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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JANUARY, 1892.

ART. I.—CHRIST'S KNOWLEDGE.

ANY controversy that seems to derogate from the honour and glory of our Lord must excite thoughts that are painful to any Christian mind. Of late a warm discussion has arisen concerning both the quality and the quantity of the knowledge possessed by Jesus Christ in the days of His sojourn in the flesh. Some who have taken up the question, it may be, are simply desirous of increasing in our minds a sense of the perfect sympathy which Christ has for His people, by bringing Him down more to the level of our weaknesses and our wants, our mental trials and perplexities. Others, assuming that He, as man, did not know more than those that surrounded Him, would lead us to believe that His acquaintance with such subjects as science and criticism was limited by the education He had received in the same way as others of the same age, station, and locality, and, therefore, that His sayings, which involve reference to such questions, are not authoritative or necessarily exact—His infallibility comprised only piety and morals. And some there are who seem as if their object was to lower the Lord altogether to the standard of ordinary humanity, by implying that when He took on Him our nature "He emptied Himself" of Deity altogether, with all the attributes, powers, and properties of Deity. He became man in such a sense that He ceased to be God; or if they would shrink from making this startling confession in plain words, at all events, He ceased to retain any of the activities of the Godhead. They were in suspense and quiescence.

The doctrine which has sprung up of late, both inside the pale of the Church and among the various Christian communities, appears to be the exact converse of the heresy of

Eutyches, which was condemned at the General Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). He held that the two natures of God and man were united in our Lord, but afterwards the latter was entirely absorbed by the former, so that there remained in the glorified Christ only one nature—the Divine. The new school appears to adopt a contrary error, and to teach that when "the Word became flesh," it was not the Deity that assumed humanity, according to the Catholic faith, but humanity the Deity, and, further, that the humanity absorbed the Deity, and only the humanity remained; and this humanity was subject to all the laws, the infirmities, and imperfections that belong to the nature of mankind. It would follow, according to this theory, that the perfect knowledge which is one of the attributes of Deity was so laid aside, so voided, that it might be compared to what any one of us might have known at one time, but forgotten at another. This strange heresy, for it deserves that name, is euphemized with a plausible gloss that this state of nescience or ignorance was voluntarily submitted to and assumed at the Incarnation, in order that He might be like to His brethren in all things.

Churchmen should possess a safeguard and a guide in their perplexities in the Athanasian Creed. We are taught to believe and confess that the Incarnate Lord is "perfect God and perfect man," yet He is "not two, but one Christ." And He is one, "not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the manhood into God"; and the unity resulting is not by confusion or commingling of the substances which would make a third substance, neither perfect God nor perfect man, but is a unity of Person. Each nature, the Divine and the human, had its own properties, perfect and distinct, yet they were indissolubly bound together in the Person of Christ. Now, knowledge is an attribute of Deity and also an attribute of humanity—in the one it is full, immediate, perfect, eternal, unchangeable, and in the other, imperfect, dependent upon means, and capable of advance and increase.

These thoughts will tend to show us on the very threshold of our inquiry that before proceeding further a caution is necessary. In reading much of the current literature on the subject, there seems to be often a confusion in the use of the word *knowledge*. *Knowledge* with us means sometimes the power or capacity of knowing—the abstract, active attribute—and sometimes the things which are known, the concrete facts that have been treasured in the mind. It is commonly said that knowledge belongs to the person, and not to the nature; but a little explanation appears to be required here. Much depends upon the sense in which the word is used. The power or capacity of knowledge is a property which dwells

in all living creatures in a graduated scale, according to the nature of the class to which the creature belongs. This capacity varies in comprehensiveness with different kinds of creatures: the natural capacity of an ox differs from that of a horse, and both from that of a dog, and to this may also be added the amount of faculty which most animals possess of receiving training and acting in accordance with it. This shows certainly a capacity of knowledge. Knowledge must, therefore, in some degree belong to the nature, as it varies as a faculty and endowment both in quality and quantity in creatures of a different nature, and it is the nature that imposes the distinction, and enlarges or limits its scope. This power or capacity in man's nature is a talent of a high order, far-reaching in energy, effort, and extent. But, on the other hand, *knowledge*, in the sense of *things that are known*, belongs entirely to the individual, whatever grade it may occupy in the scale of creation, as this is the result of the application and use of the capacity—acquisition, education, training, observation, and experience. The former is an endowment, a natural gift to all of the same species; the latter is an accomplishment or attainment, which the individual of the species has gained by the use and exercise of the faculty.

Our Lord, as man, had the human capacity of knowledge, and it may fairly be postulated that He had this property in all its fulness, as much as human knowledge can perceive and penetrate in its highest conditions. But, further, our Lord, being the very Wisdom and Word of God incarnate, remained all that He was before His incarnation, in essence, in attributes, and powers, otherwise He would have ceased to be Divine—to be God; hence perfect and eternal knowledge, being a Divine attribute, was His in all its fulness. Perhaps we may suggest a comparison between this question and that of the two *wills* in Christ which engaged the sixth General Council held at Constantinople (A.D. 681). It was there decided against the Monothelites that as in the Lord there were two perfect and distinct natures, so there were two distinct *wills*, the Divine and the human; that these were never contrary to each other, but that the human will follows the Divine, and is subject to it, and is enlightened and aided by it. So it may be argued that, although will and knowledge are very different attributes, in our Lord there are two knowledges, the one properly pertaining to the Divine, and the other to the human nature, that these are never fused or mixed, but each operates in its own sphere; but as the manhood is taken into God, so the attribute of human knowledge is elevated, aided, and regulated by the Divine in the mystery of the unity of the Person, as was necessary for the accomplishment of the work which the

Father had given Him to do. The subject is, indeed, far beyond the comprehension of man, and yet Scripture brings it down to the level of our understanding in a very practical way, by furnishing us with examples of the use made of His knowledge in the Person of our Lord.

It occurred sometime since to the writer to collect out of the Gospels the passages where the knowledge of the Lord is distinctly referred to. For the sake of brevity it will be sufficient for our argument to refer more especially to those places where the word to *know* is found. By the evidence thus furnished we shall be able in some degree to form a conception of the nature of the knowledge possessed and exercised by our Lord Jesus Christ. It must be observed that there are two verbs in Greek which are generally rendered in our tongue by one word, *know;* but they are considered to differ in this respect, that one of them (*οἶδα*) signifies *natural, intuitive knowledge,* and the other (*γινώσκω*) *acquired knowledge.* The former may well be explained by "I know," and the latter by "I come to know." This distinction, however, does not appear to be universally observed, as there are instances where the rule is not applicable (see, *e.g.*, Luke xvi. 15 and John x. 15). In both these places *γινώσκειν* is used in connection with God the Father; and in the latter, the restricted meaning would hardly exhibit the reciprocal knowledge which the Son has of the Father. Much the same may be said of ver. 27; see also Matt. xi. 27, where *ἐπιγινώσκειν* is found. Several exceptions also will be seen in the following quotations.

The texts which refer to the *Divine* knowledge of our Lord claim the first attention. These are examples in which the knowledge alleged could not have been possessed except in a supernatural, a Divine manner:

Matt. ix. 2: "And Jesus *seeing* (*ἰδών*) their faith."

Matt. ix. 4: "And Jesus *knowing* (*ἰδών*, v. l. *εἰδώς*) their thoughts."

Matt. xvi. 8: "Which, when Jesus *perceived*" (*γνούς*). This seems to have been supernatural knowledge, as it refers to the *thoughts* as well as the words of the disciples; but as Mark viii. 16 has *πρὸς ἀλλήλους*, it may be ascribed to human knowledge, on the ground that their thoughts were expressed in conversation.

Matt. xxii. 8: "But Jesus *perceived* (*γνούς*) their wickedness."

Mark ii. 5: "When Jesus saw (*ἰδών*) their faith."

Mark ii. 8: "When Jesus perceived (*ἐπιγνούς*) in His spirit." This verb signifies *accurate knowledge,* and the words "in His spirit" determine the supernatural character of the knowledge.

Mark v. 30: "And Jesus immediately *knowing* in Himself" (ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ). The same may be said as in the last instance.—N.B. ἐν ἑαυτῷ is strictly *personal.* The knowledge was personal and supernatural.

Mark xii. 15: "But He knowing (εἰδώς) their hypocrisy." The parallel in Matt. xxii. 18 (see above) is γνούς.

Luke vi. 8: "But He *knew* (ἤδει) their thoughts."

Luke ix. 47: "And Jesus *perceiving* (ἰδών) the thoughts of their heart."

Luke xx. 23: "But He *perceived* (κατανοήσας) their craftiness." This word signifies complete perception. In Matthew the parallel has γνούς (see chap. xxii. 18, and Mark xii. 15, εἰδώς).

John i. 48: "Nathanael saith unto Him, Whence knowest Thou (γινώσκεις) me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I *saw* (εἶδον) thee."

John ii. 24, 25: "But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He *knew* all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for He *knew* what was in man." In both places the verb γινώσκειν is used. The sense clearly demands that the knowledge should be regarded as intuitive, and not acquired.

John iii. 11: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do *know* (οἴδαμεν), and testify that we have seen."

John v. 6: "When Jesus saw him lie, and *knew* (γνούς) that he had been now a long time in that case." The sense here must be supernatural, for no one had told the Lord the particulars of this man's suffering.

John v. 42: "But I *know* (ἔγνωκα) you, that ye have not the love of God in you." Here, again, the knowledge must have been Divine, for God alone searcheth the hearts.

John vi. 15: "When Jesus therefore *perceived* (γνούς) that they would come and take Him by force," etc. This might be Divine or human knowledge, but it seems most probably the former.

John vi. 61: "When Jesus *knew in Himself*" (εἰδὼς ἐν ἑαυτῷ). This is strictly personal and Divine knowledge.

John vi. 64: "For Jesus *knew* (ἤδει) from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him."

John vii. 15, 16: "And the Jews marvelled, saying, How *knoweth* (οἶδε) this man letters, having never learned? Jesus answered them and said, My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me."

John vii. 29: "But I *know* (οἶδα) Him, for I am from Him, and He sent Me."

John viii. 14: "For I *know* (οἶδα) whence I came and whither I go."

John viii. 55: "I *know* (οἶδα) Him (God)."

John x. 15: "As the Father *knoweth* (γινώσκει) Me, and I *know* (γινώσκω) the Father." This must be Divine knowledge. The verb cannot be used in its radical sense.

John xiii. 3: "Jesus *knowing* (εἰδώς) that the Father had given all things into His hands."

John xiii. 18: "I know (οἶδα) whom I chose."

John xvi. 30: "Now are we sure that Thou *knowest* (οἶδας) all things."

John xvii. 25: "O righteous Father, the world hath not *known* (ἔγνω) Thee, but I have known (ἔγνων) Thee, and these have known (ἔγνωσαν) that Thou hast sent Me." The same verb is used here with reference to the world, and to the disciples, and to our Lord. In the two first it must point to human knowledge, but in the case of the Lord it could not be meant that He had come to know the Father. Both verbs are used to signify Christ's supernatural knowledge (see above, chaps. viii. 14, and x. 15). It would seem to be used here to bring out both the comparison and the contrast between Himself and others.

John xviii. 4: "Jesus therefore *knowing* (εἰδώς) all things that should come upon Him." Here is a clear knowledge of futurity.

These passages containing verbs which specify knowledge are sufficient to show the absolute and perfect knowledge which was possessed by our Lord. We have restricted ourselves to the occurrences of these verbs, but every reader will remember how many examples are given in the Gospels of absolute and perfect knowledge displayed by our Lord, such as the history of the Samaritaness, His perception of the touch upon the fringe of His garment, the *stater* in the mouth of the fish, the exact description beforehand of His own persecutions and sufferings at Jerusalem, the signs of the destruction of that city, the place of preparation of the Passover, the ever-living memory of the act of anointing His feet, the denial of Peter, and the treachery of Judas. These and numberless other examples which will occur to the reader's mind corroborate the testimony of the texts that definitely declare the perfection and divinity of our Lord's knowledge. Neither can the knowledge possessed by our Lord be compared, much less identified, with that which illumined the prophets, as some have recently argued, because the knowledge of the Lord, as being one with the Father, comprehends and unfolds the eternal past as well as the proximate and eternal future; and further, the Lord claims this knowledge as His own proper prerogative, whereas

the prophets declare that their knowledge was derived from the revelation and inspiration of God—a borrowed light, a gift received.

In searching for passages that refer to the human knowledge in our Lord, as contrasted with and distinct from the Divine, it is surprising that so few are to be found, we might almost say none, containing the verbs which definitely signify to *know*, though one or two cases may be doubtful; but there are other passages which are claimed as belonging to the category of human knowledge, such as those that relate to our Lord's inquiry for information, or His receiving intelligence of certain facts, *e.g.*, Matt. iv. 12: "When Jesus had *heard* that John was cast into prison" (see the same in ix. 12; xiv. 13). Again in Mark ix. 33: "He *asked* them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way?"

Luke viii. 30: "And Jesus *asked* him, What is thy name?"

Luke viii. 45: "And Jesus said, *Who* touched me?"

John vi. 5, 6: "He saith unto Philip, *Whence* shall we buy bread that these may eat?" This looks at first like an ordinary inquiry based upon ignorance and desiring information, but the context sets this aside: "And this He said to prove Him, for He Himself *knew* (ἤδει) what He would do."

John xi. 17: "Then when Jesus came, He *found* (εὗρεν) that he had lain in the grave four days already."

John xi. 34: "*Where* have ye laid him?"

None of these passages contain either of the verbs to *know*, and all these passages, and others like them, have really little or nothing to do with the question, as such expressions are only used in the ordinary course of conversation or narrative, and imply nothing more than intercommunication, as may be seen by similar expressions in the Old Testament, where no doubt can exist as to the meaning—*e.g.*: "*Where* art thou?" (Gen. iii. 9); "I will go down and *see* whether they have done, etc." (xviii. 21); "Because the Lord hath *heard* that I was hated" (xxix. 33); and in the frequent expression that God *hears* prayer, though He knows our necessities before we ask Him.

One or two places may be doubtful, as John vi. 15: "When Jesus therefore perceived (γνούς) that they would come and take Him by force and make Him king." This may be attributed to Divine knowledge of the purpose of the throng, or it may be a natural and merely human conclusion from the excited appearance of the multitude.

One feature in this body of texts is certainly noticeable, that all the passages, except one or two of doubtful application, which contain the definite words for *knowledge*, set forth the knowledge of Christ as absolute, infallible, and exact—in one

word, *Divine*. Indeed, from the passages which speak categorically of Christ's knowledge, we should not gather the existence of a lower or limited knowledge at all; if such existed, acting independently, it must be sought for elsewhere. Hence from this inquiry thus far the only conclusion we can arrive at is that, as the manhood was taken into God, the human knowledge was so united with the Divine in the Person of Christ, though without mixture or confusion, that they were never used apart, and thus the knowledge which He possessed and exercised was full and perfect, and His authority, therefore, on all points final, infallible, and indisputable.

