

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1891.

ART. I.—PERSONAL REVELATION.

GOD'S REVELATION IN NATURE.

WE cannot know the whole of nature, because it is God's work, and God seems to have worked from the beginning till now; therefore no finite creature can know all that God has done during an infinite time and within an infinite space.

This work of God is a revelation of God. God's own revelation of Himself in nature is not only infinite, because so far as we know nature is infinite, but is also manifoldly infinite. It is in this wise: every part is so related to all other parts that no one part can be fully known unless in connection with all those parts. So there are parts which, we may say, contain the whole; that is, the finite, rightly understood, is relatively infinite.

That which is manifoldly infinite, by stretching beyond itself, and not losing itself in the outside immeasurable, but becoming an infinite within an infinite, is found in God's revelation of Himself in Holy Scripture, no one fact of which can be perfectly known. It is found, also, in God's revelation of Himself to the ages, not one of which can be searched out unless every age is displayed, for no one age is complete unless the completion comprises all that led to the age, and all that led from the age. It is likewise found in God's revelation of Himself to every individual. There is such revelation, or we could not be conscious of it; and this stretches from the one to the many in its effects, and from the many, in larger effects, to all.

Every one of these revelations is true and perfect. At the same time every one is final and yet progressive. We learn it thus: Nature, at every moment, is that wonderful thing which, containing all that is, and being the garment of God,

cannot be added to, being already all, but does, nevertheless, every moment grow with manifold growth, because the Creator every moment brings new things from the infinitude by the sending forth of new creative powers from within Himself. The revelation of God's self in Scripture is also infinite, so is the revelation to the ages and to individuals; for these revelations, being of God, partake of that infinity in every part which is only possible of limitation as to meaning and effects by the illimitable wisdom and majesty of the Revealer.

If revelation of every sort is thus infinite, how can the paradox be maintained that this infinite is capable of extension? We may think thus: Our own individuality, and the distinctness and separateness of every atom, are a sort of personality which is really a world in itself. Every man, every portion of matter, is a meeting-place where all the world's forces and all the world's effects, and that for the past and not less for the future obtain by locality in the man a conscious personality, and in the above an unconscious personality. This personality, rightly considered, is a miniature of the Divine Personality, which, containing all other things transcendently, is only and ineffably self-contained in itself. This old truth becomes new in all new worlds, new times, and new individuals.

He who expects to arrive at the fulness of all this, physically, vitally, sentiently, intellectually, morally, must recast that expectation. Then taking up as rudimentary facts—eternity, as personified by the eternal; and infinitude, as concrete in the infinite; and all power, as individualised in God—he will have Trinity, which is the source of all life, all intelligence, all goodness, in one omnipresent Will whom we worship—Jehovah.

GOD'S REVELATION OF HIMSELF IN CHRIST

is both full and true. In Christ was the fulness of Godhead. The revelation is full: there will not be another Christ. Out of this fulness flows that progression of energy, of light, of love, which enables the capable to use science, history, criticism, experience, so that the fulness of Christ becomes their fulness. Christ is that ever-flowing river which flows through all time both past and to come. He streams into us. Then we ourselves give of that we received, with all that is human in us, and with all the Divine aids which make that human more effective and God-like. Then we, age after age, emptying ourselves into the great onflow of heavenly and earthly truth, are co-workers with God until the earth is filled with the glory of the Lord, and heaven is replenished with the children of men.

They then see the beauty of the Lord in the land that is very far off.

To deny that the earth will be filled with glory, and that man will dwell in heavenly felicity, is that wickedness, the greatest of all indiscretions, which clothes itself in formulated atheism. This atheism asserts that the God of religion is not the God of science and philosophy. The assertion of the few is disproved by the many scientific and philosophical who are Christians, and by the many Christians who are men of science and philosophers. The assertion is also rendered ridiculous by the effort to separate the scientific domain from the religious territory, for all truth is one. When truths seem to oppose they do so because our ignorance misunderstands and our wilfulness perverts them. Remove ignorance, subdue wilfulness, and we shall soon see that science and Scripture are correlatives; that both in part are by faith, both in part are by knowledge, certainly by intelligence; that, indeed, the two are one truth with different aspects, the higher rationality belonging to religion.

Gaps in science greatly coincide with our gaps in faith. As the former are filled up by verified research, the latter are occupied by light and power in the measure that a man desiring to know God finds, by sweet confirmatory experience, that he himself is known of that same God.

People who place themselves in the gaps, not to fill, but enlarge them into a reasonable dwelling-place, are inconveniently placed when the gaps are closed. It is then they utter the absurdity: "The more we know of the universal work done by the Eternal Power, the less we know that a personal God exists." It is not less perverse than for a man to declare: The more I know of the unity in all diversity, and of a master energy in all forces, the less I perceive of an all-controlling One.

Christ amongst men is the all-controlling One. In Him was, and is now that He is on the throne, that unity of person with every one of us in our special individuality which constitutes Him not less the representative of all than an example of every one in particular. He bare our sins in His own Body on the tree. That Body is now on the throne. There is not a man for whom Christ died not. There is not a man whom Christ represents not before God. Is it a question of science, of work, of suffering, of righteousness, of power to save? Christ is the all-sufficient for all and every. His righteousness is a glory covering the world, and an exactly-fitting garment for every individual. He suffered the just for the unjust. Great sinners and little sinners find Him a sufficient Saviour. In work He did all that His Father gave

Him to do. He said "It is finished," and this enables Him to supply whatever lacks in us. As for science, the spirit of investigation, of perfect truth, the unrestingness till all is done, till all is revealed that God would have us know, and that the world contains or will contain, all these are from Christ, because Christ was God manifested in our flesh, the God-man of two natures, divine and human, perfect God and perfect man in one Person.

PERSONAL REVELATION.

Here is the rub. Religious men are not able to worship a mere force that does not know them, will not help them, cannot love them. Nor can unbelieving scientific men. Their talk of silent worship, reverence for the unknown, of feeling for one without feeling, of reverence for that which is incapable of receiving reverence, is like the dressing up of nothing and then deceiving ourselves with a fictitious embodiment which, though embodied, we say is no embodiment. Of course all that ends in nothing. No, alas! it ends in sin most inexcusable and in time most irreparable.

Talk of worshipping a personal God as being anthropomorphic! Well, it is less like a man to worship a power that is not person, wisdom that has not even the consistency of a vapour, and goodness that knows nothing about itself. No man can do that unless he is self-mutilated, and not self-mutilated for the kingdom of God's sake, but an emasculated poor creature who boasts of his impotence, not knowing that his manhood long ago departed.

These people are, of course, weakly sensitive, and, as a sort of concealment for their shame, make a boast of intellectuality and freedom. They fight for what they most need and least possess, as the Swiss formerly for money and the French for glory. The Swiss are not now so much in need, so prefer to dwell in peace. The French are not sure that they are gloriously sufficient, and remain unable to put away that sensitiveness which makes itself silly in feverish attempts to show that they are cleverer than all the world; as to being truly good, only those of them who are God's children think of that. Their cure will be found when all natural research shows the whole of nature to be a representation as a whole and in every part of the supernatural, that every material thing is essentially a miraculous thing, that life is fruitful and honourable in the measure it is laid out in righteous action and patient perseverance, and that faith, united to high aspirations, as it supplies the sublimest thoughts, inspires and enables to the grandest acts.

It is time for all to think that physical exertion on our

part is a proof of personality; that the purpose for which we make that exertion being always for something concrete, and referring to things and persons, makes even the purpose itself individual. Carry this to Christ. He confirms our idea of eternal duration by giving us individually eternal life. He did not give the idea; that was bestowed when we were made in the image of God. Life is with God. He is eternal life; with Him alone is immortality. Hence our sense of everlastingness, as persons, comes by gift, and to give is personal, both in the giving and receiving. The Father, having life in Himself, gave to the Son to have life in Himself, and the Holy Ghost, being of both, yet truly one, hath also life in Himself. This life, given by the Father through the Son, and wrought in us by the Holy Ghost, gives endurance to every man's individual nature, and is a personal life. This personal life is a phenomenon. All phenomena are material reflections of their substantial essences in the unseen; therefore our personality is a finite revelation of that infinite personality, who creates, redeems, and sanctifies.

Passing from thinking to living, the exercise of will is that personal action by which, as persons, we worship and serve a personal God. We catch in music and all artistic work eloquent and fitting expression. Divine ideas, set in the music of the spheres, songs without words, wrapping our weariness in rest, and weaving into harmony, that tells of will sublime, conciliates the perplexing discords of every troubled life. God's will in those ideas is more than a brilliant star glittering on the far verge of our human horizon. It is God in us.

Can any mortal mixture of earth's mould
Breathe such divine, enchanting ravishment?
Sure something holy lodges in that breast,
And with these raptures moves the vocal air
To testify His hidden residence.—Milton's "Comus."

Going from our own life to all that is in being, we find the personality of God imprinted everywhere. Whatever is, even the smallest, possesses an individuality which is a personality of its own. Atom attracts atom throughout the universe. Sphered stars, separate and distinct, move in harmony, and all the hosts of heaven are in familiar intercourse, yet every one rules as a monarch. Metals, earths, animals, plants, the infinitesimally small and the infinitely large, throughout the immensity of space and vastness of time, are all in their own beings and existences individual, and, therefore, personal; they are the eternal and infinite appearing in time and space as the great personal power, spirit, wisdom, ruling all.

JOSEPH WILLIAM REYNOLDS.

ART. II.—A PLEA FOR THE CYCLE.

THE irrepressible cycle is to be found everywhere. It asks and obtains a favourable hearing from our military authorities; it occupies the attention of our legislators; and it claims a space in the literature of the day.

The question, however, arises whether it ought to request a hearing from the readers of the CHURCHMAN, and whether a Magazine devoted to the more sober matters of divine faith and practice ought to yield compliance. If on the score of sport, the answer would undoubtedly be in the negative; but if as an instrument in ministering to the well-being of the *corpus sanum* the cycle asks to be heard, then the case assumes a different aspect. The aim of this Magazine is, without any question, to the best of its ability, to minister to the well-being of the *mens sana*. But so close is the connection between the mind and the material body, that if the latter is not maintained in its proper condition the former—*i.e.*, the mind—must, as a necessary consequence, suffer loss. The high ideal is unquestionably to be found in the common but little regarded proverb, *Mens sana in corpore sano*.

We read in the New Testament that "bodily exercise profiteth little"; whence by some it has been very strangely contemned; but if, with the Revised Version, we read, "is profitable for a little," then we shall see that a certain value is put upon it. No one, indeed, who considers, even in the slightest degree, the wonderful mechanism of our body can for one moment doubt as to the necessity of making due use of those powers which form part of its economy. If nerves and muscles, wonderfully constructed, occupy their due place, what are they for but to be called into exercise? If they lie in a dormant or semi-dormant condition then they do not fulfil the law of their being, and a result, more or less injurious, must follow. The divine statement, "If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it," contains in it the expression of a great truth. The body, in its general condition, must be affected by the torpid state of the muscular powers; it is deprived, more or less, of one of the great mainstays of vital force. Hence arises an inert condition of the body, and there is produced what is styled by the medical faculty *functional*, as opposed to organic derangement, though, unhappily, the latter is very frequently induced. Bodily exercise also tends (1) very largely to promote the healthy circulation of the blood, and (2) to cause the pores of the skin to discharge their due office through the action of the sudoriparous or sweat-glands. As to this point, it is somewhat surprising to find

many persons most careful to maintain a due state of cleanliness by means of the morning bath, and yet, at the same time, very negligent as to muscular exertion. They seem to forget the fact that perspiration, if it be not excessive, is a material relief to the system, and may not inaptly be termed one of nature's safety-valves. Our remarks on this subject may be summed up by affirming that exercise in the open-air is a necessity for all persons of either sex if they would maintain themselves in a healthy state—exercise, be it understood, duly proportioned to their condition, and not involving any subsequent sense of undue weariness or lassitude. It is the ignoring of this essential law of our being that has occasioned so much of the indigestion, hysteria, and other kindred complaints of which we hear so much, and which seem to show a tendency to increase. So strongly impressed was a former somewhat quaint doctor at Leamington with the rationale of the cure that he is reported to have taken sundry of his patients out for a carriage-drive into the country, and then left them to walk home by themselves.

Yet, although what has been advanced will commend itself to the good sense of our readers, it is nevertheless an undoubted fact that sundry persons consider they may exert their mental powers as far as they will, or call into exercise their spiritual faculties, and at the same time disregard to a very great extent the claims of the long-suffering body. Work, work, work. Yes; but how, and of what value? Does not the mind and the soul also sympathize very decidedly with the bodily condition? Would, for instance, a hard-worked town clergyman turn out less work if he conscientiously took due exercise, not as a matter of mere pleasure, but as of stern necessity, thereby fulfilling one of God's laws? Would there not, we may ask, be more force and vigour in his work? and is it not true that what the present day demands is *quality* rather than *quantity*?—a fact not considered by many as it ought to be. The remark just made applies with equal force to all brain-toilers, as well as to those engaged in the busy avocations of professional or mercantile life. It is a humorous answer to the question, "Is life worth living?" "That depends upon the liver!" But it contains in it a world of truth, and everyone who suffers from a disordered body must acknowledge to the full that any relief in this direction is of the highest possible value. In this condition of things the cycle meets one as a friend. It says to us: "Mount me; get away from the haunts of men; speed on by the side of the river, over the esplanade, or in the woody dells; breathe the fresh air—the nectar of heaven—and you will return a new man, refreshed in spirit, and have

left your cobwebs behind you. You will, unless you have pressed me too fast or impelled me beyond your strength, experience no sense of fatigue; but a glow of health which will fit you all the better to discharge the duties of your daily life." This language contains nothing but sober truth, without any garnishing; for what can be more exhilarating than a run in the country, free from all those cares and thoughts which weigh a man down and take away the elasticity of his nature?

