

FEBRUARY 1890.

The Theological Monthly

THE NAMES OF CHRIST.
AN ESSAY IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

CHAPTER I.

THE PAULINE USAGE.

I BELIEVE it possible to establish a criterion by which we may test Greek Testament MSS. and Versions, and which may be also applied in questions of authorship and the Higher Criticism, independently of the methods usually employed for this purpose. The Epistles of St. Paul chiefly furnish the materials by which this criterion is constructed, in *the various names which the Apostle gives to our Lord Jesus Christ*. It is well known that these names are very numerous and varied, and that the Apostle passes very suddenly from one to another. The number of designations is approximately as follows: *Jesus* 12, *Christ* (without the article) 118, *The Christ* (with article) 92, *Jesus Christ* 47, *Christ Jesus* 53, *The Lord* 143, *The Lord Jesus* 15, *The Lord Jesus Christ* 23, *Our Lord Jesus Christ* 52, *Christ Jesus the Lord* 9, *Son of God* 17—altogether about 580.¹

On a merely superficial examination of the Apostle's writings it might seem that the transition from one designation to another is arbitrary, and without any ascertainable reason. But careful investigation shows that this is certainly not the case; and we soon find *laws of usage which are never violated*. In reference to some of the titles, these laws can be so definitely laid down that as to many passages we are

¹ The number cannot be given with certainty on account of the numerous variations of the text.

entitled to say, Here it is impossible to substitute one name for another without violating the Apostle's usage.

To establish this, and to explain the method here proposed, I select in the first instance the two designations *Jesus Christ* and *Christ Jesus*. Here the component elements are the same, the difference is only in order of allocation; and yet there are many passages in which we are *quite certain* that St. Paul wrote "Christ Jesus," and not "Jesus Christ."

This is true of at least 44 passages in which the entire expression is "in Christ Jesus." The Apostle never wrote "in Jesus Christ."¹ In the places above referred to the documents are almost unanimous, the few variations found being chiefly between *in Christ Jesus* and *in Christ*. Together with this agreement of authorities there goes a constancy of signification. The words *in Christ Jesus* denote the Apostle's conception of that intimate, spiritual union which Christ's servants, though still living on the earth, have with their Divine Lord. A few examples will suffice. "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." "My fellow-workers in Christ Jesus." "Sanctified in Christ Jesus." "Ye are one in Christ Jesus." "The faithful in Christ Jesus."²

Why, then, does St. Paul never write "in Jesus Christ"? Because to him *Jesus Christ* is the product of history. This name denotes that historical Person who was first known as Jesus of Nazareth, afterwards accepted as the Messiah, who lived for a season amongst men, and is now removed from the sight of His followers to heaven. The examples, when we have excluded those in which the reading is doubtful, are comparatively few. They are 20 in number.³ In most of these the historical aspect is obvious,—as in Rom. v. 15, 17, where reference is made to the great fact of the redemption accomplished by "one man, Jesus Christ." So

¹ Gal. iii. 14, where the reading *in Jesus Christ* is well supported, is noticed later.

² Rom. viii. 1; xvi. 3; I Cor. i. 2; Gal. iii. 28; Ephes. i. 1.

³ Rom. i. 6, 8; ii. 16; iii. 22; v. 15, 17; xvi. 25, 27; I Cor. ii. 2; iii. 11; Gal. i. 1, 12; iii. 1, 22; Ephes. i. 5; Phil. i. 6, 11, 19; ii. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 8.

in 2 Tim. ii. 8 he writes : "Remember that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead." In other passages there is a reference to our Lord's second coming, but it is obviously the intention of the Apostle to emphasise the fact that the Jesus Christ of history will return to judge the world. Thus in Rom. ii. 16 he says that God will "judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ;" and in Phil. i. 6 he speaks of "the day of Jesus Christ." In Phil. ii. 11 he anticipates the time when all shall confess that "Jesus Christ is Lord." There are, it is true, other passages in which the historical reference is less obvious,—*e.g.*, those in which he writes of giving thanks to God, or glory to God, "through Jesus Christ," as in Rom. xvi. 27; but here we may readily believe that the great historical fact of redemption was present to the writer's mind. Our conclusion therefore is, that in St. Paul's writings "Jesus Christ" expresses an historical conception, and "Christ Jesus" a transcendental one.

In 1 Tim. i. 15 the statement that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" may seem at first in conflict with this conclusion. Here is plainly an historical fact referred to; but then it presupposes that the Person so designated had an existence before He appeared in this world, and the transcendental name is preferred. For similar reasons there is a very strong *a priori* presumption that the Apostle never could have written the words found in the Received Text of Ephes. iii. 9: "God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." He would not use a name which is the product of history to denote One who existed before history began.

Proceeding from the 44 examples already referred to, where the readings are undisputed and the meaning clearly established, I apply the conclusion hence obtained to 14 passages where the readings vary between "Jesus Christ" and "Christ Jesus" (in every instance in gen. case: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ or Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ). They are the following: Rom. i. 1; xv. 16; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Ephes. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 1 (a); iv. 6; 2 Tim. i. 1; ii. 3; Tit. i. 1; Philem. 1, 9. I contend that in all these passages the true reading is *Christ Jesus*, and not *Jesus Christ*. What are the

grounds of decision? In all these examples we have a genitive case dependent on a noun, and the combination expresses the relationship to their Lord of Christ's servants, who are severally designated as an *apostle, servant, soldier, prisoner of Christ Jesus*. Our argument is this: When the Apostle in the undisputed texts uses *Christ Jesus* in preference to *Jesus Christ*, he expresses his conception of one who is always invisibly present with His people, not of one removed from them; and we feel sure that he would delight to think of himself as a servant who constantly stood in the presence of his Lord, and did all his work under His eye. I say nothing at present as to the concurrence of the best authorities with this conclusion, or of their divergence from it; because the above judgment is formed wholly on *a priori* considerations, *without any regard to MSS. or Versions*: I neither count them nor weigh them.

I now take two other cases where a dependent genitive is employed, but the relation of servant to Lord is not expressed. The first is Phil. i. 8: "For God is my record, how greatly I long after you all in the bowels of Jesus Christ"—A.V. (*ἐν σπλάγχχνοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Text. Rec.). I believe it is simply impossible that St. Paul could have written this. He could not speak thus respecting Christ historically conceived of; but we can very readily believe that he did write according to the Revised Version, "How I long after you all in the tender mercies of Christ Jesus," thinking of our Lord as spiritually present among His people. The second example is 1 Tim. i. 1 (b), where, for a similar reason, I read with the Revisers, "Christ Jesus our hope": He who is ever with the Church as the abiding hope of the Church.

Next come three passages where I read *Christ Jesus* (*Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, still in the gen. case, but under the government of a preposition). They are 1 Tim. v. 21; vi. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 1: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ;" "I give thee charge in the sight of God . . . and before Christ Jesus;" "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ" (A.V.). Here the thought is the same in all cases. The Apostle thinks of himself as standing in the presence of his Lord, and

in that presence giving a charge to Timothy. All our previous conclusions lead us to say that he would prefer the designation *Christ Jesus* to *Jesus Christ*. In one of these it is found in the Received Text ; in the other two the readings vary between *Christ Jesus* and *the Lord Jesus Christ*. The question then arises, Why should he not use this latter designation? The answer is found in the fact that in the passages in which the reading "The Lord Jesus Christ" is undisputed, this fullest designation of honour is specially reserved by the Apostle to denote our Lord as now seated at the right hand of the Father, and as with the Father dispensing blessings to His Church. Thus we find it in the benediction in 2 Cor. xiii. 14, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ."¹ Therefore to have written "The Lord Jesus Christ" in these three places would have been contrary to the Apostle's usage.

In Ephes. ii. 20, where the A. V. reads, "Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone," the reading *Christ Jesus* (in Greek in gen. absolute) is to be preferred. The Apostle is speaking of a living temple constructed of living stones, the Apostles and New Testament prophets forming part of the structure, the Lord Himself being the chief corner-stone. Here again the Apostle's usage is decisive, because Christ is spoken of as in living union with His servants living on earth.

In 2 Cor. xiii. 5 the Received Text reads, "Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates." If our previous decisions hold good, we ought to read, "Christ Jesus is in you," because St. Paul is here *not* thinking of the Christ of history, but of the Divine Presence in the Church.²

On the other hand, I think that in Rom. viii. 34 the reading, "It is Christ Jesus that died," is less likely to be correct than that of the A. V., "It is Christ that died." *A priori* considerations may here be viewed as weighing one against another. We have first a reference to an event of history, but the writer immediately passes to the transcendental, and

¹ Comp. Rom. i. 7 ; v. 1, 21 ; 1 Cor. i. 3 ; 2 Cor. i. 2 ; Gal. i. 3.

² This passage and Rom. viii. 34 receive further notice in a later chapter.

speaks of our Lord as being "at the right hand of God." It will be seen by one of the tables appended to this essay that in this passage my conclusion has an imposing array of authorities against it. Nevertheless two considerations tell strongly against the reading *Christ Jesus*. (1) In no other passage in the Apostle's writings can we find an instance where *Christ Jesus* denotes the Christ of history. (2) When he does refer to our Lord's exaltation to the right hand of the Father and His continual abiding there, he prefers other designations. The one constant signification of *Christ Jesus* is—Christ with His believing people, in spiritual fellowship with them.

In Rom. xv. 5, where Christians are exhorted "to be like-minded one towards another, according to Christ Jesus," this reading of the A. V. and of the Revision is correct: the Christ present in the Church is the standard after which Christians are to fashion themselves. The passage is introduced here because the readings of MSS. differ. In Rom. vi. 11 the choice of readings lies between "in Christ Jesus" and "in Christ Jesus our Lord." Here usage is in favour of the shorter reading. We cannot say that St. Paul could not have used the fuller designation; but (1) It accords best with his usage to designate the union between the spiritual life of Christians and the life of their Lord by the phrase *in Christ Jesus* without further addition. (2) The designation *Christ Jesus the Lord* is comparatively rare in his writings. It occurs less than ten times, and it is not likely that St. Paul would employ it without some special reason.

Can we define the difference between the two names? Taking it for granted that *Christ Jesus* denotes the Divine Presence in the Church, what added meaning is conveyed by the added title? The answer is given by the Apostle's own words. In 2 Cor. iv. 5 he writes: "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake." Here we see that *Christ Jesus* is presented to us not only as present in the Church, the source of spiritual life to His people, but as the ever-present *Ruler* to whom all Christians owe allegiance. He is the *κύριος*; all Christians

are His δούλοι. If we examine all the other passages where *Christ Jesus the Lord* is found, this thought is apparent.¹ In Rom. vi. 23 the addition of "Lord" is explained by the fact that the whole of the latter half of this chapter dwells on the great truth that Christians are the *bondservants* of righteousness and of God. In Rom. viii. 39 the thought of service is not so obvious. But then the conception of Christ as our Lord not only suggests our obligation of service to Him, but also that of the almighty protection which He as Lord exercises over His people. This is very appropriate in Rom. viii. 39, after the enumeration of all the dangers to which Christ's servants are exposed. The same explanation will be found to apply to 1 Cor. xv. 31 (the next verse refers to "fighting with beasts at Ephesus"); and to Ephes. iii. 11, where immediately after this name follows a reference to the "boldness and access in confidence" which Christians have through their "faith in Him." In Phil. iii. 8 the thought of the Apostle's entire devotion to his Lord is prominent. In 1 Tim. i. 12 Christ appears as the Ruler in His Church, appointing to official service (εἰς διακονίαν) those whom He approves.

Let us see how these distinctions bear on some important instances of disputed reading, taken in the order in which they occur. In Acts xvi. 31 our choice lies between the readings: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," and "Believe on the Lord Jesus." The presumption here is in favour of the shorter reading. The fuller title was the result of the growth of knowledge and faith in the Church, and in the Acts of the Apostles only three certain examples of it are found (xi. 17; xv. 26; xxviii. 31). It seems very unlikely that St. Paul in addressing the jailor would use words requiring advanced knowledge and faith; but it is quite conceivable that he would say in effect, "Believe in Jesus—believe in Him as Lord."

In 2 Cor. i. 19 we read in both the Received and Revised Text, "The Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you." This reading is most probably correct, though

¹ The examples are Rom. vi. 23; viii. 39; 1 Cor. xv. 31; Ephes. iii. 11; Phil. iii. 8; Col. ii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 2, 12; 2 Tim. i. 2.

weighty authorities are opposed to it, and instead of "Jesus Christ" read "Christ Jesus." The presumption in favour of the historical title is not so strong here as it is in many other cases, because we cannot appeal to frequent and constant usage. But there is this objection to the reading "The Son of God, Christ Jesus," namely, that no higher designation can be given to Christ than "The Son of God:" it is transcendental, above all others. Now with this exalted Person it is the object of the Apostle to identify Him who, as *matter of history*, was proclaimed amongst the Corinthians; and all usage elsewhere shows that, with St. Paul, *Jesus Christ*, and not *Christ Jesus*, is the historical name. Were *Christ Jesus* adopted here, the identification would be not of transcendental with historical, but of transcendental with transcendental, which is improbable.

In 2 Cor. iv. 10, and Gal. vi. 17, we have to choose between the readings *Lord Jesus* and *Jesus*. In the A.V. the two verses read thus: "Always bearing about in the body the dying of *the Lord Jesus*, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body." "From henceforth let no man trouble me, for I bear in my body the marks of *the Lord Jesus*." In both cases we prefer, without any hesitation, the reading *Jesus*.

The reasons of this decision are found in St. Paul's use of *Jesus* where the reading is undoubted. The way in which the Apostle uses this name is very remarkable and exceedingly suggestive. Its occurrence in his Epistles is very rare when compared with its use in the Gospels. In the four Gospels, according to Bruder's Concordance, it is used about 600 times (Matt. 175; Mark 94; Luke 99; John 234). In St. Paul it occurs, according to the text of Westcott and Hort, 17 times;¹ in Acts about 40 times. The 17 passages named include the two under discussion; the other 15, of course, supply our rule for decision.

When we compare the use made of the name *Jesus* in the

¹ Rom. iii. 26; viii. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 3 (twice); 2 Cor. iv. 5; iv. 10 (twice); iv. 11 (twice); iv. 14; xi. 4; Gal. vi. 17; Ephes. iv. 21; Phil. ii. 10; 1 Thess. i. 10; iv. 14 (twice).

Pauline Epistles with that of the Gospels, and again with the much more frequent use of other names by St. Paul himself, two questions present themselves:—(1) Why did he use this name so rarely? and (2) Why did he use it at all when there are so many others which, as regards his writings at large, he uses in preference? A third question also will naturally occur:—Why are 9 out of the 17 examples found in the Epistles to the Corinthians, and 6 of these collected in one chapter? If we can give anything like probable answers to these questions, they must needs be of deep interest. I think we can.

First, why did St. Paul write "Jesus" so rarely? We find the answer in the fact that this name, before all others, is the *purely human* designation of Christ. By this name He was known at Nazareth, and was so designated by those who had no faith in His Messiahship. The living Jesus had never been an object of St. Paul's faith; and after he became a disciple he knew not our Lord "after the flesh." Hence it is that most commonly he prefers to give to our Lord some title which *implies faith* in His Messiahship and Divinity. The designation which he employs most frequently, more than 140 times, is *Lord*, which, in his use of it, implies that Christ is to Christians what the Jehovah of the Old Testament is to Jews.

Yet there are occasions on which the Apostle not only recognises the human aspect of Christ's person, but even delights to lay strong emphasis upon it. With what special purpose does he employ it? He prefers it when he has to say something respecting Christ which is true of the *human nature only*; or else he employs it to emphasise the fact that the now exalted Saviour in all His glory is still *man*, and the representative of our race. Illustrations of the first use are found in 2 Cor. iv.; in verses 5, 10, 11, 14 of this chapter occur 6 of the 17 instances given in the text of Westcott and Hort. In our Revised Version the four verses read thus: "We preach . . . Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. . . Always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body. For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our

mortal flesh. . . . He which raised up the Lord Jesus [variation in marg.] shall raise up us also with Jesus." Here the human nature of Christ is made prominent ; His death and resurrection are referred to, and the believer's hope of the resurrection is associated with, and made dependent on, faith in the resurrection of Christ.