But although the texts which contain reference to the human knowledge, under the form of the verbs to *know*, are so few and fractional, or even undiscoverable, apart from the Divine knowledge, there are two passages in the Gospels which have been produced and pressed with no inconsiderable amount of zeal, as furnishing proof positive of limitation in the knowledge of our Lord when on earth. The first of these is Luke ii. 52: "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour (or grace) with God and man." We have no desire to evade the force of this or any other testimony of Holy Writ; but it is a matter of importance to ascertain what was the intention of the writer, or, in other words, what is the truth. In order to get at the real meaning, we must consider the whole passage. The statement that Jesus was advancing (προέκοπτε) in wisdom creates the difficulty. We must therefore compare this with the other words with which it stands connected. "Jesus was advancing," we are told, "in stature" (or age). This was a fact that was visible to the eyes of all around Him. And He was advancing in favour with men; this was the impression made upon the minds of His friends and neighbours. Both these are parallel with each other, and both clearly refer to the evidence before the eyes of men. Now, the "favour or grace with God" was the cause of the favour with men, and this stands parallel with wisdom, an abstract and invisible attribute, which can only be made intelligible to us by its results. Thus it would appear that by the advance in wisdom we are to understand that, as Jesus developed in His physical frame before the eyes of men, so to their appreciation, in His mental powers He appeared to grow in wisdom as He gave evidence of His abilities. All is spoken in a general way, as an ordinary observer would express his impressions as he witnessed the remarkable youth growing up as a pattern of intelligence and piety. It may be observed that many writers of late, when quoting this passage, confound *wisdom* with *knowledge*, whereas the words are different both in form and meaning. That the above must have been the

intention of the Evangelist or of the Virgin Mary, to whom this portion of St. Luke's Gospel has been attributed, seems clear from a passage which stands in close connection with this verse. In ver. 47 we find the great teachers of the day "astonished at His understanding and answers." This entirely refutes, as all must admit, the limitation theory that Jesus knew only what could be gathered from His own surroundings, and that His knowledge was not above the ordinary level of a Galilean peasant, as it appears it surpassed that of the most learned Rabbis of Jerusalem when He was only twelve years of age. And that without having received the special training of their schools. On the other hand, is not the presence of supernatural knowledge here recognisable? and do we not find here an answer to the question which was afterwards raised by His neighbours, who knew what His education was and what it was not, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" (John vii. 15). Further, it is to be noted that the text tells us that "Jesus was advancing in favour (or grace) with God." "Grace with God" "and wisdom" are, as we have seen, in parallel connection with each other; but how could Jesus really increase in God's favour? How could the Father love or regard His Son more at one time than at another? The thought is impossible. But it is easy to conceive that as the fruits of God's grace and wisdom were ever increasingly manifested, as the time for His entering on His public career drew nearer, all men recognised and bore witness to the preparation that was being made to effect the redemption of the world.

The second passage is Mark xiii. 32: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man—no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." This is the passage which is most tenaciously held to prove the limited nature of the Lord's knowledge. When a text seems to any extent to be at variance with the rest of Scripture testimony, it demands the most careful investigation to see if the apparent meaning is really the true one. A doctrine which depends on a solitary text has always excited some hesitation. In this case the context must be carefully and candidly examined, and then search must be made to discover some parallel passage which may throw light upon the difficulty. The first thing that strikes us in the context, going back to the beginning of the chapter, is that our Lord certainly did possess and exercise on this occasion supernatural knowledge, and that of a most minute and accurate kind, when He predicted to His disciples that not one stone should be left upon another of all that gorgeous temple that reared its glories before their gaze. Moreover, when they asked Him what would be the sign when

all these things should be fulfilled, He informed them of a series of events concerning themselves, the Jewish people, the temple, the city, the setting-up of the abomination, the captivity, the banishment—matters many of which have all become history long ago. But to the question *when* the last things should be, our present passage was intended to be the reply. Now, if this is pressed by some to prove that Christ had only human knowledge, and that of a limited character, it is equally open to others to press the proof He gave of Divine knowledge in the preceding predictions, and to urge the reminder that one part of Scripture is not to be interpreted contrary to another. There must be a mode of reconciliation even in this place. Could any one of the disciples who asked the question have furnished such an answer as Jesus did? If not, why not? The only rejoinder possible is that the Lord possessed what they did not, a knowledge far above the reach of man. The discourse certainly contains an argument as valid for one as it does for the other. In the next place, we must prosecute a search for a passage which shall supply a similar statement. It is granted by most of the advocates of the limitation theory that after His resurrection the Lord resumed His attributes, which, they say, He had laid aside; but in Acts i. 6, 7, we find the Apostles coming to our Lord with practically the same question, for the manifestation of the kingdom and the second advent are contemporaneous events: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And He said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, *which the Father hath put in His own power.*" It is to be remembered that Christ was now risen from the dead, and about to ascend into heaven. Any limitations to which he had been subjected were now removed, and yet His testimony on this point is precisely the same: "The Father put it in His own proper authority"—*ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*. Further, in this passage there is a special emphasis of position given to the words rendered "It is not for you," *Οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστί*, at the beginning of the sentence which discloses the purpose of the secrecy. "It would not be good for you, or for mankind in any generation, to know the period of the Lord's return. Such knowledge would have the effect of curtailing, or even of cancelling, the duties of watchfulness and prayer." Comparing the two passages, both as to the times when and the terms in which they were uttered, the meaning of the former one can be no other than that which has been most widely adopted by the Catholic Church, that the secret of the exact date of the winding-up of God's dealings with men has not been entrusted to any ministering angel to disclose, nor even was the Son,

either in the depths of humiliation or on the summit of exaltation, commissioned to reveal this mystery. Our Lord has told us on other occasions that the words which He spoke were the words which the Father had given Him to speak; and this one word, the date of His descent in glory, was, in the deep mystery of the union of Deity and humanity in the Person of Christ, not given Him to utter or make known. A distant comparison may be made between this and the case of St. Paul, who in his rapture heard and knew unspeakable words, and adds, "which it is not lawful for a man to utter" (2 Cor. xii. 4).

This interpretation satisfies all demands; it removes difficulties, does not set one passage of Scripture against another, but yields a sense harmonious throughout; for inasmuch as Christ was perfect God, and His Person was Divine, in His personal knowledge He must of necessity have known the day and the hour, the exact particulars of which He had already disclosed and defined, and so given proof of His omniscience; but in His office of Teacher it was not in His function to make known that which the Father had not entered in the code of revelation which it was His purpose to consign to mankind.

There is a passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (ch. ii. 7) to which teachers of the limitation-school always have recourse: "He emptied Himself"—*Ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*. It is astonishing to see how some people are satisfied the moment that a text is quoted. It does not seem to occur to some minds to ask here, "Emptied Himself" of what? Is it of the Divine essence, or powers, or attributes, or of what? The passage is perfect in its enunciations, hence the answer is ready. What does it say that Christ originally had? *He subsisted in the form* (*μορφή*) *of God.* What was it He assumed? *The form* (*μορφή*) *of servant, by becoming in the likeness of men.* What was it, then, of which Christ divested Himself? It was the *form* of God. Now, *μορφή* (*form*) is the *recognisable* side of essential or intrinsic reality—that which makes it knowable to us. It must, therefore, be the external and intelligible tokens of the Deity of which the Lord divested Himself. The essence of Deity He could not lay aside, as this was His own very Self and Personality, the core and centre of His Being. Such an interpretation as severing Himself from Deity, though only for a time, involves a patent impossibility which would negative the whole testimony of Scripture on this doctrine, and nullify the Incarnation, as the Nestorians of old did, and set aside the work of redemption altogether. Neither could it be the Divine attributes or operations, as these were the necessary concomitants of Deity, which were manifested

throughout His earthly career. Neither could it affect the Divine knowledge, as Deity without omniscience would be no longer Deity. Further, without perfect knowledge how could He be a Teacher sent from God? how could He reveal the Father, and how be the Light of the world? Hence the only conclusion is that the "self-emptying" must refer to that which concerns the *form*, the recognisable and intelligible tokens of Deity. He unrobed Himself of the *insignia* of the Godhead, such as the glory which He had with the Father before the world was; the equipments of the Deity, which if exhibited would have compelled submission and belief, and rendered humiliation and death impossible; but the intrinsic and eternal qualities of Deity, with all the powers and attributes, knowledge included, remained unchanged and unchangeable, for "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever" (Heb. xiii. 8), "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. ii. 3).

It is to be feared that on some lips the "truly human life" seems to mean a truly human life *minus* the Divine life; but the creed of the Church has ever taught us to believe in the "truly human life" *plus* the Divine life and all that appertains thereto.

F. Tilney Bassett.

Dulverton Vicarage, October 28, 1891.

Art. II.—THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

THE discussions and disputes in connection with labour questions during the last two or three years have extended far beyond the limits of the trades and communities more directly affected by them. There is, therefore, no impropriety, but rather the contrary, in the Church collectively and the clergy interesting themselves to some extent at least in the issues raised. Whilst I distinctly deprecate the clergy doing anything to lay themselves open to the imputation of being political partisans, I nevertheless see no reason why, in due and moderate measure, and on suitable occasions, they should not consider themselves, and invite their flocks to consider, some of the political and social problems of the day. I do not wish to be misunderstood herein, and therefore had better *préciser*, as a Frenchman would say, just what I mean and what I do not mean. I do not mean that they should indulge in advice, scolding, and denunciations from the "altar," such as are in vogue with the Romish priests in Ireland; nor do I mean that the clergy, under the pretence of preaching sermons, should indulge in pulpit deliverances in the nature of *Contemporary Review* articles, as do some of the Broad Church clergy.

But there is a golden mean not difficult of attainment, as those familiar with Bishop Christopher Wordsworth's well-known and delightful *Occasional Sermons* in Westminster Abbey will well remember.

The remarks which follow must be regarded as having not very specially a reference to the pulpit at all, but as rather designed to suggest matters for the consideration of the clergy in any and all of their opportunities for usefulness. These will include pastoral visiting, and such occasions as taking the chair at, or otherwise assisting at, village lectures or classes, friendly society dinners, and indeed any gatherings of this character at which openings for a little speech-making on social questions present themselves, To put it in different terms, I would say that the English clergy in England should do something to act upon the principle which underlies the idea of a medical missionary: that the parish clergyman should now and again be prepared to acquire wholesome spiritual influence over his parishioners by showing himself, and being, interested in their worldly concerns and social welfare.

I am not here going to discuss the whole question of strikes and trades unions. The clergy are best out of those disputes; nevertheless, without laying themselves open to the charge of being partisans or meddlers, the occasions cannot be infrequent when a discreet clergyman may, especially in the interests of wives and children, be able to exercise some mediatorial influence between the respective representatives of capital and labour. Without saying that Archbishop Manning has succeeded in doing any good in any of the London labour disputes, and without making any insinuation as to his motives for interfering, yet I think it probable that his action in the matter of the Dock Strike and on similar occasions tended to bring honour and glory to the Church of Rome in London on the part of the unthinking and ignorant sections of the London labouring classes.

What I really plead for is for more active sympathy on the part of Churchmen in general, and the clergy in particular, to be shown to the working classes in regard to social and home-life questions. I do not mean that Churchmen are deficient in sympathy of a certain sort. There is plenty of sympathy shown by the Church in the form of gifts of money and food. It is matter of notoriety all over England that the charitable agencies of the Church, general and local, surpass those of all the denominations put together; but material charity is in many cases not wanted and not necessary. What, however, very often is desired by the labouring classes, and is not forthcoming from their betters, is personal sympathy in the shape of advice, or even friendly greeting. Under the head of advice

I include such a case as that of a man of public standing or professional experience placing his knowledge at the disposal of those below him when brought into contact with them at public parochial meetings of any kind. The advice and recommendations of a man of known position and experience will seldom fail to be acceptable to, and be appreciated by, a working-class audience. Of course, the clergy cannot advise on every question that crops up; but they can often, when they have the will to do so, act as mediums for obtaining information; and they might, much more often than they do, use their influence with their wealthy parishioners with a view of persuading them to descend into and mix among the crowd. Perhaps in regard to no matter does the indolence and love of ease of the cultured and independent classes more painfully and mischievously show itself in the present day than in the reluctance of many such persons to alter their late dinner-hour occasionally during the winter in order to grace with their presence a penny reading, a parish tea, or some such social festivity, at which their very presence, even if they said or did nothing, would oftentimes serve as a wholesome restraining and civilizing influence.

The social questions which have come or are coming to the front at this moment are very numerous, and I cannot do more than glance at a few of them. We hear a good deal in these days of the supposed distinction between the "classes" and the "masses"; but I look upon this as a foolish and invidious form of contrast, for nothing can be more clear than the fact that every class of the community, alike those high and those low in the social scale, profit by the progress and prosperity of all other classes, and suffer by the misfortunes and adversities of all other classes. Every reader has heard of the French republican motto, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." Whether taken separately or jointly, there probably never was a greater fraud palmed off upon unthinking people. This is not the place in which to analyze the political aspects of this used-up cry, but the second member of the phrase certainly is one respecting which the clergy may often do great good to their congregations and parishioners by discussing. Quite apart from the information afforded us in various parts of Holy Scripture, especially in the writings of St. Paul, it may be regarded as most plainly stamped upon human nature that all men are not either equal nor born equal. It has often been remarked that the introduction of railways has been the introduction of a great levelling agency, and that no doubt is true. Peer and peasant hob-nob together on railway platforms, and even in third-class carriages, in a way which would have startled our feudal ancestors, and even those who lived but

two or three generations ago. The fact, however, remains, and the daily experience of everyone of us proves it, that marked differences of birth, brains, and wealth create and maintain differences in the public influence and status of individuals which no political "Sequah" can either cure or set aside. Herein resides, in my opinion, one of the opportunities possessed by the Church for teaching sober common-sense, and for warning the ignorant and unthinking classes against the ridiculous and too often mischief-making crotchets thrust upon them by artful and unprincipled paid agitators.

History furnishes innumerable proofs of the idea here hinted at, that inferior minds gravitate towards, and will always contentedly be ruled by—nay, even will blindly follow—superior minds. Many are the instances of this recorded in the annals of the British army, whilst we need go no farther abroad than Paris, and mention two or three such names as Napoleon, Thiers, and Gambetta, to realize at once that, even in the native home of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," the theory of all men being born equal is violently disproved.