The celebrated Charles Dickens, in the year 1869, contributed to the columns of *All the Year Round* an account of his experiences. He says: "The effect of acid in the system and want of tone; the connection between physical ailments and mental depression; the precise symptoms heralding gout; the varieties of dyspepsia—sleepless nights, aches in the head, loads on the chest, weariness of the limbs, dulness of eye and heaviness of spirit—were all mine." He then, having previously consulted a doctor without any benefit (though, it must be acknowledged, he was not a very obedient patient), was recommended to try horse-exercise, and he chronicles the result in the following words: "Unhappily, so far from my liver succumbing, it became worse, and my spirits went down to zero." A drowning man will catch at a straw, and in this state of physical discomfort it did not take much persuasion to induce Charles Dickens to try the novelty of the day—the bicycle—with the striking result that, as he tells us, his "rebellious liver surrendered unconditionally. . . . It is astonishing how your benevolence increases as your digestion improves. You laugh at worries which once seemed crushing; you become tolerant, patient, and amiable. You have safely and surely emancipated yourself from the penal regimen you dreaded, and can live like other people, and prosecute your work with impunity. Let others speak of the bicycle as a means of locomotion my recommendations are based on sanitary grounds alone, and I maintain it to be infinitely easier than a tonic, potion, or pill."¹

It is quite impossible to conceive of a stronger testimony to the merits of the cycle, yet we are fully aware it will be maintained that walking is the most natural form of exercise. Quite true, we reply, if circumstances permit of it and it can be obtained in sufficient quantity; but with the artificial life of the present day and the abnormal condition of things around us this form of exercise, to be of any service, is oft-times impracticable. It has, moreover, to be borne in mind that in walking the whole weight of the body has to be moved forward at every step, and thus in many cases fatigue ensues

¹ The quotations are from "Cycling and Health."

after even very moderate exertion, especially with those who have a depraved nervous condition. With cycling all this is changed; the upper part of the body rests on the saddle, the pedals support the feet, and the hands rest on the handle-bar. It may be urged in reply, this is true; but surely the effort of propelling outweighs the advantages. This can hardly be seriously intended as a rejoinder, for, when once the art of cycling is properly learnt, it is evident to all observers that on a good level road the exertion of driving a machine is hardly felt at all, whilst on a decline there is, for the most part, a pleasurable sense of repose, and it is only on rising ground that the muscles are called into active exercise. Patience and perseverance will, however, surmount the difficulties of hill-riding, and as soon as the art of taking a hill, as it is technically termed, is acquired, it will be found that all ordinary hills, and even some steep ones, can be ridden with an ease which, in the earlier days of cycle-riding, seemed to be impossible. Owing to the labour which the inexperienced cyclist puts into his work, the opinion has gained ground in many quarters, after all, it must be *hard* work; but that is owing to not noticing the difference between one who has and one who has *not* acquired the art of riding properly. In estimating the comparative ease of propelling the cycle, we have to remember that in walking the step ranges from 2 ft. 3 in.—the new military step—to 3 ft.; but on a machine, which is geared, for instance, to 54 in., every revolution of the pedals carries the rider over 13 ft. 6 in., which is a great contrast, and naturally accounts for the ease of running—a fact not understood by the uninitiated.

The inquiry next arises as to the limit of distance. This necessarily must vary with the strength and skill of the rider, and the condition of the roads; but it may be stated that the introduction of the low safety bicycle and the cripper type of tricycle has introduced quite a new element into cycle-riding. Passing by all reference to track riding, which does not come within our province, we find that about the year 1882 the journey from London to York was chronicled as having been accomplished in 24 hours; this year, in the reverse direction, it has been ridden in 14 hours 21 minutes. In the same year the longest tricycle ride ever recorded was 180 miles in 23 hours 45 minutes in a very hilly country from Derby to Holyhead. This year a rider on a Marlbro' Club is stated to have accomplished 175½ miles in 12 hours, and 317½ in 24 hours; whilst on a Humber safety 358 miles, from Bordeaux to Paris, was ridden in 26 hours 36½ minutes, this road being described as heavy, wet and hilly. It is freely acknowledged that these riders were crack riders, but the record

made serves the purpose of showing what can be accomplished, and we shall not be far wrong if we assert that one-half or one-third of the above distances can be ridden by ordinary riders under favourable circumstances. In distance-riding, the remark with respect to horses holds good—"Tis the pace that kills." If you start steadily, easing up the earlier hills till you warm into your work, you will find how natural the riding becomes. Arrange your stoppages so that your meals may be taken at your regular hours; eschew all alcoholic drinking—indeed, the less you drink the better—walk up, as the case may require, certain of the hills, even though you can ride them, you will then conserve your strength, and fifty to a hundred miles will be the result without any sense of subsequent fatigue.

But can all people ride, and are there no limitations on the score of health? Far fewer, indeed, than one would suppose, must be the reply. There are certain bodily conditions which at the first seem to militate against this form of exercise, and yet, strange as it may seem, the cycle has often proved itself to be a curative agent of the highest value. Those who entertain any doubt on this point may consult with great profit "Cycling and Health," by Dr. Oscar Jennings, of Paris, and if any further question arises as to the expediency or otherwise of cycle-riding, reference must be had to those doctors who have experimental knowledge of the wheel, and know how the body is affected by it; theory and practice are not always in harmony. If there be any form of disease in which cycling might seem to be debarred, it would be in the case of those suffering from varicose veins; but in very many cases great benefit has ensued. Dr. B. W. Richardson, F.R.S., quotes the case of a rider who, on his own responsibility, took to the wheel, with the result that he "had no reason to repent or accuse himself of rashness, for in fact the enlargement of the veins after he began to ride almost entirely passed away." The next who followed the same course was certainly not in the least injured by the exercise; "but," he adds, "in other persons the conditions are not so favourable." Dr. Jennings, in the work previously mentioned, quotes Dr. Wilhem, of Porrentry, to the following effect: "We have in our club an old man of sixty-eight, who has been a cyclist for four or five years, and for a length of time affected by a thrombus on the thigh as well as various varices. The old man says he has no greater pleasure than a ride on his tricycle. He can accomplish eighteen or twenty miles in an afternoon without much fatigue, and that on roads which but little resemble the highways round Paris."

In rheumatism and gout the cycle often acts like a magic

charm, and has given many a sufferer a new lease of life. Dr. Gordon Stables, in his preface to "Health upon Wheels," records his own experience, which is so striking that we need not adduce any others. "Ten years ago," he says, "being then in my thirty-fifth year . . . I accepted my half-pay, and ceased to serve in the Royal Navy, being a martyr to rheumatism, which I had acquired on the coast of Africa and in India. I took to literature as a profession. There was no healing power in that; but I shortly took to cycling. . . . My rheumatism used to come on periodically, and last for six weeks at a time, during which I could hardly stand on the floor, nor sleep in bed without feet and legs elevated. Since I adopted cycling . . . I have never had a single twinge of rheumatism. . . . Cycling has banished my pains and enlightened my mind, and made me physically and mentally double the individual I was that mournful morning when I left Haslar Hospital leaning on a stick."

Dr. Gordon Stables' original position was not a cheery one, neither is the condition of the poor cripple. For him the carriage or the bath-chair is the only means of his enjoying the fresh air; but, if he has the use of his arms, he has the happy alternative of cycling exercise, and by means of a machine called the Velociman can enjoy himself *ad libitum*. The writer of this paper has often seen a gentleman, well on in life, riding this machine: apart from it he can only move himself by two sticks, but when mounted he can propel himself to all parts of the town where he resides, visit the quay and other places of interest, and take a run into the country when he desires it. The machine he rides is the invention of the Principal of Charesley Hall, Oxford, and is fitted with auxiliary foot power, so that if only one leg is affected, the other may be utilized. Another gentleman, though not by any means crippled, yet, from physical infirmity, unable to walk any distance, has, ever since the days of the bone-shaker, ridden the cycle, which has emancipated him from the doctor, who previously almost lived in his house, and though now between seventy and eighty years of age, he yet can ride from forty to fifty miles a day. As to the effect of cycling on other forms of disease it is not possible for us to enter: we must refer our readers to the before-quoted work of Dr. Jennings; but it may not be amiss to state that, if cycling is kept within due bounds, and all strain on the heart be avoided, this form of exercise may be taken with as much safety as ordinary walking, and with far less fatigue.

Ought women to ride? will be our last inquiry. If what has been adduced with reference to the beneficial effect of the cycle on health has carried any weight, then there can exist

no possible reason why women should be excluded from the advantages which the cycle offers. It is, however, true that a certain Mrs. Grundy, well known for her officiousness, has lifted up her finger and said, "You ride at your peril. I will disown you." Then many a fair dame has lowly curtsied and promised not to offend so lofty a personage. Now it must be confessed that in the earlier days of the cycle women did not look graceful; the machines were not built for their special use, neither was any attention paid to the character of the dress worn. This is all changed now. Machines of a proper type can be purchased, not often hired, and the Cyclists' Touring Club has issued definite instructions as to dress, and ladies' cycling tailors are to be found in London and other large towns. Let the lady and her machine be as well suited to each other as the lady and the horse she rides; let her sit high on the saddle so that the foot should just touch the lower pedal, let her position be directly over the work, let the handles be perfectly adjusted, a suitable dress worn, and a dress guard duly fitted, then there is no reason in the world why a lady should present other than a becoming appearance. If anything like the pains were taken to fit a lady to ride a cycle as are taken in the case of horse-riding, the general effect would be more pleasing.

There is further a special reason, apart from the general advantages, why cycling should be more resorted to by women than it is at present, inasmuch as they are subject as a rule to nervous disorders far more than men, and are less disposed to take adequate exercise. Hence we find many of the medical faculty testifying to the benefit of the cycle. Dr. G. E. Blackham, quoted by Dr. Jennings, writes: "I know invalids suffering from so-called 'spinal irritation,' who could not take even short walks, and were thus deprived of necessary exercise. These sufferers have been so much benefited by the use of the tricycle that their health is now perfect. They can undertake long journeys (in one case over fifty miles in the day), and are able to go from three to five miles on foot without too much fatigue." An invalid lady also writes to the *Touring Club Gazette* to the following effect: "I have never enjoyed robust health, and for years have been a martyr to neuralgic headaches. . . . Some years ago I commenced cycling with my husband and daughter, with the result of a great diminution of my old painful malady and general increase of strength. I am convinced that all women would be better if they took enough out-of-doors exercise, and I particularly recommend cycling, for it will drive away rheumatism, neuralgia, sick headache, indigestion, sleeplessness, and that listlessness which leads to so many ills."

Numerous similar instances might be given, but there is no advantage in overloading one's subject, and enough has been written to convince any unprejudiced person of the benefits which cycling confers. Like all other forms of exercise it may be abused, but so long as the rider can eat, drink, and sleep well, he is not in much danger of overdoing it. We must beware of arguing from the abuse against the use. It has been well said, "There is a danger in eating one's daily food; we may eat too much." Still, food is a necessity of life, and so is bodily exercise, though it is hard to persuade some people. Dr. Stables very well puts it thus:

"I met J—— D—— one morning about two years ago. He was healthy enough looking to all appearance, though somewhat stout to a medical eye. Age nearly fifty.

"'Doctor,' he said, smiling, 'I read your article on "Exercise" in the —— last night.

"'Did you?' I replied; 'I hope you benefited by it.'

"'Not a bit,' he said bluntly. 'Look at me. Do you think there is anything the matter with me? I never bothered about exercise, and, what's more, I never will.'

"Nor did he. He was found dead a month or two after this near his bed. Post-mortem revealed a feeble, fatty, and ruptured heart."

God has given into our care a body which has a wonderful power of adaptation to surrounding circumstances. We have our responsibility to it as well as to those higher powers which are likewise a Divine gift. If the Apostle could say, "I pray God your whole spirit, soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," should we not do well to remember that there is a right regard for the body, and that due and fitting attention to it will bring with it its own reward, spirit and soul alike blessed.

W. E. RICHARDSON.

ART. III.—MOLINISM.

The Controversy on the Doctrines of Grace (*auxilia gratiæ*) in the Church of Rome.

FEW readers in this day of railway reading, when the cream of the greatest authors is hastily skimmed and served up to the public in the most condensed form, could venture to plunge into the depths of the profound and exhaustive "History" by the learned Serry, which extends to close upon 1,500 pages of double columns spread through a folio

of unusually ponderous dimensions.¹ Yet the materials of this most instructive history of the great conflict between the Dominicans and the Jesuits, on the doctrines of grace, are of such supreme importance that the reduction of them to a few readable heads may be acceptable, at least to those who are unable to wade through the interminable sea of narrative and document which the treatise of the great French divine opens to the student of this important controversy—one which extends itself to every branch of the Christian Church, and was no less energetically carried on by the Calvinists and Arminians at Dort than by the Dominicans and Jesuits at Trent. At the present time, however, this long warfare has a special interest from the fact that it is the longest, the strongest, the most eloquent of every protest which has ever been made against the infallibility of the Papacy; the most convincing proof that on the most vital and practical part of Christianity the popes have been absolutely unable to exercise their powers of settling controversies or defining doctrines—that the *charisma* is a mere useless appendage, the *gratia gratis data* has not enabled them to fix the doctrine or to define the meaning of the *gratia gratum faciens*, without which Christianity has neither motive power nor practical result.

The doctrine of Aquinas, which was substantially that of St. Augustine, was made by Loyola the rule and text-book of his order in regard to the “assistances of grace.” While it did not attempt to clear up all the mysteries which are involved in the motions of grace and free-will, or to make any artificial concord between truths which, though difficult to reconcile in theory, have been practically reconciled in the lives of good men in every age, it was a doctrine, nevertheless, “according to godliness,” and left the broad statements of Scripture without those artificial distinctions which proved so great a snare to all who in later ages have professed to be “wise above that which is written.”

