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

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

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW PUBLICATIONS.

In crown 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

GOD AND THE SINNER. By the Rev. CANON DENTON THOMPSON, M.A., Rector of North Meols, Southport. Containing Twelve Chapters on some Fundamental Truths of Christianity, embracing:—God—Christ—Man—Sin—Worldliness—Infidelity—Repentance—Salvation—The Christian Life—Self-Righteousness—Divine Grace, &c.

"The idea of the author is fully realized, and his volume is well calculated to fulfil a wide and useful mission."—*English Churchman.*

"The success with which Canon Thompson has accomplished his difficult task justifies his courageous act in undertaking it."—*Church Bells.*

SECOND EDITION, ENLARGED.

In cloth, 3s. 6d.; in limp leather, 5s; also in limp cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

A MANUAL FOR THE SICK AND SORROWFUL. Arranged by E. S. L.

"A really beautiful, well-arranged, and helpful book. The compiler has collected thoughts from many writers on devotional life, and has kept on a remarkably high level both of spirituality and literary merit."—*Guardian.*

"One of the best books of the kind we have seen for a long time."—*Scottish Guardian.*

"We have here a veritable storehouse of holy and beautiful thoughts upon the mystery of suffering. Nothing could be better suited for sick visitation purposes. The meditations are short and deeply sympathetic."—*Church Bells.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 5s.

SHORT READINGS FOR PARISH VISITORS. By EDWARD SIMEON ELWELL, D.D., Worcester College, Oxon (Vicar of Long Crendon).

DEDICATED TO THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. A BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

SECOND EDITION, Price 1s. net.

THE BIBLE AND THE PRAYER-BOOK. By W. M.

"A small, vigorous, and earnest book. . . Appeal is from the Prayer-Book to the Scriptures."—*Literary World.*

"The investigation covers a wide field, and the tone is as good as the purpose is commendable."—*Christian.*

In royal 16mo., paper boards, lettered, price 2s. 6d.

THE ESSENCE OF ECCLESIASTES. In the metre of Omar Khayyam. By ALASTAIR BUCHANAN.

"There's naught but vanity beneath the sun."

In foolscap 8vo., paper cover, price 6d.; also in parchment cover, price 1s.

THE MEASURE OF A MAN. An Address to Boys and Young Men. By the Author of "Unpainted Pictures," &c.

In demy 8vo., paper cover, price 6d.

A PLEA FOR CHURCH SERVICES REFORM, with special reference to the Prayer-Book, Psalter, and the Decline of Public Worship, &c. By an Anglican Priest of forty years' standing.

NEW VOLUMES OF VERSE.

In crown 8vo., Japanese vellum parchment, 1s. 6d. net.

POEMS. By W. E. WALKERDINE.

"A variety of creditable poems, narrative, descriptive, and lyric."—*Rock.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

CRUMBS OF FANCY. By LOTTE.

"The author's thoughts are suggestive, and the book is marked by earnestness of purpose and reverence for high ideals."—*Glasgow Herald.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

The National Protestant Church Union.

To Maintain the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Treasurer—T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq.
Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.

The National Protestant Church Union witnesses for—

1. The supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.
2. The sole and sufficient efficacy of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross.
3. The justification of man by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ.
4. The right of every believer to direct and unimpeded access to God, through Christ.
5. The freedom and sovereignty of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

WILL YOU HELP THIS IMPORTANT WORK?

For List of Publications, Terms of Membership, etc., apply to the Secretary, N.P.C.U.

324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

HUNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.
THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours are occupied. Expenditure in 1902, £46,642.

Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N. 11, Buckingham St., Strand, London W.C.

OPERATIVE JEWISH CONVERTS' INSTITUTION

(In connection with the Church of England.)

President: J. K. D. WINGFIELD-DIGBY, Esq., M.P.

OBJECT.—To assist young Christian Jews in distress by enabling them to help themselves. They are received for three years, provided for entirely and taught trades.

SUPPORT.—Orders for Printing and Bookbinding are very helpful, but subscriptions and donations are also needed, and will be most thankfully received by the Principal, the Rev. H. O. ALLBROOK, Palestine House, Bodney Road, Hackney, N.E.; or by the Hon. Treasurer, A. R. PITE, Esq., Effingham House, Ramsgate.

Bankers—Messrs. BARCLAY & COMPANY, Ltd., 54, Lombard Street, E.C.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND ZENANA MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

Patroness: H.R.H. THE DUCHESS OF CONNAUGHT.

OBJECT—Evangelistic, Medical, and Educational Work among the Women of India and China.

THE ANNUAL MEETING will be held at 2.30 p.m. on Friday, May 6th, at QUEEN'S HALL (Langham Place, W.). Chairman: Sir W. MACKWORTH YOUNG, K.C.S.I.

THE ANNUAL SERMON will be preached at 11 a.m. on Thursday, May 5th, at ALL SOULS' (Langham Place, W.), by the Rev. Dr. BUTLER, Master of Trinity, Cambridge.

OFFICES: 27, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

The Friends of Armenia.

President: THE LADY FREDERICK CAVENDISH.
Vice-Presidents: Hon. Mrs. FRASER and Mrs. ALFRED BOOTH.
Chairman of Committee: E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.
Treasurer: HECTOR MUNRO FERGUSON, Esq.
Secretary: Miss E. CANTLOW.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.

AN ORPHAN RESCUED, FED, CLOTHED, AND EDUCATED FOR
Per **£5** *Annum*
BY THE MISSION HOMES IN ARMENIA.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.

DONATIONS IN AID OF WIDOWS & ORPHANS gratefully received by the Hon. Treasurer as above.
CHEQUES SHOULD BE CROSSED "LONDON AND WESTMINSTER BANK."

47, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.

CURATES' AUGMENTATION FUND.

THE ANNUAL MEETING

Will be held at LOWTHER LODGE, KENSINGTON GORE, S.W., on MONDAY, JUNE 20th, at 4 p.m. **His Grace THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK will preside.**

This Society makes grants of £50 a year to Curates who have been more than 15 years in Holy Orders, and are still in full active work. Of the 8,000 Curates, upwards of 1,400 have been ordained more than 15 years, and this number is annually increasing. More than £8,500 voted last year. **URGENT NEED of additional income. Last year many strong cases had to be postponed.**

Cheques, P.O.O., and P.O.'s, crossed "Coutts & Co.," should be sent to the Treasurers, or to REV. J. R. HUMBLE, Secretary. *Office:* 2, DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

SERMONS BY THE DEAN OF ELY.

CHEAP EDITION. In crown 8vo., cloth, with a Portrait of the Dean, price 8s.

PRO PATRIA. Sermons on Special Occasions in England and America. By CHARLES WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Dean of Ely.

"An interesting volume. The sermons are robust and liberal in tone, and deal with questions of living interest."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"The volume altogether is fresh and stimulating reading, and may be recommended to both those who do and who do not accept Dr. Stubbs' advanced social teachings."—*Sheffield Independent.*

LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

THE

CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1904.

ART. I.—LOISY'S SYNTHESIS OF CHRISTIANITY.

II.