The large and very urgent question of thrift is one as to which the clergy have constant opportunities of doing good. It is a subject which has a most important bearing on the welfare of the working classes. What do we mean by thrift? A familiar proverb gathers it all up in one sentence—"Lay by for a rainy day." This, indeed, is a duty resting upon all classes; and, though needing especially to be taught to the labouring poor, it is a lesson which may with advantage sometimes be directed from the pulpit even to those in the higher stations of life. There are scarcely any limits to this field of practical usefulness. The newest, and certainly not the least important, is the question of encouraging the saving up of school-pence; and it is satisfactory to find, as I believe to be the case, that this idea has spread very largely into all parts of England. Societies such as the Foresters and Oddfellows, and, indeed, friendly societies generally, are deserving of all possible encouragement and patronage, because they are the living embodiment of the great principles of thrift. In mentioning friendly societies, I mean, of course, to recommend them generally, and not universally; because it is painfully clear that all are not equally sound and well managed—indeed, those known as "sharing-out clubs" are specially delusive. I desire, moreover, to urge that all who are not exactly capable or qualified to become members of clubs such as the Foresters or Oddfellows ought at least to do something by way of preparing for "rainy days" by becoming depositors in Post Office Savings Banks and so on, eventually becoming holders of Post Office annuities. The children of the middle classes, of

farmers and of tradesmen, ought all to be depositors in the Post Office Banks. Another class of the community who are very unthrifty are the domestic servants. As a rule, they are much too prone to spend their wages directly they earn them, instead of putting away a reasonable proportion for "rainy days." These, like many others, do not sufficiently realize the truth that if one "takes care of the pence, the pounds will take care of themselves." If masters and mistresses would only make it a rule to exhort their servants, whenever they pay them their quarterly wages, to put away at least one-half in the bank, and so spend no more than half in dress and finery, much good might be done, which the servants affected would eventually realize when times of difficulty came upon them due to sickness, or being out of place, or old age.

The many legislative enactments of the last few years have opened up new and wide fields of usefulness to the clergy in town and country alike. I pass over the subject of poor law and poor relief because that is not a new one; and it is a matter of notoriety that the clergy of the Church of England long ago, and by very far, have distanced all the denominations put together in ordinary charitable agencies and the relief of distress. I am now rather referring to the newer topics of the sanitary condition of cottages, including especially drainage and water-supply. In regard to all such matters, the opportunities of doing good which present themselves to the clergy are probably greater in every respect than those possessed by any other classes, not even excepting the medical officers of health and inspectors of nuisances of the sanitary authorities.

For very much the same reason that I have passed over poor law questions, so also will I pass over the subject of elementary education as a whole. Here, again, as in the former case, the magnitude of the work accomplished by Churchmen in general and the clergy in particular is so well-known that both arguments and statistics would be out of place in this article; but the education question resembles a toy, which was very fashionable a quarter of a century ago, known as a "Pharaoh's serpent." By setting light to a tiny pinch of a certain chemical composition, there was evolved a long, straggling, disconnected mass ten times the volume of the original material. This not inaptly represents what the old and simple idea of education—namely, the three R's—has grown to. And in its 1891 development, under the charmingly elastic phrase "Technical Education," the country is face to face with an entirely new group of educational problems, which are daily growing under our eyes at a most astonishing pace. Some even of these ought not to be ignored by the clergy—nay, even ought to be actively taken in hand

by them. I allude more especially to such efforts as village lectures and classes for teaching the boys the rudimentary principles of agriculture and mechanics, and the girls such things as cooking and household management. This last-named is a matter of enormous importance in the present day, with so many mouths to feed and food scarce and dear. It is not saying too much to say that 25 per cent. of all the food products brought into use in an average English village every week are wasted through want of knowledge to make use of them to the best advantage, so as to yield in an acceptable form that nourishment which science teaches us they are inherently possessed of. I look forward to a very great amount of good being done all over England by the County Councils in the matter of the teaching of the knowledge of useful things, if all the Councils do what the Devonshire Council and some others have already begun to do.

Another social work in which Churchmen should interest themselves, and which may be productive of a vast amount of good in all directions, is cottage gardening, under which generic head I include allotments on the one hand, and village flower-shows on the other. The economic and moral advantages of allotments were plainly proved fully half a century ago and cannot now be gainsaid. They are, briefly, the profitable use of spare time, which might otherwise be spent in the village alehouse, and direct pecuniary return in the form of crops, eatable or saleable, as the case may be.

The difficulties which have arisen in the working of allotments, whether under the Act of 1887 or under private arrangement, are almost universally financial difficulties, due to a scarcity of suitable land within easy walking distance of the dwellings of the people to be benefited. These difficulties might often be got over if landowners and farmers in the cases in question were less selfish and exacting, and more considerate in realizing the benefits which would result from a little liberality and concession on their parts. Here, then, is a matter on which the mediatorial influence of the clergy ought often to be very useful.

Cottage flower-shows seem scarcely to need to be recommended here, and I would only dwell upon them for the purpose of advocating that there should form part of them exhibitions of industrial work, including models, competitive bread-making, honey, wild-flowers, and any and every thing useful or elevating on which cottagers can profitably occupy their spare evenings, whether in summer or winter. At various flower-shows in villages round Lewes, in Sussex, a great point is made of home-made bread, for which prizes are given. This is indeed an idea highly practical and worthy of imitation, for

there can be no doubt that home-made bread is, as a rule, more pure, more nourishing, and more economical than the ordinary bread of the baker's shop.

There can be no doubt that an immense number of important social problems turn upon fresh air and pure water. There are very few rural localities in which there do not exist flagrant examples of defective drainage or water-supply which could be easily cured without much trouble or expense, and which would be cured if householders realized the influence of good drainage on good health. The systematic ventilation of all dwelling-houses, especially cottages, should also be included amongst the exhortations given by the clergy in the course of their pastoral visitations. For instance, it should be pointed out that bedrooms are far too often shut up both by day and by night, thereby aggravating the dangers inseparable from overcrowding. Overcrowding is, indeed, one of the greatest evils which the reformer of morals, whether clerical or lay, has to face, and it will continue impossible to attain any high standard of health and morality so long as the overcrowding of the dwellings of the labouring classes is permitted by landlords or connived at by local authorities.

All classes ought to be taught and encouraged to pay more attention to the water they drink. There is widely prevalent a sentimental dislike to rain-water for drinking purposes, but there is no doubt that clean rain-water, collected so as to guard against ordinary impurities, is often more safe than bright-looking spring or well water, which is frequently contaminated by sewage and organic impurities. Moreover, rain-water makes better tea and economizes the tea, and enables soap to be used much more efficiently from a cleansing point of view. In those parts of England where the only available water is that which is derived from or comes through the chalk, good tea is quite unattainable. It is a matter of easy experiment that two teaspoonfuls of tea made with soft water yield a better infusion than three teaspoonfuls put into hard water.

The advantage of filtering water is another domestic matter the importance of which should be brought home to the labouring classes. Every cottager ought to have a filter, and to use it always for drinking-water. I do not mean one of those expensive hermetically-sealed earthenware filters sold in the shops, but an open charcoal filter, which can be constantly under observation and be easily cleansed. A filter on this principle can, indeed, be made by any cottager at the cost of a few pence, by means of a large garden flower-pot, a small piece of sponge, and a few handfuls of charcoal and clean sand. Be it remembered, however, that if any doubt exists

as to the quality of any water which must be used for drinking, it should always be boiled first as an additional safeguard. To pass from the matter of drinking-water into the great temperance question would be an easy transition, but discussion of that subject would be out of place on the present occasion. I do, however, very strongly urge on the clergy who profess to be temperance reformers that their duty is not done if they do no more than urge the abolition of beer and the closing of public-houses. They must lend themselves to the provision of substitutes for both—tea, coffee, aërated drinks, etc., in the one case, and coffee palaces, taverns, reading-rooms and clubs in the other case.

The foregoing ideas will, I hope, serve the useful purpose of suggesting to some of the clergy, and to some Church workers, that in many ways there is work of a useful kind to be done by them which perhaps may never have occurred to them.

G. F. CHAMBERS.

ART. III.—THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.

THE use of the Old Testament in the New is a subject of special importance at a time when the treatment of the Old Testament is such as to undermine all belief, not merely in its function as part of the Divine oracles, but in its general trustworthiness and veracity. I take it for granted that the authority of the *New* Testament is accepted, that the words of our Lord are final, and that the expressed opinions of the evangelists and apostles are entitled to, at least, as much respect and deference as the opinions and conjectures of ourselves or other people. But I wish to investigate the conditions of the use these writers make of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and to consider the reasonable inferences we may draw therefrom. We will first examine the way in which the evangelists use the Old Testament, then the way in which it is used in the Epistles, and, lastly, the way in which Christ uses it.

I. In the first two chapters of St. Matthew[1] there are four quotations: three of them are by the prophet himself, one is referred to the chief priests and scribes. This latter is the more valuable, as witnessing to the current belief of the day as it was held by the authorized teachers of the people. They were able to give a distinct answer to Herod's question as to

[1] i. 23; ii. 6, 15, 18.

where the Christ should be born. They were able to tell from prophecy that it would be at Bethlehem. This is the more important, because it shows as a matter of history how prophecy was then regarded. It was a storehouse of predictive statement, which could be appealed to for information about the future. We are not called upon to criticise this opinion, but to note this fact. The prophecy referred to was seven hundred years old. It was implicitly trusted, and its information was believed to be not vague, but specific. Moreover, it had been *preserved* for seven centuries, through all the national calamities and vicissitudes, was in the custody of the priests, though the work of a prophet, was well known and regarded as authoritative.

St. Matthew himself quotes the prophets a dozen times, almost always with the formula, "that it might be fulfilled,"[1] "then was fulfilled," or the like. And it is to be observed that on one occasion he has apparently ascribed to Jeremiah what belongs to Zechariah; and on another[2] has rather given the sense of several prophecies than actually quoted any one.

In St. Mark there are but two places in which he refers to the Scriptures on his own account. These are in the opening of his Gospel, when he says, "as it is written in the prophets," referring[3] to Mal. iii. and Isa. xl.; and in chap. xv. 22, when he says distinctly, "And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors." The other references to the Old Testament in his Gospel will come more fitly under our notice when we examine the way in which our Lord made use of the Old Testament Scriptures.

In St. Luke there are but three instances in which he appeals to the Old Testament on his own account. These are, chap. ii. 23, 24: "As it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord;" "And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons;" and in chap. iii. 4, with reference to John the Baptist, "As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice," etc. Here, then, St. Luke acknowledges in this case the authority of the prophets, and regards the mission of John as fulfilling them, while in the other he bears witness to the observance of the law in Exodus and Leviticus at the time of the birth of Christ.

It may be convenient to examine here his custom in his other treatise of the Acts. In this book the references to Scripture, though numerous, are mainly to be found in the speeches of Peter, James, Stephen, and Paul. On two occasions

[1] i. 22. [2] ii. 23. [3] i. 2.

only can we detect the personal testimony of the writer—namely, in the narrative of Philip and the eunuch, and even here it is that of Philip rather than St. Luke, and the occasion in which he tells us that the Bereans "were more noble," or better born, "than those in Thessalonica, in that . . . they searched the Scriptures" to test the witness of Paul, and observes that it was owing to this scrutiny that many of them "believed."

When we turn to St. John, though there are but seven or eight passages in his Gospel in which he speaks in his own person, it is interesting to find that he reverts to the formula of St. Matthew, "That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes," etc.; and adds the significant words, "These things said Esaias when he saw His glory, and spake of Him."[1] And, again, in his narrative of the crucifixion, he says that the soldiers cast lots for Christ's raiment, "that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, which saith, They parted,"[2] etc.; "And after this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst;"[3] and finally, "These things were done that the Scriptures should be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken; and, again, another Scripture saith, They shall look on Him whom they pierced."[4] In the two other passages that he quotes he simply says, "His disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of Thine house hath eaten me up;"[5] "And Jesus, when He had found a young ass, sat thereon; as it is written, Fear not,"[6] etc.

From this summary of the evidence we are able to form a just estimate of the way in which the evangelists regarded Scripture. St. Matthew is the most emphatic, and St. John approximates to him. The other two, though they do not use quite the same formula, evidently regard the Scriptures as something special and peculiar, possessed of a meaning independent of any reference to circumstances of the time, and only receiving the fulness of that meaning in the events which they recorded.

And so far as the evangelists were warranted in this use of the Scriptures, they can only be justified on one of two principles—either the writers of these Scriptures were specially illuminated to foresee and to foretell the events to which their words are referred, or else they spoke words which, though

---

[1] xii. 38-41. [2] xix. 24. [3] xix. 28.
[4] xix. 36, 37. [5] ii. 17. [6] xii. 14, 15.

originally referring to something else, were overruled, and intended by the Holy Spirit to have a fuller and more appropriate reference to things far future. In this case, the appropriateness would be due to the providence of God rather than to any special superhuman endowment of the writers themselves, except in so far as they were the selected agents to whose words this appropriateness would attach. Thus their illumination, we may perhaps say, was dynamic rather than mechanical.

II. In St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans there are some fifty or sixty direct quotations from the Old Testament, introduced for the most part with some such formula as "it is written," or the like. What is more especially striking here is that it is evident that the Christian converts at Rome were as familiar with the Old Testament as we ourselves are, and, it is to be feared in many cases, much more so. But this is surely very remarkable, that Greeks living at Rome fifteen centuries before the invention of printing, which has brought every production of the mind of man within the reach of everyone, should be so familiar with the Septuagint version of the Scriptures, which existed only in MS., as to be able to recognise the Apostle's quotations and allusions, and to follow the reasoning he based upon them. It is more than doubtful if a modern writer in a document of equal bulk with the Epistle to the Romans were to make fifty quotations from Milton or Shakespeare whether they would at once be recognised by those whom he addressed. And yet it is obvious that the Roman Christians were perfectly familiar with the history of Abraham and the writings of the prophets, though they were only to be found in books which can merely have come to them secondhand, as it were, through the despised channel of the Jewish nation, and existing only in MS. This fact alone is sufficient to show the importance already acquired by these writings; and that the standard of education must have been, comparatively speaking, quite as high as, and not improbably higher, than it is among ourselves.

We turn to the first Epistle to Corinth, and in the very first chapter we find one quotation from Isaiah and another from Jeremiah, introduced respectively with the formula, "for it is written," "as it is written,"[1] showing that his readers must have been familiar with each writer, and must have conceded to both of them an authority and a specific value which they would not have attributed to Æschylus or Sophocles. The Apostle's use of the Old Testament in this Epistle extends to sixteen other instances, and contains quotations from Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Job, Psalms, Isaiah, and Hosea. It is

[1] i. 19, 31.

clear that his mind was saturated with the Old Testament Scriptures, and that his readers also were hardly less familiar with them.

In the rest of his Epistles we have between twenty and thirty direct quotations, besides many possible allusions.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews the quotations are from Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, 2 Samuel, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Habakkuk, and Haggai, with, of course, frequent reference to Leviticus; and here we have a special instance of the way in which the writer regarded the Old Testament. He did not consider the promises and assurances of the Old Testament merely in their historical light, but believed them to be legitimately of individual application. Thus, for instance, "Ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou," xii. 5, etc. This is treated as addressed not to an imaginary son, but to each of those Hebrew Christians who were in danger of giving up their faith in Christ. And, again, xiii. 5, "Be content with such things as ye have, for He hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee, so that we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper," etc. Now, this was spoken historically to Joshua, and it was spoken by God and not the historian; but the writer regards it in the light of a veritable Divine message or revelation, addressed indeed in the first instance to Joshua, but intended to be appropriated by everyone who had the faith to do so.