But this prudent reserve did not last long. The Council of Trent opened a battle-field to the religious orders, as well as to the Scotists and Thomists, which involved every religious question and extended over the whole region of faith. Lainez, who with Salmeron represented the Jesuits in that great assembly, conceived the dangerous project of introducing a new theory on the doctrines of grace, by assigning to the human will an initiative, or at least a co-ordinate influence, in the work of renewal, while St. Augustine had in all his teaching vindicated the absolute reign of grace. Many of the Fathers of the Council protested against the new

¹ Venice, 1740.

doctrine as Pelagian, and it does not appear to have commended itself to the Council, although the traces of the struggle are very clearly visible in the conflicting passages which occur in the chapters and canons on Justification, in which there are distinct indications of concessions on either side. Still, the Tridentine doctrine is not in direct conflict with that of St. Augustine, the third canon specially upholding the doctrine of the preventing grace of God leading into faith, and preceding and directing the will into the reception of it. There is no doubt, however, that in the debates in the Council an open Pelagianism was asserted by Ambrosius Catharinus, and other allies of the Jesuits. Between the first and second Councils of Trent (for we must ever remember that the Council of 1552 was as distinct a body from that of 1562 as our two Convocations of the same date) a congregation of the Society of Jesuits was held, in which Lainez was elected General of the Order. This took place in 1558, and inaugurated that new system of divinity which has since been the distinctive badge of the "Society" in all its teaching and in all its conflicts. It is described as an "*accommodatior utiliorque theologia*"—and most accommodating it has been to human nature, and most useful to its authors and to their politico-religious aims. About the same year the famous Molina invented what he termed his "*scientia media*," which professed to reconcile by way of a *via media* the ancient and modern theories, a work in which he was assisted by Fonseca, Suarez, Vasquez, and Mendoza. In 1581 one Prudentius Montemayor published theses in its defence at Salamanca, which were immediately opposed by the learned Dominican, Bannes—and were censured by the faculty of Divinity of the University.

Claudius Acquaviva (A.D. 1584), the fifth of the now long succession of Generals of the Society, next comes upon the scene. Associating with himself a number of divines of all the Latin branches of the Church—England, happily, having no place in the list—he undertook a commentary on the writings of Aquinas, in order that he might force the text of that great divine into a non-natural sense, and that the "angelic doctrine," as Serry observes, "might be mutilated by means of a new comment." "An arduous work," as he continues; but no work, either of invention, corruption, or mutilation, is too arduous for the mind of a Jesuit, as was proved by Gregory de Valentia, when arguing before the pope himself, he corrupted the text of St. Augustine in order to strengthen his case. The same unscrupulous policy was illustrated by the Jesuit editors of the works of Cardinal Contarini; by Lainez, when he argued from the forged

decretals (then already detected) in favour of the Petrine claims; by Santarelli, when he changed the words of St. Paul (2 Cor. x. 8), "Our authority which the Lord hath given us for edification, and not for your destruction," into "*potestas nostra quam dedit nobis Dominus in cœdificationem ET destructionem vestram,*" gathering therefrom that the Apostle claimed a right to punish the faithful after the Roman fashion; by the Jesuit forgers of the "Chronicon" of Lucius Fl. Dexter; by the Jesuits in China, when they dictated the imperial letter against the unfortunate Cardinal de Tournon, the legate; and by countless other members of the Society, which seems unable to touch a single document, ancient or modern, without corrupting it, unless it is able to effect the still more important object of suppressing it altogether.

With the same fatal ingenuity they cast off the "intolerable yoke" which their great founder had imposed upon them, and cut away their bark from the safe moorings of Aquinas, causing it to drift into the Pelagianism which he had so anxiously avoided and so uniformly denounced. The work of the associated divines was, however, strenuously resisted by the more grave and prudent members of the society, and was denounced by Philip II., of Spain, as "*temerarium, periculosum, jactantiâ plenum.*" At last the book was forbidden by the Inquisition. Undeterred by this rebuff, the Society, which never sinks in the stream but to rise again with new vigour a little further on, put forth a revised version of its work in 1590. But this the Jesuit rulers, with their usual wisdom, kept within their own borders and did not put forth publicly before the world. Admonished by Clement VIII. to adhere to the teaching of Aquinas, as prescribed by their founder, and to *explain* his doctrine, Acquaviva escaped from the duty in the ambiguity of the term, and in 1599 put forth the doctrine that the society "was not so tied to St. Thomas as not to be permitted to recede from him at any point." The assertion of this doctrine may be regarded as the point of departure of the Society, not only from its first principles, but from all the other religious orders, and its entrance into the new theology (and, alas! morality), of which one of its most eminent members, Caramuel à Lobkowitz, wrote: "*Tota theologia nostra nova est; non multum temporis perdo in libris legendis.*"

But it did not enter upon this perilous path without a solemn protest from the "Præpositus Generalis" of the order, Muzio Vitelleschi, whose words are much to be observed. "The opinions of some members of the society, especially in things pertaining to morals, are far too free, and not only endanger the existence of the society itself, but even threaten

to do signal injury to the whole Church of God. Let them, therefore, with all diligence, provide that all who teach or write should in no case use this rule in the choice of their opinions—‘*tueri quis potest, probabile est, autore non caret*’—but let them agree in those opinions which are safer, and are of customary use among divines of gravity and influence, which conduce most to morality, and are calculated to nourish and advance piety, and not to lay waste and destroy it.” This was the first stage of that general declension of the Society from the laws of its institution which is so clearly marked in the bull of its suppression in 1774 by Clement XIV. His assertion that it had within itself the seeds of jealousies and divisions *ferè ab initio* takes us back to the incidents of its earliest history—to Acquaviva, and even to Lainez himself.

In 1585 the pretext of directing the studies of the order enabled them to put forth a work, “*De Ratione Studiorum*,” of which Acquaviva was the author. This contained thirty-four propositions, its divisions being these: On Scripture, Providence, Predestination, Reprobation, Grace, and Justification. The University of Louvain, which was the scene of their publication, appointed a committee of divines to examine the work, who passed a censure upon every one of the articles it contained.

It was now high time for the infallible chair to interpose its authority, and no less a person than Sixtus V. comes into the midst. Wiser than either the Jesuits or their opponents, this skilled diplomatist enjoins silence and removes the case to Rome, evidently seeing that the controversy had gone too far to be closed by the mediation of any inferior authority.

It was left to Innocent XI., at a later period, to approve of the censures of the Belgian divines of the thirty-four propositions of the Jesuits. Sixtus V. appears to have remitted the subject to his successors, being engaged in temporal conflicts more congenial to his singularly unspiritual nature. But in the meantime the disputants on either side were multiplied, and the warfare had become hotter and more incapable of any peaceful accommodation or even momentary truce. The pontiffs who preceded Innocent XI. had successively renewed the prohibition of Sixtus V., and Innocent, though the first to give any sign in regard to his own judgment on the subject, did not commit himself to the stronger testimony of a bull. Innocent XII. appears to have taken the same course as his predecessors, and the Belgian and German divines were for awhile quieted.

But in the meantime a new and most important factor in the controversy, and one in whom it afterwards in a great degree centred, appeared in Spain in the person of Ludovic

Molina, who in the teeth of the prohibition against commenting on Aquinas' doctrine produced a work on the "Concord of Free-will and Divine Grace." By birth a Spaniard, he was forced to produce his work in Portugal, for the primate of Spain, the Archbishop of Toledo, had prohibited its publication in that country, and the devotion of the Cardinal Albert of Austria, who presided over the Inquisition in Portugal, to the Society, encouraged him to transfer his abode to that kingdom, and there to produce a treatise which on its appearance convulsed all the Churches of the Roman communion. Its publication at Lisbon in 1588 was followed by several other editions.

Molina, if not the first to discover, was the first to reduce to a systematic form the doctrine of the *scientia media*; in other terms, the knowledge which God possesses of what would certainly happen as the result of conditions which were not carried out. The doctrine is best explained by the incident in 1 Sam. xxiii., where David asks God whether Saul would come to Keilah—"And the Lord said, He will come down." Then David asks again, "Will the men of Keilah deliver me into the hand of Saul?" And the reply is, "They will deliver thee." In consequence of this knowledge David departs out of Keilah, and neither of the predicted consequences come to pass. Here there is a knowledge, not of a thing which actually occurred, but of one which would occur under certain circumstances which never happened.

Now it does not appear that the notion of a *scientia media* such as this would affect any doctrine except that of an absolute predestination, and would not necessarily and in itself disturb the *auxilia gratia*. But Molina followed it up into these, so as to give to the will of man in the matter of salvation a co-ordinate power with the will of God as exercised in grace, and thus to introduce a kind of semi-Pelagianism, which rapidly developed into what the Augustinian doctors denounced as Pelagianism proper.

The Dominicans, whose jealousy was early aroused by the triumphant advance of the Jesuits towards a supreme authority in the doctrines of the Church, at once joined issue with the Fathers of the "Society" at this point, and a controversy was opened which threatened almost to bring about a schism in the very centre of the Roman communion. The Franciscans rather leaned towards the Jesuits, but the learning and vast influence of the Dominicans, whose order of friars preachers gave them a special means of propagating their opinions, more than counterbalanced the skill of the Jesuits and the uncontroversial influence of the Franciscans. As in the case of every long-sustained controversy, the subjects of contention

became enlarged and the field widened. The Augustinian doctrine, which attributed all to grace, and which (as being also that of Aquinas) the Jesuits were bound to maintain in all its integrity, became gradually so contracted and explained away that the Pauline theory of justification by faith was seriously impaired; the Jesuit Bastida affirming in an address to the pope that "free-will was the preponderating influence in our justification."¹ The respective claims of free-will and grace were contended for by the two orders with a zeal and acrimony which not even the papal prohibition was able to allay, and the contest became rapidly too subtle and too metaphysical to enable the ordinary reader to take the slightest interest in it, or even clearly to understand it. In the meantime a new phase of the controversy appeared. The famous Cardinal Bellarmine entered the lists in the defence of his order, and the scene of warfare was at once transferred to Rome, in which all such conflicts in the papal kingdom must converge at last.

The Court of Rome was now compelled to break the "*obsequiosum silentium*" it had imposed on the Church, and, according to its precedents in such cases, appointed a commission of cardinals to examine Molina's book. Serry observes that it was matter of surprise that Bellarmine, who in all his discourses and controversies had hitherto vigorously defended the doctrines of Augustine and Aquinas on the *auxilia gratiæ*, should thus suddenly appear as the champion of Molina and his anti-Augustinian theories. But the rule of the order is that new opinions should be submitted, not (as was the ancient usage) to the Church, but to the Society.² And as the Society, though at first divided in its opinions, had, with its accustomed *esprit de corps*, adopted the cause of Molina, its most illustrious member was compelled to join in the defence. It must appear even more strange to the Protestant reader that the pope, who might have settled the whole controversy in the plenitude of power which he always claims, should adopt the second-hand method of a commission or congregation to determine it for him. It would seem that the boasted *charisma* or *gratia gratis data* of infallibility breaks down whenever it is reduced to practice, and that the gigantic machinery of the papacy is too ponderous to apply to any question of doctrinal doubt or difficulty, however important or even vital. Perhaps the possibility that a bull might not only terrify but even scatter the flock, made it expedient that

¹ "Liberum arbitrium esse eam causam, quæ in justificatione præponderat."

² Constit., p. 3, c. i., lit. O. Serry, Ed. Ven. 1740, p. 151.

an intermediate authority should come in, and as the wheels of the Vatican chariot, like those of justice, move slowly, the delay might wear out the patience of the combatants, or more important events might relegate Molina and his works to their first obscurity. However this may be, eight meetings of the commission were held during the year 1599.

The Jesuits took advantage of the delay by endeavouring to avert the censure which, it soon became evident, would be pronounced against them. They strove to persuade the Bishop of Forli, the theologian of Clement VIII., to authorize a compromise, and allow both the tenets of the Jesuits and their opponents to be maintained as equally probable. But the bishop reminded them that they had charged the Dominicans with Calvinism for maintaining the Augustinian doctrine, which precluded the possibility of any composition or compromise, and recommended them to await the decision of the congregation upon the merits of the whole question. They then employed two of their divines, Vasquez and Peres, to write against the doctrine of "natural predetermination" (*physica prædeterminatio*), while new defenders of Molina appeared in Spain, in Cobos and Bastida. At last the censure was formally promulgated, while Bellarmine calmed the anxieties of his Spanish friends by assuring them that the cause was still before the pope, and nothing had been finally decided.

The Society, thus encouraged, applied again for a conference between the belligerents, after having some time previously addressed the pope in the person of Molina himself, in a letter humbly asking for a copy of the decision of the Congregation, and praying, as being himself the chief party in it, to be heard in his defence. Presently an appeal was made to the Roman Catholic universities of Germany, but with little or no result. The pope referred this appeal of the Jesuits to Cardinal Madruzio, who had himself been present at Trent, and therefore knew something of the mind of the Council on this subject, and added Cardinals Bernerius and Bellarmine to the number of the commission. The replies of the Society to the interrogatories of the cardinal were so unsatisfactory, from their irrelevancy and ambiguity, that he was unable to give any judgment on them before his death, which happened on April 20, 1600. This event opened a new prospect to the Society, which entered at once upon a fresh course of intrigues, endeavouring on the one hand to delay as long as possible the judgment of the pope, and on the other to bring about their great object of a conference. For this latter end they employed Achilles Gagliardi, a skilful manager, to bring about privately what they had failed to effect in a public manner.

