimony of others for our full or further intelligence of that which is within the range of our own observation and experience. I may have a pain in my heart or head. I am dependent on the testimony of others for the cause or the removal of it. I may witness a remarkable phenomenon in the earth or sky, and be dependent on the testimony of others for the explanation of it. Whenever I wish to extend the limits of my own knowledge in any direction, I am dependent in some way or other on the testimony of others. To discredit testimony therefore in general is to perpetrate an act of moral or intellectual suicide ; and to decline to act upon it physically may even be followed by results that would be tantamount to actual suicide. Just as faith, therefore, is one of the prime essentials of life without which society could not exist, so is testimony a prerequisite without which faith would languish and come to nought. If testimony were universally unreliable, the fool only would rely upon it. If it could not be trusted, who would not cease to trust it, that is, cease to believe? The consequence would be that in this domain a condition of absolute scepticism would ensue. No man would believe his neighbour, and society would be resolved into a mass of incoherent and antagonistic atoms.

It is plain that such a condition would be contrary to the essential principles of our constitution. If we can with any truth reason from results to causes, we may with confidence affirm that this is not the condition under which we were intended to exist. Nature intended us to be dependent upon testimony for the advancement of our own knowledge and happiness, and intended us, in this as in other things, to refuse the evil and to choose the good. It is part of our duty, therefore, to discriminate in our use of this as of other things. We have the faculty of choice, and we forbear to exercise it at our peril, to our disadvantage and our loss.

Though testimony, however, manifestly extends to every department of human knowledge, the only branch of it with which we need concern ourselves at present is historical testimony, and

that more especially as affecting the channels through which our knowledge of the facts of the life of Christ is derived, and the trustworthiness of that testimony upon which alone we can venture to receive a Divine revelation. The Jewish law (Deut. xvii. 6) provided that at the mouth of two or three witnesses he that was worthy of death should be put to death, but that at the mouth of one witness he should not be put to death. In matters of history, however, we are at times dependent upon the testimony of only one witness. As far as I know, there are many things which we accept implicitly upon the testimony, for instance, of Cæsar alone. I suppose we have no other testimony but his for the astounding fact that he built a bridge across the Rhine in ten days, and demolished it again after eighteen; that he built a fleet in thirty days; that he led his army over the Cevennes in six feet of snow, and the like. No one discredits these things as facts, and yet we have no second or third witness to confirm them. In themselves they are well-nigh incredible; and notwithstanding this, we accept them as undoubted facts of history upon the mere word of Cæsar. It is evident, therefore, that historical facts demand less testimony for their reality than the law demands in matters of life and death. Provided that the character of the witness is satisfactory, it is difficult to say what statement might not be accepted. We believe the word of Cæsar because it is his word, even though the nature of the statement is such as to stagger and perplex our powers of belief, and to baffle our understanding. In this case, however, the fact, though incredible, is not unnatural or supernatural. Had Cæsar told us he had seen a dead man raised to life, should we or should we not believe him? He has not told us so, and therefore we cannot say. When, however, we come to the Gospel history, it is exactly this that we do meet with. Are we or are we not to believe it? This must, one would think, depend as before upon the character of the witnesses. Only in this case instead of one witness we have several. The extraordinary character of the facts testified to naturally demands a stronger array of testimony, and we have it. Is it or is it not adequate? How are

we to determine this question? The testimony, to be secure, must be of the nature of a continuous and complete arch. It must rest upon two opposite supports, which must be united by a continuous span. There must be at least the two independent witnesses, and they must agree together and unite in one. If matters are to be believed which surpass and contradict our experience, there must be that which shall make them antecedently probable, and that which shall tend to confirm their antecedent occurrence. There must be prior conditions and posterior indications of truth. Nothing short of this would render credible what is naturally and inherently incredible because impossible.

For instance, if a person were to appear among us now who should lay claim to raising the dead, we should obviously not believe him; and we should be justified in not believing him, because there is no reason why we should believe him, or why such a one should so appear. We can conceive circumstances under which for a time it would be difficult to detect and expose his imposture; but after a while these would vanish before the test of experiment and scientific demonstration. In what respect then were matters different in the case of our Lord? Perhaps it will be better to begin with the subsequent indications of reality. We have four independent witnesses in the evangelists. They are independent, because they are sufficiently different to prove them so. They cannot by any process of combination be reduced to less than three, even if as four they do not stand out as separate and distinct. It is true that the testimony of the evangelists does not reach demonstrably to the time of Christ; but if the Gospels are genuine, that is by the persons whose names they bear, their testimony unquestionably runs up to the time of His ministry. It is really more incredible and unlikely that the narrative of the raising of Lazarus, *e.g.*, should have been written late in the second century than that being what it is, it should have been the work of an eye-witness—conceding, of course, the abstract possibility of its being so. That is to say, admit provisionally the abstract possibility of the historic truth of the Gospel history, and, knowing what we do of the

literary monuments of the second century, it is antecedently more likely that such a narrative as that of the raising of Lazarus should have proceeded from an Apostle and eye-witness than from any writer, known or unknown, of the second century. And the writer of the third Gospel tells us distinctly that he had taken pains to ascertain the truth of what he recorded. In this respect his narrative bears a striking resemblance to the *ιστορια* of Thucydides. Indeed, I do not see in what respects it has less claim to the appellation than he has, except in the nature of the events recorded, which, as they are the matters under enquiry, must not themselves be allowed to put it out of court. The testimony of the four witnesses however, being such as it is, may for the present be set aside. We will return to it afterwards. As yet we may regard it as independent testimony, and testimony which appears to have contemporary authority. At all events, this position cannot be, and has not been, disproved. But apart altogether from this testimony, we have certain letters of the Apostle Paul which are unassailable, and which give us his own personal testimony to within about thirty years of the death of Christ. Now these letters clearly establish certain points. First, the existence of a very widespread Christian society, not of Jews only, but also of Greeks, and, in fact, of Greeks rather than Jews, in various parts of the civilised world about the year 60, that is, during the lifetime of the generation that was contemporary with Christ. This society, scattered and diversified as it was, had a common bond of union in its attachment to and love for the person of Christ. They all not only believed but knew that He had died as a malefactor upon the cross; they all knew that He was regarded as the Son of God—their belief in Him involved this, involved the knowledge that He had claimed to be so, and that the claim by them was admitted; they believed, that is, that a man who had been crucified was no mere man, but was actually the Son of God. But they could not and would not have believed this if the death upon the cross had been all that was known of Christ; in fact, whether or not He had risen from the dead, they one and all believed

that He had, and in consequence of that belief had turned from the worship of idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for and expect His Son from heaven. All this belief on their part does not, of course, show that what they believed was truth and was no lie, but it shows conclusively that there must have been certain facts connected with the life of Christ which furnished a ground for their belief. His life could have been no ordinary life to have been the cause of such a belief; on the contrary, it must have been a most exceptional life, altogether unlike any other of which they had had experience. But over and beyond this, the person who had been the means of their adopting this belief was himself the subject of a remarkable history: he had been a bitter opponent of the very Person in whom they and he alike believed; he had not only rejected the belief in Christ, but had done all he could to suppress and extinguish it in others, and yet he had himself been the main cause of the spread of this belief in Corinth and Thessalonica, in Rome and Galatia. If Christ had been the mere malefactor that His death seemed to proclaim Him, it is absolutely impossible that the career of St. Paul should have been what it was. There must have been circumstances connected with that death which gave it altogether a different character, the more so, because of the hatred with which at one time he had regarded Christ; and there is no question whatever but that by him Christ was believed to have risen from the dead, and to be the Son of God, though He had died upon the cross.

And here it is to be observed that whatever the circumstances attending Christ's death had been, they were in no case altered by the change in St. Paul's relation to them. They were what they were before his conversion, and he must have known what they were before his conversion; but it was that event, and that event alone, which altered his relation to them. The change was in him, and not in them. If, therefore, they were sufficient as a basis for belief after his conversion, it was not because they were insufficient before that he did not believe, but because he had not duly apprehended them. Now this shows us that though in the present

day much complaint is made of the inadequacy of the grounds of belief, it may, after all, be not the grounds that are invalid, but that the attention paid to them and the attitude assumed towards them are insufficient and inadequate. The same persons who now loudly complain of the insufficiency of evidence would, if they were converted, be willing to proclaim it as fully adequate. The sphere of the change must be their own hearts, and not the field of evidence. There is sufficient proof for all—there is not too much for any; but he who in unbelief finds the evidence too little, would upon belief find it enough, and more than enough. It is not the evidence which needs to be increased, but the attitude of the critic towards the evidence, which changes with his belief. This is a point which is frequently overlooked. Our feelings change towards the same person according to our view of his character and conduct; and it is not otherwise with our feelings towards Christ. Now when St. Paul was at the height of his activity in proclaiming the name of Christ, it was not long enough after the death of Christ for him to have forgotten the known character and circumstances of His life, nor for that character and these circumstances to have become materially affected by the lapse of time. Thirty years after the fall of Napoleon it was perfectly well known what manner of man he had been; indeed, the memory of his personality has hardly yet faded from our recollection in more than twice that time. St. Paul was not separated by anything like the period of thirty years from the death of Christ; in fact, his conversion occurred within ten years of that event. Alford places it in the year 37. He was contemporary with Christ, and probably at the most but a few years younger. How is it possible, then, that any halo of uncertainty can have gathered round the main facts and character of the life of Christ in so short a time as the interval between the death of Christ and that of St. Paul's conversion? And it was St. Paul's knowledge and conception of Christ that was reproduced in his converts from Rome to Ephesus. The faith of all these Churches, therefore, was no bad test by which to estimate the person and the character

of Christ. What were the circumstances attending the production of our several Gospels it is impossible to know. One thing, at least, is certain : that they all agree in the identity of the character they depict. Even the Christ of St. John is felt to be essentially the same with the Christ of the other three evangelists. The circumstances they relate may vary, but the character is one and the same. And it is obvious that very great variety of circumstance may be consistent with identity of character, as it is certain that great diversity of circumstantial detail may co-exist and be consistent with reality of incident. We take it, then, for certain that the testimony of St. Paul is valid as far as regards the general character of Christ, the nature of His death, the fact that He wrought mighty works, which are fairly exemplified by His own resurrection from the dead. The same writer vouches, also, for His birth of the family of David, for His ascension, for the meekness and lowliness of His career, and the like. It is, therefore, not to be denied that we have in St. Paul's writings the clearest possible proof that all these things were firmly held by the great mass of Christians within thirty years of the death of Christ. It is equally certain that this, which was the common faith of Christians, was held altogether independently of the four Gospels. This faith was not derived from them, and therefore cannot stand or fall with them. So far as we hold it, we resemble the Pauline Christians, and share identically the same faith with them, a faith which as it does not rest upon the genuineness of the four Gospels so it cannot be shaken, even if one or more of them should, I will not say be proved to be spurious, but should be unable to make good to the demonstration of cavillers its claim to be genuine. It is manifestly futile, therefore, to try to make Christianity answer for its life with the power to show, to the satisfaction of those who are determined to doubt, that each of the Gospels is genuine.

But though we say this, it by no means follows that the Gospels are not genuine. That is quite another matter, and is a purely literary question, to be settled by the same means as similar literary questions. Only one caution may be

entered. Depend upon it, we are not at the end of the various theories that will be propounded to account for the origin of our Gospels. One theory gives place to another, and has done so, but who shall say that we have seen the last? In all probability, the actual evidence for the genuineness of the Gospels will be in a hundred years hence substantially what it is now. A few discoveries may be made which will elucidate more or less certain points, but the main bulk of the evidence will be what it is; unquestionably not less, very possibly a trifle more. This, then, being so, it matters little what theories may be proposed. Theory cannot set aside fact; and if the facts are sufficient now, they will be sufficient to the end of time, and sufficient also to confront any form of theory. The validity of the evidence for the Gospels does not vary in proportion to the ingenuity of those who propound theories. It is the yoke to which they must eventually bow. If, therefore, there is valid reason, as we know there is, to believe that the several Gospels are genuine—that is, the composition of the two Apostles, Matthew and John, and the two evangelists, Mark and Luke—see how wonderfully that circumstance bears upon the indirect testimony of St. Paul. And even if it is not possible to trace any Gospel, say, beyond the year 70, it by no means follows that it did not exist before that time. It is quite conceivable that many years may have been spent in the composition of a Gospel before it was, so to say, launched upon the world in such a form as to admit of evidence being borne to its existence from independent sources. It is, moreover, quite possible that a Gospel may have been current in the Church for many years before the rise of such independent testimony as would witness to its existence, or which, having arisen, would survive to do so. There is nothing unreasonable in supposing, *e.g.*, St. John to have had the materials of his Gospel by him for years, before in his extreme old age, he bequeathed it in a literary form to the world. The one question we have to decide is; whether or not we are warranted in ascribing it to him. I, for my part, am profoundly convinced that, upon internal evidence alone, we are

not warranted in doing otherwise. But if this is the case with St. Matthew and St. John, it is hardly possible to exaggerate the claim which each Gospel must have upon our faith and reverence. For if there is adequate reason to believe these Gospels genuine, it is certain in that case that we have the testimony of two eye-witnesses and companions of our blessed Lord, who, from that very fact, may be regarded as commissioned to record what they have related. Consequently, if their works are genuine, it is not less certain that they must be authentic—that is, contain the narratives of those who themselves witnessed the events and faithfully recorded what they witnessed. Now it is exactly this which in the present day is so frequently denied or called in question and insinuated. It is suggested that our accounts are not those of eye-witnesses. It is, on the contrary, all but certain that they are—at least, two of them; and whether they are or not, it is certain that the incidents recorded are not one whit more incredible than those which we must postulate to account for the language of St. Paul to the Romans and Corinthians. For is the feeding of the five thousand or the raising of Lazarus more marvellous or incredible than our Lord's own resurrection? But it is impossible to account for the language of St. Paul to Rome and Corinth unless the faith in the Lord's resurrection was complete, and impossible to account for the faith being so complete and so general unless it had rested upon adequate ground. Nay, is not the faith itself the best evidence of the reality of the cause producing it? For what was that faith, so to say, but the extension and continuation of the resurrection? They who held that faith were partakers of a risen life, because they had received it from a risen Lord. I claim, then, that we should read the Gospels in the light they receive from the evidence of the early Christianity of St. Paul's Epistles, and not wait till it is absolutely impossible to doubt the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospels before we deal with the evidences of renewed and supernatural life with which those Epistles abound.