BEFORE I proceed further, I must give some account of the relations of Loisy to Professor Harnack, whose subjective synthesis of Christianity it is the Abbé's aim to dethrone. It is necessary for any full appreciation of Loisy in his merits and demerits to read carefully first the "History of Dogma" and "What is Christianity?" ("Das Wesen des Christentums"). Personally, too, I can testify that the transition from the great German critic to his Roman rival is a most interesting psychological experience. Someone, I think, has said that were a scientific treatise on the life and habits of an apteryx demanded, a German savant would evolve an account of the subject by hard work in a museum inspired by his own inner consciousness, while a savant of France would profess to know all about it after a cursory inspection of the bird caged in the Jardin des Plantes. The witticism broadly illustrates the respective trends and limitations of the rival syntheses of Christianity now propounded from Berlin and Paris. For Harnack the essential of Christianity is the subjective realization of God through Christ, apart from all social system. For Loisy Christ's "kingdom" was from the first, and is now, an objective matter, which we are to identify with a single Christian association. Harnack, attempting to reconstruct the primitive Christianity from anatomical fragments, brushes aside some of the most potent influences on actual Christian life, and tells us bluntly that the Church misunderstood its credentials from the second century onwards. The Abbé, in like arbitrary fashion, but with exquisite tact, picks out the results of destructive Protestant exegesis best suited to his

purpose, and so unfolds a tale of development from a Jesus who did not declare Himself Divine to a Pio Nono who declared himself infallible. Thus, while for Harnack there is no realization of the "kingdom" in its objective form at all, for Loisy it is strictly identified with the Church of Rome. We are shown our strange bird in a Roman menagerie, deprived of free powers of action, and adapting itself to a new climate and cramped confines, and the question is ignored whether Christianity does not show more splendid powers where these limitations are unknown.

An initial divergence in the definition of Christ's "kingdom" thus leads on to conclusions hopelessly at variance. Harnack, after complimenting the Roman Church on its past achievements, bows it out with the words: "No longer a leader, but a drag; yet the drag is not always the reverse of a blessing."[1] Loisy, conceiving of no Church life save in the unreformed fold, and assuming that all Protestant Christendom accepts the meagre, mutilated synthesis of Harnack, girds at the endless disintegrations of an "Évangile individualiste," "où l'on ne voit plus réellement que Dieu et l'âme, l'âme et son Dieu."[2]

Both critics, indeed, agree to discard the Christianity of the Eastern Church, but their gravamens are strangely dissimilar. For Harnack the Greek ritualism is the chief offence—"the injunctions to submit to religious ceremonies as though they were mysterious ministrations; to be punctilious in observing a ritual; to put up pictures, and to mumble maxims and formulas in a prescribed form." "It was to destroy this sort of religion that Jesus Christ suffered Himself to be nailed to the Cross."[3] By Loisy, on the other hand, the Greek Church (which, he tells us, "pendant les premiers siècles avait gravité autour de Rome") is discarded as outside "l'Église Apostolique," and as a victim of Byzantinism from the time of the disruption of the Roman Empire.[4] Of any other organizations endeavouring to realize "la vie collective de l'Église" he seems not to have heard.

I shall have to make frequent reference to the conflicting statements of these two great authorities in their presentation of the aims and history of Christianity. It will be best, therefore, to confine myself at present to an analysis of these two syntheses, reserving my own views of the subjects at issue for future papers on the Synoptic Christology, the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Christ, and the actual position of Rome in early ecclesiastical history.

[1] "What is Christianity?" Lect. XIV.
[2] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 192.
[3] "What is Christianity?" Lect. XIII.
[4] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 146.

Résumé of Harnack's Synthesis.

For Harnack (starting with a repudiation of the Fourth Gospel) the main points in the teaching of Jesus were: (1) The kingdom of God and its coming; (2) God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul; (3) the higher righteousness and the commandment of love.[1] "The kingdom of God" is the rule of the holy God in the hearts of individuals; it is God Himself in His power." Jesus Himself did not assert a claim to Divinity. His consciousness of being the Son of God in the Synoptic account is "nothing but the practical consequence of knowing God" as the Father, and as His Father. "Rightly understood, the name of Son means nothing but the knowledge of God." "The confidence with which John makes Him address the Father, 'Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world,' is undoubtedly the direct reflection of the certainty with which Jesus spoke. But here all research must stop. We are not even able to say when it was that He first knew Himself as the Son, and whether He at once completely identified Himself with this idea." But "He is certain that He knows the Father, that He is to bring this knowledge to all men, and that thereby He is doing the work of God." This is inferred from the texts Matt. xi. 25-30, Luke x. 21-34.[2] With limitations, this Son may be regarded as consciously the Messiah expected by the Jews, for the Evangelists connect this consciousness with His Baptism, the story of the Temptation assumes it, and the entry into Jerusalem and cleansing of the Temple proclaim Him in this character. But Christology is no feature in His teaching. To the question, "Does Jesus assume a position in His Gospel?" the answer is that "Jesus' Gospel was confined to two factors, God and the soul" (Micah vi. 6-8 quoted). "The publican in the Temple, the widow with her mite, the lost son, know nothing about Christology." "*The Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it has to do with the Father only, and not with the Son.*" But "no one had ever yet known the Father in the way in which Jesus knew Him." And so "He is the way to the Father, and as He is the appointed of the Father, so He is the Judge as well." He has thus a claim to human worship. Yet it is "a mistake to put Christology first." "A man can think and teach rightly about Christ only and in so far as he has already begun to live according to Christ's Gospel. . . . It is only the religion which a man has himself experienced that is to be confessed; every other creed or confession is in Jesus' view hypocritical and fatal."[3]

---

[1] "What is Christianity?" Lect. IV. [2] *Ibid.*, Lect. VI.
[3] *Ibid.*, Lect. VIII.

Passing to the Apostolic times, Harnack finds proof that the primitive Christian community was convinced of the Resurrection and the Ascension, and that "within two generations from His death Jesus Christ was already put upon the highest plane upon which men can put Him. It was the ideas of His death for our sins and His resurrection which explain this. . . . It is not our business to defend either the view that was taken of His death or the idea that He had risen again." But the abolition of sacrifices wherever Christianity came vindicates that view of the Atonement taken in Heb. x. "Wherever Christians have returned to sacrifices, it has been a relapse. . . . The earliest Christians knew that the whole sacrificial system was thenceforth abolished, and if they were asked for a reason they pointed to Christ's death." The rationale of the Atonement lies in the human consciousness. "Wherever any great deed has been done in history, the finer a man's moral feelings are, the more sensible will he be of vicarious suffering. Did Luther in the monastery strive only for himself? . . . Everywhere that the just man suffers an atonement is made, which puts us to shame and purifies us."[1]

In the matter of the Resurrection we may distinguish between the Easter Message and the Easter Faith. "Did Paul know of the message about the empty grave? . . . I think it probable, but we cannot be certain about it. What he and the disciples regarded as all-important was, not the state in which the grave was found, but Christ's appearances. But who can maintain that a clear account of these appearances can be constructed?" We must abandon the miraculous appeal to the senses. Whatever happened, "*this grave was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal.*"[2]

Passing on to later Christian history, Harnack finds that in the primitive society "every individual was conscious that he was placed in a living and entirely personal relation to God." But in the second century Christianity took new shape. "Faith was transformed into a Creed, devotion to Christ into Christology; the ardent hope for the coming of the kingdom into a doctrine of immortality and deification; prophecy into technical exegesis and theological learning; the ministers of the Spirit into clerics, the brethren into laymen in a state of tutelage: miracles . . . disappear altogether, or else are priestly devices."[3] This was done within 120 years, partly through the ebb of spiritual impulse, partly through the infusion of Hellenism, "which is the greatest fact in the

[1] "What is Christianity?" Lect. IX. [2] *Ibid.*, Lect. IX.
[3] *Ibid.*, Lect. XI.