The reason why so many of the instances are found in 2 Corinthians is probably this—a deep tone of sorrow runs through this Epistle. St. Paul felt that he had been despised and rejected by his own spiritual children at Corinth, and he turns with intense sympathy towards his Lord, and thinks of Him in his suffering and humiliation. How pathetic the words: "Always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus We which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake!" (2 Cor. iv. 10, 11). In such a connection it is every way likely that he would designate his Lord by that name which belongs especially to His earthly life, rather than by that which speaks of Him as the man glorified. A collateral argument for the shorter reading in 2 Cor. iv. 10 is the unquestioned use of "Jesus" in the same verse, and so often besides in the same chapter. For similar reasons we prefer in Gal. vi. 17 the reading "the marks of Jesus" to "the marks of the Lord Jesus."

The like explanation applies to 1 Thess. iv. 14. In this verse the margin of the Revised Version is certainly to be preferred to the text, and it reads thus: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep will God, through Jesus, bring with Him."

The Apostle's exaltation of our Lord's human nature is most conspicuous in Phil. ii. 9, 10, where it is placed in strong contrast with the deep humiliation of His earthly life, and of the death of the cross: "God gave unto Him the name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow."

St. Paul uses the name *Lord Jesus* somewhat sparingly. In the Received Text it occurs 17 times.¹ In the undisputed

¹ Rom. iv. 24 ; xiv. 14 ; 1 Cor. v. 5 ; vi. 11 ; xi. 23 ; 2 Cor. i. 14 ; iv. 10, 14 ; Gal. vi. 17 ; Ephes. i. 15 ; Ph. ii. 19 ; Col. iii. 17 ; 1 Thess. ii. 15 ; iv. 1, 2 ;

texts the humanity of our Lord is recognised, but it is the humanity exalted and glorified. In 1 Cor. xi. 23 we read: "The Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was betrayed," &c. Here the reference is to historical fact, and implies an acknowledgment that Jesus was the Messiah.

In 1 Thess. ii. 15 we read of the Jews: "Who both killed the Lord Jesus," &c. Here it might seem that our rule was violated, and that *Jesus* would be the more appropriate reading. But when we read the passage in Greek we do not find the two names joined together and forming one title, but "Lord" is placed in apposition with "Jesus," so that the most literal rendering is: "Who both killed the Lord, even Jesus" (*τῶν καὶ τὸν κύριον ἀποκτεινάντων Ἰησοῦν*).

In other passages we have to choose between the reading *Lord Jesus* and alternatives: for example, 1 Cor. ix. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 8. In 1 Cor. ix. 1, did St. Paul write, according to the Received Text, "Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" or "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" Here we decide at once for the latter, because (1) when the Apostle speaks of *seeing* Christ, he would naturally use the name belonging specially to His visible, human nature; and (2) because he refers to seeing Christ, not as living on earth, but as revealed from heaven, and would therefore naturally use the name employed elsewhere to denote the glorified man; while (3) He reserves the full title *Jesus Christ our Lord* for the invisible Divine Person at the right hand of God, the dispenser of grace. In 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 8 the Apostle is speaking of Christ's return to judge the world; and for the reasons just given we conclude that the reading *the Lord Jesus* is to be preferred in each case to any other. The thought expressed is that the *man* Jesus shall judge the world (as St. Paul says in Acts xvii. 31), but it is *the man glorified*.

There remain for notice three passages outside of St. Paul's Epistles, namely Heb. iii. 1;¹ 1 Peter v. 10, 14. In

2 Thess. i. 7; Philem. 5. The best editions exclude from this list 1 Cor. vi. 11; 2 Cor. iv. 10; Gal. vi. 17; and add to it 1 Cor. v. 4; ix. 1; xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 31; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 11, 13; 2 Thess. i. 8, 12; ii. 8.

¹ The authorship of this Epistle will be discussed in a later chapter.

these the Received Text reads *Christ Jesus*, which is intrinsically improbable, because in places where the reading is unquestioned this designation is never used by any writer but St. Paul.¹

We have now reviewed the passages, 36 in number, in which there is the most marked variation of reading. What value should be attached to the readings which we have chosen on presumptive evidence must be left to the judgment of the reader. The coincidence of our conclusions with the text of the most trustworthy editions and manuscripts is certainly remarkable, and serves, at least provisionally, to confirm the soundness of the principle on which we are proceeding. In no instance do the three MSS. \aleph A B combine against my conclusion, and \aleph B nowhere oppose it together. The strongest amount of opposition (excluding Tit. i. 1) is encountered by the reading adopted in Rom. viii. 34. Here, however, the reading we prefer is adopted by Tregelles, and has the support of the MSS. B D E K, and of the two Syriac Versions.

It may be observed in regard to all such passages :

1. That theological prepossessions were not likely to influence the minds of transcribers or translators. There is only one passage where such prepossessions can be supposed to have had weight, namely, 2 Thess. ii. 8, where the choice of readings is between "whom the Lord shall destroy" or "whom the Lord Jesus shall destroy." The latter reading is to be preferred, both on *a priori* and on documentary grounds.

2. The ancient Versions may be regarded in all these passages as primary witnesses. Not having to *translate* the names *Jesus* and *Christ*, but only to transliterate them, they show the readings of their exemplars as certainly as if they were copies in Greek. It may of course be said that probably in some cases the translators failed through inadvertence to reproduce the readings which they found; but then this applies equally to copyists.

¹ It is possible that in Acts xxiv. 24 *Christ Jesus* is the true reading. But if so, it should be remembered that the writer was a companion of St. Paul, and that the words used refer to the Apostle's doctrine.

The following table will show precisely the measure of agreement between the readings which we have adopted on internal grounds and those of the most approved Editors.

EXAMINATION OF 36 PASSAGES.

| Passages. | Adopted. | Received Text. | Revised Text. ¹ | Tischendorf. | Westcott and Hort. | Tregelles. |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------|
| Acts xvi. 31. ... | K. Ἰησοῦν | K. Ἰ. Χριστόν | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Rom. i. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰ. Χριστοῦ | X | ... | X | ... |
| „ vi. 11. ... | ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ. | ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. τ. Κυρ. ἡ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ viii. 34. | Χριστός | Χριστός | X | X | X | ... |
| „ xv. 5. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦν | Χρ. Ἰησοῦν | ... | ... | ... | X |
| „ xv. 16. ... | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1 Cor. i. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ | X | ... | X | ... |
| „ ix. 1. | Ἰησ. τ. Κ. | Ἰησ. Χρ. τ. Κ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 2 Cor. i. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ i. 19. | Ἰησ. Χριστός | Ἰησ. Χριστός | ... | X | X | ... |
| „ iv. 10. ... | τοῦ Ἰησοῦ | τ. Κυρ. Ἰησ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ xiii. 5. ... | Χρ. Ἰησοῦς | Ἰησ. Χρ. | X | ... | X | ... |
| Gal. vi. 17. | τοῦ Ἰησοῦ | τ. Κυρ. Ἰησ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Ephes. i. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ ii. 20. ... | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ iii. 9. ... | ομι. διὰ Ἰ. Χτοῦ | διὰ Ἰ. Χτοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Phil. i. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ i. 8. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Col. i. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1 Thess. ii. 19. ... | Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χτοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ iii. 13. ... | Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χτοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 2 Thess. ii. 8. ... | ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς | ὁ Κύριος | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1 Tim. i. 1 (a). ... | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χτοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ i. 1 (b). ... | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Κυρ. Ἰησ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ iv. 6. ... | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ v. 21. ... | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Κυρ. Ἰ. Χτοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ vi. 13. ... | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Χρ. Ἰησ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 2 Tim. i. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ ii. 3. | Χρ. Ἰησοῦ | Ἰησ. Χτοῦ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ iv. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησ. | τ. Κυρ. Ἰ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Titus i. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησ. | Ἰησ. Χρ. | X | X | X | X |
| Philem. 1. | Χρ. Ἰησ. | Χρ. Ἰησ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| „ 9. | Χρ. Ἰησ. | Ἰησ. Χρ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Heb. iii. 1. | Ἰησοῦν | Χρ. Ἰησοῦν | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1 Peter v. 10. ... | ἐν Χριστῷ | ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ. | ... | ... | ... | X |
| „ v. 14. ... | ἐν Χριστῷ | ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ. | ... | ... | ... | ... |

¹ All instances in which an Editor does not agree with the reading that has been adopted in the preceding pages are indicated in this table by the sign X. It should be said that Χριστός Ἰησοῦς stands in Westcott and Hort's margin in Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 5:—Χρ. [Ἰησ.] in Titus i. 1:—Ἰησ. Χρ. in Rom. xv. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 13. In Rom. viii. 34 these Editors admit Ἰησοῦς with doubt; similarly in 2 Thess. ii. 8. Tregelles gives a place in his margin to Χρ. Ἰησ. in 2 Cor. i. 19; and to Ἰησ. Χρ. in 1 Tim. vi. 13.

B. HELLIER (The late).

N.B.—The proof-sheets of this article were corrected by the Rev. W. F. Moulton, D.D., and the Rev. George Findlay, B.A., who have carefully tested all the references.

WHAT IS OF FAITH IN REGARD TO THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION ?

THE object of this paper is to develop, as briefly as possible, an argument on which I touched in my paper at the late Church Congress, but which the limits to which I was then confined did not permit me to treat fully. It will take the form of an inquiry into what is generally known as the doctrine of the Apostolical succession. That doctrine, as usually held, has found apt expression in the words of the well-known hymn—

“ His twelve Apostles first He made
His ministers of grace ;
And they their hands on others laid
To fill in turn their place.
“ So, age by age, and year by year,
His Church was handed on.”

I desire to investigate the historical authority for this statement, and to discover whether the rule here mentioned can be shown to have existed from the beginning of the Gospel, or whether it is to be regarded simply as an ancient and pious practice of great antiquity, most valuable as affording sufficient evidence of the validity of an appointment to the Episcopal office, and of the general acceptance of such appointment by the Church. It is obviously a matter of some consequence to know whether the practice in question be simply a venerable custom, or whether it be an *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*. If it is laid down as one of the first and most necessary principles of the Christian Church, it is of the highest importance to know upon what evidence it rests. If that evidence can be shown to be doubtful, the result will be a great simplification of some ecclesiastical controversies. In particular, the whole question of the historical continuity of our Church is placed on a broader basis, and the question of our intercommunion with the Scandinavian Churches is settled. We need no longer

spend time in disproving the Nag's Head story, or in proving that Barlow was legally and canonically consecrated. If the presbyters in the English and Scandinavian Churches were canonically ordained, the elevation of one of their number to the Episcopate was a lawful, if not, under ordinary circumstances, a desirable act; and however useful such a precaution might be to avoid mistake or scandal, there needed not the imposition of Episcopal hands to make such an Episcopate valid. I am not sanguine enough to suppose that any immediate effect will be produced by the re-discussion of this question; but these are days of candid investigation into facts and first principles. These are days when many historical illusions are dissipated, and many theories, once very firmly held, are discovered, when confronted with facts, to be without foundation. It may be that this doctrine of the Apostolical succession, when propounded to us as a necessary principle of the Church of Christ, may ultimately be found to rest upon slenderer grounds than has usually been supposed. It may be discovered that it stands upon the same basis as other ancient customs which the Church of later ages has, in her wisdom, seen fit to abandon without prejudice to her catholicity.¹ It is not proposed that she should abandon this one, for there are many strong reasons why she should retain it most carefully; but it is one thing to hold fast most strictly to a practice; it is quite another when the practice is practically elevated to the position of an article of faith.

We may, in the first place, remark that the doctrine of the necessity of Episcopal consecration to a valid Episcopate is not merely pressed upon us from a purely historical point of view; it recommends itself to many minds on grounds of ecclesiastical fitness. The reason why it has been maintained so generally, and with such eagerness, cannot be better expressed than in the words of the Bishop of Manchester's late charge.² That able, acute, and fair-minded prelate has put it in these words, "Our Church believes, in one word, that mission comes from above, from the Lord Jesus through His

¹ See, for instance, the practice referred to in p. 92, note 1.

² Primary Charge of the Bishop of Manchester, 1889.

Apostles, and those to whom the Apostles committed the right to bestow it; not from below, from the people, or those who occupy the other orders in the ministry." The doctrine that authority comes from above and not from below is incontestable; but there is a great temptation to frame our ecclesiastical theories on grounds of abstract symmetry rather than to rest them on direct historical proof. The truth, however, that mission comes from above and not from below is in no way endangered, even if we should fail to establish, as an historical fact, the assertion that in early times the mission to the Episcopal office was in every case transmitted to the candidate for the Episcopate by one already in Episcopal orders.

It will be observed that, in the passage we have quoted, the Bishop of Manchester tacitly assumes that the Episcopate and the Presbyterate are different orders in the Church of God. That this is, in some sense, the case cannot be denied. Our own Ordinal asserts it as an "evident" fact to those who have studied Holy Scripture and ancient authors. But an ambiguity lurks in the word "order." Distinction of position and dignity there unquestionably is. Whether there be an essential distinction in character and powers is quite a different question. The learned Roman Catholic writer, Morinus,¹ tells us that in the Roman Church four opinions existed on this point, one, and not the best supported of which, is usually taken for granted in our own. The first taught that consecration to the Episcopate did *not* impress a distinct character, and that the Episcopate was not, strictly speaking, a different order to the one below it. The opinion of the majority of the schoolmen was, we learn, "*Episcopatum per se nihil aliud dicere quam officium, dignitatem, potestatem, auctoritatem, sacerdoti datam multo ampliolem et augustiorem per consecrationem Episcopalem.*" This is the view of Hugo à S. Victore, Alexander Hales, Bonaventure, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas, and Scotus leans to the same opinion. The opposite opinion, that the Episcopate impresses a distinct character on the recipient, is only supported by one man

¹ *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, Part 3, Ex. 3, ch. i.

of mark, the learned Jesuit writer, Estius. Durandus invented a third theory by way of accommodation, to the effect that the offices were not twofold, nor yet exactly the same, but that the bishop has perfectly what the presbyter has imperfectly. A writer named Vasquez has attempted another method of accommodation, namely, that the two orders are the same, but that their powers differ in reference to things without. This is the view Morinus himself is inclined to embrace. In a subsequent chapter he shows that a large number of the fathers held with the majority of the schoolmen on this matter; and among them he cites Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Firmilian, Ambrose, Jerome, Hilary the deacon (whose testimony, however, as a Luciferian, is supposed to have but little weight), Chrysostom, Augustine, Theodoret, Bede, Alcuin, and others.¹ The language of the first three of these authorities is not very distinct on the point. That of Jerome, which is very express, will be discussed below. But it will be allowed that the *consensus* of authority in favour of identity of order, in the fuller sense of the word, is overwhelming, combined as it is with the silence of many of the fathers, and the comparatively slender array of authorities cited on the other side.² The language of Ambrose, Augustine (combined with that of one or two writers of earlier date whose works have been cited as his), and Chrysostom is as strong as that of Jerome. Thus the argument *a priori* for the necessity of the laying on of Episcopal hands to the validity of an Episcopal consecration is materially weakened by the fact that so many

¹ Anselm's words are very noteworthy, coming from so renowned and energetic a member of the Episcopal body. He says that bishops are greater than priests, rather by custom than by actual Divine institution. See his commentary on the Epistle to Titus, ch. i. It may not be out of place to ask, How many, even of our clergy, are aware that among the seven orders recognised in the Roman Church, that of bishops is not to be found? See the *Canons of the Council of Trent*, Session 23. In spite of the distinct assertion of the high dignity of bishops continued in those canons, there is no *order*, according to them, above that of the priesthood.