But having got thus far, that is, as the clear indications of the existence of a new and supernatural life ostensibly spring-

ing from the resurrection of Christ, what is there to prevent us from accepting the various indications of the exercise of supernatural power to which the Gospels bear witness? If Christ had so much control over nature as to rise from the dead, we can conceive of His making the blind to see, and the lame to walk, and the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak, and of His satisfying the bodily wants of thousands at a time with means altogether inadequate. And if those who were witnesses of these things assure us that He did so, who are we that we should call in question their testimony? These things are indeed difficult to believe, but they rest on such testimony that it is hard to disbelieve them; indeed, when we judge of them by their results there is only one way in which we can deal with them, if we do not believe in them, and that is, to say that the astonishment created by their supposed occurrence was such as to bring about the results of which I have spoken. But though we can conceive that under such circumstances the effects would have been considerable in the area of their supposed occurrence, yet we cannot imagine that this influence was one that would have operated thirty years afterwards far beyond that area, and in centres so distant and so wide apart as Rome and Corinth.

I suggested that the testimony to our Lord's career and character should be of the nature of a continuous and complete arch, resting upon opposite piers of evidence, and united by a continuous span. We have seen that when we approach this subject from the historical side, working *backwards* from the contemplation of known results to the investigation of adequate and apparent causes, we discover sufficiently strong indications of the presence of a superhuman agency at work. This is one pier on which to rest our arch. But there must be likewise an anterior reason tending to confirm our belief in the working of such an agency, for assuredly in the present day we should be slow to trust the evidence of our own senses if any one professed to raise the dead, and we should be justified in so doing for the simple reason that there is no valid antecedent ground why such works should be done, and every ground for

believing that they would not be done. But in the case of the Gospel history it is quite otherwise. For He of whom these mighty works are recorded does not come before us as an ordinary individual, as one of the *οἱ πολλοί* or ordinary mass of men ; but, on the contrary, as professing to be the Person whose advent had been long expected and waited for as the very fount and origin and archetype of humanity, as the promised Saviour, and the future Judge of the world. He has, therefore, to command our attention not merely as any ordinary wonder-worker, however exceptional His works, but as a Person who had first to make good His claim to be the expected One, for whom all men were watching and seeking. The central character of the Gospels, great as that character was, was nothing if He was not the Christ, was nothing if He was not the Person whom He claimed to be. Nay, He wrought His works in illustration and confirmation of that claim ; He did not advance the claim in consequence of the works which He had done, and of the attention and excitement which they had aroused.

Every one of the Gospels is careful to advance this claim on behalf of Christ long before it records any miracle wrought by Him. St. Matthew begins with His ancestry, which he traces to David and Abraham. St. Mark begins with the bold assertion that He was the Son of God who had spoken by and in the prophets of old. St. Luke is careful to record the striking circumstances which preceded His natural birth into the family of man ; and St. John, with the characteristic audacity of his eagle-flight, avers deliberately that He was the very Word of God, who was in the beginning with God and was God. It is clear, therefore, that it is not any ordinary son of man of whom the several writers speak, but One who, besides being a truly representative Son of Man, is over and above all the actual Son of God. We are specially warned, therefore, not to estimate the career of this Person as we should that of any ordinary celebrity, but as One entirely unique in Himself. What is told us about Him is told us to show how great and what manner of man He was ; but before we are asked to believe what we are told about Him, we are asked to

believe in Him, and to believe in that ideal Person who existed in anticipation and conception before He came.

Now this is the other pier on which the arch we have to construct must rest. It is undeniable that a great Deliverer was expected. The literature of Rome and Greece bears witness to such a hope, however vague and visionary; and that the Jewish nation was on the look out for His advent with whatever wild and extravagant misconceptions is patent from the facts of their history before and after the coming of Christ. It was the Jewish nation that had conceived this idea, and the fact that they cherished it was characteristic of the Jewish nation and peculiar to them among all the nations of the world. The hope may have percolated into other countries and other peoples, as it doubtless had, but the land and people of Israel were the natural home of the hope. Now in an age when prophecy is rejected as a fact, and all its special characteristics and phenomena are explained away as variations of physical conditions and incidents which had their natural analogue in the Pythian Apollo and the Delphic tripod, it is begging the question to appeal to prophecy; but if we begin with the fact that a Christ was expected with intense eagerness at the time of our Lord, we are constrained to seek for some natural explanation of the origin of this expectation.

The birth of Cæsar, perhaps the greatest man that ever lived, was not expected for ages previously; and when he was born his birth was not hailed as the realisation of a hope long looked for. In the eighteenth century the advent of Napoleon was not heralded with any prognostications of his rise, but he, like every other great man, had to win his position with struggle. It was otherwise with Jesus Christ. From the moment of His baptism He took His position as the Son of God, and maintained it to the end. He began as He went on, with the assumption of the highest honours, which He never disclaimed. He can in no sense be said to have *won* His position; He stepped into it, and fulfilled it to the end, and this was simply because He acted forthwith as the Deliverer announced by the prophets, who was sent to

proclaim the advent of the kingdom of heaven, that kingdom the mysteries of which He professed to know, and the Sovereign King of which He professed to be. But had it not been for the expectation cherished by the people, and the knowledge they had of a coming Christ, He could not have done this ; His growth and development, like that of the world's great men, would have been gradual and progressive. It was not so with Christ. He not only asserted, but displayed His power over disease from the first, and we read of no failure though but a tithe of His successes are recorded. I maintain, therefore, that critics altogether misrepresent and misjudge the case when they estimate the mighty works of Jesus Christ as they would if they had been those of any ordinary man. No ordinary man could have done them, and had he professed to do so he would justly have been discredited. Jesus Christ did not do His mighty works on the platform of ordinary humanity ; He assumed to work them as the Christ and the Son of God. We cannot, therefore, fairly judge of the works of Christ till we have duly estimated that Christ-character which He claimed to fill. If there was any ground for the conception of that character, then all the mighty works of our Lord, supposing them to be wrought, would come as indications of the justice with which He laid claim to fulfil it, and not as mere wonderful works which had first to be appraised on their own merits, without any reference to the Person in whose character He claimed to work them. The evidence for the mighty works of Christ is not to be set aside ; first we have the clear indication that St. Paul assumed them ; then we have the difficulty of accounting for the fame of Jesus so rapid and so general without them, for in that case it must have rested upon His *teaching* alone, whereas we know that His teaching had reference to His mighty works, as in the case of the message to John the Baptist ; and then we have the hatred of the authorities, to account for which points to something more than mere jealousy on account of the favour which His teaching met with among the populace ; and lastly we have the report of His resurrection to account for, which was evidently thought

likely to arise by the authorities, and was mainly due from the rapidity of the spread of the belief in it to the feeling that that resurrection was in keeping and of a piece with the rest of His career.

The resurrection of Christ, moreover, fully accounts for the exceptional circumstances of His death, just as His action in the immediate prospect of death prepares us for His resurrection. Thus the career of Christ itself is of the nature of a perfect arch, its beginning, middle, and close are mutually consistent and harmonious; and it is really impossible to leave out a single incident or element without impairing the unity and symmetry of the whole. The keystone of that arch may be said to be His death, that one incident which as a fact it is the most impossible to assail or to dislodge. But given the circumstances of the death of Christ, and it is very hard to get rid of the beauty of His moral character, the implied confirmation of His mighty works, as well as His own repeated declarations, the story of His birth, the evidence of His resurrection, attested as it is by unparalleled but assured results. And then from the position thus secured we are entitled to ask, What then was the nature of the hope which was the heirloom of Israel? Was it after all a visionary dream? And if a dream, was it substantial enough to form the groundwork and basis of a reality—such as the career of Christ? Does not the very circumstance of His having used it as such suggest the true interpretation of the dream, and at the same time serve to show that the nucleus and essential elements of the dream were a reality? Does He not by His appeal to prophecy, and by the use He made of the results of the prophets' teaching, set the seal of His approbation to the peculiar character of Jewish prophecy and prove it to have had a truly Divine mission. And, in fact, when we begin to study the Scriptures of the Jews in the light of the teaching of Christ, do we not at once feel that the dignity and significance of those Scriptures are raised to an immeasurably higher level. Before they were unintelligible, now they are explained; before they were obscure, now they are clear. He has indeed opened

our understanding that we might understand the Scriptures. And to reject the proffered clue which His career and His teaching alike suggest, is not only to reject Him, but to do violence to the endowments of reason and judgment which He has given us. We see that the Old Testament, if it means anything, has been fulfilled in the New, and that the correspondence between the Old and the New is like the fitness of a key to the wards of a lock, and may be compared to the solution of a problem or the correct answer to a sum.

And this is the more evident because the features of the phenomenon are so broad and general. It is not the particular fulfilment of any individual prophecy on which we rely, but the general tone and character of promise and expectation, of preparation and hope, which marks the Old Testament as a whole, from Genesis to Malachi. To compare great things with small, the confident anticipations of the Old Testament may be regarded as not unlike the early day-dreams of a youth who feels that he is destined to fulfil a prominent part in the world's history—a great captain, or a great leader of men, or a great discoverer. The dormant energies within make themselves felt by the possessor of them, they assert themselves with prophetic promise. So with the literature of the Old Testament. There is nothing like it in the world. From first to last it is instinct with the consciousness of coming greatness. Not merely is this so as it naturally would be with its heroes—Joseph, Moses, Samuel, David, Amos, Isaiah, and the like—but it is characteristic of it as a whole. The child of promise, the redeemed and chosen nation, the eternal kingdom, the perpetual priesthood, the succession of prophets, and the like, all point onwards to the limitless future, and arouse hopes which are extinguished only to be continually revived, till when He who called Himself the Son of Man appeared, it is equally difficult not to ask, does His character and history supply a fitting supplement to the unrealised expectations of the Old Testament? and if it does, is it not a fact that it at once makes that long series of expectations intelligible, and shows them to have

been verified? For it was not by any process of intentional imitation that the correspondence, such as it was, could have been brought about, for the character of Christ was as much the birth of history as that of Moses or David; and consequently that it forms a whole together with that of Moses, David, and the rest, is part of the net result of the combined teaching of history. If Christ was truly the Son of Man, he fulfils, in being so, the Old Testament from Genesis to Malachi; but that the Old Testament alone should have produced, after the lapse of centuries, such a character as Christ's at such a period of the world's history is what naturally could not have been expected and could not have happened.

Let us take stock then of our position, and enquire where we are. We have unmistakable historic testimony, direct and indirect, to the unique character of Christ. Of that character, His death and alleged resurrection are an inseparable part; His death, taken in connection with His words and life, implies His resurrection—His resurrection alone explains His death. It is unreasonable to suppose that He who before had escaped from His enemies when they least expected it, should have been unable to do so had He willed it at the last. "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels; but how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be." Our estimate of the character of Christ must depend not merely upon our estimate of Him as a man, but upon His estimate of Himself and the claims He advanced. When He professed to raise the dead, He professed to do so not as a man, but as the Son of Man, as the Christ who was to come, and as the Son of God. If He was what He professed to be, we have reason to believe that He could do so. "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" The circumstances of His death lead us to believe that He was what He professed to be. He set the seal to His claims by dying. He died in attestation of His claims. His own death, therefore, leads us to believe that He had raised others who were dead to life that He might bring back His own dead body from the tomb, that

He was what He professed to be—the Christ and the Son of God. But if He was the Christ, He was the promised Christ ; He was not merely the realisation of a national idea, but He was the Christ whom God had promised. He challenges, therefore, so much interference on the part of God with the course of history as is implied in His giving a promise to mankind and making a particular nation the depository and the guardian of the promise. He challenges, therefore, that interpretation of the facts of history which is implied by prophecy. In professing to be the Christ, He virtually declares that God has spoken, and that the Jewish Scriptures are the narrative of what He said, the record of the substance of His spoken utterance.