history of the Church of the second century." Intellectualism became a substitute for religious emotion. Mythological elements were incorporated, and "at last, in the worship of the saints, we see a regular Christian religion of a lower order arising." As developed in the East, "it would have done battle with the Christians of the first century, just as it did battle with the worship of Magna Mater and Zeus Soter"[1] The spiritual life was lost in traditionalism, and immense importance was attached to ritualism and profession of orthodoxy. As developed in the West, this Christianity took further colour from Roman juridical conceptions. Here Rome of necessity became the centre of Christian unity, for all that the barbarians left of Roman civilization and Roman spirit took refuge in the Roman Church. The Bishop of Rome thus "necessarily became the guardian of the past and the shield of the future," and the Roman Church the "continuation of the Roman world empire." From the initial propositions, "the Roman Church is the kingdom of God," and "the Church must govern like an earthly State," the most exorbitant demands along with degradation of the moral standard are a natural sequence. Logically, too, this line of development led up to Papal absolution and infallibility, "for in an earthly theocracy infallibility means at bottom nothing more than full sovereignty means in an earthly State." "La tradition c'est moi," said Pio Nono. The one foil to this deteriorating influence was Augustine. "That this Church became at one and the same time Cæsarian and Augustinian is the most important and marvellous fact in its history." For Augustine really resuscitated the Pauline experience of sin and grace, and to this day inward and religious fervour in the Roman Catholic Church and the expression they take are Augustinian."[2]

Naturally, this presentation of Christianity does not commend itself to the Roman Catholic professor, agreeing though he does with Harnack in disclaiming the historical presentation by Christ of His own Divinity. I endeavour now to present Loisy's reply, and the theological position taken in "L'Évangile et l'Église" and "Autour d'un Petit Livre."

Résumé of Loisy's Synthesis.

Of Harnack Loisy complains that "Il a mis l'essence du christianisme dans un sentiment." It is not true that the traditional Jewish expectation of an objective Messianic kingdom is only the husk of Christianity, and that "ce qui

[1] "What is Christianity?" Lect. XII. [2] *Ibid.*, Lect. XIV.

est personnel est le noyau."[1] Contrariwise, the "kingdom of God" familiar to us in the Synoptic record is the Church, as a delimited society fulfilling these ancient expectations. It cannot be proved by "authentic texts"[2] that the "kingdom" is a subjective realization of forgiveness and sonship. The Messianic character was not, as Harnack supposes, assumed by Jesus "comme une sorte de costume ou de déguisement dont il a besoin pour traiter avec les Juifs."[3] The claim to be the Messiah is the explanation of His calling Himself "Son of God," and it explains His whole career, and actually led to His condemnation at Jerusalem. But we must note that "la rôle du Messie est essentiellement eschatologique." "Le ministère de Jésus n'était que préliminaire au royaume de cieux et au rôle propre du Messie." Hence it is that John Baptist asks, not directly "Art thou the Christ?" but rather if Jesus is going to be the Christ. The history of the Church explains this, for she "taught that Jesus became Lord and Christ by virtue of His resurrection," and her expectation in the early age was one of Christ's "coming" (not His "return") as the Messiah.[4]

The Church, realizing its claim to embody the promises of this future "kingdom of God," and convinced by the Resurrection appearances, passed on from proclaiming Jesus as the Messiah to declaring His actual Divinity. This doctrine would be a part of the original teaching of Jesus, "if the Fourth Gospel was a direct echo of the Saviour's preaching," and if the Synoptic texts Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22 were not "a product of tradition."[5] It is useless to question whether Jesus, in the course of His human life, "avait conscience d'être le Verbe Éternel." But after all these deductions, "Il ne suit pas qu'il n'ait point été Dieu."[6]

As to the abolition of sacrifices, this cannot be pressed, since for Jews Jerusalem was the only scene of material sacrifices, and after its fall they became necessarily impossible.[7] But the conception of Christ's expiation is really only a Pauline development. It was not part of the primitive faith or of the teaching of Jesus, for "le passage de Marc [chap. x. 45] où on lit que 'le Christ est venu donner sa vie en rançon pour beaucoup' a toute chance d'avoir été influencé par la théologie de Paul, et l'on peut en dire autant des récits de la dernière scène."[8]

As to the historical evidences of Christ's Resurrection,

---

[1] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 46.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 54.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 83.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 87-89.
[5] "Autour," etc., p. 130.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 147.
[7] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 114.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

Loisy appears to take the same critical views as his opponent. "Que 'le message de Pâques' et 'la foi de Pâques' soient choses distinctes on doit l'accorder à M. Harnack." The one is the "form," the other the "substance," of the Christian faith. He goes on, however, to argue that "on ne doit pas opposer la foi comme un absolu au message qui serait relatif. . . . L'entré d'un mort dans la vie immortelle se dérobe à l'observation. Le tombeau vide n'est qu'un argument indirect."[1] The historian finds it incontestable that the faith of the Apostles did rest on a series of apparitions of the Risen Jesus, and if the Gospel story presents difficulties and divergencies in regard to the character of these apparitions, he remembers "que les apôtres, même Saint Paul, n'ont pas eu l'idée d'une immortalité distincte de la résurrection corporelle." The witness of the Gospels thus only furnishes a limited probability, which perhaps does not seem proportionate to the extraordinary importance of the object attested. "Mais n'est il pas inévitable que toute preuve naturelle d'un fait surnaturel soit incomplète et défaillante ?"[2]

The direct divergence from Harnack on the subject of "Le royaume des cieux" leads on to the chapter entitled "L'Église," pp. 127-170. Loisy here complains that Harnack makes Christianity "a spirit without a body," and the Church the outcome of the sectarian controversies of the first two centuries.[3] Rome's power of absorbing and transmuting the elements of the Gospel is really not a fault, but a merit. Though the charge has been long repeated, one cannot see how "la société du Christ était quelque chose de plus invisible et de plus intérieur que l'Église romaine."[4] From the first there was organization—first the twelve, then one selected to be the first "par une sorte de désignation du Maître." There was no occasion for "chartes constitutionelles, des inaugurations pompeuses," but organization is evinced in the Apostolic powers, "d'agréger les convertis . . . d'exclure les indignes et de maintenir le bon ordre."[5] It matters little that this primitive Church, "n'eût pas encore conscience de former une société distincte du judaisme." The Christian communities spread among the Gentiles, and gradually became a Church separate from the Synagogue. "The Apostles and first

[1] I fail here to see any difference between the positions of the two professors, save this: that the one openly disowns belief in the story of the empty tomb, and that the other thinks it advisable to disguise his unbelief in dialectic. Perhaps I am doing M. Loisy injustice, but he seems as little to recognise any *objective* reality in "la série des apparitions" as Harnack himself.

[2] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," pp. 117-122.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 128-130.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 134-136.

missionaries" instituted "collèges d'anciens ou de surveillants" for its government. In due time came the pre-eminence of the Bishop, "dans le groupe des anciens," and "celle de l'évêque de Rome entre les évêques." Just as in other organisms, it is crises and perils in the Church that create the new development of organs, and this form of development is a proof, not of decay, but of vigorous life. For it was the rise of Gnostic heresies that necessitated and established a monarchical episcopacy. "Ne s'ensuit-il pas que l'Église est aussi nécessaire à l'Évangile, que l'Évangile est nécessaire à l'Église?"[1] As the episcopal idea gained strength, so did that of the preponderance of the Roman Church. But the cause was not alone the central and imperial position of Rome. Each Church had a sense of the general unity, and "il y fallait un centre qui supportât en quelque sorte l'effort de la tendance universelle et garantît le concert des Églises en le rendant visible et régulier."[2] In the Epistle of Clement we may see how Rome dictated to other Churches, and it matters not that in this Epistle it is the Church, not the Bishop, that speaks, and that episcopal autocracy was really established later in the West than in the East. This distinction is merely an accessory; the sentiment of authority is the same in Clement, speaking in the name of the Church, as in Victor Callistus and Stephen, speaking in their own names, "et comme tenant la place d'apôtre Pierre."[3] Even in the days of Peter and Paul the central position of Roman Christianity must have been established, and "on peut penser que lorsqu'ils moururent ils ne se doutaient pas qu'ils eussent légué un maître à César, ni même qu'ils eussent . . . donné un chef suprême a l'Église." Their deaths at Rome consecrated what their presence there signified. They had made Rome "le chef-lieu de l'Évangile."[4] No wonder this idea never perished in the West. Even in the East, where Christianity was not due to Roman missionaries, there were signs that "l'Église d'Orient . . . serait entrée de plus en plus dans l'orbite de l'Église apostolique,' had not her ecclesiastical government become entangled in political ideas, and her Christianity become "une religion d'État." The loss of Rome to the Empire led men here to the mistake that "l'évêque de Rome n'a plus rien à dire en ce qui les touche, et que celui de Constantinople la nouvelle Rome a sur l'Orient les mêmes droits et les mêmes pouvoirs."[5]