But these efforts were as unsuccessful as the former, and in 1601 the pope submitted the matter to a fourth examination; and here we must observe that each examination involved several, and sometimes many, sessions of the Congregation, so that the fourth *examen* includes thirty-seven sittings. Finally the decisions of the body were handed in to the pope, who seemed very little desirous to give them his *imprimatur*, for he returned a somewhat evasive reply to the deputies who represented them, and presently turning to a Carmelite delivered an harangue for over two hours against the doctrine of the *scientia media*. But when he saw the mountain of documents which he had to encounter he observed, "It seems to me very long. If it took you a year to make it, a year will scarcely be enough to enable me to read it" ("Mi pare molto lungo. Se voi siete stato un' anno di farlo, a me non basta un' anno per leggerlo").¹ Then a qualm of conscience seems to have affected him, from the thought that Molina had not been heard in person, both being mere pretexts to enable him to temporize, and to put off the evil day of a papal definition as long as possible.

But the secular powers could hardly suffer this apple of discord to be tossed about in their dominions without applying to the pope to put an end to the dangerous game. Accordingly, Philip III. of Spain urged the Roman Court to pronounce its decision, which the pope, as usual, promised to do. The Jesuits, alarmed at this sudden danger, determined to enter upon a new and bolder plan of campaign. Hitherto they had acted the part of the patient and suffering lamb; now, however, they assumed that of the lion. They stood forth boldly in defence of their cause. Fear might be more potent with the pope than obsequious devotion and entreaty. They threatened an open schism if the censure should be promulgated with the papal sanction. They put forth before the pope the most flagrant theses, in which the Pelagian doctrines were openly declared; no longer concealed in scholastic language or confused by metaphysical statements. "And all these propositions" (exclaimed the pope) "are the doctrines of Molina! They affirm that by a certain compact between the Father and the Son, grace is given to everyone who does what is natural to him" (*quod in se est*). "Thus it is in the power of man to obtain grace as often as he does thus. Therefore grace is no longer grace, since it is given when I wish, or because I have done what is in me to do. You cannot escape this conclusion. Hence we ought to attribute our justification to our free-will, which neither

¹ Serry, Hist. Cong., p. 256.

Augustine nor the Holy Scripture admit." He ended by declaring that "such a doctrine was as opposed to true theology as any one possibly could be."¹

But notwithstanding all this resistance to their doctrine in the highest quarters, the Society ventured yet another step, and threatened an appeal to a general council, that final tribunal which the Church of Rome has ever dreaded, and whose functions and rights it has so daringly usurped ever since the Council of Constance declared its supreme authority over the papacy by dethroning the three antipopes and electing Martin V.

The unfortunate pope, wearied out and almost torn in pieces by the factions surrounding him, at last resolved to open another inquiry, which was to be conducted in his own presence. But before we enter upon this new phase of the history, we cannot withhold from the reader the various methods by which the Jesuits succeeded in terrifying the aged pontiff into the decision to reopen a controversy which had been so exhausted as to leave not a single pretext for a re-examination, and which needed only the fiat of infallibility to close it for ever.

Serry enumerates five successive schemes by which the society endeavoured to prevent, or at least to delay, indefinitely the decision of the pope on the controversy.

The first was the fear of a schism, which they assumed would certainly be opened by any pontifical judgment upon it. The second was to betray the pope into the belief that Molinism had been so eagerly embraced by the University of Paris, that there would be great danger in an adverse decision. Thirdly, they threatened the proposition of a general council, which was ever a vision of terror to the pontificate. Fourthly, and this was a method which they have systematically employed to force upon the Church their new doctrines, they conjured up visions and revelations, a method by which, even in our own day, the idolatrous devotion of the Sacred Heart has been imposed upon the Roman Church. The fifth, and this was the boldest as well as the most curious of all, was the thesis they put forth, that it was not *de fide* to believe that Clement VIII. was pope and the successor of St. Peter. This attempt was made in the University of Complutum (Alcala de Hanares), in which they proposed for discussion the question, "Non est de fide hunc numero Papam, exempli gratiã, Clementem VIII. esse verum Papam, . . . Major pars Concilii adhuc ante confirmationem Pontificis est infallibilis veritatis" (page 277).

¹ Serry, p. 262.

But the influence of the "Most Catholic King" soon dissipated these schemes, and the pope referred the theses of the Complutensian doctors to the Inquisition, which last institution managed, in the interest of the Society, to entangle the king in the controversy, by which means the pope was deterred from interposing authoritatively in the matter.

Meanwhile, the audacious thesis of the Jesuits brought them into a fresh collision with their ancient foes the Dominicans, and the redoubtable order of friars preachers at once opposed them on the new ground of the papal authority. The Jesuits, whose resources seem as infinite as their skill in employing them is unequalled, took refuge in the pretence that the theses were simply advanced for disputation according to the usual academical form, and accordingly as fictitiously opposed them as they had designedly advanced them. But the learned Dominicans, Bannes and Zimmel, had already taken up arms in defence of the pope, and the former had obtained from him a brief applauding his zeal and devotion to the Holy See. Thus supported, the pontiff resolved to open a fifth examination into the Molinist doctrine and work, which was to be held in his own presence. The main proposition which he himself started was, "Which of the two attributed more efficacy for good to free-will—St. Augustine or Molina?" Scarcely had the disputation on this point been fully opened, when the Jesuit Gregory de Valentia, arguing for Molina, misquoted the words of St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, l. xix., c. xiii.), putting "*et ipsam immortalitatis pacem*" for "*ipsam scilicet immortalitatis pacem*," which entirely altered the meaning of the passage. Convicted of his error before the pope himself, Valentia, overcome with the shame such an exposure had brought upon him, retired to Naples, and died a few months after.

It would be needless, and indeed might well exhaust the patience, and perhaps confuse the mind of the ordinary reader, to follow the argument through the sixty-eight sessions of the Congregation. Clement VIII. did, however, during the long argument, express his conviction, at great length, that the doctrine of Molina was in direct opposition to that of St. Augustine; but death came to his relief, to save him from the necessity he so much dreaded, of being compelled to condemn it.

His immediate successor, Leo XI., dying within the month of his election, the papacy devolved on Paul V. (Borghese), and with the new pope new schemes for preventing the settlement of the controversy were devised by the untiring skill of the Jesuits. They again addressed themselves to the Court of France, which again declined to interfere. Turning to Rome, they again induced their old champion, Cardinal Bellarmine, to promote their cause with the pope, in whose election he had

taken an active part. He put forth a treatise on free-will and the efficacy of Divine grace, which was presented to the pope, and answered by the learned Dominican, Lemos. Meantime the Society endeavoured to nullify the conclusions arrived at in the Clementine Congregations by proposing that these should be ignored in a new examination, which should treat the whole subject independently of any previous decisions. They then endeavoured to stave off the inquiry on the pretext that the question was not *de fide*, and might be left an open one.

But Paul V. was of too stern and sturdy a nature to yield to these intrigues. He determined to reopen the case, and instituted a new Congregation to determine it. Bellarmine, with his usual subtlety, endeavoured to introduce new difficulties in the expectation that the conclusions of Clement and his own theses would be considered together. But the Congregation simply accepted the former as representing the mind of St. Augustine. In the fifth session of the Congregation the pope closed the disputation with a definition of effectual grace which, while it contained a saving clause in assertion of free-will, declared that "God by His effectual grace not only moves the will to good works (*ad actus liberos bonos*) by internally persuading, inviting, exciting, or otherwise morally attracting it, but also truly, properly, and actively, and in this sense by a physical motion, acts upon the will *salvâ ejus libertate*, predisposing it so efficaciously (*præmovendo ita efficaciter*) that this effectual prevention of God, surely and infallibly, though freely, brings it into consent" (*ipsam determinat ad consensum*). This foundation having been laid down, the Congregation proceeded to argue the question from the Scriptures, the councils, and the Fathers; the bearing of it upon the doctrines of Calvin being discussed in the twelfth session. After the seventeenth, Paul V., wearied out like his predecessor with this endless and minute controversy, which seemed at last to be merely a logomachy, resolved to put an end to it. But the Jesuits, stronger in real power than the strongest of the popes has ever been, interposed new obstacles to the settlement of it. Paul, delayed but not daunted, commissioned his consultors to prepare a Bull on the subject, which they presented him for his approval. The instructions to the consultors declare the things to be defined—enjoin that all be done secretly, and their several conclusions not revealed to one another.

But the Fabian policy, which had made every effort to close the controversy hitherto impossible, maintained its influence to the very end. The pope hesitated and forbore to take the last step—and the delay was occasioned, not only by the fear

of the spiritual consequences which must follow his decision, whatever it might be, but from the quarrel which had arisen between the Court of Rome and the Republic of Venice, which threatened every day to break out into an open warfare. The Jesuits, with that worldly wisdom which was their characteristic qualification, saw in a moment that a successful move might at once give them the game. They entered the lists with all the zeal and enterprise of their order, and became the most eloquent and successful of the champions of the papacy against the Republic and its irresistible advocate Fra Paolo Sarpi, who has left us its history written with his wonted vigour and accuracy. The discussion of the doctrines of grace ceased with the threatened opening of a more material warfare. Silence was rigorously imposed on the combatants, who were soothed with the promise that "at a more convenient season" they would be heard again.

This prohibition was declared in 1611 and renewed by Urban VIII. in 1625. The Jesuits, with their accustomed audacity, claimed this decree of suspension as a judgment in favour of their order and its protégé Molina, and even took up as a new and most popular weapon for advancing their cause, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which was opposed to the fundamental principle of the Society, which was to follow the doctrine of Aquinas with absolute and implicit obedience. For Aquinas was the ablest and most determined opponent of that strange novelty which had its first suggestion in the hostile pages of Scotus.

The principal conclusions which must present themselves to the reader cannot but be these: first, that the *charisma* of infallibility, though very grand in theory, is utterly useless in practice, and that those who claim it are unable to solve by it the most important and practical doctrines of Christianity, although able to encumber and complicate them by the subtlest and most fruitless definitions; secondly, we find that a Bull is not really the product of the possessor of the gift of infallibility, but is drawn up by subordinate officials, the pope contributing only his signature. Bishop Ricci justly observes: "We may remark here, once for all, that the modern decisions of the popes can never have the authority which the old ones deserve, not because the power they possess in themselves is diminished, but because such decisions are for the most part the resolutions of Congregations composed generally of mere simple clerics, and not the judgments of the pope deciding with the whole of his clergy."¹

It must appear, moreover, that every Christian Church has

¹ "Apol. contro la censura ad alcuni libri publicati in Pistoja," p. 82, n.

arrived at a knowledge of the *auxilia gratiæ* with more practical success by the mere study of the Scriptures, than the Church of Rome has attained to, with the aid of all the skill and subtlety of Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans and seculars, even though her greatest champion, Bellarmine, was included among the combatants.

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

ART. IV.—INSPIRATION.

WHAT do we mean by inspiration? It is not defined in the formularies of the Prayer-Book. The word is, I believe, only twice used in the Bible—once in Job, where Elihu says, “There is a spirit in man, and the *inspiration*¹ of the Almighty giveth them understanding;” and once in 2 Tim. iii. 16, where we are told that “all Scripture is given by *inspiration*² of God”—but neither of these passages helps us to a definition of what is meant by inspiration. It seems to me that the only true way to arrive at what inspiration implies is to examine the materials that may be presumed to exhibit the unknown entity, and to determine its nature by a process of induction. For instance, to begin with St. Paul’s statement as our first landmark, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.” It matters not whether we take this as a predicate, or render “every God-inspired Scripture is also profitable” etc., because in either case inspiration of some kind is assumed and asserted. And there can be little doubt that it is assumed and asserted as the characteristic, special and peculiar, of the Old Testament. For instance, St. Paul did not include among God-inspired Scriptures the writings of Menander, Epimenides, or Aratus, which are even quoted by himself. At least, I think we have no right to assume, and cannot suppose, he did this. Thus we infer, therefore, that St. Paul recognised certain features of the Old Testament which distinguished it from all other books. What are these features? The Old Testament claims in many places to be the record of special Divine communication—“The word of the Lord came unto me,” and the like. This is only to be regarded as a direct falsehood, or as a mistaken truth, or as the actual truth. With the first we need not concern ourselves; but we must determine how far the persons who made use of this formula were protected against self-deception before we can be sure that we have in what they

¹ In Job it is *neshamah*, breath.

² In Tim. it is *θεόπνευστος*.

put on record the actual truth. When the Prophet said the word of the Lord came unto him, how did he know that it was the word of the Lord? and how may we know that he was not mistaken? If we have any guarantee for this, then we may be sure that we have in the record the results of inspiration. But even then the method of inspiration and the conditions of inspiration will not be clear to us. It will, however, be clear that inspiration must carry with it a supernatural communication and a supernatural sanction. So far as it is real it will be impossible to resolve it into anything natural, ordinary, or producible at will. St. Paul tells us that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets, by which he seems to mean that the prophets are responsible for the order and seemliness of their behaviour, but not that they can produce the results of prophecy at will.

There are two ways in which we may arrive at the conclusion that such and such a narrative is inspired. (1) One is when it comes to us as the medium of information that can only be due to inspiration, *e.g.*: If the first chapter of Genesis is true, it must be inspired, for otherwise the information it conveys could not have been known. No man could know or discover what took place before man existed, except so far as he could discover it by science. The first chapter of Genesis is not the result of science; therefore if it is true the information it conveys must have been imparted by inspiration. I do not say it is true; but I say that if it is true no man can have discovered it. I need not say that I believe it to be true, and, therefore, believe it to be inspired. I believe, also, that science has enabled us to perceive its truth in so many points that we may recognise in that fact the proof of its inspiration. It is the record of knowledge imparted by God. In like manner many of the statements of Scripture may be known to be inspired if they are true; for if they are true as matters of fact, their truth involves their inspiration. Such are the statements "The Lord spake unto Moses," "The Lord spake unto Joshua," and the like. If the fact is true and the record is accurate, then it cannot be but that we have therein what we could not have except for real inspiration.