Here then the question arises, is it possible for Christ to do mighty works in proof of His mission, and yet to base the reality of the works upon the reality of the mission? We say that Christ's works are entitled to consideration because they were not wrought by Him as a man but as the Son of Man. If His works are used as a proof of His being the Son of Man, we cannot claim His being the Son of Man as a proof of His works, except by arguing in a vicious circle. We cannot borrow any support for the apparent evidence of these works from the supposition that He was the Son of Man, which itself requires to be proved. And yet we have already admitted that if any ordinary man nowadays were to claim to do the works of Christ we should at once reject him. That is, in order to establish the reality of the works of Christ, we assume Him to have been that extraordinary Person which it is needful for us to prove Him to have been. There is clearly something wrong here. The works of Christ cannot at once be the proofs of His mission and the things which that mission has to prove. If His works are to be established by testimony, we must not make the claims of Christ which His works establish a part of that testimony by which they are established. There is no doubt that He claimed to be the Christ, there is no doubt that He claimed to do mighty works—either claim made good will sustain the other ; but how is either to be made good without the other? and what is the

nature of the evidence that will make good both? We can go a long way towards proving either; but the deficiency of proof in the one case cannot be supplied by the proof in the other, which is itself deficient. This would be to rest a superstructure upon two foundations, neither of which in itself is sound. We must not throw in the Christ-character of Christ to make good those mighty works, which are themselves to be mainly used to make good His Christ-character. What, then, are we to do? Clearly we must do our best to establish either position independently; and having done that in each case as far as it can be done, for mathematical demonstration in either is scarcely to be expected or attained, we may certainly affirm that the two high and independent moral probabilities tend mutually to confirm each other. Lines that converge in the same direction and the same plane, if carried far enough, will meet; and the convergence of probabilities points to a centre which is certainty. Circumstantial evidence which fails nowhere points to a result which is indubitable and conclusive. And it is so with Christ. It cannot be said that the evidence fails anywhere in any point. There is hardly one point that is weaker than any other, and there is none that is really weak. As I have said before, I look upon the death of Christ as the keystone of the arch, for it is that which sets the seal to His word, and His word implies and involves His claims, and His claims on the one side rest on the convergent and manifold testimony of the Old Testament, and on the other upon His mighty works, which there is so much direct and indirect evidence to prove; while from His death and His promise and His mighty works and His official character, there results the strong *à priori* probability of His resurrection, which is itself confirmed and virtually presupposed by the whole subsequent history, as witnessed by the Gospel narratives, harmonious although divergent as they are, the story of the Acts, and the phenomena implied and evidenced by St. Paul's Epistles. Here the chain of testimony is complete. They say that no chain is stronger than its weakest link; but I am at a loss to discover any link here which is really weak. The testimony of post-Christian

history is sure and definite, the body of ante-Christian history is equally sure and distinct for all needful purposes, while the Person of Christ Himself, His life character and teaching, being, as they are, absolutely unique, supplies that bond of union which at once makes the antecedent part intelligible and renders the subsequent part possible. Take away the central element, or suppose it to be inherently weak and unsound, and you leave the antecedent Scriptures a strange and inexplicable medley which can give no account for or explanation of themselves, and you leave the entire history of the Christian Church in its earliest period, which is also its clearest and simplest, as an effect without any adequate cause. The new life of Christendom is of a piece, and consistent with the risen life of Christ. It is not to be explained by His natural life apart from His resurrection, any more than it is by the life of Socrates, or Seneca, Epictetus, or Antoninus Pius. Leave out the resurrection of Christ, and the life of Christendom collapses as an effect without a cause, just as the moral character of Christ collapses if He said that He was the Son of God and was not, and promised that He would rise from the dead and did not, just as all Christian teaching must inevitably fail to produce the highest results if morality is suffered to take the place of self-sacrifice and love, and outward respectability and propriety are accepted as an adequate substitute for true conversion of heart.

The validity, therefore, of the testimony upon which we are Christians turns upon two main historical facts, which it is impossible to call in question. These are the death of Christ and His received moral character. I call this an historic fact because it depends upon history. We only know what the moral character of Christ was from the testimony, direct and indirect, of history. But at this period of the world's existence it is too late to assail the character of Christ; indeed, many who have rejected His claims have borne their testimony, such as it is, to the character of Christ. The dissentient verdicts of His own day were but the earnest of those which would prevail throughout all time. "Some said, He is a good man; others said, Nay, but he deceiveth

the people." It is strange, however, that it should be reserved for our own enlightened and eminently dispassionate generation to make the unpromising attempt of combining these opposite verdicts ; for though none, or hardly any one, will deny to Christ the right to be called a good man, many, practically with the same breath, imply or affirm that He was either deceived Himself, or was a deceiver of the people. But that He was intentionally a deceiver of the people and, at the same time, a good man is impossible ; therefore, we can only maintain this at the expense of His moral character. Consequently, the one only method of escape is to regard Christ as self-deceived, the victim of His own delusions. Whether or not this is possible must depend upon the way in which we accept the testimony concerning Him. And here, again, the central point is His death. On the supposition of personal delusion, it was a delusion that was maintained consistently from first to last, and did not waver in face of the most appalling terrors of death. He began His career with the delusion, and continued it without faltering to the end. But there was nothing in His worldly antecedents to beget or suggest the delusion. The son of a carpenter, possessed of no social status, belonging to none of the prominent parties of the day, ecclesiastical or civil, without means, without education, without friends, without influence, He burst upon the dazzled imagination of the men of His time like a flash of lightning out of the blue sky ; and as soon as He had arrived at the maturity of full age, forthwith assumed and secured at one bound the unique and unparalleled position, without a model, and without preparation or apparent design, which He was able to maintain with unexampled dignity, and unshaken confidence, and unequalled success, till the lieutenant of the Cæsars was fain to consent to His death for very jealousy ; and though he washed his hands to disclaim the guilt of putting Him to death, was obstinate in his assertion that He whom he delivered to be crucified was the King of the Jews. There is no feature in this portrait that will be challenged on the ground of history. There is no miracle or supernatural incident laid under contribution to sustain it

except the miraculous and profoundly supernatural incident of the life itself. But I can detect none of the elements of self-deception here. There are other ingredients than those of amiable enthusiasm, or patriotic zeal, or pious aspiration, that go to make up the outline and to compose the colouring of this portrait. And if unbelief should still persist in calling it delusion, it would be compelled to confess that it stands as high and solitary among the world's examples of delusion as the moral character itself is high and solitary.

If, then, the hypothesis of delusion is untenable, no alternative is open to us but to fall low on our knees and confess, with Peter, "Thou art the Christ," and with Nathaniel, "Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel." Christ must have been the good man, which they even would hardly deny who said, "Nay, but he deceiveth the people." His deception of the people must depend upon the evidence there is of His having deceived Himself. The hypothesis of self-deception is less consistent with all the circumstances of His character and career than is the reality and truth of a profession of which these circumstances would have been the natural concomitants and consistent features. But unless Christ deceived Himself as well as others, He must undoubtedly have wrought miracles, because He Himself appealed to them, and as many of these miracles, from their very nature, preclude the supposition alike of collusion and of self-deception—as, for instance, those of the feeding of the four and the five thousand—we are constrained to admit that the jealousy with which His claims were regarded owed not a little of its exasperation to these mighty works, just as, if we accept the testimony of the Evangelists, we must take account of the fact that He repeatedly declared to His disciples that after the rulers of the people had put Him to death He would rise again. And thus, upon the due consideration of these various points, the evidence for the resurrection becomes vastly strengthened, and we are the more disposed to postulate an event which everything else appears to lead up to, and which itself supplies a reasonable motive and cause for the events which followed it, as they

come before us in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the subsequent development of Christian literature and the history of the Christian Church. But if Christ was not a self-deceiver, He was that which He professed to be—namely, the Christ; and in being the Christ He proved historically the truth of the traditional claims of the Old Testament. That could have been no natural book in the volume of which it was written concerning Him; that could have been no natural literature which was instinct with, and gave birth to, the hope and expectation of a Christ. Dispute about prophecy as you will, the Book itself was and is a prophecy. That which the nation had learnt from the Book was an undying faith in an unfailing promise. But a promise implies the utterance of the word and mind of God. A promise implies intercourse, direct and unimpeachable, between God and man. Dispute about the authorship of Isaiah and the Pentateuch as you will, you must predicate, though you cannot explain, the outspoken and forth-speaking utterance of the mind of God in the records of the one and the rhapsodies of the other. And thus no honest treatment or fair-dealing consideration of the phenomena of the Old Testament is consistent with the denial of results therein, which warrant, no less than they claim, a superhuman and Divine authorship of things that were written aforetime for our learning. And thus we have, on the one side, an elaborate system of complex and undesigned preparation for some far-off, Divine event; and, on the other, the great and far-reaching consequences attending the proclamation of the occurrence of that event, which was none other than the appearance in human history of the Person of Jesus Christ, the knowledge of whose life and teaching we receive on the testimony of the first companions of Him to whom give all the prophets witness that, through His name, whosoever believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins. And thus prophecy and history, or testimony before and after, are the solid and substantial pillars upon which rests securely the compact and perfect arch of the life of Jesus Christ.

STANLEY LEATHES.

## THE DAY OF THE HEBREW EXODUS FROM EGYPT DETERMINED BY THE EGYPTIAN CALENDAR.

1. IN a paper entitled, "The Pharaoh and Date of the Exodus," published in the March number of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, the writer has shown that a comparison of Egyptian and Bible chronology,—the former confirmed by numerous astronomical dates,—places the Hebrew exodus from Egypt *about* April 20th, in 1438 B.C. In the present paper it will be shown that a reconstruction of the Egyptian calendar, based on monumental evidence, enables us to demonstrate the exact day of that event by a coincidence that could have happened only in the same year, —1438 B.C.

2. It is well known that the official year of the Egyptians was one of 365 days, which passed through all the changes of seasons to reach its starting-point again in 1,460 years. But all Egyptologists are agreed that there also must have been a fixed year in common use. A year of this kind was especially necessary in a country like Egypt, whose very existence depended on the annual overflow of the Nile. For agricultural purposes the vague year, which lost a whole day every four years, would have been entirely useless, since it was of the utmost importance that the overflow of the Nile should be noted in the calendar for the same day each year. The flooding of the Nile begins to assume its greatest force about the summer solstice, and attains its greatest height ninety days later, about the time of the autumnal equinox. The Egyptian year was divided into three seasons of four months each, the first of which,—the season of inundation,—necessarily began the fixed year. As Thoth was the first month, and as each Egyptian month had thirty days, it follows that Thoth 1 was placed  $(30 \times 4)$  120 days before the Nile flow attained its greatest height, ninety days after the summer solstice, and consequently that the summer solstice coincided with the first

day of Paophi, the second Egyptian month. There are several isolated notices in Manetho's epitomators which agree in placing a reformation of the calendar in the reign of a king named Aseth or Saites, one of the Shepherd kings. If our restoration of Egyptian chronology, as outlined in our former paper, is correct, the Shepherd dynasties cannot be placed later than the seventeenth century B.C. In A.D. 325 the summer solstice fell on the Julian June 21; and as the Julian year, as compared with the true solar year, is about one day too long in 128 years, it follows that in 1700 B.C. the summer solstice fell sixteen days later,—that is, on (June 21 + 16 =) July 7. If the reformation of the calendar indicates the time when the fixed year was introduced or modified, as seems more than probable, the first season must have corresponded with the following days of the Julian year:—

Thoth	1	=	June	7
„	15	=	„	21
Paophi	1	=	July	7 = Summer solstice.
„	14	=	„	20 = Manifestation of Sothis.
Athyr	1	=	August	6
Choiak	1	=	September	5
„	30	=	October	4 = Nile flow at its height.

3. Some Egyptologists have supposed that the fixed year began on July 20, and they assume that the era of the Sothic cycle of 1325-22 B.C. marks the coincidence of the vague and fixed years. But in such a year the flow of the Nile would attain its greatest force in the middle of Athyr,—that is to say nearly a month and a half of the season of inundation would fall after the inundation had ended, or began to recede. Riel found on the Ramesseum indications that the Sothis star rose in the time of Ramesses II. on Thoth 16, which implies the years 1265-62 B.C. As this date is nearly a hundred years later than the chronology of Lepsius and Brugsch requires, Riel concludes that the rising in question must refer to a fixed year, beginning on Thoth 15, which he calls "the Sun and Sirius-year of the Ramessides." Surely his argument is based on a *non sequitur*: if 1265-62 B.C. is connected with the reign of Ramesses II., the natural unavoidable

inference is that the chronology of Brugsch and Lepsius is wrong, and in our chronology Ramesses II. does, in fact, begin his reign in 1263 B.C.,—one of these four years. Besides, Riel's fixed year is open to the objection that its "season of inundation" does not fit the facts. The Egyptians never would have ended this season over a month too late, on November 16, as Riel's year requires.