There are here involved, therefore, two most important principles—first, the principle that there is a veritable revelation in the Old Testament records, an actual communication from God to man; and, secondly, that this communication, though historically conveyed in a particular instance, was so conveyed and recorded that it might be trusted and relied upon in the case of all those who, feeling the want of it, were disposed to accept it as made to themselves. But if this principle holds good of Scripture at all, it holds good of it as a whole, and thus throws light not only on the use intended to be made of the Old Testament, but by parity of reasoning, and yet more emphatically, on the statements and promises of the New Testament. If there is indeed a true Word of God, that Word, it follows of necessity, must be spoken by God to all His children, and in every case the acceptance of the Word must be conditioned only by the faith which apprehends it. To believe in the existence of such a Word of itself demands faith, and to believe in its personal fitness, and in the right of individual application, calls yet further for the putting forth of individual personal faith, to which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews so plainly and urgently exhorts.

The quotations from the Old Testament in the Catholic Epistles are comparatively few—some ten or a dozen. I shall remark only upon one—namely, that in 1 Pet. ii. 6. The Apostle, mindful, no doubt, of his own name received from Christ, has been speaking of *Him* as "a living stone, chosen of God and precious," and his spontaneous use of that word "precious"—"Simon, son of Jonas, *lovest* thou Me?"—reminds him of the prophet Isaiah's words, "Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone elect, precious"; and so, because this is "contained in the Scripture," he returns to it, "Unto you, therefore, which believe He is *precious*," or an *honour*, borrowing the noun suggested by the prophet's adjective, delighted, as it were, to find that the prophet has before used the same expression, and therefore the more earnestly commending it to his readers. This gives us, then, the Apostolic authority for emphasizing the *words* of Scripture. Indeed, it stands to reason that if we have a *written* revelation, that revelation cannot be independent of the language in which it is couched; and unless the language chosen is chosen at haphazard, after a manner that would do discredit to any earthly writer, it follows that we may with advantage "read, mark, and inwardly digest" the actual words of the Divine message, and trust them as being selected for a purpose, the discovery of which will, it may reasonably be supposed, reward the diligent searcher.

III. We must now turn to inquire into the use made of the Old Testament by our Lord. And first and foremost comes the occasion of His temptation in the wilderness; and here the sole weapon He used in His conflict with the evil one was the thrice-repeated appeal to Scripture, "It is written." The attempt has been made to lessen the force of this appeal by remarking that it leaves untouched the question of authorship, as though it were a matter of absolute indifference whose the words were, and we were, therefore, at liberty to assign them to Moses or to an unknown and unauthorized writer seven centuries later. But unless there is any evidence that our Lord used the words "it is written" in the vague sense of "a certain writer has said," merely meaning that it had been said by somebody, it mattered not who, it is impossible to do so with any justice. It is unquestionable that our Lord fell back upon Scripture as upon an authority by which He acknowledged Himself bound, and which He knew His adversary could not dispute. For this reason, therefore, to say "It is written" was to appeal to what they both regarded as the Word of God; but in order that it should be the Word of God it must have been authenticated as that Word, and received as such, and if not so authenticated even

the use of it by Christ Himself would not have given it any such authentication. Now, if the words in question, instead of having the authority of Moses as the law of God, were merely ideally ascribed to Him by some obscure and unknown individual in the time of Josiah, it is absolutely and manifestly impossible that they can have had the kind of authentication which our Lord assumed, and the authority which He implicitly ascribed to them. That He should have appealed to them at such a time does not in any way give them this authority, but shows that in His opinion they *possessed* it. Of course, it is possible to slur over the incidents and the record of the temptation, and to abolish, if not the person of the adversary, at all events the exceptional and superhuman character of the conflict, and to relegate the entire episode to the region of the purely subjective; but if it is regarded as in any sense the record of a really historical and objective, and not an imaginary transaction, then we may surely suppose that the adversary would not have been slow to avail himself of the substantial advantage it would have given him to be able to rebut the Lord's quotation with the rejoinder that the narrative was fictitious and the words spurious; but perhaps the devil in those days was not so acute and learned as modern criticism has enabled him to become.

The Lord's reference to the law in the sermon on the mount is manifestly not intended as in any sense a disparagement of that law, but rather as a re-enactment of it with circumstances of greater stringency, and in order to supersede an imperfect law with one more spiritual and perfect. There are some thirty passages in St. Matthew's Gospel and fifteen in St. Mark's in which our Lord refers to Scripture. It is impossible to examine them all, but two or three are worthy of special attention. For instance, he says of John the Baptist: "This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send My messenger before Thy face who shall prepare Thy way before Thee."[1] Now, here we have to note that His interpretation is authoritative; He does not hesitate in giving it; He tells us distinctly that it was John the Baptist, and no one else, of whom the prophet Malachi wrote four centuries before. This is too often forgotten or overlooked, for criticism can discover no one else as the subject of the prophecy but John the Baptist, unless it be the prophet himself, which is in the last degree improbable. But Christ tells us it was John. How, then, does this bear upon what Driver calls "the analogy of prophecy"? Malachi lived four hundred years before Christ.

[1] xi. 10.

He spoke distinctly, our Lord tells us, of John the Baptist. Here, then, surely is a crucial instance for determining the analogy of prophecy. Either the prophet's words had a meaning or they had none. If they had no meaning, we need not trouble ourselves to find out what it was; but if they had a meaning, then by no critical sleight of hand or exegetical manipulation can they be made *not* to show that a prophecy was given which entirely overlooked the immediate present, as also the four intervening centuries, and, like Noah's dove, which found no rest for the sole of her foot, was utterly without significance till it lighted on John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness. Here is verily a case by which we can partly decide what the analogy of prophecy really is. And this becomes the more apparent when taken in connection with Malachi's concluding promise to send Elijah the prophet before the coming of the day of the Lord.

But further, it is to be observed that our Lord puts Himself in the place of the speaker in the prophecy, and announces Himself as the person whose way is to be prepared, though in the prophecy that way is the way of God. The natural inference, therefore, is that He lays claim to the assumption of Divine personality, unless we are to attribute to Him or to the evangelist an unpardonable carelessness in the use of language which has confused the pronouns to no significance or purpose. So certain is it, that if we study the Scriptures like any other books we shall more and more find them to be unlike all other books.

Not only in His temptation did our Lord make use of the phrase "It is written," but that or an equivalent one was His habitual appeal. "Have ye never read?" "Did ye never read in the Scriptures?" and the like. It is by no means unfair to take this as an index of the state of education at the time, and of the extent to which the persons addressed were acquainted with Scripture, which is the more remarkable and striking when we bear in mind the exclamation of His enemies, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learnt?" It is evident that, judged only as a man, our Lord's acquaintance with Scripture was very great, and, what is more, He always assumed the existence of an equal knowledge of it in His hearers. But when we read His application of Scripture with the authority to which He laid claim, it becomes evident not only that He was acquainted with it and had the key to its meaning, but that He regarded it (and we must never forget that it was the Old Testament that He so regarded) as in a special, pre-eminent and supernatural way the Word of God. For example, when brought face to face with the anguish that was coming upon Him, and glancing

for a moment at the possible help of twelve legions of angels, He felt Himself bound by the inexorable necessities of the written Word. "But how, then, shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" Surely it is impossible not to see from this that prophecy in the Old Testament must be a very real and potent thing, to which we dare not assign any analogy of merely human foresight, penetration, or skill in the interpretation of current events. There cannot be a shadow of doubt from the way in which our Lord in the Gospels refers to prophecy that He assigned to it a very high place in the economy of Providence, and regarded it as something which could not fail. There are but two ways of looking at His conduct in this matter; either we must conceive of Him as endeavouring to fashion His career according to His previous conception of what was needful to make it correspond with prophecy (which, however, is inadequate to account for the fatal termination that was brought about by the combined malice of His enemies at least as much as by His own action), or we must regard Him as submitting—not without an intense inward struggle—to a necessity imposed upon Him by the expressed declarations of the Divine will, in which case prophecy at once assumes the character He assigned to it—that, namely, of a word given and recorded, not without illumination more than human, and by a providence not fortuitous. Compare, for example, such statements as: "The Son of man indeed goeth as it is written of Him, but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed";[1] "All ye shall be offended because of Me this night; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered";[2] "I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took Me not; but the Scriptures must be fulfilled";[3] "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished";[4] "This that is written must yet be accomplished in Me";[5] and as if to show that this view of the function of Scripture could in no way be referred to the necessary limitations of His human nature, He said unto His disciples after He was risen: "These are the words which I spake unto you *while I was yet with you*, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the Psalms concerning Me;"[6] from which we plainly see that He ratified and confirmed after His resurrection the teaching of His ministry while He was in the form of a servant and made in the likeness of men.

---

[1] Matt. xxvi. 24. [2] Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 27.
[3] Mark xiv. 49. [4] Luke xviii. 31. [5] xxii. 37. [6] xxiv. 44.

Again, it is to be observed with respect to the law of Moses that this is regarded by our Lord as having Divine authority; for He says to the Scribes and Pharisees (Mark vii. 9): "Full well ye reject the *commandment of God*, that ye may keep your own tradition; for *Moses* said, Honour thy father and mother; but ye, laying aside the *commandment of God*, have made *the Word of God* of none effect through your tradition." It is clear, then, that He identifies the precept given by Moses with the Word of God and the commandment of God. And it is impossible to lessen the force of this by saying that Christ accepts the traditional value of the law as admitted by the Scribes and Pharisees, and is content to dwell upon their inconsistency with their professed principles; because the law was either human or Divine, if it was human, their infringement of it would have been excusable, whereas it was only because it was Divine that it had been set aside and violated by their tradition, to their just condemnation. It was not a case of tradition *versus* tradition, but of tradition *versus* the actual commandment and Word of God. In like manner our Lord attributes the errors of the Sadducees with respect to the conditions of the resurrection to their ignorance of the Scriptures, as though an honest study of Scripture would have saved them from it: "Do ye not *therefore* err, *because* ye know not the Scriptures nor the power of God"[1] as taught thereby? And once more there are the well-known words, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me."[2] It matters not whether we read this as an indicative or an imperative, because in either case the force of the words "they are they which testify of Me" is the same; or perhaps it is even greater if taken in contrast to an habitual practice which was unavailing because it missed its true object, which was not the study of the Scriptures as an end in itself, but for the discovery of the Person to whom they testified.

Such, then, is our Lord's teaching as to the value and the function of the Scriptures as referring to Himself.

It is, furthermore, instructive to note the Scripture *history*, which has received the authority of our Lord's recognition. He refers to the words spoken on the creation of Eve,[3] to the blood of righteous Abel,[4] to the days of Noah,[5] to Lot's wife,[6] to Sodom and Gomorrah,[7] to Tyre and Sidon,[8] to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,[9] to the burning bush,[10] to the law of Moses,[11] to the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness,[12]

[1] Mark xii. 24. [2] John v. 39. [3] Matt. xix. 5.
[4] xxiii. 35. [5] xxiv. 37. [6] Luke xvii. 32.
[7] Matt. x. 15. [8] Matt. xi. 21. [9] Luke xiii. 28.
[10] Luke xx. 37. [11] Matt. xxii. 32; Mark xii. 16. [12] John iii. 14.

to the manna in the desert,[1] to David and the shewbread,[2] to the glory of Solomon,[3] to the ministry of Elijah and Elisha,[4] to the history of Jonah,[5] to the prophets Isaiah[6] and Daniel[7] by name, to the blood of Zechariah[8] the son of Jehoiada, to the prophecies of Zechariah, to the 8th,[9] 22nd,[10] 35th,[11] 41st, 69th,[12] 82nd, 110th, 118th Psalms.[13] Thus our Lord's testimony amply covers the three great divisions of Scripture—the law, the prophets, and the Psalms; and more especially Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, the prophecies of Isaiah, Micah, Jonah, Daniel, and Zechariah, and the Psalms. And this, it must be remembered, is His own personal testimony, not that merely of His disciples, which I have already noted. Now, in the view of this evidence, it is hardly possible to doubt that the selection of this body of references was designed; it was plainly intentional on the part of Christ to show that He acknowledged the authority of the canonical Scriptures of the Jews as they possessed them. There was no important section overlooked; even the Books of Chronicles, which, for interested purposes, are assigned a very late date, and such books as those of Jonah and Daniel, which of themselves suggest and invite criticism, are included by Him, and receive, as it were, the *imprimatur* of His recognition. Such ancient narratives as those of Abel, Noah, Lot, Sodom and the like, which, from their very character, are so liable to be consigned to the realm of the mythical, and have been treated as idle tales, are, from the very fact of His selecting them in the course of His teaching for the purpose of illustration, thereby raised at once to the higher elevation of solemn reality; for instance, when He says, "as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it also be in the days of the Son of man" (Luke xvii. 26). We can hardly suppose that He makes use of the mythical to illustrate the real, for if so, the next step will only too naturally be to resolve the real likewise into myth, and to say that as the one was mythical, so the other was and is imaginary and unreal.

In fact, our Lord's use of Scripture is very much bound up with the validity of His own mission. How can we be sure as to what He has told us about Himself if we cannot trust what He has said of Scripture? What was the point of His being greater than Jonah if the existence of Jonah was a myth? The fame of Nelson is enhanced if we say that he was greater

[1] John vi. 44. [2] Matt. xii. 4. [3] Matt. vi. 29.
[4] Luke iv. 25, 27. [5] Matt. xii. 40. 41. [6] Matt. xv. 7.
[7] Matt. xxiv. 15 [8] Matt. xxiii. 35. [9] Matt. xvi. 31.
[10] Matt. xxi. 16. [11] John xv. 25. [12] John xix. 28.
[13] Matt. xxi. 42.

than Rodney or Blake, but not by saying that he was greater that Jason. We may rightly compare Wellington with Marlborough or Napoleon, but not with Hercules or Theseus. If the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is a myth, what is there terrible in saying that it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for the city that repenteth not (Mark vi. 11), and if so, may not the day of judgment itself be a myth? If the appeal of Christ in the one case was to the popular prejudice and belief, what is there to show that it may not have been so in the other? If Moses, from the hardness of the people's hearts, suffered them to put away their wives, where was the inferiority of his license in this matter to the standard of the original constitution, if God had said only in the story-book, "They twain shall be one flesh"? If so, why might not the Scripture, with equal facility, be set aside, which spake of "the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow"; and where was the force of the question "How, then, shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?"[1] Christ either "knew all things that should come upon Him,"[2] or He did not. He either was mistaken in His estimation of the Scriptures or He was not. He either was a safe guide to us as to their authority or He was not. It seems to me we must make our choice and abide by it. He was either right or wrong in saying that Moses wrote[3] of Him, and if it was not Moses, but soneone else, who wrote of Him, then, in all probability, nay, rather we may say with absolute certainty, it was not He of whom that unknown somebody wrote. We may reasonably suppose that in saying this our Lord referred to the special promise of Moses that the Lord would raise up a prophet like unto Him.[4] Let us, then, suppose that seven hundred years later someone put those words into the mouth of Moses (for it is absurd to suppose that they could have been preserved by tradition alone for all that period), then most undoubtedly the promise becomes no promise; and as for Moses having *written* of Christ, it is on the hypothesis impossible; and if Christ was the person intended by the apparent promise, then we must believe that the Spirit of God made use of this dramatic fiction to embody and convey a prophecy of His Son, which, ages afterwards that Son would point to, though erroneously, as a prophecy written by Moses of himself, a position surely not by any means so probable or tenable as the received and *prima facie* one that Moses, being what he was, should have prophesied and written of Christ, and that Christ should refer

[1] Matt. xxvi. 54.
[2] John xviii. 4,
[3] John v. 46.
[4] Deut. xviii. 18.

to the passage in which He did so. We can easily determine what kind of faith in Christ that would be which could accept that position in preference to the other, and can partly see the question with which our Lord asked, "If ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?"[1] The one is preliminary and preparatory to the other; and if the one is not admitted it is not likely that the other will be except in pretence and feignedly.