Revelation, therefore, is the result of inspiration, and inspiration is the method or channel of revelation; if there is a true revelation, there must have been a true inspiration. The truth of the inspiration turns upon the reality of the revelation, and the reality of the revelation proves the truth of the inspiration.

But the reality of the revelation is very frequently proved by the thing revealed, and this is (2) the second way that we

arrive at the proof of inspiration. If revelation involves and implies inspiration, revelation itself is of the nature of light—it is self-evidencing, it is known by the light that it creates. When the sun bursts forth from behind a cloud, no other proof is needed of what has happened—it speaks for itself. In like manner, when God says, "Let there be light," and there is light no other proof of correspondence between the act and word is needed, for the light manifests itself, and is known in so doing. In like manner our Lord says, "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on Me should not abide in darkness." He who believes His word is conscious of its truth. There are numerous passages and statements of Holy Scripture to which this applies; they carry their own message of truth with them: *e.g.*, "God created man in His own image: in the image of God created He him." When this is stated, we at once know and feel that it is true. But could we have discovered it of ourselves? If not, then the statement of it must have been inspired; and in addition to this, it carries its own evidence of inspiration with it. In like manner the name that was proclaimed before Moses in Exodus xxxiv. 6, 7, is one that speaks for itself, whether the circumstances of its being given were historical or not; but if they were, there is, of course, no question as to the reality of the revelation as well as the truth of the inspiration. In this case, to believe the fact recorded is to accept the revelation, and this is very frequently the case in Scripture. To accept the fact related involves the acceptance of an actual revelation and a veritable inspiration, as, for instance, in the promise to David, the vision of Isaiah, and the like.

It is, however, quite possible to make the proof of revelation to turn upon the evidence of one phenomenon of it, namely, prophecy. The characteristics of prophecy taken as a whole are so special and peculiar as to defy explanation on any natural principles. After making ample allowance for uncertainty of date, obscurity of meaning, elasticity of interpretation, and the like, it is still undeniable that the broad features of prophecy defy all natural explanation, if only as is evidenced from the fact of their being unique. The survey of Old Testament prophecy as a whole presents a spectacle that we can discover nowhere else. The two great sections of it are historical act and literary composition: the former as seen in Elijah, Elisha, and others; the latter in the written works of the sixteen prophets. The four greater prophets are significantly characteristic. Isaiah, judged by his recorded utterances alone, must stand supreme among the poets of any nation. Jeremiah, by the sombre tints of his personal history, and its evidence to the reality of his prophetic mission, with the light it throws

upon the career and life of a prophet in the last days of the monarchy; Ezekiel with the wonderful illustration his book affords of the power bestowed by his prophetic gifts of seeing what was distant in space as though it were present; and Daniel with his extraordinary combination of superhuman power manifested in personal deliverance and prophetic insight shown in vision—all this makes a fourfold exhibition of varied prophetic power which cannot be paralleled outside the Bible, and serves to show that prophecy was not a simple exercise of fantastic or fanatical action which can be set aside as among the vagaries of madness, but was a highly complex and elaborate gift which moulded the agents more than they moulded it. And then, when we set over against this broad and marked picture the extraordinary reflex that it casts on the New Testament times and history, we cannot but see that, whatever the methods by which they were achieved, the results produced upon and by the prophets were of a wholly unique and highly exceptional kind, to which we can find nothing similar, even if analogous, elsewhere. We may determine, therefore, that the phenomenon of prophecy is one of the proofs of inspiration, as it was one of the agencies of revelation. And when we come to the historical books we are confronted with the probable fact that these were, as in all appearance they are, the work of prophets. The name of Samuel, traditionally affixed to what are otherwise called the First and Second Books of Kings, and the name of Jeremiah, which in like manner has been closely connected with the third and fourth, are alone sufficient to show this, apart from the antecedent likelihood that it would be so. Clearly, therefore, the books of Samuel and Kings may be fairly credited with the authority, whatever that was, with which the prophets wrote. Now, if they were in any sense real prophets, as we have seen there is evidence to show they were, they must have had a certain authority. They must have possessed a certain illumination. I admit it may be very difficult to define this, for the simple reason that if they were holders of a unique office we can have no experience, and therefore no conception, of what it was; but by the very conditions of the case they were brought into such relations to God as to know His will, because at times they were empowered to express it. We may reasonably and consistently assume, therefore, that they wrote from the standpoint of this position. What they expressed in writing was but the complement of the belief which their actions embodied. Now it is to be observed that continually the prophets sink their own personality in that of the Lord. Their utterances are, "I will do" this or that, meaning that the Lord will do it. But unless they had the fullest com-

mission and authority for so speaking, it was an utterly unwarrantable form of speech. Kuenen has no hesitation in ascribing this to the *moral earnestness* of the prophets. But I maintain that no moral earnestness would have justified the use of such language; nay, the greater the earnestness the more it would have shrunk from using it. To utter in the name of God what on the supposition there can have been no ground for knowing was His, would certainly have been a course repugnant to any honest mind in proportion to its earnestness. To say distinctly that such and such a statement was the declaration of the Lord, when there was no evidence of its being so, was equivalent to telling a lie; at least, our consciences can detect no difference, and why are we to assume that theirs could not? If, then, this is so, we must surely interpret the actions of the prophets accordingly. In the case of Samuel, for instance, much of his book is a narrative of facts in which he was a principal actor; if, then, its facts are trustworthy, the inference they suggest is unmistakable. How he acted with regard to David interprets his action with regard to Saul, and as Saul was originally anointed by him, we may conclude that he would have been naturally unwilling to anoint David but for the same authority by which he anointed Saul. But supposing Samuel to have been supernaturally directed to anoint Saul or David, there is nothing unreasonable or inconsistent in believing him in other respects the recipient of Divine directions; but if so, he was to all intents and purposes inspired—he was the channel and recipient of Divine and supernaturally-imparted information, illumination, direction. Our own conscience assents to and confirms this when we meet with such words as “Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.” If we admit the purity and truth of this sentiment, shall we question it in the case of the action which occasioned the utterance? On what principle shall we pick and choose among material that is of the same piece and indistinguishable? Nor is there any reason to judge otherwise with regard to the work of Gad and Nathan and the other prophets who may be supposed to have continued the historical work of Samuel. All we can judge of their work by is the work itself. We know not the makers of it nor how it was made, the result only is before us, but that is sufficiently great. Nor must it be forgotten, in judging of this, that though the writers are not slow to say that such and such a king did right or wrong in the eyes of the Lord (by what principle did they know this?), yet oftentimes the actions of David and other kings are related entirely

without comment, with the barest impartiality, so that we are at a loss to know whether the writer approved of or condemned them himself. Nor is there any reason to believe that persons who were left to their own unaided guidance in general matters should not be the recipients of special illumination on special occasions. It may require very little inspiration to record the incidents in the opening of the First Book of Kings, and yet these events themselves may have been so directed as to show the natural working out of the promises and purposes of God, and so the record of them may well form a chapter in the revelation, and so far may tend to confirm the inspiration of which that was the result. In all these early chapters we can see the free agents of the history working freely, and yet the general upshot and bearing of the record as a whole may be strictly in accordance with God's design and purpose. In sacred history no more than in ordinary history were the agents deprived of their freedom, though oftentimes in their actions the working of the Divine Will showed itself in an exceptional way. But even when it did so the freedom of the human agents was left unrestrained. Probably the first section of the Book of Kings which at all fulfils our notions of inspiration is the prayer of Solomon, which everyone must feel to be a very lofty and sublime passage. That there is the true spirit of the living God breathing throughout that prayer no one can doubt; but whether or not it fulfils, as I said, the popular conditions and conceptions of inspiration, I am unable to say. I think it better to try to discover by examination of the examples the actual nature of inspiration than to start with a fixed conception of it which I may find it difficult to make square with facts. Here we may observe, also, that if the incidents recorded are true, such as the fact of the priests being unable to enter the temple because of the glory of the Lord which filled it, the vision in which the Lord appeared to Solomon, and the like, then the fact of revelation and the reality of inspiration are established. But it is clear that throughout the books the evidence of inspiration is to be seen not so much in the composition of them as in the teaching of the events they record, in the intrinsic importance of these events and the unmistakable way in which, if true, they witness for God. There may be nothing of very deep spiritual import in the visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon, but the record of her visit, noteworthy and important as it is on its own account, is at least a striking instance of the way in which the promise of exceptional wisdom had been fulfilled to him, and this tends, therefore, to confirm another part of the narrative, which is of the highest importance on other grounds. On the other hand, the unhesitating and impartial record of Solomon's

fall and apostasy, spoiling, as it does, the narrative of his greatness, makes us feel that the former history is the less likely to have been exaggerated or contrary to fact. One feels, after all, that Solomon with all his greatness and glory was in the end not so great a man as his father. David's reign was marked with the troubles of war, but his own exhibited the disadvantages of peace, which brought forth fruit in the disruption of the monarchy.

Ewald, who was followed by Stanley, laboured to persuade himself and others that the real line of continuance in the monarchy was carried on in Israel, and not in Judah. Nothing can be more contrary to the whole spirit of the Books of Kings, whether they are inspired or not, than the suggestion of this theory. It is absolutely fatal to the whole tenor of the record, as well as opposed to the facts of the history. The succession of the throne had been promised to David's line. Whether as a fact this was so or not, and whatever may have been the meaning of the fact recorded, there is no question whatever as to the record. The succession to the throne is distinctly said to have been promised to David. Solomon, the beloved of the Lord, was the immediate earnest of the fulfilment of this promise. It was pledged to continue in his line. When the promise was given there had been sundry warnings of the consequences of disobedience. The luxury and self-indulgence of Solomon paved the way for the justification of these warnings, and in the time of his son and successor they were verified. Now, if all this is in any sense a record of fact, it is a record that speaks for itself, and is independent of interpretation; and the continuance of the monarchy in the line of Judah can only be regarded in relation to the fact, and as accomplishing the promise which is recorded: "I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee: but he shall have one tribe for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel." Now, will anyone venture to say that if these words were actually spoken by Ahijah, they can by any manner of means be reconciled with or explained by any natural action or ordinary sources of knowledge? It would be a bold step to take to affirm that Jeremiah, writing at the close of the monarchy, put these words into the mouth of Ahijah for the sake of mere effect, and to embellish and heighten the interest of the subsequent history, the course of which was patent to him, but could not by any ordinary means be known to Ahijah. For if Jeremiah did so, and this is the real history of the narrative, then it is useless to talk about inspiration and revelation or anything of the kind. We are simply deluding ourselves and

throwing dust in the eyes of others, just as Jeremiah, supposing him to have written the narrative, was unpardonably deceiving his own nation and the world at large in so doing. We may therefore set aside any such theory as this; but, then, if we do, what remains? Simply the record of an incident which is either true or not true—which, if it was not true, leaves us exactly in the same position as before, but which, if it was true, is not to be explained apart from inspiration, and is itself the proof and evidence of an uncommon, a more than human and a more than natural, faculty of observation and power of foresight which may serve to illustrate the true character of inspiration, but will certainly not make it more intelligible or less marvellous. Here, then, the first question to be determined must be: "Is or is not the narrative true?" If it is true, then we can begin to lay down certain principles and limits with regard to inspiration which may guide us in our investigation of it. But then, also, the authenticity of the narrative will be that upon which depends our estimate of it, and this authenticity will itself depend largely upon the character of the writers, whether or not they were veracious and trustworthy, which, in many cases, will depend upon whether or not the writings were genuine. In the case of anonymous writings like Kings and Chronicles, this will not imply a correct identification of the writers, but rather the sanction and authority with which they will have been handed down to us. In this case there is no question as to the sanction, but only as to its validity. If the sanction is valid, the books may be regarded as genuine; and if in this sense genuine, they can hardly be other than authentic. But if in this case both genuine and authentic, then what is inspiration? Clearly that faculty of Divine illumination which enabled Ahijah to declare a resolution of the Divine Will which was fulfilled in the course of centuries to come, which no insight of his own could have enabled him to discover.

We may also, I think, fairly ascribe to inspiration that series of providences and dispositions by which the incident and the promise were recorded; but though the consideration of them may reveal to us the modes and conditions of its operation, they will not explain its method or character, which must surely remain inscrutable.

I feel, then, with regard to inspiration, that the word is frequently used without any definite meaning being attached to it; but I feel, also, that it is absolutely useless for us to try to understand the way in which the thing, whatever it was, worked, because by the hypothesis the word is used to express something of which we have, and can have, no experience, and all that we can do is to observe very carefully

the evidences of this, and to be very careful not to deny the reality of the thing because we see that it transcends our own experience.

I notice, moreover, one very common tendency in the teaching of the present day, and that is to dwell upon the use of the word "inspiration" in the Prayer-book, and to make that the basis for a theory of the inspiration of Scripture, as though it showed that it was one and the same *afflatus* which dwells in the heart of the believer and which spake by the prophets. This would, of course, be to make all believers prophets, and to do away with the reality of the gift of prophecy as a thing exceptional and unique. Here, again, we fall back upon the mere phenomena of prophecy, which we maintain cannot be duly recognised without forcing upon us the conviction that the gift was special and unique. Indeed, the difference between the inspiration which breathes in the bosom of the believer and that which spake by the prophets is analogous to the difference between the ordinary operation of the Holy Spirit in the conduct of the believer and that which was manifested in the working of miracles. There is a very strong tendency to eliminate, or at all events to attenuate, the action of the miraculous in the present day—to regard it as an open question, upon which we need not pronounce; and in like manner there is a tendency to blink and to ignore the phenomena of prophecy as indications of inspiration, and to make them merely identical with the ordinary inspiration of believers; but this cannot be done in either case without detriment and damage to ourselves on the one hand, and without violence to the facts and statements of Scripture on the other.