4. Riel has, however, made it clear that the intercalary day every four years was on Thoth 15, and that on account of the oath each Egyptian king was obliged to take at his accession not to change the sacred year of 365 days, this additional day was also called Thoth 15. Thus both the official and fixed year always nominally had only 365 days, although every fourth year the latter really had 366 days. Hence in leap years Thoth 1 fell one day earlier, on June 6, and the intercalary Thoth 15 on June 20, whilst the real Thoth 15 always fell on its normal day, June 21. The intercalary day, inasmuch as it brought around the year to agree with the seasons, was properly the beginning of the Egyptian fixed year. There is another and more important reason why it should have been so considered: it is known by actual observation of French engineers that there is a difference of eleven days between the beginning of the flow of the Nile at Syene and at Cairo. In the time of the reform of the fixed year, when Egypt extended much further south, the Nile flow probably began in the extreme south on Thoth 1, and did not extend to all Egypt until fourteen days later, on Thoth 15. No more suitable period could have been selected for the beginning of the year than the general overflow of the Nile for all Egypt.

5. Thus far we have proceeded entirely on theoretical considerations, but there is abundant evidence that a year such as the foregoing did in fact exist in Egypt. A few of the most important proofs are here submitted as sufficient for our present purpose: (a) In the first place Riel has himself shown that the fixed years in the calendars of Edfu, Esné, and Dendera all agree in placing the beginning of the year on our June 20. (b) The Coptic calendar, still in use at the

present day in Egypt, is based on the fixed Alexandrian year, introduced by Augustus in 25 B.C. On the 26 of Baûneh (Paoni), the beginning of the overflow of the Nile for all Egypt is publicly proclaimed. In the Julian year, the month of Paoni began on May 26, and of course it would still do so if the Julian year were in use at the present day. Now if 1 Paoni was May 26, then 26 Paoni was June 20.

6. The Ebers medical papyrus has on its reverse side, as all Egyptologists who have examined the subject agree, a comparison between the fixed and vague year. The first line of this double calendar is as follows, "Mesore = Beginning of the year = Epiphi = Day 9 = Manifestation of Sothis." Now this means that in the particular year in question, either the Sothis star was manifested on Epiphi 9 or on Mesore 9. Egyptologists have generally decided that the rising of Sothis on Epiphi 9 is intended, and that consequently the calendar refers to either B.C. 3010-17, 1550-47, or 90-87 B.C. But if Epiphi 9 corresponds to July 20, then the beginning of the year must be placed on Mesore 9 or 1,—that is, on August 19 or 11, neither of which days is suited to the beginning of the Nile overflow. The other supposition must therefore be correct. But if Mesore 9 is July 20, then Epiphi 9, the "beginning of the year," is June 20. Consequently, the particular year intended is a leap year, for only on such years did the beginning (Thoth 15) fall on June 20. This points to either B.C. 2890, 1430, or A.D. 27. The later date is out of the question, for Egypt was then a Roman province, and the Ebers medical papyrus was written in the reign of a native pharaoh, as all agree. The earliest date is also inadmissible because the calendar was not reformed until the seventeenth century B.C. The name of the pharaoh is not yet clearly deciphered: Chabas thinks it was Menkera; but if 1430 B.C. is the year in question, then the true reading must be Mencheperra (Tutmes III.), who was pharaoh in that year, as we have shown in our former article, and the Ebers papyrus furnishes another proof that our chronology is correct.

7. In the 34th year of this same Tutmes III., the 30th of Mechir fell on the tenth day of another month, naturally of

the fixed year. The 34th of Tutmes III. is in our chronology (1465-33=) 1432 B.C., in which year, as we have just seen, Mesore 9 = July 20 (= Paophi 14 of the fixed year). From Mesore 9 to Mechir 30 inclusive are 207 days, and if we count forward 207 *days* from Paophi 14 of the fixed year, the 207th day will, in fact, fall on Pachons 10. This not only establishes the correctness of our fixed year, but also proves that 34 Tutmes III. was in 1432 B.C., for the coincidence of Mechir 30 of the vague year with the tenth day of *any* month of the fixed year occurred only once, for four years, every 120 years,—that is, in 1433-30, 1553-50 B.C., and so on.

8. In the reign of the same king there was a celebration of the vernal equinox on Pharmuthi 21, in his second year. Biot has calculated that the year intended is 1444 B.C. But this year was the eighth of Tutmes III., not the second, as the monumental inscription requires. In his second year, 1450 B.C., the 21st of Pharmuthi of the official vague year fell on April 8. The vernal equinox in 1450 B.C. fell about April 3, or on the 1st of Epiphi in our fixed Egyptian year. It would seem more appropriate to celebrate the coincidence of the vernal equinox with the first of a month than with the sixth. But if we turn to Brugsch's *History of Egypt* (i., 347), we see that the *sixth* day of each month was especially set apart for the celebration of feasts, in the reign of Tutmes III. Consequently the equinox, which fell on Epiphi 1 (= April 3), was not celebrated until Epiphi 6 (= April 8).

9. In our fixed Egyptian year the manifestation of Sothis always fell on Paophi 14 (= July 20). Consequently the vague and fixed year must have coincided in 1153-50 B.C. for in these four years Paophi 14 of the vague year fell on July 20. In the reign of Ramesses III., however, the festival of the Neomenia, or first day of Paophi, was celebrated on Paophi 19 of the vague year. (So Brugsch in Riel, *Sonnen u. Sirius-Jahr*, 213-14),—that is, the vague year had lost eighteen days, which implies (18×4) seventy-two years. If our theory of the fixed year is correct, Ramesses III. must have been reigning in (1153-72) 1081-78 B.C. According to our restoration of Manetho, in our former paper, the 20th

Egyptian dynasty, of which *Ramesses III.* was the second king, began in 1175 B.C. The first king, who must represent the father of *Ramesses III.*, has twenty-nine years in the Sothis list of this dynasty, consequently *Ramesses III.* began to reign in (1125-29) 1096 B.C. As the monuments give him thirty-one years until his associated reign with his son, *Ramesses IV.*, the years 1081-78 B.C. necessarily fall in his reign. We have here a double proof,—(1), of the correctness of our restoration of *Manetho's* system, and (2), a striking confirmation of our theory of the Egyptian fixed year.

10. The preceding facts are quite sufficient, we think, to prove that we have discovered the real fixed year of the Egyptians; and if this point be granted, we are now in a position to offer a conclusive proof that our date for the exodus from Egypt,—viz., 1438 B.C.,—is correct. It will be remembered that our former paper proved by astronomical evidence that the sole reign of *Tutmes III.*, the pharaoh of the exodus, began on *Mesore 4*, or July 20, in 1451 B.C. According to *Manetho*, he reigned twelve years and nine months to the exodus. We assume that *Manetho* reduced the vague year to correspond with Julian or Alexandrian time, otherwise he would have had a whole year too much in 1461 years. In Julian time there are three leap years in twelve years, consequently the twelve years and nine months in the official Egyptian vague year amounted to twelve years, and  $(30 \times 9 + 3 =)$  273 days. The 13th year of *Tutmes III.* began on *Mesore 4* of 1439 B.C., consequently the 273rd day after fell on *Pachons 1* of 1438 B.C.,—that is, on April 15. This is the absolute date of the exodus, according to the Egyptian evidence.

According to the Bible, the exodus from Egypt took place on the 14th day of *Abib*. *Bunsen*, *Lepsius*, *Hincks*, *Riel*, and others are agreed that *Abib* is the Egyptian month *Epiphi*, still called *Habib* in the Coptic calendar. But the Bible cannot mean the *Epiphi* of the vague year, because that year was only used for official purposes; and besides, as we have just shown, the official records place the exodus on *Pachons 1* of the vague year. Again, *Epiphi 14* of the vague year did not correspond with April 15 until

1146 B.C. The monuments show that the vague and fixed year were both used at the same time; and as the people themselves must have reckoned according to the agricultural or fixed year, the Hebrews must have also done so. Consequently, the exodus took place on Epiphi 14 of the fixed year. Now 1438 B.C. was a leap year, in which Thoth 1 was shifted one day earlier to June 6. Hence,

Thoth 1	=	June 6
Epagomenæ 5	=	„ 5
„ 1	=	„ 1
Mesore 1	=	May 2
Epiphi 30	=	„ 1
„ 29	=	April 30
„ 14	=	„ 15

A coincidence of Pachons 1 of the vague year with Epiphi 14 of the fixed year, on a leap year, could have occurred only once before in Pharaonic history,—viz., in 2898 B.C., and this date is, of course, out of the question, for no one has, as yet, attempted to place the exodus higher than 1825 B.C. If we have succeeded in discovering the fixed year of the Egyptians, then the date of the exodus may be considered as finally settled.

11. In the preceding argument we have gone on the assumption that the exodus fell on the fourteenth day of the Egyptian month Epiphi—the Biblical Abib—of the fixed year. This seems to contradict Numbers xxxiii. 3, which places the journey from Rameses on the *fifteenth* day of the first month. But the contradiction is only apparent, for it is clear from the Bible that the exodus occurred at or near midnight following the slaying of the paschal lamb on the fourteenth day of the first month. Now it is well known that the Jewish day began at *sunset*; whereas the Egyptians, in agreement with our usage, began the day at *midnight*. Consequently, the 14th day of Abib, or Epiphi, from an Egyptian point of view, did not end until 12 o'clock, p.m.; whereas, according to the Hebrew mode of reckoning, all of Epiphi 14 after (about) 6 o'clock, p.m. was counted as the *fifteenth*. It is merely a different mode of reckoning the same thing.

JACOB SCHWARTZ.

## IMAGINARY SYMPOSIUM OF MODERN THINKERS.

SUBJECT—HOW BEST TO PROMOTE HUMAN PROGRESS.

A SYMPOSIUM is supposed to be arranged, including the different leaders of modern thought, to discuss the various problems of life and religion, with which the present generation is so beset and bewildered, each one having some claim, though a small one, to attention, the reader must imagine to himself the company gathered together in some large hall or club-room, all on equal terms for the time being, no one taking the pre-eminence by social or ecclesiastical position, the sole merit to pre-eminence being the importance of the ideas each one has to give on the subject in hand, viz., "The best scheme for promoting the progress of the human race and its true development on the lines of all that is highest and best."

Rev. C. VOYSEY.—"Human Progress! What a profoundly interesting subject for discussion! And one we are not at all likely to quarrel about, since no one can dispute the fact of *progress*, though we may differ as to the greater or less power of our different schemes in *accelerating* that progress."

Several voices at once, — among which Dr. RAY LANKESTER'S was heard the most plainly.—"Not dispute the fact of progress? *I* do, for one! I deny man is progressing at all, — retrograding rather,—and before many decades have passed, will have reverted to the ascidian and barnacle type."

CLIFFORD.—"Just so. Man being only a complex union of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, evolved too, not created (since a Creator is quite an obsolete idea), the idea is ridiculous,—this one of progress, I mean,—we must just live out our little life, content, I suppose (shrugging his shoulders) to have lived,—then die, and there's an end of us!"

HUXLEY.—“Exactly. As I have said often, I know not why I was made, nor the purpose of all the pain and misery I see around me.”

DARWIN (sighing deeply).—“Alas! who can throw any light on these abstruse problems? Such mysteries are insoluble. Once I *did* flatter myself I believed in the truth of some things—in the existence of God, for instance, and the immortality of the soul; but now I am like a man who has become colour-blind, parts of my brain seem really atrophied.”

HUXLEY (in an aside to Darwin).—“Nonsense! We all know better than that. Your last book was a final proof that your brain was as active as ever. (Aloud to the others).—Of course life's a puzzle! Still we all believe in God,—Spinoza's God, I mean. At any rate, only a very great fool would deny such a God, even in his heart.”

TYNDALL (a look of surprise on his face, followed by a sudden flash of insight into the last speaker's meaning).—“Ah, yes! I know what you mean: the God in the sense of the cause of all physical evolution; a cause that was once a sort of fiery cloud, in which were lying latent not only every ignoble form of animal life, but also the human mind itself, emotion, intellect, will.”

HERBERT SPENCER.—“Evolution a fiery cloud? A most inadequate interpretation of the complex materialistic and psychical concatenation. Rather is it an integration of matter, and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation.”

Here followed a pause, complimentary doubtless to the speaker's profound utterance. At length the voice of some one standing quite close by, and evidently on very free-and-easy terms with the philosopher, was heard speaking in a tone of playful banter.

COTTER MORISON.—“Very fine, no doubt; but too fine for me, and most of us besides! This is but the fine æther of Kantian metaphysics, as I called it in my book. Schopenhauer is more to my taste,—speaks out, direct to the point,—

no long words, no talking over people's heads, which, begging your pardon, you, my dear sir, do, and spoil thereby heaps of noble thoughts. And this is what *he* says, summing it all up in a nut-shell, 'If God, previous to the creation, had been aware what he was doing, creation would have been an in-expiable crime.' Good! isn't it?" the speaker rubbing his hands with glee and looking round the room with a smile of delight at his apt quotation. Very few, however, seemed amused; and though a sort of sensation ran around the company, it was most certainly not one of pleasure.