The development of Papal autocracy in the West is briefly

[1] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," pp. 137-139. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 141.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 142, 143. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 144, 145. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

passed over. It was not only a result of the transfer of the old imperial power to the Roman Church: it was the effect of that original movement compelling the Christians to organize "qui s'était fait sentir en Orient aussi bien qu'en Occident." The Popes of the fourth and fifth centuries "veulent être les juges en dernier ressort de toute la chrétienté," just as in the preceding centuries the Roman Church posed as a type to all other Churches for teaching, organization, and discipline. A merely ideal centre, such as Cyprian conceived of, "would have been useless." Somewhere there must be a deciding voice in controversies. Local councils would not have sufficient prestige to decide them. General councils could only be an extraordinary expedient, and experience showed it was one attended with grave inconveniences. The final tribunal "ne pouvait être que dans l'Église apostolique entre toutes, qui avait la tradition de Pierre et de Paul, et dont les chefs n'hésitaient plus à se dire successeurs du prince des apôtres." From the end of the eighth century this Church openly acts as the depository of the imperial tradition, "and transfers to Charlemagne and his successors the titles of the Cæsars." At the end of the eleventh all authority belongs to the Popes; not only over Churches, but over peoples. "Le pape s'est fait éducateur social, tuteur des monarchies, chef de la confédération chrétienne, en même temps qu'il reste et devient de plus en plus le chef de la hierarchie ecclésiastique, l'arbitre de la foi." National individuality was scarcely yet sketched out, and if local Churches had kept their autonomy one would have had "la submersion complète du christianisme dans la superstition et la féodalité germaniques."[1]

In his survey of the succeeding period, Loisy ignores the real moral degradation of the Papacy. He tells us that at the close of the fourteenth century there was no longer a Christian Republic, but a collection of autonomous Christian States, and that the Papal authority was exerted with increasing difficulty, for "l'Église, riche et puissante dans chaque État, est minée par une croissante corruption" and "la papauté du XV^e^ et du XVI^e^ siècle a été beaucoup trop préoccupée de ses intérêts particuliers, et pas assez de la réforme toujours plus urgente."[2] Yet one sees that "le pouvoir spirituel du pape est allé toujours augmentant," and that this was necessary to assure the conservation of religion in the midst of the revolutions of the modern age. The Pope remains the father of the faithful and the chief of the Churches. One can foresee that "ce pouvoir ne s'exercera plus jamais dans les formes où elle s'exerçait au moyen âge. Mais ce pouvoir importe toujours à

[1] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," pp. 148-152. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

la conservation de l'Église et à la conservation de l'Évangile dans l'Église."[1]

Finally, Harnack's disparagement of the development of dogma is answered in the chapter "Le dogme Chrétien." Even Luther found a retention of dogma necessary, and Loisy defends the Pauline theory of salvation and the Logos doctrine as necessary adaptations of Christianity to the thought of primitive Christian times. He traces out the subsequent course of Trinitarian and Christological definition, and regards the evolution as "un grand effort de foi et de l'intelligence,"[2] albeit an "introduction de la philosophie grecque dans le christianisme et un compromis entre cette philosophie et la tradition chrétienne." A further vindication of this dogmatic development and of the later work of the Schoolmen is attempted in two letters in "Autour," etc., entitled "sur l'origine et l'autorité des dogmes" and "sur l'institution des sacrements."[3] But this work is written in self-defence, and the second letter is mainly an attempt to reconcile his own views with the dogmatic statements of the Council of Trent. As far as his controversy with Harnack is concerned, the root of the matter is tapped when Loisy tells us in "l'Évangile et l'Église" that in Rome and in the Latin countries religion is willingly conceived of "comme une discipline et un devoir de la société," but that "pour les races germaniques elle est un principe de vie intérieure, le poème de l'âme."[4] The main point henceforth at issue between Catholicism and Protestantism is this: "L'Évangile de Jésus est il, en principe, individualiste on collectiviste?"[5] Protestantism leads to endless disintegration. Catholicism can accept the development of dogma as consistent with a continuous ecclesiastical life. The divergence from primitive Christianity is to it no stumbling-block: "quand on veut s'assurer de l'identité d'un individu on ne songe pas à le faire rentrer dans son berceau."[6] Nor is it a difficulty that the texts it has hitherto cited do not really support its inferences. For to the objection that if the familiar texts Matt. xvi. 19, John xxi. 16, 17, are given up, and Rome's claims regarded merely as the product of an early stage of ecclesiastical evolution, "on ne pourra plus rien prouver par l'Écriture," Loisy answers, "les déterminations particulières du principe d'autorité dans l'Église ne reposent pas sur une interprétation purement littérale et logique des textes." "Le

[1] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 154.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 181.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 184.
[4] "Autour," etc., pp. 186-219, 220-259.
[5] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 192.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 200, 201.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 160.

principe est absolu, l'application est relative." It is not on texts henceforth that the controversy will be conducted, but "sur l'ensemble du fait évangélique et du fait chrétien."[1]

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

ART. II.—THE BOOK OF GENESIS (*continued*).

IF the view which I have submitted as to the so-called system of chronology of the pre-Abrahamic times commend itself to the reader, or has any verisimilitude, the question of the antiquity of man will be one upon which the Bible will give us no information. It leaves us quite at liberty to accept whatever definite results the researches of science in this direction may establish. The scientific student can enter upon his investigations in a perfectly independent spirit, and with no idea that any conclusions he may arrive at will be counted as evidence either for or against the Bible narrative. In the same way, an indefinite or illimitable time is left for the development, so far as is necessary, of different languages and racial distinctions.

But a word of caution is also necessary, especially because those who accept the doctrine of evolution—I am not concerned for the moment with its truth or not—are only ready to accept it so far as it coincides with their own views. For if evolution and development mean anything, it is that by slow degrees stage after stage of development has led to higher and higher forms of life. If you are an evolutionist, you must believe that at some stage or other from the *anthropoid* mammal was physically evolved the mammal we call *anthropos;* if you do not believe that, you are no evolutionist, and have to allow that there is a gap in your system of evolution. At the same time you are confronted by the fact that, in every known case, the mental powers and spiritual gifts of the *anthropos* are in varying degrees, yet still always capable of being distinguished from (though it is not always possible to define accurately in human language the difference) the highest form of animal intelligence. You ask the man of science, When did this difference arise? He cannot tell you. He may be able to tell you of certain implements of a rude kind found hard by the skeletons in the drift gravel of the Pleistocene period, when remains of man first appear; but the skeletons themselves reveal but little as to the stage of mental, and nothing as to that of moral, development which the

[1] "Autour," etc., pp. 173-176.

animal man had reached. Besides, no other animal possesses the gift of language in the sense in which man does. Where did these gifts come from? and how did they arise? Science cannot tell us, and the remains discovered can give no information.