² Morinus mentions that some authorities held that a presbyter had power to ordain if commissioned thereto by a bishop, and Hugo à S. Victore held that he could do so under commission from the Pope.

distinguished doctors of the Church have declared for a privilege of rank rather than what is properly known as *order* in the ministry. There is much support for the opinion that the bishop was no more than the perpetual president of the Church. It is even incorrect to say that the power of ordaining to the priesthood belongs to him alone. For the universal custom to which our own practice bears witness, was that the presbyters should be associated with the bishop in that function. It is, therefore, at least antecedently possible that the solemn setting apart of a presbyter to preside over his brethren, with the consent of the Church, and with "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," may involve as full a communication of grace and power, and "mission" from above for that office, as the laying on of Episcopal hands themselves. There is a further consideration which strengthens this position. It will be conceded that in the Roman Catholic communion the Pope is practically a distinct order by himself.¹ It will be further conceded that in that communion power is supposed to come, not from beneath, but from above. This being so, how is the Pope consecrated to his office? On the theory which has just been mentioned, it would follow that he must be consecrated or at least appointed to it by his predecessor. We know that this is not the fact. The election by the Cardinals, followed by a solemn ceremony of installation, is all that is required in order to a valid appointment to what is regarded as immeasurably the highest office in the Church of God. It does not seem necessary that the consent of the Church at large to so important an appointment should even be asked. We could not have a clearer proof that the axiom, "none but a bishop can make a bishop," is not self-evident, than the indisputable fact that it is not held that none but a Pope can make a Pope.

We are at present concerned, not with the necessity of Bishops in the Church—an opinion supported by the decisive language of Ignatius, the friend and pupil of the Apostles upon the point—but with the mode of their appointment. It must

¹ Apparently not theoretically. See the Canons of Trent cited above.

be confessed that the evidence of the universal necessity of the imposition of Episcopal hands to the validity of such appointment is by no means so strong as has been supposed. I can find no such evidence whatever throughout the whole of the second century. Irenæus is usually cited as a witness. It has generally been supposed that the doctrine of the Apostolic succession—that is, the transmission of the Episcopal character through the laying on of Episcopal hands—is established by the well-known passage, in which he traces the Episcopal succession in the Churches from his own time to that of the Apostles, mentioning, as he does, each link in the chain.¹ But unfortunately an ambiguity lurks in the word “succession” here, which has misled those who have used it. The Episcopal character could not have been conveyed by any one of the Bishops named to his successor, for the simple reason that he was in all probability dead before that successor was appointed. Thus Irenæus proves what he wishes to prove by his list of bishops, namely, the continuity of the community over which they presided. But he cannot, for the reason given above, be cited as establishing the doctrine of the transmission of the Episcopal character by the imposition of Episcopal hands.

An important passage in Tertullian (*de Praescriptione Haereticorum*, chap. xxxii.) has been similarly misinterpreted. He demands the original records of the Churches in which certain opinions have arisen. He insists that such Churches, before they can present a title to be heard, should unfold the roll of their bishops, and show that the first had had for his “ordainer and predecessor”² some one of the Apostles or Apostolic men. Here we have, it is true, the fact that the deceased prelate must have ordained or appointed his suc-

¹ *Iren. Adv. Haer.* iii. 3. He speaks first of the “successions of the Churches” (*successiones ecclesiarum*), and then specially of the Church of Rome, as the best depository of tradition, partly because of the fact that to Rome, being the metropolis of the Empire, persons resorted from all parts of the world, and partly because the successions of the bishops proved that this Church had existed as a continuous society from the Apostles’ times to those in which he wrote. It is impossible to extract more than this from what he says.

² *Auctorem et Antecessorem.*

cessor. But ordained him to what? To the Episcopate? No, for the see was not vacant while its occupant lived. He must have ordained his successor to the *priesthood*, and that successor must have been elevated to the Episcopate after his death. It was a rule, attested by at least as strong testimony as the consecration of bishops by Episcopal hands, and possibly more ancient, though we regard it as no longer binding, that the bishop should be elected from among the clergy of the vacant see.¹

The question, then, stands thus: Of the fact of the universal existence of the Episcopate in the second century there can be little doubt. But of what was supposed to constitute a valid appointment to the office during that century we have no information whatever. We know, of course, that the Apostles appointed Timothy and Titus to preside over the Churches in Ephesus and Crete. Irenæus tells us in the passage cited above that they also appointed Linus to Rome and Polycarp to Smyrna.² But how their successors were appointed we are not told. No details on this important point are to be found till the time of Cyprian, about the middle of the third century.³ But even then the information given us is very scanty. We know that by this time the neighbouring bishops came in to take part in the appointment.⁴ We know that laying on of hands formed part of the ceremony,⁵ as indeed would be almost certain from the Apostolic practice. But whether the laying on of Episcopal hands was necessary, or only extremely desirable, we are not told.

¹ See Bingham, *Antiquities*, Book II., chap. x. sec. 2, who quotes Cyprian, Julius of Rome, Celestine, Pope Hilary, and Leo the Great in support of this having been the "common rule and canon of the Church."

² Clement of Alexandria, in his *Quis Dives Salvetur*, also tells us that the Apostles appointed Bishops in various places. So Tertullian, *De Praesc. Haer.*, cited above.

³ Cypr. Ep. xl. (Oxf. xlv.), xli. (Oxf. xlv.), li. (Oxf. lv.), liv. (Oxf. lix.).

⁴ It seems strange, if the presence of neighbouring Bishops was so necessary, that neither Ignatius, nor Polycarp, writing about the martyrdom of Ignatius, should say anything about it.

⁵ Epistle of Cornelius to Cyprian. No. xlv. (Oxf. xlix.) of Epistles of Cyprian. See also Ep. lxxvii., *episcoporum iudici episcopatus ei deferretur et manus ei in locum Basilidis imponerentur.*

When Cyprian, in his letter to Antonianus, so full of information on matters relating to the ecclesiastical discipline of that day, mentions the things necessary to a valid election, he confines himself to the "Dei et Christi iudicium," the "clericorum testimonium," the "plebis suffragium," and the "collegium sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum." This last phrase is probably explained in another passage in the same letter to be the "co-episcoporum testimonium." He also mentions the vacancy of the see, and its filling up by the election of Cornelius. But we do not read of the formal imposition of Episcopal hands as necessary to the validity of the consecration,¹ although from the letter of Cornelius himself we know that in his case it formed part of the rite. Cyprian, it is true, in his sixty-seventh Epistle, mentions the custom, as "handed down from Divine tradition and Apostolic observance," that all the bishops of a province should assemble in order to a due celebration of the rite of consecration. Yet he only states that this took place "in almost all the provinces" ("fere per provincias universas"). What course was adopted in the provinces which did not follow this rule, whether any bishops or none at all were present, he does not say. And it may be questioned whether such an ecclesiastical organisation as the province was in existence in Apostolic times. It therefore appears at least probable that, however desirable it may have been for the prevention of misunderstandings that the neighbouring bishops should take part in the consecration, the doctrine of the absolute necessity for their presence in order to a valid conveyance of "mission" had not yet been formulated. Other considerations combine to make it doubtful whether this doctrine of the imparting of the Episcopal character solely through the imposition of Episcopal hands was as yet universally recognised. Thus Cyprian tells Cornelius that in his case it would have been quite sufficient for him to have communicated by letter the fact that he had been "made bishop,"²

¹ See Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*.

² *Episcopum factum*. Ep. xli. ad Cornelium (Oxf. xlv.).

such having been the ancient custom, but that the existence of dissensions about the election made it desirable that such notification should be accompanied by the testimony of the bishops who were present at the ordination. There is again, therefore, room for doubt whether the presence of the bishops was regarded as actually necessary for the validity of the consecration, or only as eminently desirable as a testimony of the fact that the election had been duly made. Whether hands were laid upon Novatian at his election or not, Cyprian does not tell us. But we learn from a letter of Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch, which Eusebius has preserved,¹ that so necessary was it that bishops should be present, that three ignorant men were sent for from the farthest parts of Italy to be present at, and no doubt to perform, the consecration. We observe further that Cornelius, in the epistle just cited, regards the consecration as performed by the laying on of the bishops' hands. This is, of course, sufficient evidence that by A.D. 250, at Rome and Carthage, and in "nearly all the provinces," the presence of bishops, and their participation in the rite of consecration, was regarded as of the utmost importance. But this is far from a demonstration of the proposition that the laying on of Episcopal hands is an invariable and necessary concomitant of a valid Episcopal appointment.

Thus the testimony of Cyprian and his contemporaries, the fullest we have, shows that the presence of neighbouring bishops at, and their participation in, a consecration was usual, and that it was most useful; but that is all. Even the fourth canon of the Council of Nicæa, though it requires the presence of three bishops at a consecration, does not prescribe the laying on of hands as an essential feature of the ceremony.² The Apostolical Canons and Constitutions are the

¹ *Ecc. Hist.* vi. 43.

² Mr. Gore, in his reply to Mr. Hatch's *Bampton Lectures*, endeavours to prove that *χειροτονία* necessarily means imposition of hands. It would be difficult, however, to deny that it is often used in the sense of election by show of hands. And how, on this view, would Mr. Gore translate 2 Cor. viii. 19? Would he insist that the brother in question was ordained by imposition of hands on the part of the Churches to accompany St. Paul with the offerings for the poor saints at Jerusalem?

only documents of early date which prescribe consecration by Episcopal hands. They require the presence of two, if not of three bishops; and when three cannot be obtained, they prescribe that the others should signify their consent. But, as is generally known, it is impossible to ascertain the date of every particular canon in that collection. That from about the fourth century Episcopal consecration was the invariable rule throughout the Church is not for a moment disputed. The only question raised is whether the Vincentian canon, "quod semper," applies to this rule, whether it is of universal and paramount necessity, or whether, like many other doctrines which have obtained a pretty general acceptance among ourselves, it is the growth of later ages. The question is by no means an easy one to settle. Every student of ecclesiastical history knows the passage in St. Jerome's letter to Evangelus, in which he states that when a vacancy occurred in the see of Alexandria it was the custom for the presbyters to meet and elect his successor, whom they thus made bishop, just as the soldiers by their election made an emperor, or the deacons an archdeacon. No one contends more vigorously than Morinus that such language excludes all possibility that any further ceremony was considered necessary by Jerome for a valid appointment.¹ The Alexandrian customs seem to have been altogether very remarkable. Liberatus, Archdeacon of Carthage, tells us, in his book published about the year 549, how in the fifth century, at the time of the candidature of Theodosius for the Patriarchate, the custom was that the patriarch elect should keep watch over the body of his predecessor, that he should lay his hands on his head,² should bury him with his own hands, and should himself take the pallium of St. Mark from his neck, after which he was regarded as his successor.

¹ Morinus *De Sac. Ord.* Nulla oratio, nulla ceremonia, nulla verborum formula usurpata fuerit.

² Bingham translates as if the living patriarch used to lay his hands on the head of the dead one. But the Latin is equally susceptible of the opposite interpretation, namely, that the dead man's hand was placed on the head of the living one, which seems infinitely more probable.

In later times the imposition of hands became the universal rule. Every known Greek and Latin and even Syriac rite seems to have included it. So universal has it become that its omission would throw the greatest suspicion on the validity of a consecration. But while we should, no doubt, hold most firmly to a rite so ancient, so practically useful, and so widely spread; while we should do well to discourage any deviations from it, we may nevertheless not unreasonably contend that we are not entitled to question the validity of every consecration, under circumstances however exceptional, which did not take place by the imposition of Episcopal hands. We do not deny the doctrine of Apostolical succession by so doing. We simply alter its form. It is traced through the presbyters, not through the bishops. Every presbyter received ordination at the hands of some bishop. He in turn received his ordination at the hands of some other chief pastor of the Church of God, and so the chain of continuity is traced up to the Apostles themselves. The continuity of the Church is equally vindicated either way, but perhaps a little more securely on the principles which have been here advocated than on those which, regarded as a universal rule, we have treated as open to doubt. For the necessity of an Episcopate is in no way invalidated by what has been said. Neither have we asserted the possibility of obtaining holy orders by an ordination in which the bishop has no share. But if from any untoward circumstances Episcopal consecration should not be able to be procured, we have contended that the chain of ecclesiastical continuity would not necessarily be broken. It seems at least probable, according to the opinion of many famous doctors of the Church, that a presbyter solemnly elected to preside over a Church, with the consent of its members, is a true and valid bishop, however unusual such a mode of designation to the office may have become, for excellent reasons, in later times. We speak, be it once more explained, of no individual action dictated by private judgment. Our remarks are confined to the public election and installation by a Church of its own chief pastor. Such a view as has been here maintained would

not justify a Wesley in presuming to send out bishops to America. It would not justify any presbyter of our own times in presuming to consecrate a bishop or ordain a priest. It would not justify the Church of England in setting aside the wise provisions of her Ordinal. It would only enable us to deal with difficult and disputed cases on wider principles than those on which many of us are inclined to act at present. It would enable us, as has been hinted above, to give the Scandinavian Churches the benefit of the doubt which at present is supposed to be fatal to their orders. And it would generally enable us to deal with the question of reunion in a simpler and less technical spirit. The truth is, that the whole subject of what is *de fide* requires to be more carefully considered. There is too much of private opinion and too little of definite Church authority in our utterances on this point at present. Some suppose that whatever has been generally believed for centuries is binding on the Christian conscience for ever after. Others quote the Fathers indiscriminately for their belief, making little distinction between a father of the first and a father of the twelfth century. Even Bingham, valuable as his work is, cites fathers of the first six centuries "in most admired disorder." We need a more careful historical treatment of the development of ecclesiastical doctrine and practice, a more distinct recognition of the fact that nothing can be regarded as an article of the Christian faith which has not been explicitly taught as such from the very first. Then at least we should be free from the reproach of practically maintaining as an article of faith that which is contained in no creed, has been laid down in no Œcumenical Council,¹ and can be proved by no distinct and irrefragable evidence from the records of the early Church—the proposition that the consecration of a bishop must in every case, and under any circumstances whatsoever, be performed by the laying on of Episcopal hands.

J. J. LIAS.

¹ The fourth canon of the Council of Nicæa (1) lays down a rule, but does not explain what will be the result of disobeying it; and (2) the canons of an Œcumenical Council are ecclesiastical regulations of high authority, but they are not articles of faith.

THE COUNTERFEIT IN CHURCH FINANCE AND CHRISTIAN GIVING.

A DISTINGUISHED writer—the late Lord Lytton—has said, “Never treat money affairs with levity : money is character.” And it is undoubted that some of the noblest qualities of human nature—as, for example, honesty, justice, prudence, benevolence, and self-sacrifice—are exhibited in the right use of money ; while, on the other hand, many of the meanest and worst vices—such as avarice, extravagance, dishonesty, and selfishness—are associated with its abuse, an abuse which perverts money into “the mammon of unrighteousness.” The handling of money enters so constantly into the engagements, duties, and common interests of life, that if we had the opportunity of examining the details of any man’s income and expenditure, and comparing these with the domestic and social claims upon him, we should be able to form a tolerably accurate estimate of his moral character.

And, if this is true as regards the individual, it is true also as regards society at large, and in particular that important section of society which goes by the name of the Christian Church. It is necessary that the Church should receive a steadily flowing revenue of material resources for the support of the machinery with which she works in order to the conversion of the world. With the aid of gold and silver alone it is possible for her to build churches and colleges, and to maintain ministers and missionaries. From a consideration, accordingly, of her methods and practices both of getting and spending money we may arrive at a fair and just judgment both as to the soundness of her moral tone and the strength of her spiritual life.

The principles of Christian giving are set forth in all parts of the Bible with great plainness of speech. The Divine law of Church finance is placarded so prominently both in the Old Testament and the New that “he may run that readeth it.” The foundation-principle upon which the

believer is to rest all his giving, and on which a congregation ought to build all its monetary arrangements, is that of *God's proprietorship and man's stewardship*. The Lord is the real Owner of every redeemed soul, and of all within him and about him that is capable of being employed in the Lord's service. His property belongs to the Lord; it is a sacred trust, which he is to dispose in accordance with the Lord's will. He is to be ready at all times to return to God those blessings which His good Providence originally conferred. This doctrine of stewardship is "the head corner-stone" of the temple of Christian beneficence.