Mr. BRADLAUGH, indeed, was the only one in the room who seemed inclined to continue the line of argument Mr. Cotter Morison had started, and for some minutes they might be noticed talking in low tones to themselves, the only words at all audible being those of "Universal commercial catastrophe,"—"If only the devastating torrent of children could be averted,"—"Malthus, a much-maligned man,"—"Suppress and eliminate this ever-bubbling mass of human misery." At the mention of this last phrase the speaker was observed to look around for some one he hoped might be there, and seeing Mr. Arnold White not far off, but evidently holding aloof, he walked up to him, laid his hand on his shoulder, attempting to draw him into conversation, but in vain; the latter gentleman muttering something about "great points of disagreement," and that for his part he not only believed in the law "*the survival of the fittest*," but also in the Maker of that law being a personal God, and the Father of the human family."

Hereupon Mr. Morison, with a look of unutterable contempt, turned on his heel, and rejoined his former companion, Bradlaugh, and every one began looking at every one, with the hope that some one would take up again the scattered thread of argument; but no one venturing apparently. At last, however, a voice was heard from a remote corner, which in clear, though forcible, tones seemed bent on making itself attended to. This was the voice of

HOLYOAKE.—"That despicable virtue of prudence I never was an advocate for. It is just the fair-seeming cloak of supineness when wrong has to be assailed, and I, for one, will

have nothing to do with it. We have met to talk about the most crucial subject, not only of the day, but for all time,—and in the name of truth and goodness let us not forget it.”

Chorus from the whole company.—“Hurrah!” while a voice that sounded like Mr. BRANDRAM’S, was heard ejaculating the line from Henry V., “He that hath no stomach for the fight, let him depart!” a quotation that at once had the desirable effect of silencing one or two querulous and dictatorial spirits who had by no means come to discuss or argue, only to find fault and dogmatize.

Then was heard the deep and sympathetic voice of ARCHBISHOP BENSON.—“I think gentlemen, we should all do well to remember the words of that remarkable, though sadly misguided, genius, George Eliot, “Nothing is easier than to find fault; nothing so difficult as to do some real work.”

ARCHDEACON FARRAR.—“True enough, indeed. Still, a remark of hers that made more impression on me than that, not only because of its profound wisdom, but far more because it is so convincing of the fact that the God-consciousness exists in those souls that least believe in it; aye, and even try to get rid of it, was this, ‘Miserable dust of the earth are we, but it is worth while to be so for the sake of the living soul, the breath of God within us!’ Nay, more: that ‘her own experience deepened every day her conviction that our moral progress may be measured by the degree in which we sympathize with individual suffering.’”

“Very extraordinary that she (such a pronounced agnostic) should have used such words,” the voice of one of the disaffected group before alluded to was heard muttering to himself. “But it was probably with her just as it was with another intellect equally superb in the prime of life, but becoming towards its close sadly weak and deteriorated,—John Stuart Mill. All his last remarks are a lamentable proof of this decadence. None of the manly independence that should characterize the man who, having freed himself from all the bugbears of superstition, retains only a puerile leaning towards supernaturalism instead. ‘Christ, the pattern of perfection,’ as he wrote! Absurd!” These remarks being made in a sort of

asidedid not interrupt the conversation of the rest, which seemed at last to have settled itself on the tolerably distinct basis that the human being was an entity, worthy of profound respect, and that, on the whole, he might be considered as being able to progress. Several of the clergy present quoting the words of St. Chrysostom with all due fervour, that "the true Shekinah is man." At any rate, the majority of the company present were clearly in favour of these two assertions, and the minority (among whom were a few men eminent in science, mathematics, and an acquaintance with the literature of ancient times) agreeing to remain silent and not disturb the flow of thought, conversation flowed on for a time in peaceful and harmonious fashion, each appearing anxious to say nothing that might give offence or might probe too deeply beneath the smooth surface of thought.

But in the nature of things this could not continue long. Here were men of comprehensive reading, powerful intellects, and a passionate enthusiasm for truth, gathered together for the express purpose of consulting as to the best methods for advancing the highest interests of the human race, and a monotonous reiteration of amiable platitudes was as senseless as it was irritating. Consequently, symptoms of uneasy stir began to make themselves visible ; and many faces that had been wearing a calm and almost careless aspect, might now be noticed to assume an eager vindictive aspect, as if inclined to dispute what before they had accepted. Mr. J. A. SYMONDS, for instance, having listened in silence to certain rather self-complacent remarks uttered by men optimistic in their ideas only because of intellectual incompetence, at length burst out with the remark,

"I am sorry to differ from you, gentlemen, in fact, to contradict you ; for as to the world growing better each day, more civilized and more moral, those best acquainted with the social condition of Athens agree that its population was as superior to us as we are to Australian savages !"

Dr. RAY LANKESTER here broke his silence with the dogmatic remark : "Exactly ; as a matter of fact, we are *not* improved either in body or mind upon the immediate fore-

fathers of our civilisation, the ancient Greeks, but are worse in every way."

"Ah!" said the traveller, Mr. A. R. WALLACE, who had not spoken at all before, but who, having visited more foreign places than all the rest in the room put together, seemed thereby to have constituted himself an authority, "Ah! worse than the Greeks? Why, we're worse than the 'savages,' as we call them. Not in intellectual matters, of course; but really in morals it isn't too much to say we have sunk far below them!"

Sensation; amidst which HUXLEY'S incisive voice was heard exclaiming: "All the more reason then for us to better ourselves! As I said in *Man's Place in Nature*, are the philanthropist and the saint (for there *are* saints, in spite of what many of my set say to the contrary) to give up their endeavours to lead a noble life because the simplest study of man's nature reveals at its foundations all the selfish passions and fierce appetites of the brute?"

Again sensation of a still profounder sort; after which Mr. CLODD (frowning at Mr. Wallace) exclaimed: "Oh! no, my dear sir! Scarcely so bad as that! Doubtless the free play of the human mind has been stifled for centuries since Christ's day, by the notion of its powerlessness to discern unaided the true from the false; yet, still——"

Here he was interrupted by Mr. WALLACE, who, in a tone implying he was not lightly to be contradicted, went on to say: "Pshaw! I repeat what I said, and have no hesitation in affirming that our vast manufacturing system, our gigantic commerce, our crowded cities, support and continually renew a mass of human misery and crime absolutely greater than has ever existed before!"

MATTHEW ARNOLD.—"Ah! and let us not forget that conduct forms three-fourths of human life! Sad indeed is the outlook! And alas! only too true!"

CLIFFORD.—"True! I should think it was! No occasion is there to go to Central Africa or to Lourdes for examples of immoral and debasing superstition! It is only too possible for a child to grow up in London surrounded by an atmo-

sphere of beliefs fit only for the savage,—beliefs founded in fraud and propagated by credulity!"

BROWNING (with a look of pain on his face).—"Ah! that is how the hard voice of science always expresses itself,—it kills the poet (the true lover of men), so to speak. With him even hate is but a mask of love's, he sees a good in evil, and a hope in ill-success! To him, men are like plants in mines, which never saw the sun, but dream of him and guess where he may be, and do their best to climb and get at him."

CLIFFORD (not in the least subdued, but as self-asserting as before).—"All very beautiful! but then you see the question is not what conclusion will be most pleasing or elevating to my feelings, but (raising his voice to an emphatic shout) *what is the truth?*"

No sooner had the echo of his voice died away than a mysterious, muffled sound, as if proceeding from the mouth of some unearthly being rather than of any one of mortal mould, seemed to steal round the room, startling every one into silence, while a bust of the late SIR ROBERT PEEL seemed slightly to move amidst the curtains which partly enshrouded it as it loomed in the far distance. "Take my word for it, gentlemen, it is not prudent, as a rule, to trust yourself to any man who tells you that he does not believe in God nor in a future state."

Silence pervaded the room, no one evidently daring to enter into conversation with a being of supernatural existence, when the bust of PLATO, that stood exactly opposite, quivered on its marble stand, and words, as musical in tone as they were sweet in meaning, emanated apparently from its lips, and fed the souls of those present.—(*Plato.*) "There is nothing more like God than the man who is just as man may be."

These voices, proceeding from no human lips, as it appeared, seemed likely, at first, to break up the meeting altogether; but in these days, when nothing can be a mystery, because science reveals everything,—days when even the secret of life itself trembles on the very verge of discovery, it was not at all likely but that some materialistic explanation

would be given of this ultra-spiritualistic phenomenon. And another minute revealed it,—for there, emerging from the mantling curtains that enwrapped the limbs of the greatest philosopher of ancient times was the magnificent form of LECKY, who had suddenly, and with a dash of waggery conceived the idea of making these busts appear to have come to life, and utter characteristic and luminous sentences.

“Ah! gentlemen,” he cried, as he stood erect in the middle of the room, “we owe much more to our illusions than to our knowledge. Remember that, ye men of science! Our knowledge, not only of truth, but even of the existence of the Creator (who, by-the-bye, *is* Truth itself), is derived not from the material universe, as you fondly imagine, but from our own moral nature. Quite as truly a part of our being as is our reason, it teaches us what reason could never teach,—the supreme and transcendent excellence of moral good,—which, rising dissatisfied above this world of sense, proves itself by the very intensity of its aspiration to be adapted for another sphere,—while it constitutes at once the evidence of a Divine element within us, and an augury of the future that is before us.”

HUTTON.—“Yes, of course, it is our *moral nature* that teaches us all those higher truths,—and reason, splendid attribute of man as it may be, has really nothing to do with it, unless indeed we admit that it is reason so diseased as to be unworthy of the name. A morbid rationalism, in fact, making men ask for some reason deeper than beauty before they can admire, for a reason deeper than truth before they can believe, for a reason deeper than holiness before they can love, trust, or obey!”

MARTINEAU (quietly, as if talking to himself).—“Ah, yes! all these doubts of God's goodness, whence are they? Rarely from those broken in the practical service of grief and toil, but from the theoretic students at ease in their closets of meditation, treated themselves, moreover, gently enough by that legislation of the universe which they criticise with a melancholy so profound.”

FRANCIS GALTON.<sup>1</sup>—“ Ah ! but then this is our difficulty ; there is no sharp demarcation, don't you see, between these moral promptings that are ' natural ' as we call them, and those that are ' supernatural ' as *you* call them, and as it is everywhere acknowledged to be a fit question for the intellect to decide whether the evidences of the senses are, in any given case, to be depended upon, so is it perfectly legitimate to submit religious convictions to a similar analysis. And for these reasons we (the sceptics) deliberately crush those very sentiments and convictions which the religious man prizes above all things. He pronounces them idols created by the imagination, and therefore equally to be abhorred with idols of grosser material.”

MATTHEW ARNOLD, with a look of mingled misery and ecstacy, repeats, as if in a kind of rapturous dream, the following lines :—

“ Weary of myself, and sick of asking  
 What I am, and what I ought to be?  
 At the vessel's prow I stand, which bears me  
 Forwards, forwards, over the starlit sea.

“ And a look of passionate desire  
 Over the sea and to the stars I send.  
 Ye, who from my childhood oft have calmed me,  
 Calm me,—ah ! compose me to the end.

“ Unaffrighted by the silence round them,  
 Undistracted by the sights they see,  
 These demand not that the things without them,  
 Yield them love, amusement, sympathy ! ”

He paused, and the rhythmic melody of the poetry acting like a charm, dispelling words expressive of disagreement, when suddenly every one started as a loud and impetuous voice was heard to exclaim, the speaker's hand enforcing his ideas by striking it heavily down upon the table,<sup>2</sup> “ All very well when the sea's calm to talk like that, but wait till the wind blows, and the waves roar, and depend upon it from

<sup>1</sup> Author of *Hereditary Genius*.

<sup>2</sup> *South Sea Bubbles*.

the depth of every man's soul arises the cry, "Oh God! give me a sign that I may know I am not utterly lonely and forsaken! I can't endure the idea (I should go mad if I did), that the misery of life and the purpose of the universe can never be known or explained by man. Well do I remember, even when a boy, all the awful agonies of prayer and despair that used to seize me, and the desperate longing for some absolute revelation to comfort me which I might trust in implicitly."

O. WENDELL HOLMES.—"Yes, that's how it is! People talk as if religion were just a matter of intellectual luxury that we can take or leave as we like. Why, it's our life! Our consciousness partakes of it! To the Infinite our souls are constantly yearning! And though it is very possible that a hundred years from now the forms of religious belief may be so altered that we should hardly know them, yet the sense of dependence on Divine influence, and the need of communion with the unseen and eternal, will be *then* just what they are *now*." Again a pause, during which the clock upon the mantelpiece sounded out in slow and ringing chimes the hour of four, and told the assembled company that they had already been talking for more than an hour, and yet had scarcely done more than state their own personal beliefs or disbeliefs in the matter of religion, while the subject they had met to discuss in all its length and breadth had hardly, except in an indirect way, been even glanced at.