Our Lord's citation of Scripture may be interpreted in three ways.

First. It may be regarded as a conventional use, even as He certainly adopted the conventional expression of the law, meaning thereby the whole of Old Testament Scripture, when He said of a verse[2] in the 82nd Psalm, "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods;" and added, "If he called them gods to whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken;" and again, "But this cometh to pass that it might be fulfilled which is written in their law, They hated Me without a cause" (John xv. 25), the reference in this case also being to the Psalms; or, as the multitude said, "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever" (John xii. 34). To suppose, however, that such a usage will account for our Lord's reference to Noah, Lot, and Abraham, or for his quotation of the law as the law of Moses, is inconsistent with His assertion on the one hand that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail; and with what in any other case we should almost call His superstitious deference to the requirements of prophecy, as when He said, "But how, then, shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" as though He were bound by the letter of Scripture as by a kind of destiny. Even admitting that He adopted the premisses of His adversaries with regard to Scripture, we still have to explain the fact that He acknowledged the predictions of Scripture as the chart that was to direct and govern His own career, and consequently we must estimate any other utterances by these, rather than reduce them to the supposed level of the others, which is, from the nature of the case, impossible; and therefore to suppose that our Lord's language in reference to Scripture is merely conventional, is incompatible with the facts, and inconsistent with His character.

STANLEY LEATHES.

(To be continued.)

[1] John v. 47. [2] John x. 34.

Art. IV.—NOTES AND COMMENTS ON JOHN XX.

No. III.

WE arrive at ver. 3, and address ourselves to consider some verbal details of the text in that verse and some verses which follow, and then to pause for reflection on their contents.

It may be noticed in passing that the Greek text before us in this neighbourhood is remarkably free from various readings —at least, from such various readings as in the least degree call for comment in such a study as this. The margin of Scrivener's Testament shrinks to a narrow compass here, giving only seven variants, none of them of the least practical moment for our purpose, through the first twelve verses of the chapter. This is a relief to the reader who is, above all things, looking for spiritual edification. Not that even the minutest details of a critical "apparatus" are to be despised or regarded with impatience from another view point; they are witnesses to the mass of material which exists for the determination of the text of the New Testament, a mass (need I say?) incomparably greater than that which survives in the case of any classical author. Still, it is not unwelcome to find that our examination of some passage of peculiar sanctity and glory need not be interrupted by the note which registers some itacism, or the presence or absence of a subscript iota, or the like.

Ver. 3. *So Peter went out* (ἐξῆλθε). That is, he left the house where he was lodging, or he left the city gate, or the word very naturally includes both. The gates of Jerusalem were not shut, apparently, at the time. The Master and His followers had found no difficulty in leaving the city on the night of Thursday, though undoubtedly it was late when they walked to Gethsemane. The vast concourse of the Passover necessitated such laxity.

If ἐξῆλθεν includes a reference to the *house*, that house very probably was the Passover-abode of St. John. Not that it would be a house of his own; that would be a possession most unlikely in the case of a Galilean countryman. But St. John's connection with Jerusalem had something special in it; he was "known" (γνωστός) to the high priest (xviii. 15), and it is at least very possible that near kindred of his were domiciled at Jerusalem, and that, if so, he lodged with them on his visits there.

So Peter and his friend *went out*, and now *they were coming to the tomb* (ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον). The Greek tense and preposition indicate that they were on the way, and now nearly there—not merely in a direction to reach the place, but

almost arrived. They had left the northern gate, and were perhaps not a hundred yards on the road from that "green hill" which to us is "far away," but close to which was the Arimathean councillor's garden wall.

Ver. 4. *So they were running, the two together* (Ἔτρεχον). Either they had been going at full speed all the way, or the nearness of what they craved to see now quickened their pace; but the former alternative is more likely. And now, near the goal, the other disciple προέδραμε, ran in advance, took a start forward (we observe the aorist, of course) *quicker than Peter*. We do not read the reason why, though it is he who writes. "Because he was the younger man" is an account sometimes given; but we know nothing at all of the ages of the Apostles relatively to one another. Tradition and pictures commonly make St. Peter an elderly man beside the Lord Jesus and beside St. John; but it is at least as likely that the company were much of an age with one another and with their blessed Leader. In xxi. 18, if I have at all read aright the bearing of the words there, "when thou *wast young*,"[1] Peter is regarded by his Master as a young man still. Did not the feet of Peter flag because his heart was heavy and his conscience heavy-laden? It was less easy for him than for John to hasten to that tomb to which he had, so it might have seemed to his troubled soul, almost betrayed his Lord. However it might be John outran his friend, *and came first to the tomb*—to the scene which still, no doubt, bore traces of the presence and then of the flight of the sentinels, who not very long before, perhaps not an hour before, had been so sorely scared by the rocking of the ground and by the angel's glory, and had rushed in confusion into the sleeping town. All was silence now. And now, *stooping from the side* (παρακύψας), *he sees lying the linen cloths.*

Such a *sideway* stooping is implied by the structure of the sepulchre. It would be the only way of looking into a horizontal cavity, through a low orifice, without so placing the body as to get in the observer's own light. As it was, he got a view of the interior, and this was what he saw, in the twilight of the cell, doubly dusky in the early morning shadows: τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα, the long folds, or strips, of fine, white linen (ὀθόνη) lying in the grave-niche. This was not what should have been had the sacred Body been still there. *Then* he would have seen a solid white mass, an ample roll; *now* he found a length of laid-off linens, thin and empty. And here, of course, was part of the mystery and surprise: the Body was gone, but the winding-sheet was left!

[1] See the CHURCHMAN of April, 1891.

Of this Mary had said nothing; her eyes and mind had observed only the removal of the stone, and her account would prepare them to find merely a vacant grave. So it was an unlooked-for riddle, what was there, as well as what was gone; and with that sight and its perplexity there stole perhaps the first subtle ray of resurrection hope into the mind of John. It was indeed a disappearance, but not a mere disappearance —certainly no hurried "snatching" of the elaborately enfolded corpse. The long, long linens had been disengaged completely, and left in the place where what they held had been.

He did not go in, however. Why not? There is not much need to ask anyone who has ever looked into or even upon the coffin which conceals a beloved form, or has visited the recent grave which has received that coffin. No commentary is wanted by such readers to explain St. John's look, but refusal to step, into the tomb of his lost, dear Lord and Friend. But with that simple reason of the bereaved heart others no doubt mingled. John was in a conflict now of grief and *wonder*, and thought as well as sorrow may have preoccupied him and left him motionless for the moment. But however, he *says* nothing about his reasons, and how can we analyze them all? Very subtle is the influence of character or circumstance; we should need to know John's character and Peter's far better than even we do to be able quite to tell what checked the one and what impelled the other at that narrow door. But none the less important is it to take note of these unexplained details, just because they are unexplained. Coming one after another as they do, set down thus so simply and without anxiety, yet minutely, they carry the very tone and accent of the eyewitness. We seem to stand there watching; the whole motion of the scene is before us; all is near, real, natural, visible. And then we remember that this fourth Gospel (whoever wrote it) is no piece of modern literature, written in our age, when imagination has trained itself, more or less consciously, into an almost morbid activity, not least in the way of reconstructive narrative. It is the work of a far simpler and less self-conscious age, written (as we remarked in a previous number) centuries before the art of successful imitation of fact in fiction had developed itself, even in the centres of human culture. This quiet, while emphatic, minuteness of detail in a scene which yet the writer regards as vastly important would be, if I judge in the least aright, a literary impossibility in the first or second century, even for a trained *littérateur*, if the writing were not a record of observed fact. As it is, it is just the diction of him who knows that "that which our eyes have seen, and our

hands have handled, concerning the Word of the Life, *that* we declare unto you" (1 John i. 1, 3)—and for a reason which lifts a narrator to a very different moral level from that of calculated fiction—" that your joy may be full; that ye may believe that this Jesus is the Christ, and that, believing, ye may have life in His Name."

Ver. 6. *So Simon Peter comes, following him, and went into the tomb.* Perhaps only a few minutes or even moments intervened. The backward Apostle cannot have been far behind his friend, who probably, as we saw, had run in front only when both were near the garden.

And now, at once, Peter stoops and enters. Again we conjecture the motive. Why did he pass in, and leave John at the door outside? There was something characteristic in the motive, for we remember the parallel action, xxi. 7, where Peter is the disciple to hurry to the shore. In this case was not the heart whose intensity of emotion checked the feet on the way, just the heart to find itself unable to linger a moment when the feet had reached the goal? However it may be, here again is the touch of historical, not poetic or constructive, detail.

And he views the linen cloths lying. He takes his view, he gazes: *θεωρεῖ*, far more than *βλέπει* (ver. 5), means a deliberate look—the look of one who is taking in the scene and something of its significance. And what does he say about it? For indeed we seem to hear him speaking from within the cavern, and telling his friend outside, point by point, what he finds. " Yes, here are the winding-sheets as you saw them; and here, too, what you did not see, is the napkin, the *sudarium*, which was fastened round His head. It is put here, or left here, apart, by itself; not thrown on the rest, but rolled up (*ἐντετυλιγμένον*), in a separate place (*εἰς ἕνα τόπον*)."[1] *He views the linen cloths lying, and the napkin that was over His head, not lying with the linen cloths, but apart, rolled up, and put in a separate place.*

Here were fresh signs of something very different from what they and Mary had feared. Here was no hostile invasion of the grave, no rough and careless removal; rather all the marks of order and attention—we might almost say of neatness. If, in that moment of profound feeling, there was time to think (and thought often goes quickest at such times), John might have thought how entirely unlike this was to the work of enemies, and that to remove the body at all was extremely unlike the work of friends. Who would have done it? Joseph of Arimathea—the very man who had laid the shrouded body

[1] Literally, of course, "*into* one place;" brought *to* it, and laid *in* it.

there with such reverent pains? Any other members of the circle of disciples or supporters? Such a thought as this last most certainly would not have occurred to John, in the entire absence of probable motive. All alike were unexpectant of a resurrection; all alike were in the depth of distress and disappointment, and probably also in much alarm for their own safety. All, if they had leisure or courage for much such reflection, must have been thankful that their beloved Master had found (by no means of theirs, for they had none) an honourable burial. Certainly, in any case, *they* would not have stripped the cloths away.

Enemies had not so gently unwound the corpse. Friends would not have unwound it at all.

Ver. 8. So, with the dawn of a blissful hope in his soul, and probably with a sudden throng of memories in his mind—memories of words spoken by Jesus, and of prophecies He had half explained—*the other disciple, who came first to the tomb, went in.*

And he saw (εἶδε). Here is a third verb, with βλέπειν and θεωρεῖν. And it is used in its proper place: ἰδεῖν tends to indicate a sight which is also intelligence. He saw the facts and their meaning.

And believed. Here was infinitely more than an empty grave, an absent corpse, an unused winding-sheet, a folded napkin. Here was—resurrection. He believed, he accepted without direct sight the certainty that there was life here, after death. He believed the *fact* that Jesus lived again, and he believed the *truth;* he recognised a Divine fact, a fact of prophecy. For how does he proceed?

Ver. 9. *For not as yet did they know the Scripture, that of necessity He would rise from the dead;* that by a supreme necessity, in the predestination of the eternal plan of Messiah's work, He would die and rise again.

The Scripture (τὴν γραφήν), a singular which seems almost always in the New Testament to refer to some one *passage* of the Old. We are not told what "scripture" to St. John just then shone out as *the* Resurrection promise *par excellence;* but as we read the Pentecostal sermon of his friend (Acts ii.), we may well suppose that Psalm xvi. may have been the place.[1] But whatever "the scripture" was, "they" had not understood it. But now John—at least John—did. The ray of fulfilment lighted up the prophecy. The fact, once seen, began at once

[1] The "Scripture" for a *third-day* resurrection is undoubtedly, on our Lord's own testimony, the narrative of Jonah. But the third day is not immediately in view here.—The testimony of this brief passage to the apostolic belief in definitely predictive prophecy is very impressive, by its very passingness.

to kindle into the glorious truth. The grave was vacant, and *so* vacant that Jesus had not been lifted away from it by other hands; He had *left* it. And so at once the strangely-hidden secret was solved; the impossible, the incredible, the unwelcome had become the glorious truth of life. Jesus, the dead, was risen.

He believed with a faith decisive and new, as an experience in his mind. What a wonderful candour there is in the admission, "as yet they knew not"! This aged saint and prophet does not shrink from telling the world that for three long years, spent in his Saviour's company, he had laboured under an immense mistake about that Saviour's work. He had laid his head upon the breast of Jesus Christ, and yet had never understood that He had come on purpose to die and to rise again. This is no ordinary frankness; it is, in fact, nothing less than the simplicity of transparent truth, the truthfulness of a man to whom the reality, the glory, the blessedness of his Master are so precious that he cannot pause a moment to think of his own reputation in telling his Master's story. Rather, he is glad to recall the contrast, because it was even more happy than humbling—the contrast between his own strange blindness in the old days and the sunrise of joy and life upon which he now entered, and which he owed entirely to his Lord. We are welcome to know anything, everything, about John's slowness, dulness, oblivion, ignorance, about his poor insight into Scripture, his earthly view of the Kingdom, his temporal ambition, his unbelieving despair, if the contrast may only lead us, for whom he writes, and whom he loves by anticipation as fellow-believers, to a full view of the sacrifice, the victory, the life, the love of the Lord Jesus Christ. "He knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe."