The other foundation-stones are familiar to us all. Our giving, if it is to be Scriptural, must fulfil certain conditions which the sacred writers uniformly insist upon. It ought to be *spontaneous* or voluntary. In this respect it should resemble the offerings of Israel at Mount Sinai for the erection of the Tabernacle, or those for the building of the Temple in the days of David, or those for the repair of the House of God in the time of Joash. The Lord's law is, "Freely ye have received, freely give;" and He will not stoop to accept what is given "grudgingly or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver." Again, our giving ought to be *systematic* and proportionate. We should have a definite plan in the amount and measure of what we give. What we offer for God's acceptance is to be proportionate to what we have received from Him: it must be "the firstfruits of all our increase." Moses ordained with reference to the three great annual feasts—"None shall appear before the Lord empty: every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which He hath given thee." And Paul in like manner said to the Corinthians, "Let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." Once more, our giving ought to be *sacrificial*. God "spared not His own Son," and we make but a poor return when we give only what we can easily spare. We must not offer to Him "of that which doth cost us nothing." We are cheerfully to contribute to Christ's cause such amounts as will involve us in sacrifice. "Honour the Lord with thy substance"—not with

thy loose change. The blessing which there shall not be room enough to receive is poured out in richest measure upon those Churches which practise liberality, "to their power, yea, and beyond their power;" as well as upon every poor widow who "of her penury has cast in all the living that she had." There is only Christian giving where there is the spirit of self-sacrifice. Our beneficence is to symbolise the complete surrender of the soul to the Lord.

It is also fundamental and vital that we keep constantly in view the fact that giving of our substance to the cause of Christ is at once an important *act of worship* and a precious *means of grace*. Instead of being a necessary evil, it is a spiritual good. So far from being a secular function, it is to be inspired by love to the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour, and it ought to be both in matter and manner an adequate expression of gratitude for the blessings of His redemption. God requires us to devote a portion of our money to sacred uses, as one main means of keeping us near to Himself, and making us like Him.

Such being the foundation-principles of Christian liberality, it seems to follow as a matter of course that the methods of finance which the Church practises should all be of such a kind as to "adorn the doctrine," and not to contradict or caricature it. She should not regard any of the precepts of Holy Writ which bear upon forms of giving as merely "counsels of perfection," but should earnestly strive to recommend and practise them. Her financial methods should be such as are either directly authorised in the New Testament, or are at least in manifest harmony with the great spiritual principles of Christian beneficence that are enunciated there. To say that some presently employed modes are more or less directly opposed to Bible teaching and example is not to bring a railing accusation against any denomination in particular, for all sections of the Church unfortunately are to a greater or smaller extent involved in the same condemnation.

Our purpose in this article is briefly to criticise some of the most prevalent forms of Christian giving which are prac-

tised in our time. We shall not make any reference to the State-Church system of ecclesiastical finance ; but shall deal only with the questionable and sometimes discreditable methods which are so generally employed by all the various Churches, and even by those among them who inveigh most loudly against what they call the sin and scandal of the State patronage and support of the Church. The task may seem an ungracious one, for we have received many of these methods by tradition from our fathers, and some of the most hallowed associations of our Church life may be intertwined with the practice of them. But it is a duty, notwithstanding, to bring all our ecclesiastical usages in every department to the bar of Holy Scripture ; and our criticism of these may be altogether honest and faithful without being at all conducted in an ungenial or unsympathetic spirit.

We shall consider first those financial modes which are usually adopted for obtaining the funds which the Church requires for her ordinary every-day purposes.

There is one method, happily also in universal use, which has the merit of being thoroughly Scriptural. This is, of course, the offering for the support of ordinances which the worshipper *brings with him to the house of prayer* Sabbath after Sabbath. The recorded practice of both the Old Testament Church and of the early New Testament Church gives its authority to this observance. The Jews were long ago instructed to "bring an offering, and come into His courts ;" while the first Christian disciples not only "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching," but also in "fellowship" (*κοινωνία*) with one another ; and this fellowship included not only acts of common worship, but—in connection with these—the making of the collection or contribution to the Church fund, and for the relief of the poor. Giving to God is thus associated with public worship, and forms a part of it. The Scottish custom, however, of receiving the collection at the church door as the congregation assembles is undoubtedly open to the objection that such an arrangement tends to divorce the offering from direct connection with the service, instead of helping the people to regard it as an integral part

of the worship. Under such circumstances, indeed, the wonder will be if many of the worshippers do not forget that the contribution is in its ideal purpose a spiritual offering, and come to regard it as merely a small secular donation towards meeting congregational expenses. We fear that north of the Tweed still, as at Burns's "Holy Fair" a century ago, the sight of Black-bonnet the elder standing over the collection-plate¹ in the porch too often suggests the thought, "We are expected to pay here." And a still more serious defect consists in the fact that most congregations throughout the United Kingdom persist in looking to the daily offering as only one of various available sources of Church income, and one moreover which in itself could never be made sufficient as a means of provision for all congregational necessities. Having but little faith in the Lord's method of systematic and proportionate beneficence, we supplement our appeal for free-will offerings put into the collection-plate, by the invention of methods in connection with which the coercion of the will is but thinly disguised, and which may be described as ecclesiastical force-pumps to raise money. Indeed, the very expression "to raise money" is significant of departure from Bible principles and observances. And we need not wonder that the treasury of the Church tends to run low, and that her finances are frequently in a critical state, so long as we practise methods for obtaining funds which, either in their own nature or in the circumstances which we associate with them, are not in strict harmony with the principles of the Word of God.

Let us first take the *Pew-Rent* system. It ought not to be difficult to show that this mode of contribution offends against the great Bible principles to which we have appealed. Individuals, of course, may and do sometimes associate the thought of an offering to God with the giving of money for the support of the Gospel ministry in the form of a pew-rent.

¹ "When by the plate we set our nose
Weel heapèd up wi' ha'pence,
A greedy glower Black-bonnet throws,
And we maun draw our tippence."

—Robert Burns's "Holy Fair," 1786.

But the tendency of this method of finance, as such, is not to encourage devout thoughts. In itself the seat-rent is a secular contribution to the Church's exchequer, and not a spiritual one. It is a commercial payment rather than a Christian offering. Both the Free Church of Scotland and the United Presbyterian Church take this view of the matter; for, in the former, the Deacons' Court, which has charge of all the congregation's secular affairs, appropriates the sittings, and determines whether there shall be seat-rents or not, and if there be, what the rates shall be per sitting; while in the United Presbyterian Church the letting of the seats and the collection of the seat-rents are committed in like manner by a congregational committee of management. The idea underlying this arrangement seems to be that the seat-rent is a tax or assessment levied upon the basis of the space which the worshipper occupies within the Lord's house; and that it is his duty to pay his pew-rent periodically for the same reason that he pays his house-rent—that is, he owes the Church the market-price of the accommodation which it provides in order to place him within hearing of the Gospel. If this be the correct theory of the seat-rent, then the payment of it is a commercial transaction, and nothing more. It represents a contract made with man, and one from which it cannot but be difficult to exclude the bargaining spirit. So it is quite in harmony with the genius of the system, that in prosperous congregations, where the most eligible pews are much in demand, they should be let, as is done in some quarters in America, on the competitive principle, and with the aid of the auctioneer's hammer.

It is true, indeed, that the commercial element must of necessity enter to some extent into the arrangements of our Church life. So long as the Church lives in the world it cannot but do so. Our Lord Himself recognises the presence of the element when He says, "The labourer is worthy of his hire" (Luke x. 7). And from this point of view it may reasonably be argued that Christian beneficence does not begin until after the worshipper has contributed, according to his ability, his fair share of the necessary expense of the

conduct of the public services. That is to say, what he gives for the support of ordinances is just a return on his part for value received. All the same, however, ought every contribution to the Church fund to be made, not so much in recognition of what the office-bearers have provided, but rather as a thankoffering to God for the benefits of salvation. Now it is one serious objection to the pew-rent system that it inevitably thrusts into the background the thought of spiritual indebtedness, and emphasises only those considerations which belong to the mere externals of Church life.

From the fact that the seat-rent is a payment, it follows, accordingly, that the seat-holder is tempted to occupy his pew, cherishing the smug satisfaction that he has discharged the main part, or even the whole of his responsibility, in the matter of contributing to the support of the Church. He is apt to think of the receipt which was handed him by the seat-letter as a discharge in full of all the demands that can be reasonably made upon him. Every appeal to give he is prone to regard as so much begging. He is a righteous and an honourable man, for he regularly pays his way as a seat-holder and member of the Church: what more ought to be expected of him?

There are other objections to the pew-rent system. It encourages a selfish spirit of proprietorship in the seat-holder, instead of an expansive and self-sacrificing Christian charity. It tempts him to think of his pew as his own private property, possession of which might very well be protected by a law of trespass. The competition for coveted pews, moreover, is a frequent cause of heart-burning among brethren. The annals of every congregation that follows this system of finance can tell of unworthy bickerings, and even of families withdrawing from the Church altogether as the result of some painful rivalry connected with sittings. In short, this method tends actually to nourish and stimulate those baser passions of human nature which it is the business of the Church as the body of Christ to labour to mortify in its every member. And it does so because it is a method of fixed payments, and not of voluntary offerings. It has been well said that "only

voluntary giving reacts with moral benefit upon the giver. A serious moral loss, therefore, results from the seat-rent system."

Another inconvenience is, that this method emphasises and encourages class distinctions in a place where, of all places in the world, these should be allowed to fall into the background. Within the house of God, if anywhere, "the rich and the poor" ought to "meet together," seeing that "the Lord is the Maker of them all." Most congregations, however, in order to obviate in some measure the inequality of the pew-rent assessment in relation to the widely different pecuniary circumstances of the people, arrange that there shall be pews at high prices and pews at low prices—the former, of course, being those which are most in demand. And so, under the pew-rent system, the congregation is divided into a series of graduated social classes. To the man with the gold ring the system says, "Sit thou here in a good place;" and to the poor man, "Sit here under my footstool." But is not such an arrangement at variance with Bible principles about the treatment of the poor? And what may the Lord Jesus Christ be expected to think of it?

More than this, universal experience has shown that among the working classes the pew-rent operates to a considerable extent as a prohibitory tariff upon Church attendance. An artisan who possesses a mind of only moderate sensitiveness will shrink from allowing his children to occupy more sittings than he finds that he is able to pay for. If he has a large family, it is natural that he should cherish a repugnance to the thought of some of his children occupying seats which may be allotted to them gratuitously, as if they were paupers. Rather than this, he will in many cases elect to leave the children at home, or send them to the meetings of some religious organisation which is not in connection with the Church; the result in either case being that they will be in danger of growing up from childhood to manhood without having acquired the invaluable habit of Church attendance. So, while it is the will and command of Christ that "the poor have the Gospel preached to them," the pew-

rent system operates largely as a toll-bar which excludes the poor from the sanctuary. Even during what are called good times this evil more or less obtains; but when the times are hard it is aggravated a hundredfold. When trade is depressed and work difficult to be got, or when sickness necessitates an unusually heavy domestic outlay, the payment of seat-rents may become an impossibility; gradually arrears of unpaid sittings accumulate, the family becomes in consequence irregular in their attendance, and by-and-by perhaps its members yield to the temptation to lapse from Church ordinances altogether.

It follows that this mode of contribution to congregational funds tends to thwart and impede evangelistic effort. It converts the Church into a religious club or proprietary institution, the members of which are prone to be content with occupying their own cushioned seats and enjoying their own edification; or into a spiritual warehouse, in connection with which the main purposes are accomplished when a large number of good customers is attracted, and the concern becomes financially a conspicuous success. And the levying of pew-rents engenders the feeling on the part of the lapsed that they are not made thoroughly welcome to come and hear the Gospel without money and without price. In as far as any financial arrangement tends to induce the resident families of a congregation to think of the Church mainly as "our Church," rather than as an instrument in Christ's hand for the extension of His kingdom, just in so far will even the lapsed and the careless catch the infection, and be more readily attracted to mission halls as places where they may be likely to get nearer to God than they could do within the assemblies of the Church itself. We are persuaded that whenever in the future the main body of the Church shall become morally enlightened and quickened as to its duty to make the whole life of man its own, it will at once wipe away this reproach of treating pews as personal or private property, and regard them henceforward as one of the many trusts which are to be used by God's stewards for the advancement of the kingdom of heaven.

A second form of giving which is greatly in vogue in our time is the *Special or Extraordinary Collection* which is taken on occasion of some special religious service. In principle, doubtless, the soundness of this mode is unexceptionable; but observation shows that it is often much abused in practice both in connection with congregational anniversaries and public sermons on behalf of charitable institutions. It would be wrong, of course, to say one word in depreciation of the custom of annually commemorating any event in the history of a congregation which it is desirable for the people to keep in remembrance; much less would we discountenance the delivery of public discourses the object of which is to disseminate information, and to foster sympathy and liberality, in regard to any philanthropic enterprise which deserves the support of the community. Under the Jewish Dispensation much emphasis was laid upon anniversary services. The Hebrew Church had in particular three great annual festivals of Divine appointment, and these were observed regularly through the years and centuries. The Passover celebrated the deliverance from the bondage of Egypt. The Pentecost commemorated the giving of the Law from Mount Sinai. The Feast of Tabernacles reminded the Israelites of the pilgrimage in the wilderness, and it was also a festival of thanksgiving for the ingathering of the harvest and the vintage. These anniversaries were observed "before the Lord" in His temple at Jerusalem; and at every celebration there was a special anniversary offering. But while the offering was an essential part of the service, it was by no means intended to be the principal feature of it. The main purpose of the three annual feasts was to impress the memory, heart, and conscience of the people, with a view to their spiritual improvement, and as the result of their devout contemplation of the great things which God had done for them in the past. The thankoffering which they brought in their hands was to be only the outward and visible sign of the adoring gratitude of their hearts. What, accordingly, we deprecate as not morally healthful in connection with many Church anniversary services in modern times is the planning

of all the arrangements with the one main purpose of gathering pecuniary revenue out of them. It is notorious that in some cases, when the anniversary meetings become due, even the office-bearers find it difficult to tell a stranger what congregational event they are intended to commemorate—whether the origin of the congregation, or the opening of a new place of worship, or the settlement of the present minister. The one thought which is uppermost in their minds is that of the special anniversary collection. In fact, the so-called anniversary services might more appropriately be termed "Liquidation of Deficit Services." Sometimes the annual commemoration is removed two or three months back or forward from the actual day which is professedly being remembered—a Sabbath being chosen which is financially convenient, rather than the one which is historically correct. Some congregations also hold anniversary services twice or even thrice a year, for the sake of having two or three special collections. And we have heard of at least one coast congregation adopting the device of making three, if not four, "quarterly" collections during the four summer months of the coast season when the visitors are present.

The evil to be guarded against in connection with these special services is the encouragement of forced and spasmodic pecuniary contributions—Christian giving, the amount and motive of which are determined by pressing appeals from without, by a temporary congregational excitement, or by the impulse of other transient feeling. Yet this evil largely prevails. In planning the services referred to, care is generally taken to secure the visit of a great preacher, especially of one who, in addition to other elements of pulpit eminence, possesses the ability to affect his audience in the region of their purses. As Dr. Symington, of Birkenhead, has said, "Our plan is to lay hands on Paul, Apollos, Barnabas, every eloquent and gifted preacher, and turn him into a machine for raising money." Then perhaps large placards are posted, announcing the special services, and the Church-notices column in the Saturday newspaper contains a prominent advertisement on the subject; after which all the arrangements being at length

duly completed, much may still depend upon the accident of favourable weather on the day appointed, for a wet Sabbath may seriously injure the collection.