Hereupon MR. ARNOLD WHITE, in a petulant tone, exclaimed, "Gentlemen, this will never do! If we don't settle on something to be done for the mass of seething misery around us, there's no knowing what may happen. Just let me read a few sentences from a paper largely read among the working classes;" hereupon opening a badly printed and wretchedly flimsy newspaper, he read therefrom the following startling sentences:—

"Are you a socialist? Then you ought to be,—and I'll tell you why,—because in the richest country the world has ever seen, the vice and misery, the drunkenness and the prostitution in it, are for the most part the result and the fear of

want. Because the useful classes are forced to work from sixty to a hundred hours a week for a bare living, while black slaves are employed only forty-five hours a week, and are fed. Because 800,000 agricultural labourers who produce more than £250,000,000 worth of food in a year rarely escape disease due to insufficient nourishment. Because women are paid wages they cannot live on, and consequently there are 100,000 prostitutes in London alone. Because one child out of three comes to school without breakfast,—because Professor Huxley says that the chief diseases in our great cities are due to slow starvation, and that he would sooner be a savage in the backwoods than an English labourer.’” Then, dashing the paper down upon the table near which he had been standing, and casting a defiant look at a group of clergymen who happened to be grouped together near, he exclaimed, in a tone not remarkable for softness, “There! That’s what the masses think! while they laugh to scorn all your Christian panaceas and anathemas!”

From one of these clergymen, however, came an answer as silencing as, by the last speaker, it was little expected.

J. LLEWELLYN DAVIES.—“It is futile to enter into controversy with those to whom Christ is only a well-meaning enthusiasm!” and turning on his heel he seemed about to leave the Hall, when, oddly enough, as he passed the large statue of Burke that stood near the door, the sentence written beneath caught his eye, and stopped him in his determination,—“The shield of calumny is character” (*Burke*). “Of course it is,” he thought, “and why should I (or any of us) care, when conscious of noble effort in the cause of humanity!” And as he stood with steps arrested, a clear voice near him caught his ear.

JOHN MORLEY.—“Harmony of aim, not identity of conclusion, is the secret of the sympathetic life. And science, when she has accomplished all her triumphs, will still have to assist in the building up of a creed by which man can live.”

“Just so,” said a venerable-looking clergyman, whose bent form and snowy white hair indicated great age. “That reminds me of good old Archbishop Sharp’s remark, made

nearly 200 years ago, "If *we* don't teach these poor creatures, then the *devil* will!"

TYNDALL (muttering to himself).—"Pooh! Devil! Who believes in him nowadays, or in 'the Fall' either, or, as I prefer to call it, 'that catastrophe in Eden'?"

COTTER-MORISON (with a laugh, having overheard him).—"Absurd! Just as absurd as going to Christianity for advice on pecuniary matters. As Strauss so neatly observed, 'The incapacity of Jesus for financial transactions was utterly hopeless.'"

SWINBURNE.—"No, no, my dear Sir. That's a wilful distortion of facts, which even a poet, never strong on facts, you know, cannot allow to pass by in silence. In Christ I behold the ideal of humanity,—a semi-legendary Christ, no doubt; still, a type of human perfection,—and possibly Jesus *may* be the purest and highest type of man on record."

Then taking Cotter-Morison by the hand, he led him to where the bust of NOVALIS stood, and while they stood together looking up at those features, so melancholy and so intellectual, the poet recited to the author this passage from his writings (Novalis). 'The problem of civilization in modern days is to realize in society the ideal of Christ.'

But it was of no avail, and the author of the "Service of Man," turning away with a look of unutterable scorn, quoted with gusto VOLTAIRE'S celebrated sentence, "Ne mention pas ce nom 'Jésus' à moi." But Swinburne would not allow him to escape without a last word, and raising his clear voice, he pronounces with true poetical inflexion the following words from ROUSSEAU, "Hear what your favourite philosopher wrote, 'If the life and death of Socrates be those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus Christ are those of a God;'" and resolutely turning his back upon the author, he walked deliberately away to the other end of the room, where a distinctly different atmosphere appeared to pervade the conversation.

On the way there, however, narrowly escaping an utter discomfiture of person by the sudden flight from the room with headlong speed of the tall and awkward personality of

THOREAU, exclaiming, as he fled past his English friends, "I am tired of frivolous society, in which silence is for ever the best manners. I would fain walk in deep waters, but my companions will only walk in shallows and puddles. Superstition! it has always reigned; and it is absurd to think that these men proceeding to church on Sunday differ essentially from the Roman nation. They have merely changed the number and name of their gods."

But if Thoreau thought to escape without hindrance, he was mistaken, for CLIFFORD, standing near the doorway, planting himself full in his way, and grasping him by the arm, made him listen to what he had to say. "Conscience! you believe in that; and what is it? Why, the voice of man ingrained into our hearts commanding us to work for man. And he who wearied or stricken in the fight (as you seem to be) asks himself in some solitary place, 'Is it then all for nothing?' a presence (in which his own personality is shrivelled into nothingness) arising within him says, 'I am with thee; I am greater than thou.' Many names have men given to this 'Presence.' Still, one and all, they seem to me to be reaching forward with loving anticipation to a clearer vision yet to come."

"And is it you who say that?" asked THOREAU, in blank amazement; then muttering to himself something about "The very presence of society limiting one's freedom of action," and that "When Goethe needed to recruit his strength he retired into solitude," he hurriedly left the room.

His absence, however, was little noticed, and beyond the fact that some one near the door gave him a parting fling as it closed upon him by quoting his own words against him, viz., "The highest that man can attain to is not knowledge but sympathy," the conversation went on as briskly as before. Swinburne and TYNDALL were conversing together, apparently in sweetest unison,—the latter having just remarked, "That it was his firm belief that the poet had a great part yet to play in the world, in the heightening and brightening of life, which so many of us need."

"Ah! as Milton said so exquisitely," replied the poet,

“What if earth be but the shadow of Heaven?”

Professor DRUMMOND (speaking impatiently).—“Men are all quite clear about the ideal, but how to secure that willing men shall attain it,—that is the problem?”

“Of course, of course!” said J. A. Symonds, “Just as Epicurus told his pupils more than 2,000 years ago (so we have not advanced much since), that everything in human actions which is virtuous or vicious depends upon man’s *knowing* and *willing*, and that education consisted in accustoming the mind to judge accurately, and the will to choose manfully.”

GREG.—“Yes, that is what I have always said: if we can only teach the youth of this nation to keep themselves unstained amidst the contaminations of an evil world, then any errors of theological opinion they may imbibe are comparatively immaterial.”

RUSKIN.—“Aye, IF! but in that *if* lies all the rub. How to get our youth to see what ‘contamination’ is,—to make them see what this choice between good and evil is that we talk about so glibly. It makes me sick when I think how coolly Goethe could mince about the problem, ‘who seeks for goodness must himself be good.’ Faugh! as if we didn’t all know that, without his telling us. Take my word for it (mine, no Heaven’s; or Hell’s, if you won’t take Heaven’s), no one ever gets wiser by doing wrong, nor stronger.

“Forming your character, do you say?—*de-forming* it, rather. Better that a red-hot iron bar had struck you aside scarred and helpless than that you had so acted. Man only gets stronger by doing what is right. The one need is to do *that*, under whatever compulsion, till you can do it without compulsion, and then you are a man.”

There was such a magnetic force in these words, uttered too, as they were, with a sort of prophetic declamation of woe to all those who heard and yet did not profit, that an awe-stricken silence pervaded the group of listeners,—and it was with a feeling of relief that the voice of LECKY was heard, speaking the following comforting words of hope and reassurance.

"Blessedest of all thoughts!—the lines of our moral nature tend upwards. And all religions that have truly governed mankind have done so by virtue of the affinity of their teaching with this nature, by speaking, as common religious language describes it, *to the heart*,—by appealing not to self-interest, but to that Divine element of self-sacrifice, which is latent in every soul. The reality of this moral nature is the one great question of natural theology, for it involves that connection between our own and a higher nature, without which the existence of a First Cause were a mere question of archæology, and religion but an exercise of the imagination."

LORD TENNYSON.—"Ah, yes! Love! That's the secret that explains anything! As I said, long ago, in Locksley Hall,

"Love took up the harp of Time,  
And smote on all its chords with might;  
Smote the chord of self, which trembling  
Passed in music out of sight."

BROWNING.—"Very much the same as my own interpretation in *Fifine at the Fair*—viz., 'Life means learning to abhor the false, and love the true.'"

RUSKIN, pointing to a motto written upon the cover of a book he held in his hand (Thomas à Kempis).—"Go where thou wilt, search where thou wilt, thou wilt not find a sublimer way above, nor below, than that of the Cross."

J. A. FROUDE.—"Yes, indeed. As all earth's worthies have ever found. Life with such was no summer holiday, but a holy sacrifice offered up to duty. A life, hard, rough, thorny, trodden with bleeding feet and aching brow, the life of which the Cross is the symbol. And, strange to say, that is the highest life of man. Look back along the great names of history, there is none to whom it has been given to do the highest work on earth whose life has been other than this,—one and all, their fate has been the same, and the same bitter cup has been given them to drink."

The solemnity of the speaker's manner communicating itself to every one, far off or near, silence prevailed for several minutes, till the voice of MATTHEW ARNOLD was heard in

brisk tones asserting itself,—“Yes, of course, we all feel that to be true. In fact, if any one can show me ten square miles, *outside* of Christianity, where the life of man or the virtue of woman is safe, I throw up Christianity at once!”

Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD (in a patronising tone).—“Do you think so? Christianity seems to me something very small and local!” as my hero Robert Elsmere said.

FREDERIC HARRISON (with all the eagerness of delighted reciprocity of feeling).—“Exactly so, my dear madam! Theology is for ever talking in that fashion about worldly matters, and so on. ‘What have I to do with thee?’ it virtually says, ‘I must be about my Father’s business!’” ironically smiling.

STANLEY (the traveller, with a burst of impetuous feeling).—“What stuff! It says nothing of the kind! Livingstone, at any rate, didn’t! That glorious fellow! That incarnation of Christianity! Thinking of no other work in life than that hardest one of all, travel and discovery, and why? not for his own pleasure, but that he might attract the good and charitable of other lands to bestir themselves for the redemption of the poor African heathen. He, indifferent to his fellow-creatures? Why, no harassing anxieties could ever make him complain. His, the Spartan heroism, the inflexibility of the Roman, the enduring resolution of the Anglo-Saxon never to relinquish his work (though his heart yearned for home) till he could write ‘Finis’ to it.”

GLADSTONE.—“And the Christian type (exemplified as it is in this grandest of men, and happily in many others) is, let it not be forgotten, the product of the Christian scheme. The very qualities which are commended in the Sermon on the Mount, and which form the basis of the character specifically Christian, were, for the Greek and Roman mind, the objects of contempt. From the history of all that has lain within the reach of the great Mediterranean basin, not a tittle of encouragement can be drawn for the ideas of those who would surrender the doctrines of Christianity and yet retain its moral and spiritual fruits.”

Rev. ANDREW DOUGLAS.—“Yes, it is the incarnation of

God in Christ that contains the promise and potency of all the civilizing influences that are yet to come. *God dwells in the world.* He is immanent as a brooding, watching presence in all things, and the forgetfulness of that truth is the cause of all our theological confusion, and consequent social misery and wrong."

GREG.—"And if we had set our fancy to picture a Creator occupied solely in devising delights for children whom He loved, we could not conceive one single element of bliss which is not here."

J. A. FROUDE.—"Ah! how true! In the long run, too, it *is* well with the good. Neither is the creed of eighteen centuries about to fade away like an exhalation. Christianity has abler advocates than many of its professed defenders, viz., in the many quiet men and women who, in the strength of it, live holy, beautiful, self-denying lives. And as long as the fruits of it continue to be visible in self-sacrifice, in those graces which raise human beings above themselves, and invest them with that beauty which only religion confers, thoughtful persons will remain convinced that with them, in some form or other, is the secret of truth."

He paused; and whether the company were convinced or not, they all remained silent, until the following words, uttered in a gentle, murmuring voice, as if to himself rather than to the others, proceeded from the lips of the poet TENNYSON:—

"I found Him not in world or sun,  
Or eagle's wing, or insect's eye,  
Nor thro' the questions men may try  
The petty cobwebs we have spun.

"A warmth within the breast would melt  
The freezing reason's colder part,  
And like a man in wrath, the heart  
Stood up and answered, *I have felt.*"

J. A. FROUDE (his earnest tones at once commanding attention).—"My dear friends, as things are now, we really have no idea of what a human being ought to be. We respect money, rank, ability. *Character* is as if it had no existence.

In the midst of this loud talk of progress, it is with saddened feelings we see so little of it. There is progress in knowledge and in material wealth ; but we cheat ourselves if we conclude out of this material splendour an advance of the race. Let us follow knowledge to the outer circle of the universe ; the eye will not be satisfied with seeing nor the ear with hearing. Let us build our streets of gold ; they will hide as many aching hearts as hovels of straw. The well-being of mankind is not advanced a single step !”