So, with all the quiet simplicity of truth, he closes this part of the story. Ver. 10: *So the disciples went away again to their own abode* (πρὸς ἑαυτούς). That was all—all, at least, that we are to know for the present. We have seen them in the moment of their first faith long enough to confirm our faith; but how they felt, what they said, on the way home and at home, what Peter said to John about the denial in this new light, and what John said to Peter, what Mary felt and said when they met her beneath the roof of John's abode, all this we do not know. It is all written, not for effect, but for fact; for truth, for faith, that we too might believe.

For my own part, after tracing out again the details of this section of St. John's story, one thought comes uppermost in the mind—the thought how invaluable to the inquirer after Jesus Christ, and also, at least as much, to the believer in Him, are the strong, definite lines of the *narrative* of His

triumph. Here we have been standing almost entirely aside from explicit Christian doctrine, and looking simply at events. Some of them have been very small events in themselves: the grief and hurry of one affectionate woman; the actions of curiosity and search on the part of two perplexed and anxious men; and then the fact that they had mistaken certain venerable writings; and then their quiet retirement to their abode again. No instruction; all narrative.

For that very reason, how invaluable it is in its proper place! How good it is for me, for many reasons—for reasons the very deepest—to be able to touch this paragraph, and handle it, and feel in it the texture of mere fact; to find myself in contact, not with a poetic cloud, however coloured, but with the angles of the Rock of Ages! The material is hard, for it is solid—hard with a hardness which sustains, not wounds. It is the rock—it is indissoluble fact. I take no pains to make it stronger; I neither can nor need; it is *fait accompli;* Jesus is risen.

Why is this fact-character of the Gospel so very valuable to me?—this objectivity, this view of spiritual truth as bound up for ever with events which really happened in time and place, quite external to me and independent of me?

It is so because, on the other hand, my need of the Gospel is a thing so profoundly *internal.* I know, with the most direct of all sorts of knowledge, I know as an inner fact, my essential need of a SAVIOUR. I know my sin, and I know my want. There is that in me which asks, and must ask till satisfied, for pardon and for holiness. And this asking is prompted by more motives than one. First, as regards the question of pardon, there is the conviction (very plain, stern, and unpoetical) that without pardon there is danger—danger of an indefinitely awful sequel to the fact of unforgiven sin. And then, in a similar way, the desire for victory over sin, and the liberty of holiness, arises in part from a very plain, stern source—from the fact that sin met with compromise and surrender is a hopeless bar between me and the possession of the peace of God. And then, in harmony with these inner facts, springing up with them, yet from an even greater depth, there are other reasons. Somehow I know that I am made to know God and to love Him, and that the heart will not rest until it rests in Him.[1] It stands to reason, in the deepest sense of reason. What but the Maker Himself, for the thinking thing which He has made, can be the point of rest, the ultimate centre, the never-disappointing satisfaction, the spring never dry, the tree which bears fruit every month?

[1] Augustine: *Confessiones, ad init.*

Positively or negatively, the human soul is always athirst for God, for the living God. Probably we, writer and reader, have known more or less of both phases of that thirst; the negative consciousness, as we get conscious of the insufficiency of anything less than Him for rest and joy; and then the positive consciousness, when grace shows us that the Lord God, known, trusted, embraced, is "all our desire"—our joy which cannot waste, our pure and purifying happiness.

So the soul asks, implores, the pardon which it knows it will never merit. It asks, it thirsts, for the knowledge of the eternal holy and happy One, and, in that knowledge, for a joy which is absolutely unattainable elsewhere.

Now, the very fact that these realities of the inmost heart of man are what they are, *internal* facts, is what gives its peculiar preciousness to the objectivity of the Gospel, to its character as a compact mass of *external* events, achievements, done apart from us, done for us, by Another.

When the soul cries out for God, it implores not an echo, but an answer. A mere series of impressions roused by another series will not satisfy. No webs woven out of "inner consciousness" will bear the strain of the consciousness of conviction. No Saviour constructed out of the elements of self can be the Saviour from self, from the sentence hanging over it, from the bondage of sin within it.

Here the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ comes in as it is. From the exactly opposite quarter it comes to meet me at the precise point of my need. It is not aspiration or emotion. It is fact—outside, objective, the work of Another; done in history; done without thought, or choice, or leave of mine; while I was non-existent; while I was yet to be, and was foreseen as to be, in my sinfulness and extreme unworthiness of such benefits. And this work of Another, what is it? It is the death and triumph of the eternal and incarnate Son of God.

This is history, recorded and attested event. It no more depends on me for its truth than does the history of Cæsar, or of Cromwell. External to me stands this wonderful fact, Jesus Christ, slain and risen. I do not make it, but I take it.

He is, indeed, "the thing that I long for"; the propitiation for my sin, proved to be such by His resurrection after His altar-death; the adequate Cause, wholly by Himself, why even I, touching Him, united to Him, should be not only forgiven but accepted with Divine joy by the Father who infinitely loves Him.

He in His Person and Character is indeed competent to fulfil my heart's desires for a satisfying Object of pure and worshipping love—"chief among ten thousand, altogether lovely."

And this wonderful and all-blessed Lord thus satisfies the human soul because He is not the echo but the answer. He is not a splendid figment of speculation. He is revealed through events of history; in lines of fact which do not depend on our moods, and cannot change. He is revealed in a historical though supernatural birth, a historical though sinless life, a historical while propitiatory death, a historical while supremely miraculous resurrection. As He is history, He stands clear of this sinful, anxious, inner world of mine; and He is therefore able, as He is the Truth, to be its refuge and its peace. Jesus Christ, immovable in Himself, is my point of rest, my spring of life.

Such are some of the thankful thoughts with which we may stand by the empty sepulchre while the Apostles walk away to their own homes. The garden, the rock, the cave, the winding-sheet, are no scene of romance; they are historical: "Handle them and see." Jesus Christ has actually suffered and risen again in anticipation of my needs, and of my complete incapacity to meet those needs out of the resources of self.

Let us often walk to Joseph's garden accordingly. When the heart is heavy and weary, casting about for peace, or when it is preoccupied and earthly, and refuses to attach itself in conscious, affectionate faith to its one and perfect hope, Jesus Christ, then let us not go deeper into the heart, for it will only disappoint us, but let us return to the facts—to the Person who is our Life. Let us stand again beside the open and vacant sepulchre, and see again and trust again the risen Son of God. There let us leave behind alike self's sinfulness and its imagined righteousness, and calmly give thanks for His great glory and accomplished work, joining Bonar as he sings:

> "Thy works, not mine, O Christ,
> Speak gladness to my heart;
> They tell me all is done,
> They bid my fear depart."

H. C. G. Moule.

Art. V.—THE SERVANT OF CHRIST.

No. I.—Prudence.

IT may be taken for granted that all sincere Christians are eager to seize hold of our Lord's own words as the simple rule of their life. They know, of course, that what has, in the providence of God, been handed down to them of His discourses does not represent the hundredth or even the

thousandth part of the whole mass of His human conversation. It is no news to them to be told that if all the memoirs had been put together which might have been reported, it would have been difficult for any conceivable place to contain all that would have been written. For three years the Light of the World never ceased offering, to all who could listen, the wisdom which every place, occasion, and character suggested; whereas all that we now have could be read through in a single day. If we are reminded of this, we answer that such a consideration only makes us the more tenacious of those gem-like summaries of His sermons, illustrations, revelations, warnings, and promises which God has allowed the inspired memories of the evangelists to give us. Christians know again that our Divine Lord condescended to speak as an Eastern to Easterns, as a founder to His Apostles, as a wanderer to an unsettled society, as a perfect man to imperfect men, who could only understand a certain order of ideas presenting points of contact with the range of their experience and their thoughts. They do not, therefore, expect to find in His special directions and advice particular provisions directly applicable to every contingency of European organizations, rules distinctly fitted for every variety of modern institutions, or anticipations, communicated to minds which could not understand them, of all the phases of modern usage and speculation. When this is put before us, we answer that it would have been the very opposite of what we know to have been the genius of our Lord's reformation of religion, if He had framed a second law to the stringent clauses of which all Christians of every age and every sort of circumstances must conform. What He came to do in the way of teaching was to breathe a new spirit on the earth, to supply new principles of action in those great questions which underlie all others, and by showing what a perfect life would be under certain surroundings, to establish a model by consideration of which men might discover, in harmony with what general outlines their own lives must be drawn in order to fulfil the will of God, and to have an assured and living faith in His mercy through Christ. And, therefore, when we say that Christians are eager to seize hold of our Lord's words as the simple rule of their life, we mean that, wherever He has laid down a wide principle, wherever He has given a lesson of conduct, wherever He has thrown heaven's light on human meanness, depravity, and folly, wherever He has told us the purposes and thoughts of God, there we believe that, unless we feel ourselves bound to follow, we are no true disciples. If we do not literally pluck out the right eye or cut off the right hand, it is because we know that our Lord was establishing a principle by a paradox, and we, at any rate,

acknowledge the grievous folly of not trying to rid ourselves of every hindrance to our better life. Although we do not go and sell all that we have and give to the poor, at all events, we have little reason for satisfaction if we do not wish to act as though we and all things that we have are not our own, because we are bought by God with a price that cannot be repaid. Like our Lord, we do not refuse to be put on oath before the magistrate, but we insist on the impiety of lightly binding ourselves under solemn sanctions. We do not give a man our cloak if he has already taken our coat, because under the resources of modern civilization he would immediately take it to the pawnshop; nor do we lend indiscriminately to all who may wish to borrow, because under the imperfect constitution of contemporary society such loans end, as a rule, in the public-house, and we know that our Lord was illustrating a principle in the most forcible and picturesque language at His hand; but we recognise in these parables the principle that all that we can do for others is nothing but our reasonable service. We find, in fact, in our Lord and in His words the perfect ideal towards which every day we must struggle, and in accordance with which all the plans of our life must be detailed.

In the Sermon on the Mount, as everybody knows, our Lord said, "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink." Here we seem to have a really wide and general principle expressed in plain and simple language, addressed indeed to His own disciples, who had, of course, many special circumstances which do not belong to us, but evidently written for our learning, that we might have life. "Take no thought for the morrow," as it is put in another place. Here seems at once a considerable difficulty, because, if we read them rightly, the words appear absolutely to cut away the ground from all human prudence and foresight, and the qualities which make men into good citizens. Is the statesman to be depreciated in proportion as he lays his plans deeper and wider for futurity? Must the merchant no longer accumulate those vast stores of wealth which alone can accomplish gigantic works of benevolence, and erect the magnificent buildings which prevent the life of towns from becoming altogether mean and sordid, and encourage those arts which help so truly to raise the soul above itself some stages towards God? Has it become wrong for a father of a family to think anxiously and laboriously for the future of his children, or to provide for his own old age? Take no thought for the morrow? May none exercise caution in choosing and preparing that path of life in which he may best develop himself for the service of God, Him of whose forethought the whole

world is an expression? Is it even forbidden to execute careful plans for acquiring by daily struggles fresh habits of virtue, and for stripping off all the old remnants of evil which may still be clinging about us? In a word, is it better to be improvident than provident, careless than thoughtful, indolent than sagacious? Did Christ denounce Prudence?

This apparent contrast between the most elementary suggestions of common-sense and the supposed direction of our Lord is no mere thing of straw, but a real difficulty, which has often seriously been urged by Christian people, and which either gives them an uncomfortable feeling, only half acknowledged, that they are not actually living or attempting to live as Christ would have had them; or else makes them clumsily try to adopt a purely unreasonable mode of action, which our Lord would have been the first to condemn.

But the contrast is, fortunately, after all only apparent, because the direction itself is only supposed. This is, in fact, one of those cases where an imperfect translation in the Authorised Version, by not giving full force to the sense, has altered the whole meaning. Readers of the Revised Version are aware, as scholars have of course known all along, that our Lord did not really use the words "Take no thought," at all, but a much stronger expression: "Be not anxious," "Be not distracted," "Be not bewildered with care"; or, as it is in the parallel passage in St. Luke, "Be not tossed about at sea." The whole passage in the Sermon on the Mount is an illustration of the impossibility of serving God and mammon at once. Therefore, in all those tendencies which we are to understand as forbidden, the idea of mammon, greed, covetousness, ambition, worldliness, must enter in and be recollected. So that this Divine teaching does not mean any such thing as "Never take any thought for the morrow"; far from that; it is "Be not distracted about your life and your position in it, be not distracted about your food, be not distracted about your dress." Such distraction will spoil your spiritual life, and your bodily life also. Your Father is not the Father of flowers and birds in the same sense as He is of you; yet He gives them their principle of growth which arrays them in their proper beauty, and provides them with their proper food; so, if you are not too much set upon lower objects, will He give you also such an inner spring of moral health, strength and development, which will lead you up through every grade of happiness. If you can grasp firmly, through faith in your Father, the right frame of mind, it will be a necessary consequence that you will exercise that Prudence which is one of His own eternal attributes; but it will be such a Prudence as seeks in all things first the Kingdom of God and His righteous-

ness, brings all words, thoughts, motives, actions, to the test of His truth, and never allows itself in any situation whatsoever which may involve a conflict with His will. Do not merely follow after holiness first in point of time, and then think yourselves free for unrestricted worldly occupations; but make the true life the one great object of every day and year, and then nothing will be wanting.

To this effect, also, there is a very beautiful traditional saying of our Lord given by Origen: "Ask for the great things, and the little will come; and ask for the heavenly things and the things of earth will be given you also."

"And do not vex and distress yourselves," He goes on in this passage, "by taking to-day the cares which properly belong to to-morrow; for, in spite of My wishes for you, and My warnings, while you are yet in the world you will no more be able to avoid thought and trouble than you will be able to leave the world at your own time and choice. Each day will bring its own business. All I ask is that you do not allow yourselves to be so far harassed by these provisions, that you are compelled to neglect the better part; so much choked with the thorns and thistles of the plans of this world, and beguiled by the deceitful attractions of riches, that the word within you would become overgrown, and you yourselves be made unfruitful. In this, as in all other cases, I have given you the principle, the inner spring; it is for you to apply it, each to his own case, with earnest sincerity, under the indwelling power of the Divine Spirit. Be not distracted. Be not bewildered with anxiety. Be not tossed about at sea."

The meaning of the injunction thus brought out by the Revised Version is in entire accordance with those other lights which fall from our Lord's personal example and precepts across the same subject. He was not, of course, likely to recommend this virtue with any direct stress, for it is a habit of mind so natural to sensible men, and particularly to His own countrymen, that they were far more likely to exaggerate it into a vice than to neglect it as an excellence. A very ordinary moralist can sufficiently tell us its advantages. Isaac Watts can say, "Without a prudent determination in matters before us, we shall be plunged into perpetual errors." Collier can say, "Prudence is a necessary ingredient in all the virtues, without which they degenerate into folly and excess." We can learn from Milton that "Prudence is that virtue by which we discern what is proper to be done under the various circumstances of time and place." We can learn from Goldsmith that "want of Prudence is too frequently the want of virtue; nor is there on earth a more powerful advocate for one than poverty." There is truth in the sonorous remark of

Dr. Johnson that "The great end of Prudence is to give cheerfulness to those hours which splendour cannot gild, and acclamation cannot exhilarate." But such observations did not come within the scope or the style of our Lord. His mission as a teacher was rather to spiritualize and give vitality to the moral elements which He found to His hand, than to call attention to the commonest rules of ordinary conduct. Having all the lessons of the Old Testament before Him to explain and to fulfil, to lift out of the region of the letter into the sphere of the spirit, He did not need to repeat the cautions of the Book of Proverbs against indolence and improvidence, nor the triumphant songs of the poets in favour of the blessings insured in this life by righteousness, sobriety, and forethought.