Now, to one who looks at things of that sort *ab extra* it seems that, if you take the principle of evolution as a working hypothesis to explain how this world of ours is ordered, you are only at the beginning of your difficulties. I am speaking now as one taking cognizance of such matters from outside. For instance, let it be granted that *anthropos* is evolved from *anthropoid*. This does not involve necessarily all the *anthropoids* of the same species; there are some left behind. It is only the fittest *anthropoid* that becomes the *anthropos*. Some of the *anthropoids* survive and perpetuate their species. How long is this to go on? and is it possible that, after all, there may be an inferior race which looks like *anthropos*, but is really *anthropoid?* Do we not find, for instance, in more districts than one in Africa, mammals that we class as *anthropos*, but that, if we had a free hand, we should class with the *anthropoids?* And, if this or anything like it be so, is there not suggested by it something like an answer to the *vexata quæstio* of the union between "the sons of God" and "the daughters of men"? May it not be possible that union was possible between an *anthropos* and an *anthropoid* of this left-behind race, and, also, may it not be possible that, in certain cases, the influence of the *anthropos* would be sufficient to make the resultant progeny rather of the *anthropos* type than of the *anthropoid?* In this way, might not only the fact that, if, as with most scientists, the universality of the Flood is not accepted, we meet with what we should call degraded races still surviving in the world, be accounted for, but also the fact that, when the *anthropos* meets in struggle for survival with such races, such inferior race, as in Australia and North America, dies out? In this way, too, or in some way like it, the old question asked by the scoffer, as to who Cain's wife was, may find its answer. I only throw these statements out as suggestions, in order to show how, in many ways, we are merely at present at the threshold of a great question, which, with all its difficulties, we may perhaps meet again later on in our investigations.

In his introduction Dr. Driver discusses

THE PATRIARCHAL PERIOD.

We are anxious to quote here one sentence from that discussion:

"The supposition that the writer (or writers) of Genesis may have based his (or their) narratives upon written documents, contemporary with the events described, does not alter the case: there is no evidence, direct or indirect, that such documents were actually used as the basis of the narrative; and upon a *mere* hypothesis, for the truth of which no positive grounds can be alleged, and which therefore may or may not be true, it must be apparent that no further conclusions of any value can be built" (p. xliii).

I quote these words in full because, if I understand them aright, there seems to me to lie hid in them a great fallacy. (1) To begin with, there is no evidence outside the Book of Genesis itself of documents having existed either contemporary or non-contemporary; (2) there is no evidence of such documents having been actually used; (3) there is certainly no direct evidence, at any rate as to Genesis, of their being non-contemporary, as the "Higher Critics" contend; and (4) the whole position of the "Higher Critic" is based upon a *mere* hypothesis, which may or may not be true, and it must be apparent that upon it no further conclusion of any value can be built. Certainly there are no conclusions sufficiently sure to "seriously diminish the confidence which we might otherwise feel as regards the historical character of the patriarchal narratives" (p. xliii).

Whilst we are at length left in rather a nebulous state as to the historic personality of the patriarchs, we are given enough statements to make us cling to a belief in them as real persons. The tenacity of memory amongst an unliterary people; the agreement on the whole of the two independent narratives J and E; the sobriety of these narratives; the great moderation in the claims made on behalf of the patriarchs; the fact that, though promised the land, they never take possession of it; the fact also that Moses, the great lawgiver, is not made the starting-point of the "Israelitish tradition"—all these will suffice, surely, to satisfy the mind of an ordinary reader of such an unsophisticated narrative (to say nothing of the accuracy of the topography and of the descriptions of Eastern life, which Dr. Driver says must not be taken for evidence) of its historicity.

The next point about which something must be said is

Tribes represented as Individuals.

On this point Dr. Driver writes with much more reserve and caution than some of the "Higher Critics." The absurdities, for they can be called no less, to which some have been led in this regard can be best estimated when we say that one critic has pronounced Rachel and Leah (the wives of Jacob, according to the narrative as it has come down to

us) to be "a distinction without a difference," and both names to be "corrupt fragments of Jerahmeel" ("Encyc. Bibl.," 4004).

But even the more moderate statements must be carefully examined. Thus, Dr. Driver says: "Bethuel is mentioned as an individual . . . but his brothers Uz and Buz are tribes" (p. liv). But they are not said to be tribes in xxii. 21, but stand on exactly the same level as Bethuel. It is true that the names became the names of tribes and countries, but it does not necessarily follow that the tribe had not an eponymous founder; we certainly have no right to deny the existence of such persons. The Arabian tribes of the desert still look back to eponymous founders, just as, I suppose, the Scotch clans, which still remain so clannish, do. This will apply equally well to Dr. Driver's next assertion: "Keturah . . . is spoken of as Abraham's second wife (xxv.); but her sons and grandsons are tribes (xxv. 2-4)," p. liv). This, again, is not said, though it is implied by what is said (xxv. 6), that they were the founders of tribes. Again, in referring to Gen. x. (p. liv), he does not tell the English reader, what he does, indeed, tell him elsewhere (p. 112), but what ought to be repeated here, that the names can be classified as personal names, local names, and tribal names with either a plural or gentile termination. These differences must surely have had some meaning to the original compiler of the list, or, at any rate, in the sources from which he derived his list, whether they were oral or written. It is clear that in later times the children of an eponymous ancestor were called either "the children of the person," or, for shortness' sake, by his name. Thus, in Num. xxxii. 39, 40 (JE), we have the same people called "the children of Machir" (ver. 39) and "Machir" (ver. 40). In Num. xxvi. 29, the next passage quoted, it is said "Machir . . . begets (the country) Gilead" (p. liv), but the insertion of the words "the country" is quite arbitrary. The passage about Jephthah is more difficult (see Judg. xi. 2), but I incline to think that the passage is much plainer if we read אִישׁ גִּלְעָד instead of גִּלְעָד in the latter part of ver. 1, and translate "and a Gileadite begat Jephthah. And a woman of Gilead bare him sons." The same may be said, generally speaking, of the rest of the instances quoted (p. liv); and in treating some of them there is a lack of appreciation of the poetical surroundings in which they occur. The use of the same word for a country and its people is not limited to the Semitic languages. We say, for instance, England was victorious, meaning "the English people."

At this point I think we may stop to notice how the spirit of quite a different form of interpretation recurs in these

lucubrations of modern writers, who do away with the personality of the patriarchs, and look upon the account of them as a parabolical account of the history of tribes. Time was when people thought less of the actual history of the patriarchs and their real place in the affairs of their times, and more of them as types of the coming Messiah. They pressed their typical interpretation so far that even, for instance, the number of Abraham's "trained men" (Gen. xiv. 14) was held to be capable of a mystical interpretation. The result of this was that any typology in the Old Testament was discredited. Now, I should be the last person to say that there are no types to be found in the Old Testament. No doubt the persons who took part in the actions and the authors who originally described them were absolutely unconscious that they were types, but, when one action after another can be brought into line as contributing to a series of what we call types, I think we may reasonably conclude that men in the later generations of the world were intended under the Divine guidance to see that all those actions had a meaning beyond what they had to their own time, which was to meet with its full verification in later times. But the consequence of all this was that men failed to look upon the patriarchs as men of like passions with themselves moving across the field of history. Now again we are bidden to disbelieve, or, at any rate, in a great measure to ignore, their personal character, and to see in them simply puppets set up to typify various tribes and their histories.

In both cases an unequally balanced method of reasoning is at work. Eponymous ancestors, names of tribes, possible types, can all exist in the same narrative, and no one of these need necessarily oust the others.