GUIZOT.—“ Not one jot. Yet Christianity, in spite of all the attacks which it has to undergo, and all the ordeals through which it has had to pass, has for eighteen centuries satisfied infinitely better the spontaneous cravings of humanity. And why ? Because it is pure from the errors which vitiate the different systems of philosophy, and because it fills up the void that these systems create in the human soul. And it alone has the right to succeed, for it alone knows man rightly as he is, and alone satisfies man by furnishing him with a rule for his guidance through life.”

J. ALLANSON PICTON.—“ People seem to forget that religion (the Christian religion) is as legitimate a fruit of human development as science, commerce, or art, and we can no more eliminate it from our total conception of the ideal human life than we can exclude social loyalty or intellectual ambition. And just now there seems slowly permeating the heart of humanity the sense of a universal order. . . . In the course of a thousand generations men have found that in a universe of order the lessons of morality are guaranteed by a perception of universal law. And the signs of the times point to the establishment of a commonwealth wherein each shall be more consciously dependent on every other for order and peace. And when the time comes when all men realize how the supremest joy of life is to be conscious of having done something, however little, for the good of humanity, then will have dawned that redeemed world, which is the same thing as the Kingdom of God.”

Chorus from certainly the majority in the Hall : “ *And what is that but the practical outcome of Christianity ?*”

E. N. SHEFFIELD.

## CURRENT POINTS AT ISSUE.

### WORTHLESS WORSHIP.

THE worship of the vague something that makes for the hazy something else, seems to be the pet piety of the day. At least with those who would pose as the disciples of the Apostle of sweetness and of light. The latest guide through this baseless fabric of a vision is Mrs. Russell Barrington, who, in a paper recently published by her, says some things that are wise, and many that are otherwise. We are told that "no straining of the intellect can ever give us what in its essence the intellect does not contain," and also that orthodoxy has attempted to use the intellect where the intellect is out of place. This is undoubtedly true, but what then? Are we to discard the use of the intellect altogether in matters of religion, because it has been sometimes abused? Apparently so, for we are to abandon creeds, desert churches, and find a satisfying contentment in intimations of a communion with a great spirit of nature and of righteousness; or, as we are told by Laon Ramsey in a recent number of *The Westminster Review*, "We know and feel that there is a tendency which makes for righteousness, and it is to this we are willing to give praise and glory." So the religion of this æsthetic culture is to praise and glorify "a tendency." We are not told the origin, end, or aim, if any, of these tendencies and intimations. Our emotions are to be stirred by them, and that is sufficient. Do these excellent people ever think that they are resting in emotion only; resting in those feelings that, being independent of the will, if the right mental condition happen to be present, rise spontaneously on the presentation of their proper objects. But such unwilled states cannot have any more real religion in them than has the enjoyment we feel when eating something pleasant to the palate. Would these evanescent gushes of sentiment, however proper they may be in their own place, ever have regenerated the world, or built

up Christendom? This empty craze might be left to take its own course, did it not become positively mischievous. For once men are persuaded that the purest pleasures of eye or ear are religion, they will seek no other, and thus lose priceless blessing. Beside all this, our friends must remember that the world is not made up of Grosvenor Gallery drawing-rooms, art exhibitions, flowery meads, and shady glades; there are also nocturnes in black to be found in our city slums, where the making for righteousness is not distinctly visible. What religion is to be preached here? As well try to stay the conflagration of a powder mill with a bottle of rose water, as still the passions of men, hush the accusings of conscience, allay the forebodings of a dread hereafter with the vague puerilities of sentimental tastefulness, or the sofa verbiage that would offer suffering man a "tendency" instead of a God.

It were well to ascertain, if we can, the causes of this fashionable frivolity, that, if possible, they may be counteracted, and the current turned into a truer channel. That there is such a set is unfortunately too true; even Mrs. Lynn Linton cannot write a very able essay on Self-Respect in the first number of *The New Review* without a sneer at "the spiritual abasement of the pious," and the information that "self-respect is banished from our Litany." Dr. Liddon is undoubtedly correct when he attributes much of it to an insufficient knowledge of Christianity, to the "complete absence of any preparation for sounding its depths, surveying its wide horizon, and apprehending the inner harmonies of its spiritual teaching."

#### NOT "DISSECTING FOR A SOUL."

A writer in the *Spectator* seems to slightly misapprehend the reason for dissecting the brain of Mr. Irving Bishop. Dr. Irwin says that he wished to see "if he could find any explanation of the thought-reader's mysterious powers." The writer contends that if either Mr. Bishop or Dr. Irwin thought they could by any process of dissection "'explain' thought-reading, or any other act of mind, they were certainly even more credulous than curious." It may be at once

conceded that no physical state can explain a mental state in the sense of accounting for its origin or nature. When the surgeon says that a pressure on the brain explains a certain mental condition, all he means is, that the discovery of the one fact produces anticipation of the other ; but he does not pretend to account for the connection between the two. He may go further, and call it a causal connection ; beyond that he cannot pass. We therefore regard this particular dissection as a perfectly legitimate and scientific one, not having any materialist bias, but one that might have been undertaken by the sincerest Christian.

Here was a man with, apparently, a special mental faculty ; it was therefore an interesting question whether that were accompanied by any cerebral peculiarity. If not, then one point would be decided : that there might be a mental variation without a corresponding brain variation. If, on the other hand, there should be discovered some new feature in the brain formation, queries at present unanswerable would at once arise, such as "Is this variation accidental, or is it an invariable accompaniment of the new mental condition?" This is the first step of a true and large scientific induction that would extend over hundreds of years. Here also is an opportunity for the Darwinians. It would be most helpful in the struggle for existence to be able to read the thoughts of others. No doubt it might be sometimes excessively disagreeable, but it would be helpful. Have we, then, in Mr. Bishop, or in others who may resemble him, a fresh departure, that in countless ages will culminate in the survival of the fittest—that is, of those alone who will be able to read at a glance all the thoughts of those with whom they come in contact? We cannot say, but our descendants of the thousandth generation may be better informed.

#### WILL AND BELIEF.

Surely Professor Huxley cannot be serious in all he says in *The Nineteenth Century* for June. He first explains the agnostic position to be—"that it is wrong for any man to say that he is certain of the objective truth of any proposition

unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty." What sane man would assert anything else? It is not true to say you are certain of that of which you are not certain, and to believe you are certain without a sufficient reason for your belief is folly. He must also be in joking mood when he tells us, "The cleric asserts that it is morally wrong not to believe certain propositions, whatever the results of a strict scientific investigation of the evidence of these propositions." If he really believe this of the clergy, he must indeed have a low opinion of them. Does he imagine the clergy know so little of reasoning as to fancy that they attribute any moral quality to belief, or disbelief, as such? No one can will to believe anything. He must believe according to the evidence. If the evidence produce conviction, he must believe—there is no escape; if the evidence do not produce conviction, he cannot believe. The Professor, in his merry mood, writes as though these miserable clerics thought they could believe or not just as they pleased. Badinage such as this is scarcely worthy serious controversy. Nevertheless, what he quotes from Dr. Newman may in certain cases be true, "that religious error is, in itself, of an immoral nature." While it is a fact that we cannot will to believe, it is equally a fact that our will may greatly influence our decision, by causing us to select certain lines of evidence rather than others on which to concentrate the attention. Prejudice may warp the judgment, and cause certain witnesses to be called, while others equally trustworthy are held back, and so a verdict may be given that is immoral, because produced by immoral means. We therefore utterly repudiate his charge, that "for him (the cleric) the attainment of faith, not the ascertainment of truth, is the highest aim of mental life." Faith that is not true is a lie, and a lie cannot be the highest aim of mental life. The cleric is supposed to know at least the text of Scripture, and does not forget the injunction, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." He has also ever present to his mind the Master's prayer, "Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy Word is truth."

JAMES MCCANN, D.D.

## CURRENT LITERATURE.

On the Inspiration of the Bible. IN a work entitled *Inspiration of the Bible* (1) Mr. Horton gives the result of an inquiry into a subject which is of perennial interest. To the question, What is inspiration? Mr. Horton answers, "Precisely what the Bible *is*;" which he further explains by saying, "We call our Bible inspired, by which we mean that by reading it and studying it we find our way to God; we find His will for us, and we find how we can conform ourselves to His will." And the "inquiry" finishes by a hope that "if it has done something towards distinguishing between the lanthorn and the light, and has thus led the reader to give a more concentrated heed to the light, it has answered its purpose." This purpose is a noble one, and yet there is a danger lest if the "lanthorn" be impaired and destroyed, the light may be extinguished by the adverse winds of controversy. We "have the treasure in earthen vessels," but while we should value the treasure as much as possible, there is no particular need, nor is it always possible, to heighten the value of the treasure by lowering the importance of the containing vessel. God has chosen to reveal His will through human agency; the human agency is seen; and though not absolutely perfect, it is certainly most admirable. Mr. Horton's book is written in an easy and pleasant manner; it contains some masterly analyses of parts of the Bible, *e.g.*, the Book of Amos, and the Epistle to the Galatians. But while there is much to admire both in the purpose and the execution of the work, we cannot say that we feel Mr. Horton has achieved the purpose he sets out with.

In the seventh *Congregational Union Lecture* (2) Principal Cave handles the question of the "Inspiration of the Old Testament" with distinguished ability, and endeavours to ascertain inductively whether it is inspired or not. He interrogates it first concerning its historical veracity, and then examines its contents to determine whether they give evidence of knowledge above human power to discover for itself. He adheres to his method with admirable rigidity. A very large proportion of the space is devoted to the Book of Genesis, not

merely because it has been assailed so furiously and confidently, but because its statements render it peculiarly appropriate as a sort of test case. In two very carefully worked-out chapters he discusses "Genesis and Ethnic Traditions," and "Genesis and Science." Under the first head he avails himself of books as old as Bryant's, almost forgotten, but by no means useless, *Analysis of Ancient Mythology*, and as new as Professor Sayce's *Hibbert Lectures*. He shows that with regard to the deluge and other matters, these widespread traditions are "primitive, original, ancient, pure, historical." There is nothing actually novel in either the argument itself, or the method of putting it, but its re-statement in the present connection has great value. He adduces a large amount of "evidence from parallel conclusions of Genesis and Science." The whole lecture is a piece of sound reasoning, but the sections on "The Unity of Language," and "God and Divine Things," strike us as peculiarly happy and telling. Principal Cave seldom attempts to prove too much. Here we may mention an objection to the method of the entire book, peculiarly apparent, however, in these two chapters. The positive argument is put fairly and forcibly, but no attempt is made to solve or remove difficulties and objections that do not belong so much to the reasoning as to the subject-matter with which it deals. For example, with regard to "creation in Genesis and Science," and the "genealogy of races," the argument as it stands seems unanswerable—we are in the presence of genuine history. The correspondence between Genesis and universally acknowledged fact cannot be gainsaid. But, on the other hand, there are discrepancies, real or apparent, about which the lecturer is perfectly silent. The object is to demonstrate the existence of a vast amount of information, thoroughly trustworthy and indicative of supernatural communication. When this is proved the difficulties and discrepancies, however important and perplexing, must occupy a subordinate place. We do not take any exception to this principle, but we wish that it had been clearly laid down by the author himself.

When Principal Cave proceeds to "the authorship of Genesis," he perforce abandons this indifferent attitude towards rival hypotheses and plausible or reasonable objections. He advocates the Mosaic authorship, chiefly on the ground that no other writer can be suggested except at an impossibly early late date. Nothing finer than his examination of words, phrases, or tone can be desired. He decides in favour of Moses as himself the Jehovistic writer, who incorporated

an earlier Elohist document with his own composition. At any rate, the Elohist was "pre-Sinaitic," and probably employed yet earlier sources of information, both oral and written.

Upon the authorship and Divine origin of the law he expresses his opinion with a confidence partly derived from his previous conclusions. His contrast of "the journal theory," and the "evolutionary theory," is excellent in its keenness of discrimination and vigorous grasp. And, by the way, only an expert could have summarised the history of the criticism of the last four books of the Pentateuch so succinctly and accurately. The Lecture on Prophecy seems to us conclusive in its main contentions, and we are glad that it does not rest its case solely on the Messianic prophecies, but adduces the predictions concerning the destinies of particular cities and nations. But, after all, the purely positive argument limps a little at this part of its journey. There is sufficient strength in the rationalistic objections as to the fulfilment of the forecasts about Tyre and Babylon, for instance, to make a plea unsatisfactory that pays no heed to them.

Highly as we appreciate this learned and logical volume, we cannot but lament that its concluding chapter has not been written with somewhat more care and insight. To say that "Divine co-operation with man is just what is meant by Inspiration," is as nearly as perfect an example of the absence of lucidity in a definition as can easily be found. The initial capital as well as the context compels us to limit this assertion to the inspiration of the Scriptures. But when God raised up Sennacherib there was "Divine co-operation with man," and every real prayer would come under the same category. The distinction drawn between the various modes and degrees of inspiration has some noteworthy elements of truth; yet they cannot be reached inductively, but only deductively, as the inclusion "of Canonic Inspiration" in the list clearly evidences.