Yet, on this point also, we are not left without instruction. The constant reference to the tender care and watchful protection of our Father in heaven is not without its own practical application when we are told to be perfect even as He is perfect. Again, in spite of the circumstances which made the society of our Lord and His company so very exceptional, He submitted in all things to the ordinary rules of human existence, and did not live actually from hand to mouth; for one of the number was definitely the treasurer, and carried a purse to supply the wants of the Master and His followers. We are told in impressive words that we are to make to ourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; words which, while they expressly inculcate a wise, righteous, and spiritual use of property, cannot certainly mean that we are to neglect and despise it altogether. That the blessings of comfort and of earthly happiness in all its manifold variety were not to be austerely repudiated is abundantly shown by the emphasis of the promise that our heavenly Father is to give good things to them that ask Him. That this life, in its changing aspect of our country, our homes, our families, our responsibilities, our capabilities, our interests, has a particular claim is clear from our Lord's direction about the Roman coinage: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." Our Lord Himself gave the sanction of a miracle to the duty of providing for obligations and contingencies, when He directed Peter to look for a piece of money in the fish's mouth. By the preparation previous to the Passover we see that it was not His habit to take things at haphazard. "Lord," asked His disciples confidently appealing to His custom, "where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee the Passover?" The story of the five wise and five foolish virgins depends, in fact, for its point on drawing on our sympathies with careful provision for the future, and on our

natural quickness to acknowledge the absurdity of indolent procrastination. On watchfulness He constantly and solemnly insists; and if we do not manage well the affairs of this life, who shall commit unto us the heavenly treasure? Lastly, when the unwise servant hid his lord's money in a napkin, the severest reproach with which his master could upbraid him was this: "O foolish and slothful servant!" "If any man," says St. Paul, "provide not for his own kindred, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

This, then, is the result of our Lord's teaching on Prudence. What restrictions does His warning against distraction place on our conduct and disposition of our minds and time? In what key is the tenor of our lives to combine with the melody of this elevated spirituality? "Ye cannot serve two masters." That is the leading note—not God and the world at once. One must come before the other when questions arise, and crises involving choice and judgment impend. Which is it to be? In some way or other to every man, many times over, in larger plans and schemes, in the smaller details of every day, the test will present itself: Is my motive God or the world? Do I act as if I thought God merely a useful and honourable appendage to my daily interests; or do I recognise Him as the mainspring of all thoughts and doings, the source of my hopes and wishes, the aim towards which my whole activity tends, the breath and atmosphere in which it moves, the sustenance on which it is nourished, the medicine by which it is strengthened and corrected? Or do I allow myself to be distracted from my true being by attributing importance to such a thing as food, through that mean and deadening attractiveness which degrades it from being God's daily and pleasant gift into the debased character of becoming an object for its own sake? Do I disturb the even tenor of my upward progress by permitting the poor folly of vanity about dress or personal appearance to obtain a serious thought in my mental economy? Do I rust the brightness of God's armour by setting my heart on gain, wealth, pomp, display, the emptiness of passing human greatness and society, the deplorable stupidity of spending my time and money on the treacherous commodities of the markets of Vanity Fair?

Some may be placed in more difficulties of this kind than others, both by position and natural temperament. Some may have little to wish for, and may find it easy to look up for the light of God's friendship in all things. Others may be by nature ambitious, and to them the false delights of vain things may seem real enough. To one the world may mean one thing; to another, something quite different. To all alike the spiritual ideal is given; by all alike must be remembered the

homely truth that if we are to have this deep sense of tranquillity about the future on reasonable grounds, those grounds must be that we have done our best to provide for it.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Notes on Bible Words.

No. XVI.—"VIRTUE."

IF there be any ἀρετή (Phil. iv. 8): *virtus*, in the Vulgate; hence our "virtue": "whatever virtue there is;" (Alford). Any particular moral excellence; whatever may rightly be called "virtue."[1]

This common heathen term for moral excellence, ἀρ., seems to have been studiously avoided by St. Paul; he uses it only here. Is there in this passage, with ἀρ. and ἔπαινος, a summation? Or (with Bishop Lightfoot) thus: "Whatever value may reside in your old heathen conception of virtue, whatever consideration is due to the praise of men . . ."[2]

This word is used elsewhere in N.T. only in 1 Pet. ii. 9, of God; 2 Pet. i. verse 3 of God, verse 5 of believers.

1 Pet. ii. 9, ". . . show forth the praises" (marg. or, "virtues")[3]: perfections. The R.V. has "the excellencies." Sept. in Isa. xliii. 21, here quoted, for "praises" has ἀρετάς. (Isa. xlii. 12 and lxiii. 7.) The praises, says Canon Cook, are the recognition of the divine attributes.

2 Pet. i. 3, ". . . called us to glory and virtue"; *marg.* "or, *by*." R.V. "by his own g. and virtue,"[4] ἰδίᾳ δ. κ. ἀρετῇ. *Excellency*, says Dr. Lumby; in exact accordance with the usage in the first Ep.: "the manifestation of God's working in and for believers."

Verse 5, "add to your faith virtue." R.V., "in your faith supply virtue." Vulg. ministrate in fide vestra virtutem: ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ . . . *in* (in the exercise of) your faith provide, or furnish. The "special sense" (Lightfoot) in this verse seems to be *vigour*; earnestness, moral courage; as Bengel, "a strenuous tone and vigour of mind."

"Virtue" also stands (A.V.) for δύναμις, *power*. Mark v. 30, "perceiving in Himself that virtue (δύναμιν, virtutem) had gone out of Him": R.V., "that the power *proceeding* from Him had gone forth." Luke vi. 19; viii. 46: "power."

---

[1] See P. Book: ". . . true religion, and virtue." Cf. Bishop Butler. Diss. II. "Of the Nature of Virtue." Meyer says ἀρετή designates moral excellence in feeling and action.

[2] "Praise is the reflection of virtue."—Bacon.

[3] Vulg. ut virtutes adnuntietis (les vertus). *Virtus*, properly, by derivation, manliness, courage, and so like the classical ἀρετή, of action, or in ethical sense, excellence. Cf. Wisdom iv. 1.

[4] Vulg. propria gloria et virtute. Cf. Hab. iii. 3 and Isai. xlii. 8.

Review.

The Country of the Vosges. By HENRY W. WOLFF. Longmans. 1891.

THIS is no ordinary book of travels which a man may run through to while away the passing hour; it is rather a book of more abiding interest. The author writes as one who has not only a knowledge of the country he describes, but who is also acquainted with its past history and surroundings. He is withal a good linguist.

In commencing his wanderings through the Vosges, Mr. Wolff's starting-ground is Metz, which though not in that country, yet, as he says, "lies most temptingly in the way;" of the town he gives a graphic description. "The streets are, in the more interesting part of the town, all charmingly up and down. Near the Esplanade . . . is a curious little twelfth-century oratory of the Knights Templars, plain and chaste, but good—only now appropriated as a military telegraph station. Those Templars had a house of some pretensions in Metz in the Rue des Trinitaires (St. Livier), near that most interesting old Merovingian palace, on the walls of which you may see a remarkable quaint old relievo sculpture of undoubtedly Merovingian date, showing the Franks in the act of driving the Romans, symbolized as a lion, out of Gaul." Of the churches, we read they all "have good stained glass, for which Metz is famous." Speaking of the Jews, with whom Lorraine, Alsace and the adjoining German States swarm, the opinion is given decidedly "that as now practising their trade in these parts, the Jews constitute—speaking in a general way—a very pest to the country, being surpassed in pestilential character only by the Christian money-lenders. . . . In Alsace and Lorraine, up to the time of German annexation, really nothing had been done for popular credit, and the peasantry had no one to go to but the Jews." But now the communal and savings bank funds have been made available for loan purposes, though the "distrustful peasantry seem still to prefer dealing privately with the Jews."

In visiting the battle-field, a little graveyard is discovered, "in which may be seen a record of our share in that terrible year's work. Gravestone No. 456 bears this incription:

IN MEMORY
OF
HENRIETTA CLARK, DEACONESS,
FROM
CHESWICK, CUMBERLAND,
ENGLAND.
BORN DECEMBER 24, 1837;
DIED OCTOBER 29, 1870.

"The poor lady, people in the village will tell you, died as a kind nurse to the soldiers."

Leaving Metz our readers may like to hear what the author has to say

of Bitsch and its fortress. It has a special interest to us, because "in the Great War between 1802 and 1814 a number of our people, taken prisoners, were locked up there." Of their being cruelly confined in the casemates of the fortress we are glad to read it is "a myth . . . But no doubt the casemates had been freely impressed for punishment cells, as the names scratched into the walls clearly proved. Damp, unhealthy tenements they were. . . . And within them were terrible torture-holes, flat recesses let into the wall, in which prisoners were placed with a door closed right against their face, so as to leave them no space for moving. There were two rings fastened, the one to the inner wall, the other to the door. To the ring in the cell the man's one leg was chained; to the one in the door his one arm, and then the door was closed, and thus he was unable to move, unable almost to breathe."

We may now turn from such a gloomy picture and visit Strassburg. Contrasting his former visit in 1861 with his present one, we read: "There are the same familiar squares, narrow and crooked streets, buildings of the Reformation era, those picturesque backyards of two or three centuries ago—the most striking is that of the Raven's Inn—with verandahs and quaint carvings, and rich festoons of creepers, little bits seemingly made for the painter's brush. . . . I had not the slightest difficulty in finding my way about. Yet there was one change, and that I thought very striking. In 1861 I had found the whole city German, very German—except the official apex, which of course was French. In 1890 the apex was as distinctly German, but the city had become to a considerable degree French—French in speech, French in manners, French in sentiment. The whip too freely used had made the horse jib rather than go—the correcting alkali had produced an acid reaction." Our author speaks of the charm Strassburg had for Goethe, who "went into raptures over it all." "The dialogue in the Well scene in Faust is said to be taken almost word for word from an old Strassburg Brunnen-gschbräch, published early in the last century, which may be summed up in saying: 'They clung tenaciously to all that could recall the past good times, and foster a hope for a return of the happy epoch.' But 'Quantum mutata!' are the sad remarks. 'No doubt the glory of the second Strassburg will in some sense exceed the glory of the first. But it will be of an entirely different type. French associations will be rooted out—in course of time—trust Berlin for that! But these hosts of Prussian soldiers, *Geheimräthe*, Prussian this, that and the other, are every bit as much strangers in Strassburg as ever the French were. And if they go on exploiting the newly-recovered city, as they have begun, before long it will be reduced to the level of a very ordinary North German provincial capital—prosaic, common-place, uninteresting—instead of being that dear old, genuinely Swabian city, with so much that is racy still about it; so much that is commemorative of old times, so much that has made the city the historical Strassburg that it is."

If our total abstaining friends want fresh scope for their energies, Strassburg will furnish them with a fine field. "For it," we read, "has always been a beery place," and "has not only managed to maintain and develop this cult of beer within its own limits, but has moreover taught

sympathetic France to drink beer wholesale—as if it likewise had become a German province, and partly to forsake wine."

We are sorely tempted to give some further extracts relative to Strassburg, and especially of the industry of the *pâté de foie gras*, but we must forbear. Further in his book we have an account given of Oberlin's church at Foudai. "The one church of the district as it used to be in Oberlin's days. . . . A most bare and uncomfortable place of worship this church looks—as are indeed its sister buildings. For Vosgian Lutheranism is a stern and severe creed, averse to luxuries and comfort. Advisedly there are no forms put up for the congregation, but mere carpentered beams, on which people may sit, but cannot lean back, or possibly, as M. Dietz was careful to point out, 'go to sleep'—be the sermon never so soporific. This church was built by Oberlin 115 years ago, in the plain, barn-like style, which seems so dear to orthodox Lutherans. The tower is much older, and, having been consecrated before the Reformation, is still regarded with peculiar awe as indelibly 'Catholic.' In it is hung a bell, cast in the twelfth century, dedicated to the Virgin, and partaking accordingly of the 'Catholic' character of the town. In other respects these Lutherans are less rigid. They use their church for all manner of purposes—lectures, and meetings, and social gatherings—more particularly at Christmas time, when the German Christmas-tree is placed familiarly upon the altar, and the parishioners assemble for a pleasant social evening in the body of the church."

In these extracts we have let Mr. Wolff speak for himself. His work is full of valuable matter, which should be interesting at all times, but is especially so in connection with the country coming under German rule. We hope our readers will derive as much pleasure as we have in perusing the volume.

W. E. RICHARDSON.

Short Notices.

Christus Comprobator: The Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament. Seven Addresses. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

IN the December CHURCHMAN we expressed the hope that Bishop Ellicott's Charge would without delay appear *in extenso;* and we heartily welcome this volume, published by the great and venerable Church Society, and earnestly invite to it the attention of our readers.

From the fourth chapter, "The Appeal to Christ," a lengthy extract appeared in "The Month"; and we content ourselves at present with remarking that to that passage are appended in the volume two or three footnotes. Here is one, a note following the words "realm of history" (CHURCHMAN, p. 167). His Lordship says:

Comp. *Lux Mundi*, p. 360 (ed. x.). See also Sanday, *Oracles of God*, Lect. viii., p. 110 (Lond. 1891)—an interesting lecture, but deficient in its

realization of the truth (see below) that the nature of the humanity of the sinless Lord was not, and by the nature of the case could not be, "on the same footing with that of His fellow-men" (p. 111).

The "Bishop" referred to in this portion of the Charge, as many of our readers would be aware, is Bishop Moorhouse (see CHURCHMAN, p. 168: "A Bishop preaching from a University pulpit"). The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol gives the reference to "a recently published volume of sermons by the Bishop of Manchester." Canon Meyrick's article on the Bishop of Manchester's sermon (CHURCHMAN, May, 1891), we may observe, has been reprinted, and may be obtained as a pamphlet from Mr. Elliot Stock. Bishop Ellicott, like Canon Meyrick, quotes the Bishop of Manchester's words, "limitation as well in knowledge as in *moral energy*."

Social and Present-Day Questions. By FREDERICK W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon of Westminster, Chaplain to the Queen and House of Commons. Pp. 360. Hodder and Stoughton.