We now reach the final section of Dr. Driver's introduction. Its subject is—

THE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS,

and he includes under this head Inspiration and the Scope of Inspiration. In spite of himself, we might almost say, he is constrained to admit that the Book of Genesis is unique. It "is a marvellous gallery of portraits, from whatever originals they may have been derived. There is no other nation which can show for its early history anything in the least degree resembling it" (p. lxix). If this be so, then there is at least ground for wondering, after all, whether this uniqueness may not extend in other directions as well, and include the historicity of the information, short, simple, and unembellished as it is, as to the earliest times which the book professes to give us. It is scarcely necessary in these days to set up the

doctrine of verbal inspiration in the form in which it was asserted in earlier times in order to refute it. That is to prejudice the whole discussion.

But the idea, to most Christians, of the religious value of Genesis extends far wider than critical views will carry us. They see, it is true, the Providential guidance towards the foundation of a people to perpetuate, however imperfectly the individual may have contributed his part, true religion in the world. But they see more than this: they see the Divine purpose to regenerate the human race, and to restore its innocence, by and through an actual person, expressed more and more clearly even in those early ages (*e.g.*, *cf.* iii. 14 with xlix. 10). They, at any rate, can also see, not from one instance, but from many, how the Almighty was indicating by His providential guidance of the world's history, under types and figures, His purposes to be carried out in future ages for the redemption of mankind. If they can see all this, and the vast majority of Christians think they can do this—and spiritual insight (thank God for it) is often to be found where critical insight is lacking—then it will be a long time before they will accept the awfully dangerous doctrine which is presented to them to-day, that in an admittedly inspired book you may have set before you religious truth and scientific and historical error. The science and the history of this book are not the science and history of the twentieth century; at the same time, we feel quite sure—and the opinion is a growing one—they are not opposed to it. The book is not in its intent and in its contents a scientific or a historical manual; its purpose is a much higher one, and that purpose it will be found more and more to fulfil, without in the least traversing any *absolute* truth which science or history may finally arrive at. A divinely-inspired book could, we feel sure, never do that.

I have thus far dealt only with the introductory matter, as it presents to us the so-called results of modern criticism. But before discussing other matters—as I intend to do, if the editor will permit me—it seems to me that one point should be mentioned here.

Behind all these questions there looms a much weightier matter, which is for the most part left out of sight altogether. The religion of the inhabitants of the earliest ages of the world—was it arrived at by a process of evolution, say through fetichism or animism, or whence did it come? If it came by evolution, and the popular forms of polytheistic religion in Egypt, Babylonia, and Greece were evolved from such baser forms, how do you account for the fact that there seem to have existed side by side with them purer esoteric

forms of faith as far removed from the popular forms as the religion of a cultured, intellectual Roman Catholic Englishman is from that of an Irish or Spanish peasant or a South American? Will not analogy rather teach us that the same causes have been at work, and that the popular religion is a *corruptio optimi*, as even the esoteric form may be in a less degree?

Or, again, if religious belief is developed by an evolutionary process, how comes it that the first man, according to the Biblical records, is in close communion and intercourse—it may, indeed, be childlike intercourse, but it is none the less intercourse—with a God, to connect whom with totemism, fetichism, or animism, would be arrant blasphemy? And if we do not allow the revelation of God by Himself to man at the beginning—and I do not see how we can do this if we apply the principles of evolution to religion—then it seems to me that we are perilously near to, even if we do not actually arrive at, attributing religious untruthfulness as well as scientific untruthfulness to the Book of Genesis. Here is the *vera crux* for which, as it seems to me, there is only one solution.

HENRY A. REDPATH.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. III.—THE "PILGRIM'S PROGRESS" AS A MANUAL OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

IS a knowledge of the "Pilgrim's Progress" ever required from candidates for Holy Orders? Yet where, in the same compass, shall we find more shrewd, yet highly spiritual, teaching? where shall we meet with more thoroughly practical, yet more entirely Scriptural, advice and exhortation upon that life which should be, *par excellence*, the life of the Christian pastor? What, I believe, makes the book so extremely valuable as a manual for the pastoral life is its remarkable combination of such very different qualities, each of which is found exhibited in it to a very high degree. And when we remember that it is now more than 200 years since the book was written, it is truly wonderful how very little of it can be pronounced as antiquated, or can be regarded as out of date. The whole allegory may be taken as a signal proof of the identity of (1) the teaching of the Gospel, (2) absolute truth, and (3) the most complete or perfect wisdom—in other words, the highest and deepest common-sense. Where else, for instance, shall we find such a combination of

intense moral earnestness and of such a "saving" sense of humour? Bunyan most certainly did not regard the "serious" life as the "sad" life. The way in which Christian saw, and was taught to see, the incongruities of life is in itself a most valuable lesson, and one not a little needed in the clerical profession at the present time.

May I suggest the following idea for a reading of the allegory? We may regard Christian as the typical Christian pilgrim on his journey through life. Now, the Christian minister is often called the "parson"—surely the typical *person*, who must be a model and example of what the Christian *persona* should be; thus it is no far-fetched idea to regard Christian as a type of the *persona Christiana*—the Christian pastor.

As an example of the kind of study of the book to which I would point, let me draw attention to a few passages from the earlier pages of the first part of the allegory which seem to contain some very valuable lessons for the clergyman's life.

1. I would notice Christian's devotion to his "Book." "He was, as he was wont, reading in his Book." It is to the study of this Book that his conversion and his call are attributed. His Book, or the Roll, is his constant companion on his journey. By even the temporary loss of his Roll he suffers evil on the way. In connection with this trait I would remind my readers that the best and greatest books are those into which their authors have put their "best selves." Is not this true of sermons? And where in a like compass shall we find a fuller knowledge and a more practical application of Holy Scripture than in the "Pilgrim's Progress"? When Bunyan writes of Christian's "devotion to his Book" he is surely writing of himself. But what of this "devotion" in the pastor's life generally to-day? Is there not more than a danger that amid its ceaseless activities, its carefulness about many things, this paramount necessity—of feeding the soul with the food of highest wisdom—may be neglected? Is not this want of persistent study of Holy Scripture, at least to some extent, evident in much of the preaching of the day? May not the reaction against the sermons which were "mere strings of texts," have gone too far?

2. Very early in his journey Christian has to cross the Slough of Despond. About this experience some extremely interesting particulars are given—*e.g.*, (*a*) it cannot be mended; (*b*) millions of good instructions have been applied to it; (*c*) by the direction of the Lawgiver there are certain good and substantial steps, but that in "change of weather" these steps are hardly seen. In his dealing with this Slough of Despond we have a striking example of Bunyan's know-

ledge of human nature, as of the particular trials and temptations of those who seek the higher life either for themselves or their fellows. We gather that to these a measure of "despondency," so well described as "fears, doubts, and discouraging apprehensions," is an all too common experience; but it is not a universal experience, for students of the "Pilgrim's Progress" will remember that *Faithful* does not pass through the Slough. He is contemporaneously tried by Wanton—"that had liked to have done him an injury." Probably Wanton left Christian alone from seeing that her blandishments would be wholly lost upon him. Here are surely two lessons for the pastor, for the man who would usefully deal with souls, who would successfully practise that hardest of arts, the *regimen animarum*. First, he must not assume that another's experience of temptation can be always measured by his own, either in variety or intensity. Second, with regard to this particular trial of despondency, that there are certain Divine rules given for safely passing through this experience, but that under certain "atmospheric conditions" (the description is widely applicable) these rules are apt to be lost sight of and forgotten.