Despite a few unguarded expressions, an occasional defect or two, and the awkwardness of the closing lecture, this work is one of the most powerful contributions to Apologetic Literature that has been published in this country for many a day. No ministerial library should lack it.

(1) *Inspiration and the Bible.* By R. F. Horton, M.A. Second Edition. London: J. Fisher Unwin. 1888. Price 5s.

(2) *The Inspiration of the Old Testament inductively considered.* The seventh *Congregational Union Lecture.* By Alfred Cave, B.A., Principal of Hackney College. London: Congregational Union.

Some  
Roman Catholic  
Books.

It may be that the Pope's name will give a certain status to the little book on the *Practice of Humility* (1) which he composed while Bishop of Perugia ; but it is pretty certain that the work will not add any glory to the Pope's reputation as the sovereign Pontiff. It is a simple little treatise such as any pious Romanist might compile. At the end of it the Pope puts extracts from several of the Fathers of the Church, and one can hardly read them without feeling that they confute some of the statements in the body of the work. For example, on page 84 the reader is advised to address himself to Mary as the mother of God ; and on page 87 to the Saints ; but there is no such recommendation by any of the Fathers quoted at the end of the book ; and the prayer from the Imitation, which concludes the work, is directed solely to God, the source and giver of all good. The treatise is furnished, we cannot say adorned, with a portrait of the Pope, which is anything but a flattering likeness.

The author of *Theological Influence of the Blessed Virgin on the Apostolic School* (2) sets himself to prove that the historic evidence for the Deity of Jesus Christ hangs on the facts given by the *Blessed Virgin to the Gospel writers* and to the Apostolic band ; and he makes a great show of helping out his argument from the writings of Rénan. It may well be that certain of the facts of the Gospel history were told to the Evangelists by the Blessed Virgin ; but that by no means proves her title to the worship and adoration which the Romish Church accords her. The author in one part of the work goes into some evolutionary theory about virgin births, quoting Haëckel's dictum about honey bees ; and seems therefrom to draw proofs of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, but the proofs are far-fetched and not logical. The work is embellished with an engraving of an Italian fresco of the Virgin, of the date of the 14th century. This is at the beginning, and at the end is a poor little engraving of the head of the Saviour, and the size and position of these pictures seem to indicate the gist of the book which, if it serves any purpose, is intended to exalt the Blessed Virgin at the expense of the Son of Man.

In *The Haydock Papers* (3) Mr. Gillow gives us a glimpse into English Catholic life under the shade of persecution and the dawn of freedom. "The Haydocks of Cottam" are inseparably associated with the history and traditions of Lancashire, and may be regarded as a typical (Roman) Catholic family. The papers are not

of much general interest with the exception of the doings and sufferings of the students at Douay and St. Omer, during the French Revolution. The book is illustrated with a print of Crook Hall, and two or three other cuts which are very poorly done ; but the printing is good, and the whole get-up commendable.

The fourth volume of the Library of St. Francis de Sales (4) consists of letters "to persons in Religion." They are chiefly addressed to the members of the Order of Visitation which he founded, and give an insight into the relationship in which he stood to the ladies who, under various circumstances, applied to him for advice. The letters may possibly serve for the reading of the inmates of Nunneries and Religious Houses, who give themselves up to the practice of the "interior life"; but to the ordinary reader they simply show that St. Francis was a kind-hearted, patient, and devout man, who made the best use he could of his correspondence, which must have been somewhat extensive.

*Spiritual Retreats* (5) consists of notes of addresses given in the Convent of the Sacred Heart, at Roehampton, by Archbishop Porter, presumably to congregations of women. They are published with the purpose of keeping in the minds of these hearers the subjects brought before them by this prelate, and that purpose will no doubt be easily attained, as the notes are clear, and full enough for ordinary reading. We shall not be expected to agree with a good deal of what the Archbishop says ; but on the other hand his remarks on some subjects are sensible and useful ; what he says on the subject of "worrying," on the exercise of hope (pp. 230, 231), and on sins of the tongue are very good, and doubtless the Archbishop's opinion on the equality of the sexes found favour with his audience. With regard to mental prayer and meditation, he quotes Bellarmine's saying, that he would answer for the salvation of any one who made a quarter of an hour's meditation every day ; and he makes much of St. Dominic's invention of the rosary, which, the Archbishop says, has been the means of reviving the Church. He adds, "how such a result was produced is a puzzle to those who do not consider what the rosary is ;" and we may add it is a greater puzzle to many who do, for how saying Aves in a mechanical way can glorify God, or be prayer, or be pleasing to the Almighty is very difficult at least for non-Roman Catholics to see. We are glad to note that the Archbishop does not lay so much stress as many others on the worship of Mary, which is not in these considerations very largely

touched upon. In two of the retreats the reading recommended is the Imitation, but in other two portions of the New Testament are enlarged upon.

*The Wandering Knight* (6) is the translation of an allegorical romance which had been long forgotten. It is the opinion of some that Bunyan was indebted to this romance for the meditations that suggested and the materials that supplied the substance of his immortal work. The original of the *Wandering Knight* was first published at Antwerp in 1557, and was soon afterwards translated into several languages. It is not likely, however, that Bunyan ever saw it, and even if he did see it and could read it, his *Pilgrim's Progress* is as different as possible from it, and as superior to it as the light of the sun is to that of a taper. Larousse, in his *Dictionnaire Universelle*, observes that the *Wandering Knight* was composed "with the object of inspiring sentiments of the purest piety," and its intention is no doubt very good. But it seems to us that a Christian who framed his faith and practice after the model of the *Wandering Knight* would not now be considered either a good Romanist or a good Protestant, for it goes too far for the one, and not far enough for the other. As a specimen of the literature of the age in which it was written, this romance is curious and interesting; the translator's English is in many places open to objection, but possibly he desired to be as literal as he could. How far it will serve the purpose intended by its publication we cannot say; but we suppose that when Bishop Weathers sees nothing to object in it, and Cardinal Manning gives it his imprimatur, it will find many readers; and we are willing to allow they may peruse a great many books that are worse than the *Wandering Knight*.

*The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations* (7) is the sixth volume of the Formation of Christendom in which Mr. Allies traces the rise of the Papal power, especially in the period which succeeded the overrunning of the Roman Empire by the several Gothic nations. His chief authority is the letters of the Popes stored up in Mansi's vast collection of Councils. As an *ex parte* statement it is tolerably strong, though even here there are not wanting many proofs of the difficulties that the Popes had to establish their claims, which were probably at all times more strongly claimed than readily admitted. Of course, the foundation of all is the claim to

the Petrine supremacy, which Protestants can see no proof of, or any reason other than a political one for ever bringing forward.

*St. Peter's Chains* (8) is the title of a little book of sonnets by Dr. A. De Vere. It is divided into three parts: 1st, entitled, "The Revolt against Christian Civilisation," by which we are to understand the taking away of the temporal power of the Pope; 2nd, "The Witness of History," deploring the way in which the Church of Rome has been despoiled; 3rd, "The Hope of the Future," which sets forth the aspirations that the poet feels about the restoration of this power. But he fails to impress us either with the awfulness of this deprivation or with any confidence that the temporal power ever will be restored. The sonnets are of the regulation form, but show more religious zeal than literary merit.

**Some Protestant Books.** The parish of Little Sodbury, in Gloucestershire, is an out-of-the-way little village. It is of no importance from a political or even social point of view. But it ever will be famous as the residence of William Tyndale, who for two years lived there professedly as tutor to the children of Sir John Walsh. The debt of gratitude that the world owes to Tyndale all Protestants will readily acknowledge; and many will welcome the handsome reprint of the *Obedience of a Christian Man* (9), which forms the fifth volume of the Christian Classic Series issued by the Religious Tract Society. This book of Tyndale deserves to be read with attention by all concerned for the welfare of true religion. It is strong in language, but then Tyndale felt strongly, and he lived in days when men did not hide their indifference under a cloak of politeness. As Mr. Froude says, Tyndale "writes with Saxon simplicity, and with a grandeur unequalled, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars." These words apply primarily to the translation of the Bible Tyndale made, but in this book Tyndale makes his meaning as clear as possible, and as a model of language can hardly be surpassed; this makes it valuable, though its worth in this respect is far outweighed by its arguments against the claims of the Pope, and the errors of Romanism.

*Romanism and the Reformation from the Standpoint of Prophecy* (10) is the title affixed to a series of lectures delivered by Mr. H. Grattan Guinness, in Exeter Hall, under the auspices of the Protestant Educational Institute. Mr. Guinness takes the prophecies of Daniel, of St. Paul, and St. John, and shows their bearing on the

Roman controversy. He works out his points with a good deal of skill, and works himself up at times to a high pitch of fervid enthusiasm, not to say vehemence. It is clear that Mr. Guinness is very much affected with the aspect of Romanism at the present time, and his conclusions will be interesting to those who, like him, are struck with the advance Romanism is making in England, and with the approach of that END which Mr. Guinness has done so much to try and determine the approximate date of.

*The Fourth of the Church History Series* (11), issued by the Religious Tract Society is an account of the Council of Trent, by Mr. T. Rhys Evans, of Brighton. It is founded on Sarpi's history, enriched by Courmayer's notes. It is entitled "A History of Romish Tactics," and in its way it certainly takes the reader behind the scenes, and shows him what intrigues were used in order to bring the legates to any kind of unanimity in issuing their decrees. It, perhaps, is difficult to make the records of the Council easy reading; so Mr. Evans's book is not an especially interesting one, but it is a valuable addition to Church history, and deserves to be read as showing what are the claims of Romanism, and how those claims were formulated.

(1) *The Practice of Humility*. By H.H. Pope Leo XIII. Translated from the Italian by Dom Joseph Jerome Vaughan, O.S.B. London: Burns & Oates.

(2) *The Theological Influence of the Blessed Virgin on the Apostolic School*. By Christianus. London: Frederic Norgate. 1888.

(3) *The Haydock Papers*. By Joseph Gillow. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

(4) *Letters to Persons in Religion*. With an Introduction by Bishop Hedley. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

(5) *Spiritual Retreats*. Notes of Meditations and Considerations given in the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Roehampton. By the Most Rev. George Porter, S.J., Archbishop of Bombay. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

(6) *The Wandering Knight*. By Jean de Cartheny. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

(7) *The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations*. From St. Leo I. to St. Gregory I. By Thomas W. Allies, K.C.S.G. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

(8) *St. Peter's Chains; or, Rome and the Italian Revolution*. By Aubrey de Vere, LL.D. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

(9) *Christian Classic Series V. The Obedience of a Christian Man*. By William Tyndale. Religious Tract Society.

(10) *Romanism and the Reformation from the Standpoint of Prophecy*. H. Grattan Guinness, F.R.G.S. Hodder & Stoughton.

(11) *Church History Series IV., The Council of Trent*. By T. Rhys Evans. Religious Tract Society.

**Magazines.** THE new number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1) contains some notable articles, among which we may mention that by Dr. Lyman Abbott on the Epistle to the Romans; that on the Scriptural Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, by Dr. Thwing; and that on the "Use and Abuse of an Important Principle of Interpretation." The whole number, however, is replete with interesting and valuable matter.

*The Baptist Quarterly Review* (2) is a very ably edited periodical. The current number contains an account of the Epistle to the Romans, treated historically, and an excellent article on the Church of England by Professor True. The Editorial department contains some novel views, the Homiletic department some helpful suggestions, and the Review of Current Literature is well done.

*The Homiletic Review* (3) for May is a capital number of this excellent magazine. The Review Section contains a good article on Latimer, the Homilist; a Symposium on Preaching, and other useful articles. The Sermonic Section is filled with notes of excellent discourses by notable preachers, together with themes and texts of recent sermons. There are also Exegetical, Editorial, and Miscellaneous Sections, which are most excellently handled.

*The Expositor* (4) still runs its useful course, and the eighth volume is now before us. It has a list of eminent names as contributors, at the beginning, and an index of them, with their contributions, at the end. As might be expected from such eminent divines, there are many very good articles in the volume, among which are the general reviews of St. Paul's Epistles by F. Godet, the Pauline Antilegomena by W. H. Simcox, and those on the Idea of Priesthood by Professor Milligan. The other articles are excellent, though we do not quite accept all Dr. Marcus Dods' reasons for modern scepticism, and think there are others he has missed. We wish *The Expositor* all the success it deserves. The volume has what looks like a good portrait of Heinrich Ewald for a frontispiece.

(1) *Bibliotheca Sacra*. April, 1889. Oberlin, Ohio: published by J. Goodrich. London: Trübner & Co. Price 3s. 6d.

(2) *The Baptist Quarterly Review*. New York: Baptist Review Association. London: Trübner & Co. Price 75 cents.

(3) *The Homiletic Review*. May, 1889. Funk & Wagnalls, New York and London. Price 30 cents.

(4) *The Expositor*. Edited by Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A. Third series, vol. viii. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Price, 7s. 6d.