Of the twenty-seven Orations (which is probably the best word for them) in this volume, several deal with social questions, as the title-page states, and biography. Here, for instance, are several titles, "National Duties," "Trials of the Poor," "Religionism," "Art," "General Grant" and "John Bright." On the eloquent preacher's earnestness and fire we need not comment. Not a passage is dull or feeble. Of striking facts, illustrations and anecdotes, there are many. Here and there, as we think, there is a lack, *not* of "finish," as Disraeli once said, but of balance. We give a few specimen sentences from "Religionism":

At this very day there are many whom I do not wrong in saying—for they make it their open boast—there are many who are trying to undo as far as they dare the work of the Reformation. But the Reformation was nothing but the sweeping away of accumulated falsities and mountainous corruptions. And if—may God avert the omen!—but if the Church of England should grow gradually false to the principle that she is a Reformed Church, one thing then I see with the absolute certainty of prophecy, that there will be from her a vast secession—"Every knee that hath not bowed to Baal, and every mouth that has not kissed him." If—and I say again may God avert the omen!—but if the Church of England should indeed dwindle and degenerate into a feeble imitation of the Church of Rome, with a pale reflexion of her doctrines and a poor copy of her practices, then sooner or later, if truth be truth, she will collapse into irremediable ruin, and upon those ruins shall be built once more a truer and a purer fold.

The Fireside. Pictorial Annual. 1891. Edited by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. "Home Words" Publishing Office, 7, Paternoster Square.

In this volume, handsomely got up, as usual, appears a great variety of matter. Principal Moule contributes "First Impressions of Rome," and Dr. James some social Essayettes. The Tales are by Mrs. Marshall and Miss Giberne. There are many extracts. All, of course, is wholesome.

The Socialism of Christianity. By W. BLISSARD, M.A., Vicar of Seasalter, Kent. Elliot Stock.

Mr. Blissard is thoughtful and outspoken; many will think he lacks caution. In an introductory letter, Bishop Mitchinson discreetly commends the book.

Christianity and Buddhism. By T. STERLING BERRY, D.D., Rector of Birr, Diocese of Killaloe. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This is a volume of the Society's "Non-Christian Religious Systems" series, and it contains the Donnellan Lectures for 1889-90. Dr. Berry writes well; he is clear, and as a rule sufficiently firm. It is desirable that Buddha's religion should be fully known, so far as the laws of decency and propriety will admit of details being given from his own Scriptures. Dr. Berry might have done something in this way by referring to those pages of the Pārājikā book, which are filled with details of fearful vices. The sins of the Bhikkus, it may be admitted, are not chargeable to Buddha; but what can be said of the legislation which makes vices, almost inconceivably abominable, of less degree in guilt than actions which result in the reproduction of the species?

Good Words. 1891. Edited by DONALD MACLEOD, D.D., one of Her Majesty's Chaplains. Isbister and Co.

First and foremost in this Annual may be noticed the Novel which the critics have been lately commending, "The Little Minister," by the author of "A Window in Thrums." The other work of fiction running throughout is Mrs. Oliphant's "The Marriage of Elinor." There are papers on Art and Travel, Social and Biographical papers. Some "Sunday Readings" appear by the Bishop of Winchester. The illustrations are beautiful.

The Newly Recovered Apology of Aristides. With extracts from the Translation by Professor J. RENDEL HARRIS. By HELEN B. HARRIS. Pp. 100. Hodder and Stoughton.

A distinctly helpful book; and many of our readers who were interested in the article on the "Apology" in a recent CHURCHMAN, by Rev. Morris Fuller, will be pleased to hear of it. The frontispiece shows the Convent of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, in one of the libraries of which the MS. was found by Professor Harris.

The Gate Beautiful. By HUGH MACMILLAN, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., author of "Bible Teachings in Nature," etc. Pp. 284. Macmillan and Co.

This is a delightful book. It consists of twenty-seven "Bible Teachings for the Young": "The Gate Beautiful," "The Thistle," "The Barberry," etc. Dr. Macmillan's pen has lost none of its pictorial power.

An attractive and really cheap volume is the Annual of the *Sunday Magazine* (Isbister and Co.). We especially note "Reminiscences of Archbishop Magee," by the Editor, Rev. Benjamin Waugh, whose name is so well-known in connection with the championship of little children.

There are several religious papers. Mr. W. T. Stead writes about General Booth. The Tales seem of average merit, and there are many illustrations.

We certainly cannot commend *Advent Readings*, by M. E. Granger, with an introduction by Canon Knox Little. The writer states that while the Church of England "urges the need of private confession and personal absolution in certain cases, she abstains altogether from defining the degree or extent of the necessity. If then, to individual consciences, belongs the responsibility of accepting or resigning so solemn a Rite (which partakes of the nature of a sacrament), and so unspeakable a blessing" . . . and so on.

In a new edition of Archdeacon Farrar's works, issued by Messrs. Macmillan and Co., appears his *Seekers after God*. This work has had, we see, a large circulation. The copy which we have read, and read again, was published in the year 1873. From Messrs. Macmillan we have also received the second volume of the new issue of Maurice's *Sermons*.

The third edition of *The Church of England*, by the Rev. William Odom, Vicar of Heeley, Sheffield, is revised and enlarged (Sheffield : T. Widdison, 14, Fargate). There is a real need for sound Manuals.

An interesting and useful work for young readers, or Sunday-school Teachers, is the Rev. R. H. Brenan's *The Children's Afternoon;* or, "Words to Young Children." The volume is well illustrated, and tastefully got up. (Elliot Stock.)

In the *Church Sunday School Magazine* appears a paper by the Bishop of Dover (read at the Canterbury C. S. S. Conference in October), "How Sunday Schools may be made more successful." The Editor comments upon some depressing statements, quoted by the Bishop, about criminals who had been Sunday scholars. The whole matter—present-day statistics of this sort—should be inquired into.

In the *Sunday at Home* appears an interesting paper on John Bunyan's "Book for Boys and Girls"—a facsimile of the unique first edition (1686), published by Mr. Elliot Stock.

Nearly thirty years ago, in the course of a conversation with the Rev. James Vaughan, the Incumbent of Christ Church, Brighton, about useful books, the present writer mentioned Oxenden's. "Yes," said Mr. Vaughan, "and yet I sometimes wonder why they have so large a circulation. What do *you* say?" "They meet a want," we replied. "But *how?*" inquired our friend. "Well," we said, "they are printed in good type, they are not too big, they are simple, and they point to Christ." Mr. Vaughan quite agreed, adding a remark about their loving earnestness. This chat comes quite fresh to us as we turn over the pages of Bishop Oxenden's latest work, *The History of my Life* (Longman, Green, and Co.). As the Rector of Pluckley, Mr. Oxenden was for a long time, through his excellent little books, one of the best-known men in the Church of England. "The Pathway of Safety," we observe, has reached its 363rd thousand, and "The Earnest Communicant" its 587th thousand. "Over Two Million Copies" of this author's writings, it is stated, have

been sold—2,000,000! How many parallels to this total, we wonder, in books distinctly religious, can be found? Bishop Oxenden's first Publisher was Mr. Macintosh. Then Messrs. Hatchard took charge of his numerous writings; and lately they have issued from the house of Longmans. Mr. Oxenden, as everybody knows, became Bishop of Montreal, and resided in Canada several years. In a vigorous and honoured old age the Bishop has given this Autobiography to the Church which he has served so well. It contains several stories. We quote only one, about Manning, a school friend at Harrow, now Cardinal Manning. The Bishop writes: "There was, even in those early days, a little self-assertion in his character. On one occasion he was invited to dinner at Mr. Cunningham's, the vicar of the parish. On his return at night, one of his friends questioned him as to whom he had met, whether he had enjoyed his evening, and especially as to what part he had taken in the general conversation. To these inquiries he answered that he had spent the evening pleasantly enough, but that he had said but little, and, indeed, had been almost silent, for there were two or three superior persons present; and he added, 'You know that my motto is, "Aut Cæsar, aut nullus." I, therefore, held my tongue and listened.' This was characteristic of the after man." A brief extract from this Autobiography was given in the December CHURCHMAN. We heartily recommend the book.

Letts's Diaries are now published by Cassell and Co. We recommend *Letts's Clerical Diary for* 1892 and the *Tablet Diary.*

With the *Musical Times* for December 1st is issued an interesting "Mozart Supplement." Mozart died December 5, 1791.

We heartily recommend a biographical sketch of our much-esteemed friend Canon Carus, with extracts from his writings, having the title "Speaking Years." ("Home Words" Publishing Office.) The venerable Canon's "Reminiscences of Professor Sedgwick" appeared in the CHURCHMAN of February, 1889.

Two volumes of a rather rare species, "Tales for a Bible Class or Night School," by Rev. W. E. Heygate, are issued by the S.P.C.K.; both for Boys. These well-written Tales, an experienced Teacher tells us, are admirably adapted for the purpose.

Several books have reached us too late for notice in the present number. —*Two Sailor Lads* is a story of stirring adventures, by that popular writer, Dr. Gordon Stables (John F. Shaw and Co.).——*Hazell's Annual for* 1892 is excellent, as usual (Hazell, Watson, and Viney).——*The Oxford Miniature Bible* is a gem; the smallest ever printed: a dainty present (Henry Frowde).——*Our Darlings* (Shaw) is as bright and helpful as usual.

The annual volume of *Cassell's Family Magazine* is a marvel of excellence, in its own line. We often commend this high-class Magazine.

Messrs. Partridge and Co.'s annual volumes are, as usual, attractive and cheap. What can be better, for the class of readers kept in view, than the *Mother's Companion*, *Friendly Visitor*, *British Workman*, and *Band of Hope*?

THE MONTH.

THE announcement of the engagement of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale to Princess Mary of Teck has called forth the expression of hearty good wishes on every side.

The Bishop of London's Charge, marked of course by earnestness and good judgment, contains much that is timely.[1]

What should be done in rural parishes is a question now earnestly asked in political, specially in "Radical" circles.

The scandal produced by the obstinacy of the Salvation Army, in Eastbourne, playing in Sunday processions, contrary to a local Act of Parliament, still continues.

The trial of the Archbishop of Aix ended in a judgment for the Government, and a fine of £120. The Archbishop has not shown much of a conciliatory spirit.

The Unionists are entitled to put East Dorset against South Molton. The Gladstonian candidate was a good one, but the Conservative won.

Mr. Chamberlain's frankness at the great Unionist gathering, in Birmingham, has been of good service.

The London School-Board election has ended in a distinct triumph for the Moderate party. Mr. Diggle, whose success is marked, was unanimously re-elected Chairman.

We record, with regret, the death of Bishop Perry, an old and honoured friend. Born in the year 1807, he came out Senior Wrangler in 1828, and was chosen Bishop of Melbourne in 1847. The good Bishop took much interest, from the first, in this Magazine; one of his last writings was a paper in the CHURCHMAN on the proposed addition to the Catechism. Dean Vaughan, preaching in Llandaff Cathedral, closed his sermon with the following reference to the late Bishop, who was for some years a Canon of Llandaff:

> I do not purpose to speak his panegyric; he would have been the first to deprecate human praise, most of all in the house of God. Many things might be said of him. I might speak of his youthful honours—the first place amongst his fellows in a great university. Somehow he never reminded us of these; later services, higher honours eclipsed them. And yet I think that those attainments of the youth were always

[1] The *Record* says: The signs of coming struggle are all around us, and, if it were not so, the utterances of public men are too startlingly clear to be overlooked. It is difficult to take up a newspaper without coming across some such declaration as that which Mr. Shaw-Lefevre is reported to have made at Salisbury: "If the Liberal party are returned to power, one of the first measures which they will undertake, next to Home Rule, will be the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales and Scotland." If the threats of leaders and would-be leaders of the Radical party are unambiguous, the warnings of prominent men on the other side are not less so. Thus the Bishop of Loudon, in his recent Charge, announces: "The proposal to confiscate the Church's endowments it is now the evident intention of her enemies to push forward with all possible speed." The Bishop's opinion is, perhaps, entitled to the greater weight because he used his influence in 1885 to be-little the danger which then existed, and to decry all active measures of Church Defence as unnecessary and dictated only by an idle and ignorant panic. We think he is quite right now, and we are certain that he was quite wrong then. The danger then was more veiled than it is now; but, on the other hand, it was for a moment more imminent. The ingenious attempt to smuggle a disestablishment majority into the House of Commons was for a moment perilously near success, although the peril passed away directly it was discerned.

present in him, giving him a clear judgment, a strong logical instinct, a desire to prove all things before he could hold fast the true. We think rather of his twenty-eight years as the first Bishop of a great dependency of England, which he largely helped to organize into a great ecclesiastical province, which he found with three clergymen and left with a hundred, which he traversed in days before railroads, in any sort of conveyance, his faithful wife always beside him, making, as it were, his own roads as he visited the distant settlements and rough homes of the flock of God entrusted to him, And when he ended that long life of the bodily Episcopate, how did he still watch over the relinquished charge in keen interest, constant correspondence, and ceaseless prayer! And then his early, his lifelong friend, our own Bishop, whose body sleeps outside, and whose statued likeness is ever before us within, made him a Canon of this church, and said of him, in doing so, that while he was here Evangelical truth would always be preached in this cathedral. You are witnesses that it was so. Some of you felt that it was good for you to be here when he was the preacher; some of you felt that, after all, the preacher was the sermon. And why should I try to set him before you as a man—you who knew him—not so well, however, as I, who had been a boy under him at Cambridge, honoured from those first days with his friendship? Many things I might say. He was a just man, he was a kind man. He was a gentleman to the backbone; he was courteous; he was open-minded within limits; he was ready to hear and give an answer, even among men who differed from him; he was hopeful, he was generous, as to the motives, as to the man within the man, of persons who did not see with him—growingly so as life advanced and the soul mellowed towards its ingathering. And now he rests and is perfected. Now he sees all truth in the truth. Very blessed for him the beatific vision; all elements of light gathered into the light. Yes, he is happy now. But his was a happy life even here. It was the life of the pure man, as earth permits purity. He loved earth as Christ loved, as God loves it. He enjoyed its social gatherings; he led conversation towards topics lovely and of good report; it was a pleasure to him to mingle with his fellows; he was genial, he was generous, he was liberal in his constructions of men; he was catholic in the truest sense, because he was evangelical. He rests now from the burdens of old age, from the new notions of an age not his, from the fancies and the new instincts and intuitions of an age that shall be. Blessed be God for His primeval ordinance of generations! We are snatched by death from the unamalgamable, from the intolerable, from the impossible.

At the General Mission, held in Bath, the Dean of Norwich was the Missioner at the Abbey Church.

The death of the Bishop of Carlisle has called forth due tributes of respect. Who that used to hear "Harvey Goodwin" in his Cambridge pulpit has ever forgotten that experience?

The Archbishop of Dublin, says the *Record*, will shortly confer priest's orders upon some members of the Spanish Reformed Church who have already been admitted to the diaconate by him. In these cases the service will be conducted in Spain.

The Bishop of Liverpool has issued directions forbidding laymen to deliver addresses in the churches of his diocese.

The Bishop of Edinburgh has authorized the use of a special prayer in his diocese during the continuance of the epidemic of influenza.