3. One of the earliest acquaintances Christian makes upon his journey is Mr. Worldly Wiseman, who notices his "laborious going," draws attention to his "burdened manner," and advises him "with all speed to get rid of his burden." But how? Evangelist has pointed out a certain way in which this may be effected. Mr. Worldly Wiseman advises quite other means. Here we meet with one of the strongest and clearest features of Bunyan's great work. Throughout the "Pilgrim's Progress" we have an intense conviction, a vivid realization, of the sense of sin, and of the evils in the world which sin, and nothing else than sin, produces. Christian is flying from sin and sin's great effect, destruction; his pilgrimage is one lifelong warfare with the various forms and phenomena of sin. The Gospel is the only remedy for sin; the Cross the only means of deliverance. The want of, or at least the diminution in, this sense of sin is said to be a feature of the present age. Has this heresy affected the clergy? Are we tempted to trust in various substitutes for the Gospel and its methods? Are some of us inclined to dwell in Morality with Worldly Wiseman, and with Legality and Civility—in other words, in the "growth of civilization," in "social improvements," in "Acts of Parliament," in the "civilizing influences" of recreation-rooms, clubs, innocent pleasures, and a more generally diffused education?

4. Two of the richest "seasons of refreshing" which Christian meets with on his journey are those when he is received

by Goodwill at the Wicket-gate and when he is entertained in the Interpreter's House. In the first case Bunyan describes how Christian "knocked more than once or twice. . . . At last there came a grave person to the gate . . . who asked . . . whence he came and what he would have." In the second case "he knocked over and over; at last one came to the door. . . . The Master of the house after a little time came to Christian and asked him what he would have." By these descriptions Bunyan would surely teach us that the greatest opportunities for instruction are only obtained after persistent effort, and after we have made ourselves thoroughly clear as to the nature of our own special needs.

We must notice that by Goodwill, as also by the Virgins in the House Beautiful, Christian is very closely catechized upon the various experiences of his journey. No doubt a very important lesson is indicated here, and one which we are too often slow to learn—the value of recalling and of pondering over the meaning of past experiences (one of the great lessons of the Book of Proverbs). Most clergymen, in a fashion, "learn from experience," but how seldom, I fear, are we careful to meditate upon our experiences—whether these be personal, or in dealing with others—and to record them either mentally or in writing, as a guide or as a warning with regard to future needs or temptations.

5. The various sights which Christian was shown and the various lessons he received in the Interpreter's House are among the richest teachings of the allegory. First and foremost is the exquisite description of "a Picture of a very grave Person," which "in a private room" Christian "did see hang up against the wall." "It had eyes lifted up to Heaven, the best of Books in his hand, the Law of Truth was written upon his lips, the World was behind his back. It stood as if it pleaded with men, and a Crown of Gold did hang over his head." Has ever a more perfect description of the ideal of the pastor and of his hoped-for reward been penned? And let us not forget that this picture did "hang upon the wall in a *private* room"—surely in his heart, where he may ever keep it at once in sight and in mind. And Bunyan's interpretation of the picture is as perfect as his description of it: "The Man whose Picture this is is the only man [the only type or kind of man] whom the Lord of the place whither thou art going hath authorized to be thy [that is, the Christian's] guide in all difficult places thou mayest meet with in the way; wherefore take good heed to what I have showed thee, and bear well in thy mind what thou hast seen, lest in thy Journey thou meet with some that pretend to lead thee right, but their way goes down to death."

After seeing the picture, Christian, it will be remembered, is taken by Interpreter into other rooms, in which he is shown various common sights—the quarrelsome children, the damsel sweeping the dusty room, the fire burning against the wall which is invisibly fed, and each of these sights is interpreted to him. The question is here suggested, Do we sufficiently value and use parabolic teaching, the object-lessons which may be drawn from sights with which the plainest and least educated of our hearers are familiar? And do we sufficiently practise ourselves in the art of the higher and deeper interpretation of the ordinary experiences of life? Some of the greatest preachers have been masters of the art of illustration. Mr. Spurgeon used to lay great stress upon the need of "windows of agates," through which light comes upon subjects which otherwise may be, at least to some of our hearers, dry and uninteresting. One action, if apparently an unimportant one, of Interpreter must not be forgotten. Before he takes Christian round his house he has a candle lighted. The man who is called to the office of interpretation constantly needs to have his *own* candle relighted. Without other than merely "natural" light the office of interpretation cannot be satisfactorily performed.

6. As an example of the compressed nature of much of Bunyan's teaching, and of his power to cram a wealth of meaning and suggestion into a single paragraph, take the following: "Now I saw in my Dream that the highway up which Christian was to go was fenced on either side with a Wall, and that Wall is called Salvation. Up this way therefore did burdened Christian run, but not without great difficulty because of the load on his back." (We must remember that Christian has just left Interpreter's House.)

Notice, then, that as the immediate result of Interpreter's teaching—a fresh accession of spiritual and moral truth and insight—Christian's journey does not become easier, but he journeys more rapidly and more safely. The result of spiritual insight is to provide a wall on either side: knowledge tends to keep us in the right track by teaching us what to avoid. At the same time, knowledge does not necessarily abolish difficulties. By further revealing to us the complexity, the many-sidedness of life, it may actually increase them. And in itself knowledge has no power to release from the burden of sin.

7. Immediately after this paragraph comes Christian's arrival at the Cross, where he is released from his burden, which rolls and falls into the sepulchre. The telling of this incident may be noticed as an example of another feature of Bunyan's work—its great *reverence.* This reverence is marked and revealed by an extremely wise *reticence.* Bunyan's

writing may be quaint and homely, but it is never irreverent. The sources of this reverence are, I believe, first, Bunyan's intense conviction of the reality and importance of all with which he is dealing, and the tremendous issues involved in the lifelong conflict with sin; and, second, he never attempts to tell or to describe what he believes has not been revealed, or what he has not experienced in himself or witnessed in others.

8. Another very instructive passage in the early part of the allegory is that which describes Christian's experiences up the hill called "Difficulty," and which precedes his arrival at a "very stately Palace . . . the name whereof was Beautiful."

Here, again, as throughout the allegory, we shall profit in our study in proportion to our careful attention to detail. Notice, then, the *position* of the hill, which lies neither at the beginning nor near the end of life's journey. And has it not often been remarked that probably middle life is of all life's periods the hardest? The enthusiasms of youth are lost or spent; the calm of age, or the feeling of the absolute futility of the struggle with evil (the temper of mind—a terrible one—of the old cynic), have neither as yet been reached. And has it not been pointed out that the "sad period" of the twenty-third Psalm lies in the two middle verses? And perhaps in no profession is there a more severe "testing time" than that of early middle life to either the town or the country clergyman. The temptation to acquiesce in present conditions as inevitable then begins to fasten upon a man. He may cease to study, and that may imply that he is also ceasing to think. A few years earlier he may have believed he could rise above the "average," and do better work than some around him. Perhaps he has not obtained promotion; he has worked for some years in the same sphere, and the sense of the monotony of his task is growing. And there are other difficulties incident to this period of life. Then expenses, as his family require education, are apt to grow, while his income does not increase; it may even actually diminish. Bunyan was quite right in placing the Hill of Difficulty where we find it. But at the foot of the hill there is a spring—surely to suggest that our journey up the hill will, to some extent, depend upon our condition when we begin the ascent. It will go hardly with the man who during the closing years of youth has become careless in strengthening and refreshing his spiritual life. Then how true to experience the apparent threefold choice of ways of surmounting the hill, and the appropriateness of the naming of the wrong ways as Danger and Destruction! When faith grows cold and the flame of spiritual life burns low, then what have been termed "working substitutes" for these all too readily appear. The clergyman

or the Church is tempted to compete with the world in the world's methods; but that pathway is dangerous, and leads to destruction. And in these days of religious indifference on the one hand, and of religious competition on the other, this temptation lies very near.