And when I thus appeal to the phenomena of prophecy, let me try to explain and illustrate what I mean. In the Books of Samuel we first meet with the idea of an anointed king. The nation wanted a king, and a king was given who was the anointed of the Lord. That was his position, whether or not there was any Divine sanction to his appointment. Subsequently, by a series of very marked events, which seem to have been recognised by both the parties concerned, the originally anointed king was set aside, and another designated as his successor. After an interval of years the second king is established on the throne, and the promise of continuance is distinctly and emphatically given to him. This promise is recorded at large in the Books of Samuel and Chronicles. If the history is reliable, there can be no question as to the promise and as to its nature. David was not the dupe of Samuel. Samuel is hardly to be regarded as the deceiver of David. There was a common element in which they both believed, and to which they both were witnesses, if the history

is true, and is to be understood in its natural sense. But over and beyond this we have many of the literary productions of David which bear witness to the fact of this promise, and to its existence as a factor in the life of David and in the national life of his people. These productions can only be regarded as entirely independent of the history. They cannot have produced the history, nor can they have been produced by it as a mere record of events. They are a witness to the reality of the history as a series of facts, and can be the outcome of nothing else. In some of the later Psalms—*e.g.*, the 89th—we find this hope almost extinguished. We see it struggling against the effect and influence of untoward circumstances, but even then there is no question as to the hope itself. It had been a reality, and the memory of it was fresh in the minds of men. We pass on for several centuries, and in the time of Jeremiah, at the close of the monarchy, we find him saying, "I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper." Nevertheless, Zedekiah, whose name would correspond to this prophecy, was carried into captivity, and his eyes were put out. Still, when, contrary to all precedent, the nation returned from captivity after seventy years, its leader was Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David; and centuries afterwards it was said of Christ: "The Lord God will give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end," who was a lineal descendant of Zerubbabel and of David. Now, it is to be observed that this promise, which is attributed to the angel Gabriel, is but the echo of the others. Whatever *it* may be, the others were there for centuries before it; and the very fact that events must have seemed to contradict and belie them served all the more to render them conspicuous, and to emphasize them as failures. Consequently, if anything occurred subsequently to give them fresh meaning and significance, it would be more than ever impossible to call them in question as prophecies—at least they were not prophecies after the event, and at least there could be no doubt that in form they were prophetic. When, however, it was found, as a matter of fact, that this new meaning and significance were so striking as to give an impulse that would last, in the form of a new religion and belief, for eighteen centuries and not exhaust itself, that circumstance alone would surely place the ancient prophecies in a very different light. And this is how we see them now. For a period of nearly three times the length of that which had elapsed at the commencement of the Christian era these prophecies have blazed and shone forth with that new light, and instead of making the other dim, it

has only brought out its meaning more and more clearly. It is not open to us to say that this was its meaning; but, at all events, we can say that this would be an adequate and a worthy meaning, and that if this be not its meaning, then the known history of the prophecy till the commencement of the Christian era, and its sudden revival then, are altogether and alike inexplicable, while its subsequent history and aspect is entirely without parallel, and not to be accounted for.

Bishop Butler, indeed, does not hesitate to say that "the *apparent* completions of prophecy must be allowed to be explanatory of its meaning." But if this be so, then the argument from the apparent completeness of the prophecies concerning Christ as a whole is an incontrovertible proof that they were meant to refer to Him; and this is why the argument from prophecy was found to be so cogent and so successful in the days of the Apostles. They had then the original authority of the prophecies as an accepted and unquestioned basis to work upon, and they were able to show conclusively that the events to which they bore witness rested fitly and securely upon that basis. Nowadays our position is less favourable, for the prophecies are rejected as prophecies, and the correspondence between them and Christian fact is rejected likewise as an unmeaning accident; but it is still a valid and incontrovertible argument that the phenomena of the life and teaching of Christ have conclusively established as prophecies those Scriptures which might indeed have been questioned as prophecies had it not been for the occurrence of these events. I venture, then, to affirm that the phenomena of prophecy, thus regarded as a whole, are a strong evidence of its inspiration, because these phenomena are so numerous and so varied that the notion of their being the designed result of any one man or of any number of men is absolutely and altogether absurd. We cannot account for the features which we have before us upon any natural principles, but are compelled to admit that there were forces at work in their production of which we know nothing, and must be content to know nothing, except that they were not and could not have been natural. And thus, however gladly we may admit that in any Christian's heart there are evidences of the presence and operation of the same Spirit, it is absolutely impossible to say that there is any evidence of His presence to the same extent, and of His operation in the same way. If the Christian is under the influence of His holy inspiration, he certainly has not been inspired so as to produce results in any degree comparable to those which were produced by Samuel or Jeremiah, by Hosea or Isaiah. We only, then, confuse ourselves and others when we attempt,

from the common and vague use of the word "inspiration" in both cases, to infer that there was nothing more in the one case than there was in the other. We may not be able to define what were the elements of differentiation, but one reason why we cannot is because in our own case we have no experience of any such elements to enable us to do so. But to conclude from that reason that they did not exist is to shut our eyes to the evidence of fact, and to refuse to acknowledge that which is too patent to be ignored.

To take one more instance in proof of the reality of prophecy. As early as the song of Moses we have the very striking words, "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, His people," words which at any period of the national history, between Moses and Ezra, are not likely to have been the spontaneous expression of Jewish sentiment. Later on, we find it written in Hosea, some eight centuries before Christ, "I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy, and I will say to them which were not My people, Thou art My people, and they shall say, Thou art my God," a promise which is the more remarkable because it speaks of what is to be the individual confession of each member of the people. Again, in Isaiah, "It is a light thing that Thou shouldest be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be My salvation to the end of the earth." This was written seven centuries before Christ. It is true that St. John and St. Paul both recognised in these passages the promised admission of the Gentiles. The point to be observed is that it was there before they recognised it. They did not put it there; and because they found it there, it was not the less conspicuous, nor was the application inappropriate, because they made use of it; and it is yet further to be observed that the verdict of eighteen centuries since their time has only served to make their application the more remarkable, and the original declaration of the prophet the more significant and marvellous. It is nothing to the point to say that there is no connection between the facts of history and the prophecy, because that is the point to be proved, and the evidence is all the other way; whereas, in support of the contrary, there is nothing but assertion and a preconceived opinion of the improbability and impossibility of prophecy. But the question to be determined is whether the alleged evidence of prophecy is sufficient to establish the fact or not, instead of whether or not it is likely or possible that there should be such a thing as prophecy. The defection of the Jewish Church and the admission of the Gentiles, however, do not rest upon the precarious interpretation of one or two texts, but upon the

uniform testimony of Scripture, from one end to the other, while as a matter of fact we are ourselves witnesses of the remarkable way in which history has corresponded with and confirmed this testimony. It is for us to determine the direction in which these facts point; but this much is certain, that if Moses, Isaiah and Hosea wrote as we know they did many centuries before Christ came, and the history had been developed, it could not have been by any natural instinct of their own, but simply and solely because they were inspired thus to write. It is no business of ours to decide how far they may have understood the full significance of what they wrote. We have their words before us, and we have the facts of history side by side with them.

The only question is what is the relation between the two, and whether the correspondence which undeniably exists does or does not point to an over-ruling mind and providence which

Deep in unfathomable mines of never-failing skill
Has treasured up His bright designs and wrought His sovereign Will.

But if this is so, then inspiration is a fact. We may reason about its methods, its conditions, its operation, and the like, but we cannot deny its specific difference from every faculty which we ourselves can conceive. We are bound to acknowledge its reality. How, then, does all this affect such apparently mundane compositions as the Books of Kings and Chronicles?—are they also inspired? What about the genealogical lists in Chronicles? What about the preservation of a number of minute details touching the Temple and its services, which have lost their interest for any human being? The answer is a very simple one. These things are all parts of a whole; they had their place in their day—they have not wholly lost their use in our own; they are at least a witness to the degree of scrupulous care with which these things were put on record and were not left to chance or consigned to oblivion. We can check and countercheck by them, not always indeed to our satisfaction, the independent statements of other sources, while it is not to be denied that some of the very grandest cartoons of all history have been sketched for us by the writers of Kings; and the Second Book of Chronicles has preserved to us a multitude of incidents and details of the very highest interest which, but for the compilers of it, we should not have known, and which, whether or not we accept the moral reflections, which he has combined with them, are at all events fraught with lessons of their own which it is not safe to neglect. There are not wanting here, also, indications of the presence of the like power, exerting itself indeed in a

somewhat different way; but yet so as to set a broad mark of distinction between these writings and any others of a similar character. To take one instance, the verdict that is passed on the conduct of each successive king as he is withdrawn from the scene is only to be regarded as authoritative or conjectural or blasphemous. How is it possible for any ordinary man to say that such and such a king did that which was right or that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord without blasphemy, unless he has access to sources of information which enable him to do so? What English historian would be justified in so dealing with the large majority of our kings? But the writer of Chronicles has no hesitation: he knows. If this knowledge was not feigned or conjectural, it must have been authentic; but if it was authentic, then the writer must have been inspired, or at all events enlightened authoritatively to such an extent as to enable him to pass his judgment with decision and accuracy.

It is thus, then, that I use the word "inspiration," which I am not at all jealous of or anxious for, and which I cannot define, to express that unknown but very manifest power by which certain undeniable features of the sacred Scriptures have been produced. We must postulate such a power in order to account for them. We may call it inspiration, revelation, or what we please. "The meaning, not the name, I call." We may try to explain it by all the ingenuity we can command; we cannot ultimately do so. Like the other methods of Divine operation, it must ever remain inscrutable, mysterious, profound. But for all that, I maintain that it is still an entity, substantive, valid and concrete, of which the proofs are innumerable, and by no means easy to be disposed of.

"But what about verbal inspiration?" some reader may say; "you will surely not undertake to defend that?" Here again I would ask, What do you mean by verbal inspiration? Let us be quite sure that we know what we mean by the words we use. A moment's consideration will show us that, however much the phrase "verbal inspiration" may have been abused, and I am no advocate for the abuse of anything, the inspiration of any book or document must be very closely connected with the inspiration of its words. Indeed, what is a book but a collection of words, and what then is an inspired book but an inspired collection of words or a collection of inspired words? The former is the more accurate, and in some respects the preferable definition, but we shall soon see that in certain cases the one must involve the other. For instance, it will not be possible obviously to discuss any particular prophecy apart from all reference to the particular words of the prophecy. If, then,

the prophecy is inspired, the words of the prophecy must be inspired: the inspiration must, so to say, pervade the words. For the meaning of the prophecy will vary as the meaning of the words varies, and if the words are tampered with so as to alter their meaning or to deprive them of all meaning, there will be an end to the prophecy. In this sense, therefore, inspiration implies and involves verbal inspiration. Let us take an example. "Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel." It is not to be denied that St. Matthew has here altered the original words of the prophet, which were "thou" or "she," thus clearly showing that he was no slave to the letter, and that the inspiration, if any, of the passage, was independent of any such verbal change. But there is another word in the passage about which controversy has hotly raged, *i.e.*, the word "virgin" and its technical meaning, and the attempt has been made to invalidate the evangelist's quotation by the assertion that this technical meaning is uncertain, if not erroneous. Now, I would even venture to say that I think we do the evangelist wrong if we suppose that he intends to rest the weight of his reference upon this single word or its technical meaning. He is drawing a parallel between the incidents of the birth of Jesus and the statement of the prophet, and he says, "now *all* this was done that it might be fulfilled." He saw the fulfilment of the promise quite as much in the name Emmanuel, *e.g.*, and the general history of the Lord's birth, as he did in the prophet's use of the word "virgin." And may we not say that, whatever encouragement was offered to Ahaz at a period of great national depression by the birth of the child Immanuel, which may be presumed to have been *not* of a virgin, a far more glorious promise of hope was associated with the birth of the second Immanuel at a period of much deeper national depression, when so many incidents of remarkable providence combined to signalize His birth. But the difficulty we have in making the prophecy correspond with the event, is one which we owe mainly to our crude, preconceived notions about verbal inspiration; for whatever may be the importance attaching to this particular word "virgin," it is, after all, of subordinate importance, because virginity is not to be predicated in the first instance, and in the second, though unquestionably it is implied and assumed, it is hardly intended to be forced into that position of solitary prominence in which it has been, as it seems to me, unduly placed.

This instance, however, though it serves to show that there may be a certain amount of elasticity in the words employed, shows also that, whatever correspondence there may be between history and prophecy, must be a correspondence dependent on

the words, and therefore, so far as inspiration is involved, it must be a verbal inspiration, for the evidence of inspiration is in the particular words used, which, within certain limits, cannot be replaced by any others, or there would cease to be even the appearance of prophecy. For myself, I may say that I cannot contemplate the various phenomena of the Old Testament without distinctly tracing innumerable instances and indications of inspiration, and these may be multiplied indefinitely according to the faith of the student. The point to be determined is whether or not the Holy Spirit spoke by the prophets in an exceptional way, and if He did we can never be sure that He did not intend us to see some mark of correspondence He may have enabled us to perceive, while we may be perfectly certain that the broad and patent features of correspondence which exist *passim* in the Old Testament Scriptures, and which may or may not have been made use of by New Testament writers, were put there expressly for our learning, and that we shall be rejecting His guidance and teaching if we refuse to note them. For instance, I cannot but believe that the words of Abraham, "My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering," were both spoken and recorded under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and that we, as Christians, were intended to see in them a promise that was and could only be fulfilled in the Lord Jesus Christ. Abraham, like Caiaphas, may not have intended to prophecy, and may not have known that he did so, but I am justified in believing that there was a providence that directed the utterances of both, and that it was not by human accident, but by Divine design, that the utterances in both cases were recorded. And in this I believe I am right in tracing an evidence of inspiration. But when it is borne in mind that instances of this kind may be multiplied to almost any extent, and will continually reveal themselves to the zeal and diligence of the devout student, the inference becomes irresistible that the Bible is no ordinary book, and that that which differentiates it from all other books is the presiding influence of the Spirit of God working for a purpose, and that purpose to lead men to Christ. I may be as far as ever from knowing what inspiration is, or being able to define it. I may be very careful, as I shall always try to be, not to conceive of or represent inspiration in a manner or under conditions that will involve us in contradictions, and be opposed to facts; but that in dealing with the history and prophecy of the Old Testament and the history and teaching of the New I am brought face to face with phenomena which can be explained on this theory, and on no other, will be to me a deeply-rooted and growing conviction which nothing will be able to shake.