We rather think that the Apostle Paul, were he amongst us now as a preacher of the Gospel, might be expected to decline invitations to take part in anniversary services as these are presently conducted in many of our Churches. At least he once wrote to the Corinthians stating that on the occasion of his next visit to their city he wished very much not to find himself under the necessity of preaching for a collection (1 Cor. xvi. 2). Possibly he had in his mind the disagreeable recollection of having at some former time occupied the position of appearing to compel Christian liberality. So he requested that the offering of the converts at Corinth in aid of the poor saints at Jerusalem might be all ready in bulk sum by the time of his arrival, in order, he says, "that no collections be made when I come." The modern practice, therefore, of holding extraordinary Church services mainly for the sake of the extra collection which may then be taken is not one which can be said to be in the line of Apostolic tradition. Rather, does it not seem to involve a degradation of the other ordinances of worship,—viz., prayer, praise, and the reading and preaching of the Word,—to use them merely in subordination to a pecuniary contribution, if not avowedly as the very means of obtaining it? The office-bearers of the Church should sanction no financial arrangement which is fitted to encourage their fellow-members to forget the great spiritual ends contemplated in the worship of God and the proclamation of the Gospel.

A third form of ecclesiastical finance which is universally practised amongst us is that of gathering up the offerings of the people periodically *by the hands of Collectors* whom the Church sends to their homes for the purpose. It is unnecessary to say more about this method than to remark that it would be more in accordance with the Scriptural idea of free-will offering were the people to bring their contributions to God's altar with their own hands, instead of waiting to have them called for. The work of the collector is occasionally

found to be somewhat irksome and unpleasant, for the reason that his or her visits are so frequently regarded as involving the application of more or less external pressure to the will of the person who is solicited to give. Indeed, it is not uncharitable to suspect that many of the subscriptions which are taken up from house to house are given as the result of their having been begged for ; they are not always purely free-will offerings to the Lord. As a recent writer has pithily said, "We collect and pay taxes. We gather by collectors what law demands. But love should collect for itself."

We do not remember even one instance in Scripture of any offering in connection with the Church being gathered by a band of collectors who went round for it to the people's homes. As writers on systematic beneficence have often pointed out, the uniform Bible precept is not only "give," but "bring." "Bring an offering, and come into His courts." "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse." "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring Me an offering." And such also was the practice in Bible times. Abel "brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof." For the erection of the Tabernacle "the children of Israel brought a willing offering unto the Lord, every man and woman, whose heart made them willing to bring for all manner of work." One feature of the revival under Hezekiah was that "the children of Israel brought in abundance the firstfruits of corn, wine, and oil, and honey, and of all the increase of the field ; and the tithe of all things brought they in abundantly." And so also in New Testament times. The woman "brought an alabaster cruse of ointment." The people "cast their gifts into the treasury." Barnabas, "having a field, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the Apostles' feet." The Macedonian Christians "besought Paul with much entreaty" that they might be allowed to share in the good work of relieving the poverty of their brethren at Jerusalem. It is evident, therefore, that were the Church of the nineteenth century strictly to follow Scripture precedent, she would send to the homes of her people only for the offerings of the infirm and the sick, and others who are so

situated that they cannot themselves bring their gifts as a part of their public worship.

Thus far we have dealt with the financial methods which are usually in operation for obtaining the funds which the Church requires for every-day congregational purposes. We shall consider briefly now in what remains some of the expedients which are frequently adopted when the purposes or circumstances are extraordinary. It may be that a new church or manse requires to be built, or an oppressive debt to be liquidated, or a load of accumulated annual deficits to be removed. What is to be done in such cases? A congregation that is not permeated with the conviction of God's ownership and man's stewardship, and the members of which have not learned to give systematically and proportionately as an act of worship and a means of grace, will often be at its wit's end to know what to do. Eventually, however, having no heart for the Bible method of liberality, it may be expected to have recourse to one or more of the counterfeit methods of man's devising.

One of these is the *Conditional Subscription*. This is not infrequently offered by some wealthy member who is apprehensive that the congregation may fall into the habit of leaning too heavily upon himself in the discharge of its financial obligations, and who desires accordingly to show a becoming example of liberality, while at the same time teaching his fellow-members a salutary lesson of self-reliance. So he offers to contribute a certain large sum, provided that the congregation combine to furnish an equal amount within a certain time which he stipulates. Or, it may be, one member promises so much, provided other five members will each contribute a similar sum. Sometimes the conditions of such an offer are duly fulfilled, and the money that has been wanted is "raised"; in other cases, however, the proposed terms are not complied with, and the offerer is applauded for his liberality, while at the same time he has it in his power to keep his money to himself. But, we ask, is finessing of this sort at the door of the Lord's treasury at all in the line of Scripture principles of giving? Surely not. Such bargain-

making in connection with one's contributions to God's service is a device which is inconsistent with Christian simplicity, and with the true spirit of Christian liberality. Should a member of the Church, whether rich or poor, judge that a certain congregational object is a worthy one, and that it is his duty to give a certain sum in support of it, let him devote that sum whether others give or not; let him give it in single-mindedness, and with the desire and prayer that it may have the moral effect of stimulating the liberality of his fellow-members. Every man's rule of giving ought to be how much he himself owes to his Lord, and not the generosity or the niggardliness of other Christians with whom he happens to be in Church-fellowship.

A second modern make-shift for liquidating Church debt may be typically represented by the "*Snowball*" and other similar devices. It takes the form of an ingenious arithmetical labyrinth, and makes appeal besides to the very indifference of those who are asked to contribute, and to the recognised reluctance of the natural man to part with money for religious purposes. "How strange it would seem," writes one, "if we stumbled, in some Syrian monastery, upon a hitherto undiscovered Epistle of Paul, and found him saying, 'Now concerning the collection of the saints, my counsel is that you set a snowball fund a-rolling;' or heard him advising Timothy to try to wipe off the debt upon his new Church at Ephesus by seeing how 'a sale of bricks' would do!" The "*snowball*" is credited in theory with this advantage, that in connection with it many hands make light work; and we may see at once by an example how it is expected to roll. Every collector undertakes to give, say, one shilling, and to get four friends to contribute each the same sum; collector A has to secure four B's, each B four C's, and so on up to perhaps G. Each G is to obtain from four friends one shilling each, or otherwise (including his own personal subscription) to collect five shillings. Each of the G's forwards the five shillings to the F who appointed. Each F will thus receive £1 from four G's, and, adding one shilling, will forward £1 1s. to the E who appointed. And so if each of the E's, D's, C's, and B's does

his or her duty, A will by-and-by be brought into possession of a monetary "snowball" of £1,092 4s. But in all this what an absence there is not only of arithmetical, but of Christian simplicity! And how much disagreeable begging does the actual working out of such a scheme in all its ramifications entail!

"O how unlike the complex works of man
Heaven's easy, artless, unencumbered plan!"

The familiar couplet may be applied not only to the Divine method of justification as compared with man-made methods, but to the Divine law of Christian giving as contrasted with these roundabout and sensational devices for simply "raising" money.

Another plan occasionally resorted to is that of lectures, concerts, or other kinds of *Popular Entertainments*. Recourse is had to such gatherings for the purpose of mitigating the indigence of the Church of Christ; and much loving labour and clever ingenuity are expended—often, too, with disappointing results—in order to make them successful. Properly speaking, however, the taking of tickets for meetings of this kind is not Christian giving at all. Such expedients appeal to the natural desire of getting something: they do not profess to have in view the cultivation of the spiritual grace of giving. In this country happily we have not yet entered upon the down-grade on which many congregations in America have been going for some years as regards this matter of counterfeit liberality by means of ecclesiastical amusements. Among the methods largely used in collecting funds for Church purposes—and even in the New England States, among the descendants of the Puritans—are fairs, festivals, harvest-homes, excursions, concerts, tableaux, and amateur theatricals. In announcing these gatherings in the religious newspapers, this style of advertisement is frequently adopted:—"Wanted, a thousand persons to eat oysters for the benefit of the —— Church." Or, again:—"A novel feature of the Ladies' Fair and Festival at the —— Church will be a pedestrian contest for boys between the ages of eight and sixteen years. Mr. ——, the getter-up of the contest,

will give as a prize a handsome pair of pigeons of choice breed. Boys who contend for the prize must pay an entrance fee of ten cents, which goes to the Church, and the winner takes the doves." It is indeed marvellous that American piety can tolerate this sort of thing for a single day. These sensational and undignified artifices are entirely in opposition to all the precepts and examples, as well as to the prevailing spirit, of Holy Scripture on the subject of giving. Instead of being acts of worship, they are revelries of Vanity Fair. So far from stimulating Christian self-sacrifice, they must inevitably foster worldly self-indulgence. They teach the people to spend, and not to give. They fritter away the Church's energies, rob her of her spirituality, promote carnality and worldliness among her young people, and give great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme.

We must now say a few words before closing regarding the *Bazaar* method of obtaining supplies for extraordinary purposes in connection with congregational finance. It is, of course, indisputable that the principle which underlies the "sale of work" is a sound one—viz., that gifts of time and labour and skill, capable of being translated into money, may honourably be offered for the cause of Christ. At the same time, it is matter for wonder to many thoughtful minds that Christian people possessed of means, who desire to aid a deserving cause, should not give their money to it directly instead of by the circuitous method of playing for a few days at shop-keeping, with the pastor of the church as shop-walker. Bazaars are most commonly resorted to as an expedient for extinguishing the burdensome debt which so frequently remains upon congregations as the result of the erection of new places of worship. And yet it is now becoming a question whether the system must not be credited with actually creating quite as much debt as it extinguishes. For sometimes a congregation allows itself to build a church of a style entirely out of keeping with its means, or to add one or two thousand pounds of additional outlay to the building estimates, with the avowed intention of by-and-by liquidating the deficit by means of a great, popular fancy-fair.

Be this as it may, however, it is undeniable that the first honest simplicity of the sale of work is now gone. Abuses have rushed like a flood into the bazaar system. This method of obtaining money is every year becoming more circuitous and expensive as well as more worldly and morally counterfeit than before. Surely the Lord Jesus Christ never intended that His Church should solicit public charity as being a pauper institution, which requires to be sustained with the aid of banners and bands of music, gay costumes and insinuating smiles, comic minstrels and dramatic reciters, mock auctions and fortune-tellings, not to speak of the huckstering of dolls and pin-cushions. One naturally remembers the whip of small cords, and the indignant command to "take these things hence."

But the worst feature of the Church bazaar, as conducted at the present time, is the prevalent use of the raffle and the lottery. This device directly appeals to the gambling spirit. How sad it is that when a Christian congregation resolves itself for a few days into a trading company, the system upon which it relies for a considerable part of its profits is one which is at once commercially illegal and morally degrading! Can we wonder that the leprosy of gaming has spread so widely among our young men in this age when the Christian Church is setting before them so conspicuously such an evil example? With what consistency can the Church rebuke any form of trade immorality so long as she is herself guilty of encouraging law-breaking in the form of gambling? It is true, doubtless, that many of the friends who purchase tickets for a pony-phaeton or a fire-screen may do so, not because they covet either article, but simply with a benevolent desire to contribute to the success of the bazaar. All the same, however, their example in buying tickets tends to encourage the growth of the gambling spirit in others, who do really hope to win the article that is being thus disposed of. The apology that at a Church bazaar the money is for God does not make the lotteries godly: it is rather an aggravation of their ungodliness. The modern bazaar system, take it all in all, presents to view a miserable travesty of

Christian giving ; so much so, indeed, that one of our fashionable ecclesiastical fancy-fairs may sometimes even be described with tolerable accuracy as "Three Days' Gambling in the Name of the Lord."

Our task in writing this article has been the somewhat ungracious and unpleasant one of criticising and condemning financial practices which largely prevail in our Churches, and which many of the best of our people find no fault with, or are even ready to defend, just because they obtain everywhere, and have—at least some of them—been bound up with our Church life from our childhood. We shall now conclude with a sentence or two upon what we conceive to be the duty of ministers, as the pastors and teachers of the Church, in connection with this important matter.

First, we ought from the pulpit and in our Bible-classes to preach and teach Scripture principles on the subject of Christian liberality. Many ministers are far too reticent on this matter. We know the truth about it ourselves ; but surely we fail in our duty if we do not tell out that truth with all plainness of speech to our people. One portion of the trust that has been committed to us is faithfully and lovingly to exhibit Divine principles concerning the stewardship of money. The Bible abounds both in precepts and examples on this subject : let us make these the texts and themes of pulpit discourses. We must exhort the people not only to present themselves to the Lord, but to offer of their substance, with due system and in due proportion, for the advancement of His cause. And in all our teaching, let us point to the cross of the Redeemer as the supreme inspiration to beneficence on the part of His redeemed people.

Secondly, we should discourage reckless spending on the part of congregations. Many of our present-day unworthy methods of Church finance are the direct result of congregational extravagance. Oftentimes the building of an expensive new church is proceeded with, the leaders of the movement vaguely hoping that after it is opened the necessary funds will be forthcoming to pay for it. Many an impecunious or illiberal congregation erects a graceful Gothic structure, with

an elegant spire and a sweet-toned organ, and then overlays the whole for perhaps an entire generation with a heavy mortgage. But every minister should do everything within his power to restrain his people from impulsively contracting obligations which are likely to remain as a permanent burden. The Church of Christ is bound to set an example of obedience to the precept, "Owe no man anything."

Thirdly, we ought to discountenance all questionable modes of obtaining money for Church purposes. We should resist whatever pressure may be put upon us in favour of any scheme for liquidating debt which our consciences tell us is morally unjustifiable. A little firmness on the part of ministers, we are persuaded, is all that is needed in order to the abolition of bazaars, or rather, in order to restore the bazaar to its original type, that of the simple and innocent sale of work. And then, with regard to those more permanent and continuous methods (such as the pew-rent) which contain elements of adulteration, while it may not be desirable or perhaps practicable that any of these should be abruptly laid aside, even for others that are manifestly better, is it not right at least that the teachers of the Church should take suitable occasion to point out the defects that belong to them, with the view of gradually educating popular conviction and feeling towards a greatly needed reformation?

And, finally, it is our part to labour to lift up the Church to a loftier spirituality. The kingdom of Christ is not of this world; and yet the chronic Antichrist within the Church is its worldliness. The aid of money is meanwhile necessary, at least in part, for the carrying on of the Divine work of the kingdom; but the Church's office-bearers, if they are faithful, will constantly resist the tendency to reduce her to the level of a mercantile corporation, together with the temptation to bow down before any money power. Eagerness for merely material success is one of the sources of spiritual weakness. If the Church is to possess the world, she must herself be unworldly not only in her general spirit, but in her modes of getting and spending the Lord's money.

CHARLES JERDAN, M.A., LL.B.

DISCERNMENT OF SPIRITS.

AMONG the numerous gifts of the Holy Spirit mentioned in 1 Cor. xii. 10 which are bestowed on some of God's children, is one described by the Apostle as that of the "discerning of spirits," or, as we might briefly describe it in modern phraseology, "the power of discriminating" between that which is true and that which is false. This gift, like many others, is one which, to a certain extent, is implanted in the individual, but which also can be cultivated. It is a gift which a very large number of earnest Christians do not in the least possess; but nevertheless it is amongst the most important of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, for without it God's children are very often found to support the greatest errors. It was not the clear-headed theologian Paul, but the loving, gentle Apostle John who wrote the words, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." If one of the Apostles more than another might have been expected to have overlooked erroneous teaching, it would certainly have been John, whose whole spirit breathes so entirely that of love; and perhaps, for that very reason, it was he who was selected by the Holy Spirit to pen these words of warning to us; words that are perhaps of even greater importance now than they ever were, though it is doubtful if there ever was a time in the history of the Church when they were not needed. The history of religion in all ages teaches us that there have always been some of whom it might be said, as it was said of old by Jeremiah the prophet, "For they prophesy falsely unto you in My name: I have not sent them, saith the Lord."

It is often erroneously assumed that those who associate with teachers of error are of a charitable nature, and that they breathe therefore more of the loving nature of our Saviour than others. This assumption is, however, by no means a correct one, for our Saviour, like His beloved disciple John,

was a frequent denouncer of erroneous teaching, and His scathing denunciations of the superstitious and latitudinarian doctrines of His time are too well known to need quotation. Much of the so-called charity that exists among some earnest Christians might be more correctly put down to a defective power of the discernment of spirits. The individual in whom this gift is wanting is quite unintentionally doing an enormous amount of harm by supporting certain forms of erroneous teaching. If there is one thing more certain than another to the thoughtful student of Church history, it is that religious errors have mainly been introduced through the medium of good men, and not of the bad ones. The popular idea of error is that bad men, with some ulterior purpose, inculcate it as far as their influence permits. But though it is quite true that bad men do, for their own purposes, propagate erroneous doctrines, still it would be incorrect to say that the propagation of error is due only to bad men. Unlike truth, error has been more or less indigenous to the human heart ever since the fall of our ancestors, and consequently its growth is entirely spontaneous. The late Bishop Lightfoot used to say that one of the strongest proofs of the fall of man is the spontaneous development of evil in every form—morally, physically, and spiritually. Erroneous notions of every kind are continually springing up and presenting themselves in different forms. False teachers, with that quick perception which self-interest so frequently supplies, detect which specie of this spiritual fungi will best suit their purpose, and they set to work to cultivate and develop these erroneous notions; and in doing so they frequently become very popular, as the natural tendency of the vast majority in this fallen world is ever towards that which is evil and untrue. But the action of the false teachers would not be sufficient to account for the widespread propagation of error among God's own children; and were it not that the false teachers receive an enormous amount of help from really good people, who are lacking in the power of discrimination, error would not be so widespread as it is. Unfortunately, however, for the cause of truth there are some very excellent, good

people, who have not cultivated the gift of the discernment of spirits, who lend their support to much that is erroneous, and thus commend it to others over whom the influence of the false teachers would have little or no effect.

Good people sometimes do an incalculable amount of harm by speaking in a vague way about certain truths, not making it quite clear to their audience what they really mean. The late Charles Kingsley very sensibly said, "Without any cold caution of expression, it is a duty we owe to God's truth, and to our own happiness, and the happiness of those around us, to think and speak as correctly as we can. Almost all heresy, schism, and misunderstandings, between either churches or individuals, who ought to be one, have arisen from the fault of an involved and vague style of thought." Outspoken language, put in a kindly way, seldom makes enemies, and it often wins the admiration of the honest ones on the opposite side, who can respect the man who calls a spade a spade, even though they cannot agree with him. A vague, slipshod way of thinking and speaking, instead of decreasing generally increases differences of opinion. The antidote for religious strife is not slipshod inaccuracy, but rather the cultivation of that spirit of love which always takes great pains to enable the individual to understand the fundamental principles on which his opponent bases his arguments. We do not want more vagueness in the way we state our own views, but we do need more accuracy in our knowledge of our opponents' views. But when we have done all we can to understand each other, we must still expect to find in a fallen world, in which there is a spontaneous development of evil, much which we must oppose in a spirit of love.

There is, perhaps, no greater trial to a really liberal-minded man than to be endowed largely with the gift of the discernment of spirits. The individual so endowed frequently has to bear the life-long reproach of being narrow-minded and intolerant, whereas in reality he may be neither the one nor the other, but only the possessor of a keen perception of the dangers which in the future may arise from certain erroneous doctrines which he finds very popular, and which he is asked

to support. No man can be endowed with this gift without being more or less a religious statesman. He must have the peculiar gift of being able to forecast danger in the future from the action of the present. As the great bulk of people have no such gift, and are content to live like children only for the present, without a thought of the morrow, it stands to reason that those who are gifted with the faculty of discrimination have frequently to pay a frightful penalty for their gift by being denounced by their neighbours and acquaintances with being wanting in the gift of charity, because they do not lend their support to that which they know will certainly lead to evil in the future.

There is another trial to which these have to submit, and that is, to being classified by the indiscriminating world around them with those who really are wanting in love and charity. It is, of course, possible in spiritual things, as in other things, to cultivate certain gifts at the expense of others, and some undoubtedly cultivate the power of discrimination between good and evil, but at the same time fail to cultivate other gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as love and charity. Consequently such degenerate into what the Scotch call "heresy hunters." They are as quick as possible in detecting the slightest form of unsound doctrine, but they fail to discriminate between the errors of the intellect and those of the heart. All of God's gifts to man are capable of abuse as well as of use, and it is possible to develop the keen perception of error to such an extent as to eclipse all other virtues. The well-balanced mind must be careful not to exaggerate truth to that extent that it becomes an error, for such a thing is quite a possibility. Indeed, speaking generally, almost every religious error against which we have to contend has arisen from the exaggeration of, or the incorrect way of stating, a certain truth. Our aim must be to cultivate the gift of the discernment of spirits, but to be careful to combine with it another of God's gifts to His people, that spirit which believeth all things, and hopeth all things, for it is only by the happy combination of God's gifts to mankind that we can ever hope to do full justice to any of them. SETON CHURCHILL.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ITALY.

ITALY is not specially distinguished for religious thought, and yet those living in trans-Alpine lands look to her for light. Laymen do not concern themselves at all with religious questions ; they leave it to the clergy to think for them, and to inculcate any doctrine whatsoever, without troubling themselves in the matter : they practise religion or leave it to their families to do so, but they do not reason it out. Italy holds in her bosom the head of Catholicism, who thinks for every one : the clergy itself is inspired with one thought only, that which comes to it from the Pope. Protestantism is also represented, and each Protestant thinks for himself, as all who profess it (except the Waldensians) embrace it on their conversion from Catholicism. It behoves us first to examine Romish thought which is pre-dominant, and then we shall enter into some details as to evangelical thought.

Romish thought, which radiates from Italy over mountains and seas, is the old thought of the middle ages, unlike that of modern times. It has the advantage of unity, which is lacking in times of liberty. Now, when unity is not compulsory, when it is compatible with a degree of liberty, it may prove seductive, and Protestants should be on their guard.

Leo XIII., who has a firm hold of the ship's helm, as the "faithful" assert, is alive to all that transpires in his vast realm, and he does his utmost to cause one thought and one will to rule them. His work appears to us political rather than religious, misty rather than luminous ; but its influence may be more felt perhaps at a distance than near where the mystery is revealed. As a philosopher and a scholastic theologian, he first aims at binding Reason to the Catholic faith as a handmaid to her mistress. For this purpose he had only to use the *Somme* by Sir Thomas Aquinas, which is, speaking properly, the philosophy of Catholicism, a system complete from this point of view. Even previously to becoming Pope, Cardinal Joachim Pecci had established the Academy of St. Thomas in his diocese

of Perugia. Raised to the Holy See, he has prescribed the study of the *Somme* in all the seminaries. He has given his reasons for so doing in his Encyclical *Acterni Patris*, and he exhorts his reverend brethren and sons to interpose between themselves and God the all-efficacious mediation of the Blessed Virgin and her chaste spouse. Thus are philosophy and superstition united on the Holy Papal throne!

Last year, on the 18th of March, there took place in the presence of the Pope, in the large and magnificent Salle Clémentine, a formal attempt at discussion on certain articles of the *Somme*. Three pupils of the Seminary defended its doctrines in Latin, and three bishops attacked it. The Pontiff manifested entire satisfaction with the splendid results—Rome prepares skilful logicians, as well versed in the *Somme* as they are ignorant of the Scriptures.

The avowed aim of the Pope in giving a philosophical direction to theological study is to enforce one single line of thought and mode of procedure in the defence of Catholicism. The Catholic forces appeared somewhat scattered in the combat; it was necessary to rally the ranks. Leo XIII. has put into practice the infallibility proclaimed as a theory by Pius IX., and although infallible he aims at being wise and strictly logical. Nothing must henceforth remain undecided. In the days of Pius IX. certain questions were still undecided, on these Leo XIII. has pronounced his verdict. After the death of Antonio Rosmini, who had written a book on the Five Wounds of the Church, there appeared under his name, some writings in which certain germs lurking in his former writings were discovered to be fully developed. In the time of Pius IX. no remarks were made. Leo XIII. caused them to be examined by the cardinals of the Inquisition. The Supreme Council decided that forty-two propositions should be censured and condemned. By a Papal decree they have been censured, condemned, and proscribed. As a great philosopher and a saintly man, Rosmini had many adherents in Lombardy and Piedmont; the Pope's sentence has reduced all opinions to one only. As an act of authority this is impressive, but to thought it is crushing.

Leo XIII. wants philosophy, but the philosophy of Catholicism; he wants history as well, but the history of Papacy based on the Papal Archives. On the 18th, 1883, he addressed to the Cardinals Deluca, Pitra, and Hergenröther the Encyclical *Sape Numero Considerentes*, by which he decided on publishing the *Register* of the Vatican (*res gestas*) in honour of forgotten Popes and for the glorification of the Papacy. He opened up the Archives of the Vatican, and placed them at the disposal of the above-mentioned Cardinals, who are to continue the annals of Cardinal Baronius. Father Calenzio of the Oratoire has been entrusted with part of the work. Professor Carini is occupied with another portion of it. The result is to be a universal Ecclesiastical History, comprising the history of the jurisprudence of the Popes, the diplomacy of the Popes from the time of Martin V. to our own days, the biography of the Popes, an account of the principal controversies, the history of the universities of the middle ages, scholastic theology, Pontifical Chancellory, &c. This history will serve as a source whence material can be drawn for text-books for the Catholic schools, for polemics, or for popular tales. The documents to be consulted in the Archives of the Vatican form no less than 4,000 volumes, referring only to the period beginning with Gregory VII. and ending with the close of the 18th century. Cardinal Hergenröther has published the *Register* of Leo X.; those of Clement V. are being published under the direction of Padre Tosti, Keeper of the Records at the Vatican.

Unity of thought aims at unity of action, and the whole at the universal dominion of the Holy See. The Pope has also favoured the Jesuits, who make as much use of him as he of them. It was to them that he addressed, on the 15th of July, 1886, his brief *Dolemus inter Alia*, in which he approves and confirms all the privileges, powers, and dispensations hitherto enjoyed by them. "Our present letters," he says, "testify to the love which we bear, and which we have always borne, to the illustrious Company of Jesus, so devoted to our predecessors and ourselves, the generous foster-mother of men eminent for their renown, for their sanctity, and for

their bearing, and the source and mainstay of wholesome and solid doctrine. May she continue her mission of conducting and bringing back by means of holy enterprise the faithful and the heretical to the light of the Truth, and of educating young men in the Christian virtues and polite literature, and of teaching the philosophy and theology of the "Angelic Doctor."

St. Thomas of Aquinas, the Popes, and the Jesuits, these are the resources of Leo XIII. The Bible counts for little in religious thought as directed by the Pope, who appears to use his great wisdom and ability to supply the deficiency with theology, and with the book on the Papacy, which is to issue from the Archives of the Vatican replete with its glories and free of all its baseness and its cruelty.

Some attempts have been made to go back to the Scriptures, to draw from the Source, to lead the people thither, to induce the Pope to renounce his temporal power and confine himself to his spiritual domain. Father Curci has made heroic efforts to stem the current, but he has been baffled, swept away, submerged. The attempt he made was an indication of a religious need which the skilful Jesuit thinks the Church should meet, so as to keep hold of its members and prevent their going over to the Evangelical Church. That such a need exists is further attested by the speculation engaged in by the great publisher Sonzagno, who is bringing out a colossal edition of the Bible and of the Gospels by Padre Curci, with illustrations by Doré. Another significant publication is the *Life of Jesus according to the Gospels*, by R. Bonghi, a Deputy to Parliament and ex-Minister of Public Instruction.

Hence it results that the religious thought, moulded and directed by the Pope with consummate skill, is opposed to the religious sentiment of the liberal population. Religious thought is here enveloped in a political thought because of the Papacy, which is inevitably intolerant, encroaching, and absorbent; and this thought clashes with an opposite policy. How necessary it is that in such a spiritual condition Protestant religious thought should be manifest! What part does it play?

P. GEYMONAT, D.D.

ARCHDEACON FARRAR'S "LIVES OF THE FATHERS."

CHURCH HISTORY, including the struggles of beliefs and opinions within the Church, illuminated by illustrious and impressive personalities, has a fascination which the dry chronicler of synodical canons could neither conceive of nor produce. Archdeacon Farrar's book has done much to popularize a line of study which before was dull and repulsive by his large and powerful biographical sketches and studies, more or less thin or full in proportion to the material at hand. And if he would only take some pains to be accurate, and be content with saying a thing once instead of twice or more, as we too often find him doing, we should give his picturesque and vigorous descriptions a hearty welcome. This latter vice of prolixity, had it been curtailed, might have considerably reduced the bulk of these two volumes, rendering them no less attractive to the reader and far less amenable to criticism. As regards the former, our author's laxity, combined with his unquestionable pretensions to scholarship, makes reviewing an ungracious task but a needful duty.

From a note (Preface, p. xiii. 1) our author claims to have taken some pains with his chronology, . . . "silently considering the evidence, and following what seemed to me the most probable and well-supported conclusions." We turn with some expectation of a semblance of accuracy to the "Chronological Table of the Bishops of Rome," on p. xx. One may note by the way that it is superfluous in the work as a whole, because at the end of vol. ii., pp. 707 *seq.*, we find in "Notes on the Early Bishops of Rome" a complete list with dates of accession, of which more anon. Its only excuse therefore would be the serving as a framework on the threshold into which the sequences of biographical detail might fit. It is avowedly founded on two lists, that of Jaffé's *Regesta Pontificum*, &c., and that of "GAIUS'" *Series Episcoporum*, &c., each given with exact reference to editions and date. Will it be believed that there is no such person as "Gaius," and as

a modern chronological author, no such name? The name thus masquerading under the Roman form of Gaius is the Teutonic GAMS. We see at once the double fountain of easy error here at play. The Archdeacon probably writes a puzzling hand for a typesetter, who makes the best shot he can at the letters intended. The correction of proofs is a servile task, from which literary lions recoil, and of this we shall perhaps see further symptoms. Still they might, if so, keep a jackal to do it for them. Hence Gaius *vice* Gams results easily. But this is not all, or nearly all, the disaster of this luckless "Table." A few of its earlier contents will suffice to show the flaw which pervades three-fourths of its entire extent. Side by side we annex the same links of succession as they appear in the author's Table, and in the actual authorities, Jaffé and Gams respectively:—

| (1) ARCHDEACON FARRAR'S TABLE. | | (2) JAFFÉ'S TABLE. ¹ | | (3) GAMS' TABLE. | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|------|------------------|--------------|
| | | (Jaffé) (Gaius) | | | |
| | | A.D. | A.D. | | |
| St. Peter | <i>circ.</i> | — | — | 29?—64? | 41—c. 65...7 |
| Linus | " | 67 | 79 | 64?—76? | 67—c. 79 |
| Cletus | " | 79 | 91 | 76?—88? | 79—c. 91 |
| Clement | " | 91 | 100 | 88?—97? | 91—c. 100 |
| Evaristus | " | 100 | 109 | 95?—105? | 100—c. 109 |

It will be seen by comparing (1) with (3) that our author meant (after sinking St. Peter as unhistorical) to be faithful to his "Gaius," who gives, as does Jaffé, for each Pope's name the probable years alike of accession and demise; but that, splitting up these into *two* lists of separate authorities, and writing "Jaffé" at the head of one and "Gaius" at that of the other, he establishes what seems "a very pretty quarrel" (opening discrepancies of from one to a dozen years) between the authorities on which he relies, which, of course, in blissful unconsciousness, he makes no attempt to reconcile, but passes over *sicco pede*. Further, when we put the thus dismembered Gams together, we discover that the Archdeacon does on the whole adhere to him, but that in the seven or eight instances out of over forty in which he differs, he does *not* a bit the more follow Jaffé. Hence we infer

¹ By the ? affixed the uncertainty of the actual years in these early dates is meant to be marked.

the purely otiose character of the reference to Jaffé's list. He is merely a decorative witness, called but not examined. The Court sees through the resources of Counsel, and resents this attempt at ornamental figures. But more singularly still, in about the last quarter of the entire Table of Succession,¹ notably from Bishop or Pope Mark onwards, the duel of the rival chronologists (apparently with equal unconsciousness on our author's part) is happily reconciled; so that Jaffé and "Gaius" march on in harmony confirming one another. The whole reminds one of Vergil's *Troja* in *Æn.* v. 586-87, where the youthful skirmishers—

" Nunc spicula vertunt
Infensi, facta pariter nunc pace feruntur."