STANLEY LEATHES.

ART. V.—THE CATHEDRAL AND THE DIOCESE.¹

THE beauty of our cathedral churches always commands admiration; but the question is often asked, Are they centres of useful work or spiritual influence bearing any just proportion to the magnitude and magnificence of the fabrics? If not, how can they be made such as they ought to be? Now, in considering how the efficiency of any institution may be increased, I take it to be a safe and sensible rule to inquire, in the first place, what purpose it was originally intended to serve. The best reforms are commonly those in which a return has been made to first principles. This, in fact, is reform as distinguished from revolution.

In the question before us the very name "cathedral church" may help us to a right answer. The cathedral church is that in which the bishop's cathedra, throne, or "stool" (as it was called in early English times) was placed. It was originally the church of the bishop, and of the staff of clergy who were appointed by him and were most closely associated with him in his work as the chief pastor of the diocese. Round about the church they dwelt; in it they worshipped; from it they went forth on their missionary journeys; to it they returned for bodily rest and spiritual refreshment. The immediate companions and assistants of the first bishop in any diocese formed the original chapter: thus the chapter is prior to the cathedral; the chapter was not created for the cathedral, but the cathedral for the chapter. Now, all the ancient canonists unanimously and emphatically assert that the essential function of a chapter—the true end for which it exists—is to be the bishop's council or senate. Monarchy was not to be any more absolute in the Church than in the State. As the king had his council, so the bishop had his to assist him in the administration of the diocese, to supply his place so far as it could be supplied during his absence or illness, or during the vacancy of the see. This relation of the chapter to the bishop is expressly recognised in the ancient statutes of nearly all our cathedrals, and not denied in any. I could cite many passages in proof of this statement did space allow, but it must suffice to say that the bishop is commonly styled the "head of the chapter," and that he could convene it whenever he pleased for consultation on diocesan affairs, issuing his mandate to the dean to summon it for that purpose. The right of the chapter, indeed, was restricted in most, if not all, cases to the expression of opinion and delivery of advice, the final decision resting with the

¹ This paper was read in substance at the Chichester Diocesan Conference in 1890.

bishop ; but in important questions connected with the disposition of patronage, the trial of delinquent clerks, the foundation of collegiate or monastic churches, the passing of rules ("constitutions," as they were called) for the observance of the clergy throughout the diocese, the consultative right of the chapter was generally respected. St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln A.D. 1186-1203, was careful, we are told, to appoint wise and learned men as prebendaries, on whose advice and judgment he could rely. The practice of convening the chapter as a diocesan council became rare as time went on, from causes to which I shall presently allude ; but it never quite died out, and of late years it has been revived in several dioceses. I may mention more especially Salisbury and Lichfield.

After having been long suspended in our own diocese, the action of the chapter as a diocesan council was called into being by our present Bishop in the year 1876. His right to summon it was disputed by the residentiary chapter of that day, some of the members of it maintaining that we were not a chapter at all, but only a fortuitous concourse of clerical atoms. Nevertheless, we did meet and we did deliberate, and the first scheme for the constitution of the Diocesan Conference was the result. This institution, at any rate, owes its birth to the action of the cathedral chapter resuscitated by our Bishop fourteen years ago. It has since been called together from time to time ; and if it were annually convened as a diocesan council, it might originate much useful work and make its influence felt in all parts of the diocese. The right of summoning the chapter for consultation on diocesan affairs is almost the only survival of the power which the bishops originally enjoyed as acting heads of the chapter for all purposes. It would take too long to trace the steps by which they gradually lost this position and sank into that of mere external visitors, the exercise even of their visitatorial rights being often vehemently resisted, and the final issue of the strife being in most instances the singular anomaly that the bishop has less power in his own cathedral church than in any other church in his diocese. It must suffice to say that the weakening of the tie between the bishop and the chapter dates from the institution of the office of dean soon after the Norman Conquest. The deans being acting presidents of the chapter, and more constantly in residence than the bishop, gradually drew to themselves the chief practical power. They were elected by the canons, and the aim of the whole body was to make themselves an independent corporation, shaking off the authority of the bishop as much as possible. The cathedral, of course, lost much of its proper character as the mother-church of the diocese.

Nevertheless, for some centuries at least after the Norman Conquest the cathedral was a centre of activity, which made itself felt not only in the city, but more or less throughout the diocese. (1) It was a school of architecture. The masters of the fabric kept in touch with architects and masons of the highest repute not only in England, but on the Continent. They not only secured good designs and workmanship for the additions and repairs executed in their own cathedral, but were doubtless consulted about the building of many of the parish and conventual churches, for in these we can often detect adoptions or imitations of some of the work in the mother-church of the diocese. (2) It was a school of music. It was the business of the precentor (the second dignity after the dean) not only to make the music in the cathedral as good as possible, so that it might be a model for all other churches, but also to superintend schools of song throughout the diocese. By some cathedrals (I cannot say whether our own was one) grants in aid were made to these song-schools, except those which were entirely supported by a prebendary or by the rector of the parish. (3) It was a school of grammar, under the superintendence of the chancellor (the third dignity), who was a kind of minister of education. He had the oversight of schools not only in the city, but in the diocese, with the exception of such voluntary schools as were maintained entirely by a rector or prebendary, and of the prebendal school, of which the master was a prebendary appointed by the chapter. The school of theology was also under the chancellor. He was bound to lecture in the school himself, and to provide for a continual course of instruction. This part of his business was lightened at Chichester (as was the case in many other cathedrals), about the middle of the thirteenth century, by the foundation of a theological prebend, with the duty of lecturing annexed to it. The chancellor was also the official secretary of the chapter, their librarian, and the keeper of the chapter seal and the chapter archives. His duties were so important that he is sometimes styled "*principium et quasi undamentum ecclesiæ*;" they were so various and onerous that in some cathedrals he was assisted by a vice-chancellor. (4) The treasurer (the fourth dignity) was not only the custodian of the "ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof," but also the official dispenser of charitable funds, which in some cases included clothing and medicine as well as money.

The duties of the four chief dignitaries compelled them (indeed, they were compelled by statute) to be resident in the cathedral city during the greater part of the year. Besides them, however, there was always a fluctuating number of

canons in residence. Originally all canons were free to reside either in the precincts of the cathedral or on their own prebendal estates, and all were summoned to the chapter meetings. I cannot now describe at length how residence in the cathedral city came to be discouraged; but it was chiefly through the institution of a curious custom that if a prebendary wished to come into residence he must purchase his right by a series of costly entertainments. This device deterred many from coming at all. At last, in nearly all cathedrals the number of residentiaries became fixed, never, I think, exceeding eight or falling below the mystical number of four. This small knot of residentiaries gradually drew all power into their own hands: when a vacancy occurred they called another prebendary into residence whom they would; and then there was no security that the precentor, chancellor, or treasurer would be called into residence more than any other canon. Their offices, therefore, became practically abolished, and as the non-residents also ceased to be summoned to the chapter meetings, the ties which had formerly connected the cathedral with all parts of the diocese were severed. At last, when it was decreed that each of the four so-called residentiaries should actually reside only three months in the year, being an absentee, if he pleased, for the remaining nine, the chapter became a mere shrunken shadow of its former self, and the cathedral came to be regarded less as the mother-church of the diocese than as the private chapel of the dean and the four venerable clerics, who attended in their turn the daily service behind the massive screen which parted the choir from the cold and empty nave. Then came the retribution. In the first half of this century there arose a great demand for more churches and more clergy owing to the vast increase of the population. How was provision to be made for the increased supply? The cathedral bodies had large estates, but could not point to any useful work commensurate with their wealth. Here was an excuse for acting on the convenient principle of "robbing Peter to pay Paul." Accordingly by the Cathedral Act of 1840 the cathedrals were shorn of a large portion of their revenues, which was thrown into the great crucible of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' fund. Hardly had this been accomplished than an earnest desire arose to make our cathedrals once more centres of life and power. The cathedral bodies themselves wished to be useful, and the public wished to see them useful, just when they had been deprived of the material means of usefulness.

Nevertheless, even with crippled resources much has been effected, and still more may yet be done. I am one of those who think that a most effectual way to increase the usefulness

of our cathedrals is to work as far as possible on the lines of their ancient constitution. For example, making due allowance for altered circumstances, I think that the ordinary offices of precentor, chancellor, and treasurer might still be made extensively useful, if the duties were discharged by three residentiary canons who were really resident not for three months only in the year, but for eight. A resident precentor, if he were a man who could speak and act with authority as having a thorough scientific knowledge of music, might promote the cultivation of church music in the diocese in many ways. He might form associations in various centres for the study and practice of music, more especially sacred music, advising them in their choice of music, and from time to time attending their rehearsals and concerts. He might, with the consent of managers, inspect the music in Church schools, thus relieving Diocesan Inspectors, who cannot always be musical men, from one part of their duty. Being in touch with the musical world, he might be helpful in the selection of organists, as well as in the choice of music for parish church choirs. In all this work he might be assisted by one of the priest-vicars, acting as succentor under him. The duties of the chancellor are discharged in part by the Principal of the theological college. If he had not time in addition to these duties to act as librarian and keeper of the records, a priest-vicar might be appointed as his vice-chancellor for these purposes. I think that the cathedral library might be of great use and value to the diocese if it were made the receptacle of all materials which could be collected for local history from parish registers and other parochial or municipal records. It would then gradually become a central depository of information concerning the ecclesiastical history of the diocese. The chancellor also would naturally take a leading part in the direction and oversight of any efforts for promoting systematic religious instruction, either ordinary, such as the diocesan inspection of schools, or special, such as the scheme for the preparation of which this very conference has been asked to appoint a committee. I am not fond of the system of rolling two offices into one. It has been one of the many causes of the decrepitude of our cathedrals in modern times. But if we have an archdeacon as canon residentiary, I am inclined to think that the office of treasurer might very suitably be held with the archdeaconry, for it pertains to the office of archdeacon to see that the churches under his care are in proper repair, and duly provided with the required "ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof," which was precisely the business of the treasurer in respect of the cathedral.

I do not find in ancient statutes any special duty assigned to

the dean in relation to the diocese at large. As acting head of the whole cathedral body, and responsible for the good order and well-being of the whole institution, he was obliged to be more continually in residence than any other dignitary. The cathedral has, of course, the first claim on the time and attention of a dean, but there will always be intervals of leisure in which he can take a leading part in good work, for the benefit of the city and of the diocese, and as we know from experience at Chichester, men of learning can find time for literary work of lasting value to the Church at large.

In some cathedrals the diocesan inspector, in others the diocesan missionary, is a residentiary canon. Opinions may differ as to the expediency of this arrangement; and I will content myself with saying that it is at any rate entirely in harmony with one of the original purposes and ends of a cathedral chapter, which was, as I have said, to assist the bishop in the evangelization of the diocese.

The great size of a cathedral church and the multiplicity of its parts point to the ways in which it may be used; first for large gatherings, as on the occasion of a visitation or synod, or for choral festivals, or performances of sacred music such as Bach's Passion music on a large scale, or for assemblies of clergy in retreat: secondly for a variety of short services, for lectures, or classes of instruction. I was told the other day that in one of our Midland cathedrals during the season of Lent there were no less than five daily services, various in length and character, adapted to the different classes of worshippers for whom they were more especially designed; and at most of them a short address, an instruction or meditation was delivered. I may mention that it is the practice of one of the canons in the same cathedral at a certain hour on market days, when the city is most full of people from the surrounding country, to take any who like to come over the cathedral, giving them an explanation of its structure and some account of its history. Large numbers, I am told, of the country folk avail themselves of this privilege every week, and it is easy to see what an opportunity may thus be afforded for giving such instruction upon the history of the National Church as may help to explode some of the vulgar fallacies of the day upon that subject. Let me, in conclusion, sum up the points for which I contend.

1. An annual convocation of the whole chapter as the bishop's diocesan council.

2. An occasional, if not annual, convocation of the whole chapter by the dean, for consultation on all matters of vital importance touching the fabric or services of the cathedral.

3. A lengthened term of residence for three at least of the residentiary canons, who should hold, if possible, the offices of precentor, chancellor, and treasurer, or at any rate have some definite duties assigned to them.

It may be said that the old constitution, as I have sketched it, is an ideal which was never thoroughly realized. I grant it, and I am far from denying that, even as it is, the cathedral has been, and may be, a source of useful influence, because able and zealous men will always devise some means of doing good. But in all matters it is well to have an ideal to aim at, to keep it steadily in view, and to get as near it as we can. And I do thoroughly believe that the restoration in its main features of this ancient constitution is the only way to recover for the cathedral its true character as the mother-church of the diocese and enable it to become a centre of life and light and power.

W. R. W. STEPHENS.

Notes on Bible Words.

NO. XII.—“CONVERT.”

THE influence of the Vulgate on our theological language, as all students know, has been great. A remarkable illustration is the word “Convert.”

“Conversion” appears once in our Bible. Acts xv. 3, “declaring the conversion of the Gentiles” (R.V. and A.V.), τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν: (la conversion). The Vulgate gives *conversationem*. This word ἐπι-στροφή occurs only here in N.T.