Thus, whether his authorities for chronology agree or disagree, seems all one to the Archdeacon. "I would recommend you, sir, the habit of verifying your references," said the veteran Dr. Routh to a novice in theology. What would he have thought of the slipshod inaccuracy which compels us to add to a distinguished writer the recommendation of revising his proof sheets? Had either been done with moderate care, such a Benjamin's mess of blunders as the above would have been impossible.

The lists of early Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch might better have followed that of the Bishops of Rome in the Preface, instead of following the entire work at the end of the second volume. The latter list is without any, even approximate, date; a mere sequence of names. This, however, is merely a question of arrangement. What *does* follow in the Preface is a Table of General Chronology, reaching through nearly five pages, to 496 A.D. The only two "Roman Bishops" mentioned on its first page (we have not sifted it further) bear dates in conflict with those in the previous table of those bishops. These are "Sixtus I. Pope c. 109," given previously as "Jaffé 119, Gaius 126" (*i.e.*, really as *from* 119 to 126); and "Polycarp visits Anicetus at Rome, c. 151," whereas Anicetus similarly figures as "Jaffé 157, Gaius 167," making the date of 151 impossible, since Anicetus was "Pope" at the

¹ The whole reaches from 29 A.D. (Gams) to 418.

time of the visit. The "birth of Tertullian" is given as 150, which in the Life of Tertullian (i. 159) is stated to have been in 160. Turning again to the "Notes on the Early Bishops of Rome" (ii. 707 *seq.*), Linus is there dated 62, whereas we had him previously as "Jaffé 67, Gaius 79;" the false date 109 for Sixtus I. is repeated. Dionysius is here dated 269, who appears in the previous list as "Jaffé 259, Gaius 268." But the blunder which dates Anteros in 234, with an explanation that he was "Pope for only a month" [really six weeks] at the turn of the year 235-36, has an almost comic effect. Again, the last paragraphs of chap. xiii. s. ii. place the date of the death of Basil's mother as *before* the most important epoch of his life had commenced, by which we understand, of course, his episcopate, which, in fact, fills section iii. Now, on ii. p. 33 a letter is quoted, describing the troubles of that episcopate as already begun in 371 A.D., whereas the mother's death is given on ii. p. 89 as 373. After this the less said about chronology the better. We will give the Archdeacon *carte blanche* for the rest of his dates, which are many, and Chronological Tables not a few.

The placing Nazianzen "in the Tiberine district" (i. p. 686) makes one rub one's eyes. We read on ii. p. 40 of an "ordinary clerical dress" as usually worn at or about 358 A.D., but on p. 495, "In the fourth [century] the ordinary dress of the Christian minister was in no way distinguishable from that of laymen." At ii. p. 500, "Mani, Manes, or Manichæus [the heresiarch] lived towards the close of the third century," but on p. 717 the "Manichæans" appear among "the chief heretics of the SECOND." It is not for us *tantas componere lites* of a distinguished writer with himself.

There are other tokens of either "scamped" proof sheets or a scampering pen. Thus "our Homily on alms and deeds (*sic*)" is referred to i. p. 316. "Cuttlefrogs" occurs in a list of unpleasant creatures quoted on p. 456. On ii. p. 602, note 1, we read, "At the Hampton Court Conference the Bishops refused to admit the Puritan gloss¹ into Article XVI." This is per-

¹ This "gloss" probably refers to the proposal to insert after the words in Article XVI., "We may depart from grace given and fall into sin," the words,

fectly true, but not to the purpose of the text, which says, "The Pelagians were right, and not he [Augustine], when they refused to admit an unmixed corruption and absolute depravity of human nature as the result of Adam's sin;" which implies that the reference should be not to Article XVI., which is "Of Sin after Baptism," but to Article IX., "Of Original Sin." The rest of the note *has* a bearing on the text, but seems rather to contradict than to confirm it. The discussion of such points would lead us too far into the field of controversial theology; we therefore merely note the net result as forming an undigested whole. Among minor oversights, the heading of chap. viii. runs on throughout "First Exile of Athanasius," although the chapter covers matter down to his return from his *second* exile.

What to make of a statement on ii. p. 716, deriving "Ebionites" as an alternative possibility from a Hebrew word meaning "to deny," which Hebrew word is non-existent, and if it did exist, has no single syllable or letter in common with "Ebionite" or "Ebion," its supposed derivative, it is impossible to say. We can only suspect a confusion of the author with some added blunder of the press.

We find a short quotation from Tertullian in English on i. p. 243 in the text, and its original Latin on ii. p. 544 in a note. The same note has the original of a quotation from Lactantius which has already appeared in English three pages earlier. The motto-heading, chap. ix., is quoted from a sermon of Cardinal Newman's, and ends with, "Its [the Truth's] preachers suffer, but its *course* prevails," where "its course" should probably be "its cause." The age of Julian at his death is given ii. p. 39 as "thirty-seven," but the authorities, led by Clinton, agree in thirty-two (*b.* 331, *d.* 363).¹ We have Antioch described at ii. p. 642 as this "regenerate Athens of the East," where the context suggests that *degenerate* must have been intended. The Archdeacon has been in his time head-master of a school.

"Yet neither totally nor finally." This, however, relates to the doctrine, not of the depravity of nature, but of the indefectibility of grace.

¹ We had almost failed to notice that on i. p. 565 this age is correctly given as thirty-two.

What would he have done to a boy who had brought up a piece of work so teeming with proofs of carelessness?

Another point which moves our protest is prolix repetition. In a course of biographies which touch the same series of events, and in point of time largely overlap, this becomes the easiest of faults to a narrator. Some of these biographies run more or less in pairs, as those of Ambrose and Hilary, Jerome and Augustine, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen; and here the temptation to repeat requires a vigilant self-restraint which our author is probably too far gone in popularity to cultivate. Thus we have two chapters headed "Tertullian and Montanism" and "Tertullian's Montanistic Writings," which a writer less the victim of his own diffuseness would have condensed easily into one. Accordingly, the unnatural austerities of the Montanists, their tyranny over natural affections, gloomy and fanatical practices, come before us, pp. 189-90, and again pp. 210-13. The story of the child made first to partake of a heathen sacrifice, and then afterwards of the Christian eucharist, comes twice before us in the life of Cyprian, i. p. 299, and again p. 333. The scandals caused by the so-called "Brides of Christ" are noticed under "Tertullian," i. p. 172, again under "Cyprian," p. 268, and with kindred immoralities, arising from the undue exaltation of celibacy and monkery, form repeatedly throughout the two volumes the subjects of severe comment.¹ The extent to which the titles Pope (*papa*), Patriarch, and Archbishop were current amongst the higher clergy in the earlier centuries is touched and retouched in three notes on as many pages (vol. i. p. 262, 1, 448, 2, and 496, 3), which partly repeat and in some degree conflict with one another. "The most perilous charge against Chrysostom" is explained on ii. p. 685, having been already explained on p. 677. The common studies, retreat, and asceticism of Gregory and of Basil, and their joint authorship of the *Philokalia*, occur duly on longer or shorter scale in both their lives (i. p. 693, ii. pp. 15-17). A Præfect of Cappadocia is

¹ See i. pp. 267-68, ii. pp. 81-82, 328, 332, 335-6, 369, 481, 552, 663. The best and most balanced view of the evils as against the benefits of asceticism is to be found at ii. pp. 631-36.

restored to health by pickled cabbage on ii. p. 21, and again on p. 59. The deposition and exile of Gregory, and Basil's low estimate of the Arian Bishop who displaced him, is repeated with the same quotation, ii. pp. 61 and 86. The anecdote of Basil refusing his own brother (Gregory of Nyssa) as his associate in a mission to Rome, again with the exact quotation (differently Englished however), is found at ii. pp. 68 and 88. The usefulness of Basil, as Presbyter to Eusebius Exarch of Cæsarea, by reason of his superior theological training and ecclesiastical experience, together with the jealousy of Eusebius against Basil, owing to the influence with which this prominence invested him; their consequent abrupt breach, and Gregory's (Nazianzen) success as peacemaker between them, is all detailed at i. pp. 711-12, and again at ii. pp. 25-26. The contrast between the earlier tolerance and later rigour of Augustine's views is noticed ii. p. 526, again at p. 531, and again at p. 544. The remonstrances of Marcella against Jerome's licence of speech occurs at ii. pp. 276, and again at p. 291. The "pale and wrinkled faces of eunuchs in the streets" occurs on pp. 285 and 287. On p. 281 a statement of Jerome in the text is repeated in the note. But we fear we are wearying the reader with labour thrown away. What garrulous man in company was ever checked in his anecdotic prolixity by hints that his hearers had heard that before? But, moreover, the pen-garrulous man has the weight of his own laziness to back him. It is less trouble to let the pen flow freely than to re-peruse what is written in order to prune or weed.

It is a serious oversight in enumerating the passages which mention "fasting" in the New Testament to omit one so conspicuous as 2 Cor. xi. 27, as our author does on ii. p. 229, note, where he says that "apart from two passages [to which he refers], it is *not once* mentioned in all the Epistles."

How the results of Imperialism were to debase the simplicity of the Faith and the characters of ecclesiastics, and to transfer to Christianity the apparent responsibility for the foul vices or fashionable follies nurtured by Paganism, but above all to set and fix a standard of orthodoxy by persecution, and so to bequeath to the Church that dismal legacy of

which the Inquisition is the last codicil, is well told by the Archdeacon in many an eloquent page. Beyond even this, it tended to throw overweening power into the hands of the bishops, and thus dislocate permanently the relations of the three orders.

When the clergy of our day, convened by their bishop to a synod, are told, as some have been told, that they have no right of speech beyond a question which he will answer, they are really imbibing the dregs of that Imperialism which saw danger in a free-spoken presbytery and found convenience in an encroaching prelacy. The beginnings of this tendency within the Church itself are manifest, as we shall see already in the period of Origen, but were stimulated and multiplied subsequently.

The union of wide and boldly speculative thought with a gentle, calm, and almost passionless moral nature is what distinguishes Origen. With a more profound philosophic basis of reasoning than even Augustine, he draws with equal scrupulosity his proofs, or what he deems as such, from the arsenal of Holy Writ. It is true that finding an idea of the Gospel symbolized in a Mosaic rite is not the same thing as proving the truth of that idea from the Old Testament. But making due allowance for such a strain on the sense of Scripture, Origen is intensely scriptural. Yet his freedom places him in a position, relative to subsequent speculation, similar to that occupied by Lord Bacon in respect to modern natural philosophy. The nature of God and of the Trinity (although the relations of the Third with the other Two Divine Persons are not defined), the Unity, the Eternal Generation, the Incarnation, the creation, man's soul and human free-will, and the effect of the Fall on both of them; the idea of mediation, the law of nature and of Moses, the Church, the clergy, confession, absolution, Hades and Paradise, the nature of and purposes furthered by penal infliction, the beatific vision and the consummation of all things—all fall within the horizon swept by the view of Origen; and are all discussed with a dispassionate equanimity which might well have disarmed controversy of its asperities.

But even in peaceful times fame stirs up enemies, and troubles kindle in fiery times, as in the case of Savonarola, round a blameless life of lofty energies ; and these causes, no less than his own zeal alike to learn and to teach, led Origen to travel far. He visited the Palestinian Cæsarea with a shorter and a longer residence, besides sojourning at Rome and Antioch, as also in Achaia, Cappadocia, and Arabia. He stayed twice at Athens, and wrote some of his commentaries there. He speaks of himself as "having visited many places, and everywhere sought those who announced that they knew anything." In Cæsarea he had firm friends in the local bishop and Patriarch. They recognized his conspicuous powers by enlisting him as a lecturer or preacher, albeit a layman at the time. The Patriarch of his native Alexandria, who had befriended him before, resented this ; and wrote to remonstrate as against an unprecedented novelty. But several then recent instances were at once quoted against him. Origen, however, returned to his jurisdiction, and stimulated by the bounty of a wealthy friend, Ambrosius, wrote now or laid the deliberate foundations of other works, exegetic and miscellaneous, and began that mightiest Biblical work, the *Hexapla*, the fame and a few fragments of which alone have come down to us.

But Greek philosophy was in the air of Alexandria, and no open mind could escape it. Origen had evidently strong sympathies with inquirers who came asking the gravest and deepest questions. In short, his sympathies were "a world too wide" for those of Demetrius the Patriarch. He quitted Alexandria. The immediate cause was a summons to Achaia to compose some controversy ; but passing again through friendly Cæsarea, he was there ordained, a step which infringed the canonical claims of his native Patriarch, a small-minded stickler for such points, who thereupon succeeded in making Alexandria too hot for him. His dignified sense of injury, and fear lest the unruffled calm which his meditations needed should be disturbed, are expressed in a fine philosophic passage, translated, i. p. 412, but too long for extraction here. He seems always to have retained the enthusiasm of his friends ; and the much later statement that

one of them, Heraklas, who had taken charge of the school in his absence, turned now against him, probably arose from a mistake in the name.¹ He consulted his own peace by again leaving his native city to return no more. After his departure, Demetrius the Patriarch convened first a synod of bishops and presbyters, and then a trio of bishops. Both "sat upon" Origen; but only the latter, probably creatures of Demetrius, voted his excommunication. He found, however, a refuge again in Palestine. His visit to Antioch had been at the instance of an imperial lady, Julia Mammæa, related to several Cæsars, and the mother and chief educator of Alexander Severus, who indeed never effectually escaped from the maternal apron-string, and died, so to speak, strangled in it. Her habits of parsimony were adopted by him towards his legions, who of all things abhorred a stingy Cæsar, and the result was a fatal mutiny. But the fact of having enjoyed the favours of the virtuous and the worthy, marked out Origen as a likely victim to the savage Maximin, the next for awhile successful pretender to the purple, whose emissaries, however, he escaped by retiring to Cappadocia.

"From A.D. 235 to A.D. 237 he lived in hiding in the house of a learned Christian lady named Juliana. By a curious coincidence this lady had inherited the library of Symmachus, the translator into Greek of the Old Testament. Juliana possessed a copy of this translation with other interpretations of the Scriptures, which were to Origen of priceless value, and which made the time of his retirement very fruitful." He returned however to Palestine, left it again for Arabia to compose discords or allay doubts. While there, at Bostra, a neighbouring town to Pella, the well-known place of refuge of Jewish Christianity, he made the acquaintance of Philip the Arabian, who, after murdering the third Gordian, was acknowledged as Emperor by the legions and Senate. He and his wife Severa had strong prepossessions in favour of Christianity, and Origen wrote to them to urge its claims.

¹ Names framed on those of the Greek deities were specially common and popular; and none more so than those moulded on Herakles.

Had Philip's short reign of four years been lengthened, this might have ripened into conviction, with consequences antedating Constantine. But the legions again revolted in favour of Decius, and in the resulting civil war Philip was slain. The persecution kindled by Decius found Origen at Tyre, and there, after suffering innumerable atrocities and indignities, he died in 253 A.D.

The grudge which Demetrius, his Patriarch, bore him, arose perhaps in part from the natural jealousy of being in his larger sphere outshone by a subordinate of commanding genius. There were, however, graver differences arising out of the growing tendency, which Origen resisted and Demetrius fostered, to formulate the Church Visible into a rigid network of dioceses in which the Bishop could say, "*L'Eglise c'est moi.*" Alike at Rome under Zephyrinus and Callistus, and at Carthage under Cyprian, we observe advances in centralization at the expense of Christian liberties. The larger and more liberal spirit was represented by Hippolytus in Italy, and by Origen in Egypt; but the tactical advantages of central organization threw more and more weight on the other side. Origen looked to the moral influence of holiness as the chief factor in Church government; the Patriarch rather to official authority and coercive anathema. Origen distinguished the ideal, perfect, and glorious Church, "not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing," from that compromise with human imperfections of which the parables of the Tares and of the Draw-net are the fixed illustrations.

Demetrius, with Cyprian and many another after him, ascribed to this latter the privileges and attributes of that former, and exalted into a cardinal virtue obedience to the Church rulers of the day.

Of all known literary losses sustained by Christianity since the Apostolic age, the greatest is that of Origen's *Hexapla*. And the recovery of even the least precious of his lost writings would be like the salvage of Crown jewels. In the *Hexapla* the foundation of all Biblical criticism was laid; and as it included a revision of the LXX. Text, which it found encumbered with the corruptions of four uncritical

centuries, besides forming a basis for the later labours of Jerome, it has through that LXX. and Jerome's Vulgate perpetuated its influence in a most important part, although lost as a whole. But more than this, Origen's works have been a mine of treasure from which subsequent writers of all parties have helped themselves impartially. Probably not one of the Greek Fathers, and few of the Latin, have not drawn largely upon that ample store. Although his own books were garbled in his lifetime, his *obiter dicta* delated as formulated opinions, his speculative theses twisted into deliberate conclusions, and his private meditations pirated into publicity; yet this posthumous verdict, by nearly universal suffrage of the greatest minds, lifts him upon a pedestal round which detraction snarls in vain. Not only into the text of Scripture, but into its exposition, he struck firm and deep the roots of his penetrating genius. Yet more, he was the first to place the principles of Christianity in systematic relation with the demands of reason, and "make philosophy the handmaid to faith." A single sentence from his works seems to have suggested the germinal principle of Bishop Butler's *Analogy*.

For a lucid sketch of a perplexed subject we may commend the Archdeacon's chap. xvii. continued, on "Augustine and the Donatists." It reproduces with greater clearness, in thirty pages or less, matter on which Böhringer, the well-known German biographer of various Fathers, has expended ninety much more densely printed; and but for Böhringer this perspicuous summary of a prolix and entangled controversy would probably not have existed. The Donatist question, degenerating into a factious squabble of ferocity and persecution, was in effect what ultimately wrecked the Church of Africa: and the Archdeacon ably shows how the cause wrought out the effect.

We do not think him equally successful in his chapter on the "Pelagian Controversy," which stirs far profounder questionings than Donatism ever reached to. The enquiry how to reconcile human freedom of will with Divine absolute supremacy is obviously not a special product of Christianity.

It is a problem which confronts the theist on the barren rocks of speculative reason as fully as it does the believer in a revelation. It is sure to emerge wherever any attempt is made to systematize absolutely the relations of the human and the Divine Spirit; yet nearly all such questions are discussed relatively to each other or to fixed practical standards, and therefore a wide circle of discussion may be swept without ever stirring this, which has seemed to so many powerful minds the master-problem of all. Such was the case with the præ-Augustinian Fathers. The collision which strikes light on a question had not in their days taken place. The Archdeacon says of Pelagius and Augustine:—

“Both of them appealed to the authority of previous Church writers, and here also [*i.e.* as well as when citing Scripture] they might equally claim as many sentences and expressions on the one side as on the other.”

This we believe to misrepresent the real state of the case. A sample or two will show that Augustine's supposed support from earlier writers was of the thinnest and feeblest kind. He takes Cyprian's words on *Sanctificetur Nomen Tuum* in the Lord's Prayer, expounding that we pray that that Name may be sanctified *in us*. But we have received baptism, or we could not use the Prayer. Therefore we pray for “the gift of perseverance,” and this is wrested into making Cyprian a perseverantist in Augustine's sense. Again, Ambrose had said, “If a man be a follower of Christ, and says he does it because it seems good to him to do so, he does not therefore deny that it seemed good to God, for by God man's will is prepared.” Here Ambrose obviously includes as equally axiomatic man's will and God's will—the *visum* of both—and urges that one does not exclude the other. Augustine cites it to show that Ambrose's view was *his* view, *i.e.*, that one *does* exclude the other, *viz.*, the Divine the human. He does not venture to claim Origen, that would have been too obvious a strain even on the forcing-pump of controversy. In Calvin we find an ingenious confession that Ambrose, Origen, and Jerome were all opposed to his own views, which he seems to have regarded as accurately reflecting those of Augustine (*Instit.* iii. xxii. 8).

It is in balancing evidence on a point like this that we expect such a rapid—one may say, headlong—writer as our author to fail. But for vivid and effective delineation of a most characteristic story, take that of Augustine and Alypius, and the uproar in Church over the question of the ordination of Pinianus (ii. pp. 575 *seq.*).

That which gives an imperishable interest to the great or notable men whom Archdeacon Farrar has portrayed, is the historical momentum which they give to the whole after age of the Church and of the world, throughout the centuries which follow the fall of Jerusalem, and which makes that catastrophe the turning-point of human history. These new forms of spiritual life wait in solemn groups round the lingering death-bed of the old Empire and assist the birth throes of all that has come since. The Julio-Claudian dynasty dies out in Nero, the Flavian in Domitian, that of Trajan, recruited by adoption, in Commodus. Each of them thus determines in a monster from whom a long-suffering world at last relieved itself by an assassin's hand. The next, the Septimian, ends in a bright specimen who similarly perished, but untimely and too young to make his mark, Alexander Severus. Ruthless ferocity, military energy, and unlettered barbarism make up the character of Maximin who follows. That such a series should be tolerated, and should go on repeating itself, until the dead level of a sycophant empire is reached in Arcadius and Honorius, is a cumulative proof of the moral impotency of what once was mighty Rome.

It is probable, indeed, that the progress of Christianity hastened her decline and precipitated her fall. But this was chiefly owing to the instinctive antagonism with which she encountered the Christian idea of virtue, sanctified by religion and sanctifying freedom. That idea contained the germ of a new liberty, and therefore was inconsistent with—if one may coin a word—an *effetescent* Cæsarism. Because Rome was identified with an idea irreconcilable with Christianity, therefore her decay was irretrievable. This applies primarily to the Imperial city and its society, to other cities and their societies in proportion as they approached it. No socio-

political system, which had absorbed so much refinement and imbibed so much philosophy, ever sank so deeply and debased itself so utterly in secularism, selfishness, sensuality, and servility. But besides all this, there reigned in all classes, as evinced by their ruling passion of gladiatorial games, a public gluttony of blood. Gibbon's golden age of the Antonines did nothing to temper this. The influence of the personal character of those emperors perished with them, nay, probably left the Empire, through their long spell of peace, more steeped in effeminacy than they found it. Never were the words which Shakspeare has put into the funeral oration over the first Cæsar more amply verified—

"The evil that men do lives after them ;
The good is oft interred with their bones"—

than in the case of these specimens of paganized perfection, the Antonine Cæsars. They had done nothing to educate the Senate and people to higher aspirations, as shown by the fact that the Roman world presently resigned itself to such a trio of outrages on humanity as is presented in Commodus, Caracalla, and Heliogabalus. It is true that the vigorous personality of Septimius Severus breaks the downward drag between the first and second of these. But he again was a "barrack" Cæsar, and found campaigns in the East the only antidote to decay. And if he was one of the best, what can be said of the worst?

These remarks are in close relation to the condition of Church life depicted in several of these "Lives," notably in that of Jerome. He is the satirist (in prose) of his age. The parade of wealth, vice, and folly, made splendid in the public eye by every refined device of ostentatious effeminacy, has Jerome for its chief exponent in A.D. 390. It shows that old Roman society, debauched for three centuries by many a Cæsar, Senator, and Consular, poisoning and corrupting the Church by being transferred to her bosom under conditions of nominal conversion. From that poison the Roman Church has never really recovered. A vigorous Pope may turn moral sanitor. He purges it awhile—*tamen usque recurrit*, being a bane bred in the soil and nurtured in the air.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Dogmatics. *The Redemption of Man* (1) is the title which Dr. Simon has affixed to some "Discussions bearing on the Atonement." The learned author does not claim for these discussions anything like completeness, they are just one of the many attempts to restate the doctrine in terms which suit the present age; and we cannot say that this, any more than the others, are entirely satisfactory. But nevertheless the work is well worth reading; the subject it deals with is of everlasting importance, and Dr. Simon brings together a mass of information which is very valuable. In the introduction he gives a *résumé* of the various ways of stating and treating the doctrine of the atonement; and then in several chapters he gives the result of his own studies. He sets out with the idea that "the earthly mission of our Lord Jesus Christ, with its *obedience unto death, even the death of the cross*, was an episode in the history of the kingdom of God. . . . It might be called an act or scene in the great drama of history." Dr. Simon holds that the universe in its totality, with its innumerable intelligences, constitutes the kingdom of God. The kingdom of heaven is the identity of the *de jure* and the *de facto* kingdom of God. The end of the mission of Christ was to establish the kingdom of God, not in the *de jure* sense, for in that sense it already existed, but in the *de facto* sense; in other words, to realise the kingdom of God. There are chapters dealing with the Constitution of Humanity, Relations of Man to God, Hebrew Sin-offerings with Ethnic Parallels, the Anger of God, Forgiveness of Sin, Passion of Christ, Atonement and Prayers, and the Historical Influence of the Death of Christ, and also interesting notes on various topics connected with the subject. It is possible that these "discussions" may grow into a valuable treatise on the whole subject; meantime they form valuable food for thought. We observe that Dr. Simon seems to object to the term orthodoxy, and prefers *orthopisty*; and he adds that "there is such a thing as a right faith, that is, using faith in an objective sense; there is such a thing as the objects of faith held and presented in their genuine, undiluted, untwisted form. Those who change, diminish, mutilate, misrepresent them, Paul anathematises."

Attached to Mr. Copinger's *Treatise on Predestination, Election, and Grace* (2) is a Bibliography of those and kindred subjects, such

as Fate, Providence, Prescience, Grace, Redemption, Necessity, Cause of Evil, The Fall, Assurance, &c., extending to 216 double-columned pages of small print. Mr. Copinger's labour in tabulating all these authors and their works must have been immense, it is both an astonishing part of his book and a most useful one for reference. He must have felt a considerable diffidence in adding another volume to the vast literature on this subject, which, though perennially interesting, has, one would think, been by this time almost exhaustively considered. However, we heartily welcome Mr. Copinger's treatise, and we do so all the more for being the work of a layman, one who has had a legal training, who can weigh evidence and calmly judge amidst conflicting statements and opinions. He rightly says that "No doctrine is taught in Holy Scripture upon which men have been more divided in opinion than the doctrine of Predestination and Election. Many hold the doctrine in such a way that they find it inconsistent with certain parts of Scripture, and it is clear therefore that they cannot hold the doctrine aright, for no part of God's Word can actually be inconsistent, however it may appear to be, with any other part. Every part of it is equally true. One part throws light on, and is, as it were, a key to unlock other parts. No particular part of the Bible is the ground of our faith and the rule of our life. It is the Word of God as a whole. We are instructed to compare Scripture with Scripture and search out 'all the counsel of God' (Acts xx. 27), so far as it is revealed, if we wish to become 'wise unto salvation.'"

Proceeding on this principle, Mr. Copinger, after giving a short history of the doctrine, goes on to examine each opinion of those most known, and finds that the Bible does not support Calvinism, or Arminianism, or Augustinianism, or the Necessitarian Doctrine, or Pelagianism. Each of these may have the support of a certain set of texts, but there are others that oppose it; and the true doctrine must be something different from either. He finds no fault with the 17th Article of the Church of England, and therefore, we suppose, Mr. Copinger upholds the teaching of that Church on this subject. He examines in detail the various texts of Scripture and passages from the Fathers, which are supposed to be the stronghold of either party; and if there be a fault to be found with his treatise, we should be inclined to say it comes from the fact that Mr. Copinger does not with sufficient distinctness state his own views. He is fair to all, and impartially states their reasons, but he also shows their weaknesses.

We have read this treatise with much satisfaction, and we can heartily recommend it, and hope it will be widely read and pondered; for, on the whole, the subject is treated in a manner which is especially suitable for theological subjects being free from the personal animus which disfigures a good many valuable works. The last five chapters of the treatise are of a practical nature, and contain a great deal which is both valuable and beautiful. After going through the polemical parts, one comes into these chapters as it were out of a tangled wood into a beautiful green meadow across which the sunshine of God's goodness gleams gloriously. Mr. Copinger truly says that "The doctrine of Election is not to be regarded as a dry theory or sentimental idea, but as a spiritual and practical truth. . . . The doctrine of Election is a doctrine full of life and peace to those who are exercised thereby, a most powerful incentive to righteousness and holiness, a constraining motive, a binding obligation on all to love and honour God who has so loved and chosen them."

God in the Bible (3) is the title of the thirteenth series of Mr. Joseph Cook's Boston Monday Lectures. The subject is Inspiration, and is treated in the author's usual style of vigorous eloquence. Mr. Cook is well able to make up his mind in most matters, and when he expresses his opinion he does so with no hesitating or halting speech. We are glad to welcome such a champion on the side of orthodoxy; and we can commend Mr. Cook's lectures to many who may have doubts or difficulties on this question. The account of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians is capital; the lecture on Christ's Estimate of the Old Testament Scriptures is very striking; and that on the Fulfilled Predictions ought to be convincing to anybody. Each lecture has a "Prelude," and in these introductions Mr. Cook treats of subjects so widely separated as Mormonism and Free Speech, Woman's Influence in the Temperance Reform, and Jewish Opposition in the Matter of Education. There are some hymns, which are not nearly so good as the lectures; and the volume closes with a *symposium* on Inspiration, in which a number of professors express their views on the subject.

(1) *The Redemption of Man*. By D. W. Simon, Ph.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1889. Price 10s. 6d.

(2) *A Treatise on Predestination, Election, and Grace*. By W. A. Copinger, F.S.A., Barrister-at-Law. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 10s. 6d.

(3) *God in the Bible*. Boston Monday Lectures, 1888. By Joseph Cook. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1889. Price 3s. 6d.

That a twelfth edition of Dr. Kinns' volume, *Moses and Geology* (1), should be issued within eight years of its first publication, is a proof of its value and of the need which it is designed to meet. And not alone will many thousands of ordinary readers rejoice that so much harmony can be traced between the Bible and science, but it appears also that in this volume Dr. Kinns is in agreement with many men of the highest scientific attainments. In the present edition the facts are drawn from the latest scientific discoveries; Dr. Kinns' arguments are quite up to date; and though scientific knowledge will undoubtedly increase and broaden as time goes on, still we can well believe that the foundations here set out will stand firm, and we take comfort from the thought that the authority of the Scriptures will not suffer diminution, but rather they will receive support from the discoveries of men of science when these are looked at in the proper way. Dr. Kinns' work is an extremely interesting one; he touches upon all sorts of knowledge; he gathers his facts from the highest authorities in all departments; he can incorporate the sequence of creative acts or events as stated by Prof. Huxley, and earn Mr. Gladstone's thanks for so doing. He has consulted all sorts of authorities, living and dead, and marshalled his facts in such a way as makes his work a most engaging story. And one great charm of the work is the reverent, hopeful, and thankful spirit in which it is written, showing how a man of science can be that and everything besides that a Christian ought to be. The body of the book consists of thirteen chapters, in which the successive acts of creation as related by Moses are considered; then there are four "Addenda Chapters," as the author calls them, in the first of which an account is given of Mr. George Smith's discovery of the Assyrian history of the Flood; in the second there is a curious explanation of the signs of the Zodiac; then follows a chapter on the Fall and Redemption of Mankind; and lastly, one on the Power of Prayer. The Appendix contains information respecting diamonds, the earthquake at Lisbon, the expansion of gases as seen in the explosion of gunpowder, &c., the length-of day and night at the poles, the names of the most lately discovered minor planets, Jonah and the whale, and the learning of Moses. The whole work is profusely illustrated and well printed, and is a cheap and attractive volume, which we can most heartily recommend.

(1) *Moses and Geology*. By Rev. Samuel Kinns, Ph.D. 12th Thousand. London, &c. : Cassell & Company, Limited. 1889. Price 5s.