Στρέφω is to *turn*; reflexively, to *turn one's self*. Acts vii. 42, “God *turned*,” ἔστρεψε; Vulg., convertit. So pass., Luke vii. 9, “*having turned*”; Luke xxii. 61, Καὶ στραφείς ὁ Κύριος ἐπέβλεψε, “and the Lord turned and looked upon;” Vulg., Et conversus D. respexit (Et le Seigneur se tournant, regarda Pierre). Acts vii. 39, ἐστρέψασαν, “turned back in their hearts.” The Vulgate here has *aversi sunt*. Absol. and trop., *turning from one's course of conduct* (to change one's mind). Matt. xviii. 3, “Except ye be converted,” στραφῆτε; “except ye *turn*,” R.V. (Vulg., nisi conversi fueritis).

Ἐπιστρέφω is to *turn to*. Acts xxvi. 20, “that they should repent, and turn to God” (se convertissent à Dieu; Vulg., converterentur). to *cause to return*, Luke i. 16, “shall he turn unto the Lord”; Jas. v. 19, 20, “one convert him”; “which converteth the sinner.” Intrans., to *turn one's self*. Acts ix. 35, “they turned to the Lord:” *turn one's self about*, Acts xvi. 18, “Paul . . . turned, and said:” to *return*, come back. Luke ii. 20, “the Shepherds returned.” Metaph., to *turn*

for the worse,—Gal. iv. 9, “how turn ye,” ἐπιστρέφετε : present tense, change going on (πῶς—interrogatio *admirabunda*; Bengel). 2 Pet. ii. 21, “to turn from the holy commandment :” to turn for the better,—Matt. xiii. 15, A.V., “be converted”; R.V., “turn again.” Luke xxii. 32, “when thou art converted,” A.V.; R.V., “when once (ποτε) thou hast turned again.” Acts iii. 19, “Repent” (μετανοήσατε), “be converted” (ἐπιστρέψατε), *turn again*, convertissez-vous¹; xxviii. 27, “and should be converted,” *turn again* (ἐπιστρέψωσι), “and I should heal them.”² In the mid. and 2 aor. pass., to turn round. Matt. ix. 22, “Jesus turned him about.”

In Isa. vi. 10, the A.V. has CONVERT, “understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed”; the R.V. has *turn again* : Sept., ἐπιστρέψωσι. (Vulg., et convertatur, et sanem eum). The verb is שׁוּב, to turn about; fig., *to turn one's self*. Psal. li. 13, “sinners shall be converted unto Thee”; R.V., *marg.*, “return.” (See Isa. x. 21.) Isa. i. 27, “her converts”; as in *marg.*, “they that return of her”; lit., “her returning ones” (Dr. Kay). Psal. xix. 7, “is perfect, converting the soul”; as in *marg.*, *restoring*; “bringing it back.”

שׁוּב must be studied. See e.g., Deut. iv. 30, “If thou turn”; 2 Kings xvii. 13, “Turn ye”; Prov. i. 23, “Turn ye at My reproof”; Ezek. xviii. 30, A.V., “Repent and turn,” ἐπιστρέψατε καὶ ἀποστρέψατε ἑα, “Return ye, and turn yourselves from . . .” R.V.

The R.V., in keeping “turn” or “return,” generally, for both Hebrew and Greek, does well.³

The N.T. ἐπιστ. repeats the “Turn” and “Turn yourselves,” or “return,” of the O.T.

In writings and addresses, not seldom, probably, teaching about “Conversion” is imperfect. One point in illustration. The turning from sin to holiness, “conversion,”⁴ though the result of the Spirit's influence, is referred to in the Scriptures as the work of man, and *commanded* by God. Regeneration, on the other hand, is never attributed to man, nor made the subject of a Divine precept: it can never be repeated.

Short Notices.

MUCH that is interesting and helpful will be found in *Sermons preached in Clifton College Chapel, 1888-1890*, by Rev. J. M. Wilson, M.A., Headmaster (Macmillan and Co.). Archdeacon Wilson is very, very “Broad” and has lately made a strong pronouncement in that direction. His school sermons, however, are, in their way, excellent.

A new edition of *Scenes and Stories of the North of Scotland* is before

¹ “Repentance,” change of *mind*, and “turning,” change of *life*; compare Jonah iii. 10, with Matt. xii. 41. With true *repentance* there is always true *turning*.

² Mark (iv. 12) has a paraphrase. In Matt., John, and the Acts, appears the Sept. καὶ λάσσωμαι αὐτοῦς.

³ In Isa. lx. 5, “abundance of the sea shall be converted,” A.V.; R.V., “turned.” The verb is *haphak*, to turn, turn one's self, to change.

⁴ “Sincera ad Deum et omne bonum conversio.”—*Helvet. Conf.*

us (Edinburgh: James Thin). Mr. Sinclair's description of Scottish scenes is vivid and racy. It is a pleasing book, with good illustrations.

We heartily welcome a new volume of Discourses by the Rev. Alfred Oweu Smith, Curate of Hoylandswaine, *Balaam and other Sermons* (Elliot Stock). Mr. Smith's *Bethel and other Sermons* was recommended in these pages last year.

A good specimen volume of the "Expositor's Bible Series," published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, is Dr. Kellogg's *The Book of Leviticus*. Dr. Kellogg says: "However any may seek to disguise the issue with words, if in fact this Levitical ritual and code of laws came into existence only after the Babylonian captivity, and in the way suggested, then the Book can by no possibility be the Word of God in any sense, but is a forgery and a fraud."

We are glad to see Dean Plumtre's Boyle Lectures for 1866 in the excellent "Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature," a series to which we have often referred (Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh). In a footnote on page 104 we are pleased to notice a statement of Dr. Plumtre's opinion as to the so-called Deutero-Isaiah prophecies. He does not agree with Delitzsch in the last edition of his Commentary, or with Professor Driver in his work on Isaiah.

In *Murray's Magazine* appears an admirable article by Miss Balfour, an account of "Two visits to the West Coast of Connaught," the first with her brother, the Chief Secretary, and the second with Lady Zetland.

In *Blackwood* appears an interesting review of "Archbishop Tait." *Blackwood* points out that Tait's steadfast adherence to his principles was always conspicuous. The tempting opening of a Glasgow Professorship, with its high fees and much leisure, was in vain. Tait could not swallow the Westminster Confession. He said: "I have nothing to do with judging other people, but it seems to me that a man who, intending to remain an Episcopalian, sets his hand to such an unqualified declaration, does neither more nor less than write one thing and mean another." There was enough of that in another direction in those stirring days in Oxford, says *Blackwood*. Either on one side or another the young don would have none of it. *Blackwood* continues: "At twenty-three he became a Fellow of his college. The reader does not need to be reminded what the period was in which this young man entered active and responsible life, for the air has recently been agitated by too many echoes and revivals of that exciting time to leave anyone who has any title to the qualifications of reader, in oblivion of Tract xc., and all the tumults which arose from it. We confess for our own part that all the interesting subtleties of the mind of Newman, and his picturesque position, which is so dazzling as to confound the judgment, do not conciliate us to this much discussed tract, and that the plain man's simple inability to see how he could write one thing and mean another is to ourselves much more sympathetic. We do not, however, intend to enter upon this question, which has already been so widely discussed, except to note that by the date 1841, at which it was issued, Tait at thirty was in so influential a position, as Senior Tutor of his college, as to be able to inspire and lead the Protest of the Four Tutors, the first strong barrier put up against that wonderful and exuberant flood. It was in Oxford, at least, the unpopular side to take. His own generation was drawn away to a great degree by that romantic and attractive influence, and some of his most intimate friends were deeply influenced by it, and for life. Tait called no names, imputed no motives, at this or any other time; but he set himself like a rock against the current which, in his plain and strong judgment, was sweeping onward not only to theological changes of the most radical description, but to what was of even greater importance, a loosening of the common bonds of truth and honour."

THE MONTH.

PARLIAMENT was on the 5th prorogued until October. The Irish Land Purchase Act, the Tithe Rent-Charge Act, and the Free Education Act tell of a successful session. The Clergy Discipline Bill failed to pass. Nothing has been done in the way of "Church Reform."

The result of the Wisbech election affords matter for serious thought. How will the agricultural labourers, as a rule, give their votes at the next election? About the Home Rule question they seem to care very little.

The Birmingham Bishopic scheme is, perhaps, making good way. The late Bishop of Worcester, Dr. Philpott, has offered to resign £500 a year of his pension that it may go towards the stipend of the proposed see. Meantime a suffragan Bishop of Coventry is appointed.

Representatives of the Order of Foresters assembled in London were invited to attend in a body the Morning Service in St. Paul's, and the Archbishop of Canterbury preached the sermon. Comments in some newspapers seem to show ignorance of the fact that a "Church parade" of Friendly Societies has been common enough in rural parishes the last few years.

The *Daily News*, in "Life in our Villages," points out that "the agricultural labourer is abandoning the land he was born on, and making his way into the towns." The movement is indeed all too plain. The Census shows that while the towns and mining districts are increasing fast, the rural counties have stood still or fallen off. What is to be done?

A donor, who does not wish his name to be mentioned, has sent the Bishop of Carlisle £10,000 for the augmentation of ten poor benefices.

The Dean of Bristol, Dr. Elliot, appointed by Lord John Russell in 1850, has passed away, at the age of ninety-one.—At a special service held in Westminster Abbey on the 16th, Archdeacon Farrar paid a tribute to the memory of Mr. Russell Lowell.

Canon Barlow, we gladly note, has been elected to the see of North Queensland.—Bishop Stanton has been cordially received in his new diocese.

In the *Church Pastoral Aid Magazine* appears the report of an interview with Dr. Blakeney, the honoured Vicar, as to the very successful work of the Church in Sheffield.

In the *Times* have appeared letters from "A Suffering Layman," protesting against the long sermons preached by deputations. That the Incumbent should preach the sermon is one suggestion. The mistake, as we think, is this: A deputation preaches a sermon of the usual kind and usual length, and then takes ten or fifteen minutes more for the work and claims of his society.

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
A Church Crusade, by Rev. W. H. Hunt	518	Oxford Movement, the	528
A Plea for the Cycle, by Rev. W. E. Richardson	622	Padre Curci, by Canon Meyrick	588
A very early Christian Romance, by Dean Spence	366	Permanent Claims of Old Testament, the, by Dr. Leathes	337
Advent, the, by Rev. W. T. Hobson	113	Personal Revelation, by Preb. Reynolds	617
Alphonse Gratry, by Rev. W. A. Purton	476	"Ransom," the, by Rev. R. Helme	398, 485
Archbishop Tait, by Dean Boyle	690	Social Position of Women, by Miss C. M. Birrell	25
Assisted Education, by J. W. Diggle, Esq.	541	Story of Gergesa, by Rev. A. Pearson	449
Bishop of Manchester on our Lord's Knowledge, by Canon Meyrick	393	Systematic Almsgiving, by W. E. Hubbard, Esq.	535
Brotherhoods, by Canon Jenkins	157	The Cathedral and the Diocese, by Preb. Stephens	658
Cases of Old Sermons, My, by Rev. R. Glover	579	The Ignatian Epistles	431, 493
Churchmen in Council, by Rev. C. H. Minchin	18	The late Hero-Worship of Dr. Newman, by Canon Meyrick	270
Daniel, by Preb. Bassett	417, 461	The Laws of Marriage, by Chancellor Espin	230
Deuteronomy, by Preb. Bassett	309	The Present Work of Our Lord, by Principal Moule	71
Döllinger on Infallibility, by Dr. Plummer	289	The Round Towers of Ireland, by Rev. W. Cowan	573
"Foundations of the Bible," by Prof. Margoliouth	225	The Seventy Weeks of Daniel, by Rev. John Milner	94
Four Great Prebendaries, by Dean of Salisbury	151	The Supernatural, by Preb. Reynolds	513
Gambling, by Dean Lefroy	57	The Three Graces, by Canon Stewart	67, 125, 136
"General" Booth's Scheme, by Rev. J. F. Kitto	169	The Watch at the Grave, by Canon Jenkins	597
Hospitals, by Sir William Moore	280	Tithe Rent-Charge Troubles, by Rev. H. T. Armfield	80
Hymns of the French Église Réformée, by Rev. W. A. Purton	85	Three Recent Histories of Israel, by Prof. Ryle	246
Indigestion, by Sir William Moore	146	Two Passages from the Epistles, by Rev. W. C. Green	386
In My Parish, by Country Parson	43		
Inspiration, by Preb. Leathes	642		
Isaiab, by Preb. Bassett	28		
Isaiab and Micah, by Canon Girdlestone	505		
John Sinclair, Archdeacon, by Archdeacon William Sinclair	294, 352		
Lambeth Judgment, the, by Rev. R. W. Kennion	181		
Lambeth Judgment, the, by P. V. Smith, Esq.	191		
Maxims of the Jewish Fathers, the, by Dr. Sinker	281		
Modern Pessimism, by Rev. M. Kaufmann	561		
Molinism, by Canon Jenkins	629		
Nature and the Bible, by Dr. Leathes	1		
Necessary Postulates of Christian Belief, by Preb. Leathes	131		
Notes on St. John xxi., by Rev. H. C. G. Moule	191, 239, 323, 375		
Nursing, by Sir W. Moore, K.C.I.E.	408		
Our Lord's Humanity, by Rev. H. C. Adams	196		
		REVIEWS:	
		"The Christian Ministry," by Principal Moule	101
		"The Finding of the Cross"	217
		Dr. Plummer's "St. James," by Dean Boyle	442
		Dean Vaughan's "Lebrews," by Rev. W. E. Richardson	444
		"Laurence Oliphant"	606
		Mr. Dimock's "The Death of Christ," by Dr. Dyson	549
		NOTES ON BIBLE WORDS: 50, 99, 165, 216, 279, 332, 387, 441, 499, 554, 604, 664	
		NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS: 51, 106, 166, 219, 280, 333, 339, 448, 500, 554, 609, 665	
		THE MONTH: 56, 112, 168, 223, 280, 336, 392, 443, 504, 560, 616, 667	