9. "Now about the midway to the top of the Hill," we read, "was a pleasant Arbour, made by the Lord of the Hill for the refreshment of weary travellers," etc. I would commend to my readers a very careful study of this passage, for I think the whole question of relaxation or of recreation—experiences surely needed in the pastor's life—is very wisely treated here. When Christian arrived at the Arbour, "he pulled his Roll out of his bosom, and read therein to his comfort: he also now began afresh to take a review of the Coat or Garment that was given him as he stood by the Cross." Two uses of a period of relaxation seem to be indicated. It is an opportunity for study; it is an opportunity for the review of one's self and one's conduct. Bunyan, it will be remembered, proceeds to show how such a period may be misused. He tells how Christian, "pleasing himself awhile, fell into a slumber, and thence into a fast sleep"; the Roll, the very means of study, falls out of his hands and is temporarily lost. The experience here indicated is not an uncommon one at the present time.

The foregoing examples are all taken from less than a fifth of the first part of the allegory, and even in this small fraction I have passed over many more passages than I have cited, wherein are contained most valuable lessons for those whose calling is that of the Christian pastor. But those I have cited will, I believe, be amply sufficient to prove the assertion that there are few books which contain more sound and useful guidance for the minister of Christ than Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress."

W. Edward Chadwick.

Art. IV.—THE DEFEAT OF ADAM AND THE VICTORY OF CHRIST.

INSTEAD of allowing our minds to be perplexed by the speculative theories of some modern critics of the Bible, it will be wiser to dwell upon the great practical truths which it reveals. There are two which lie at the very root of our Christian religion—the defeat of Adam and the victory of Christ.

It matters not in the least whether the story of Paradise

Lost is a literal narrative or a Divine allegory like that of Paradise Regained, which we have in Rev. xii., where the devil is represented by the same symbol of a serpent. Whether it be an allegory or a literal narrative, it reveals the fact and suggests the nature of the fall of man.

Man was made in the image of God, and yet as regards his body he was of the same materials as the animals beneath him. This is implied in the words, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. ii. 7).

And so we see before us in Adam a creature with an animal nature, but with intellect and reason to guide him instead of mere instinct, and a God-like principle which should enable him to control and to direct to their right uses the functions of his lower nature.

How long he remained in a sinless state we are not told, nor how his character developed under the guidance of his heavenly Friend. Nor do we know how long he had Eve for his companion.

Previous to the great temptation the condition of our first parents in Paradise must have been one of supreme contentment and happiness; and yet their virtue was only of a very negative kind, due to the absence of temptation, and therefore to an entire ignorance of evil.

But they were intended for the higher state of positive virtue, the virtue of those who have resisted and overcome temptation, and so have become capable of the safe enjoyment of moral freedom, involving the complete subjection of their lower to their higher and God-like nature.

It is a sad and most humiliating fact, but a fact which is stamped upon the heart of every man and upon every page of the history of our race, that the fall of our first parents involved the almost entire loss of this control.

There are still periods, indeed, in the lives of many men and women when they seem, for a time at least, to regain something of this control over their lower nature. The love of man and woman, when it is pure and real, gives, at any rate in its earlier stages, a glimpse of what Paradise must have been before the fall, and reminds us of the caution which Milton represents the angel as giving to Adam:

> "In loving thou dost well, in passion not,
> Wherein true love consists not. Love refines
> The thoughts, and heart enlarges; hath his seat
> In reason, and is judicious; is the scale
> By which to heavenly love thou mayst ascend."
>
> *Paradise Lost*, viii. 588.

And doubtless there are many men and women who, in the

figurative language of our Lord, "have made themselves eunuchs and remained virgins for the kingdom of heaven's sake." There is, indeed, nothing which so helps to purify the thoughts, and to give a man something of the control over himself which Adam lost, as an enthusiastic love of Christ and active devotion to His service (Rev. xiv. 4).

That the result of the fall, however, was the loss of purity in all the children of Adam, with all which naturally follows that loss as regards other forms of temptation, is clear from the sacred narrative. It is not easy otherwise to understand why an outward act of disobedience should have resulted in such a consciousness of shame as led them to make themselves coverings for their bodies.

There is no sense of shame in the lower creatures, who simply follow their instincts, and in many respects set an example to man which he would be wise to follow. They "have no understanding," and so feel no shame. But the universal feeling of shame in man is the clearest proof that he is conscious of having lost nearly all control over his lower nature; that, created in the image of God, he has failed to maintain his noble status, and so is unable to rule himself and to guide and control his passions and appetites by the light of intellect and reason and the laws of His Creator.

Such, then, was the nature of the fall. It was a humiliating fall—a fall from a high estate to one in many respects lower than that of other creatures in the earth. It was a hopeless fall. There is only one gleam of hope in the sad story, that woman, in a measure the cause of the fall, should eventually give birth to Him who should destroy the power of their great enemy, their tempter, and their deceiver.

As regards the causes of the fall, nothing is more plainly revealed in Scripture than that it was the work of the Devil, "that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world" (Rev. xii., 9). Man did not fall from his high estate in consequence of any defect in his God-like nature, but as the result of deception from without. The Devil deceived the woman, working on her pride and sensuality, and the woman persuaded the man. As St. Paul writes: "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in child-bearing" (1 Tim. ii. 14).

This gives us some kind of answer to that most perplexing question, the origin of evil. The origin of evil in the universe is indeed an insoluble mystery; but as regards the human race in this world it is revealed with terrible clearness. "An enemy hath done this," said our Lord, to account for the tares in the wheat-field.

What would have been the condition of Adam's children if he had not fallen we are not told. The Bible does not tell us what might have happened, but what did happen, and so reveals very clearly the consequences of the fall.

A great deal is said in these days about heredity, and that immoral tendencies are imparted by the immoral to their children, and so there is no difficulty in believing that the moral weakness and immoral tendencies of the human race are inherited from our first parents. And this is what we usually call original sin, moral weakness, the almost entire loss of control over the thoughts and appetites and passions of our complex nature.

That God should have allowed the Devil to tempt our first parents may be an insoluble mystery, but that He did so is plainly revealed, and that as a result of his victory the Devil became "the god of this world." As such he has his worshippers, and the chief part of his worship, in all the false religions of the heathen world, consists in the practice of the most loathsome impurities and unnatural crimes, such as those described in the Epistle to the Romans.

Since our present state of moral weakness is the natural consequence of the sin of our parents, it may be regarded as our misfortune rather than our sin. And our natural state of helplessness is well expressed in the plaintive cry of the Psalmist, "in sin hath my mother conceived me" (Ps. li. 5).

That, however, which is at first our misfortune too early becomes our own personal sin, when we fail to guide our steps by the light which still remains with us, and the promptings of conscience, more or less clear in proportion to our surroundings (Rom. i. 18-20). But we are, as it were, the soldiers of a defeated and routed army, and most of us have given up the battle and become the slaves of the great enemy of God and man, by right of conquest the god of this world.

Such, then, was the condition of the whole human race before Christ came—a state of utter and hopeless corruption, a state of slavery to the great enemy of God and man. And such is still the condition of the human race where the power of the victorious Second Adam is unknown or unfelt.

There are, of course, many ways of looking at the work of Christ, and many theories about the meaning of the Atonement, and many attempts to explain the moral difficulties which most of them suggest.

But if we confine ourselves to the narrative of the New Testament and to the plain teaching of Christ, His chief work consisted in a life-long battle with the Devil and a final and complete victory over him on the cross.

The defeat of Adam involved an almost entire loss of

control over the passions and appetites of his complex nature. It was the work of Christ to regain for man this control, to maintain it in His own Person, and to impart a similar power to all believers. For this purpose the Son of God became incarnate. Taking a perfectly human body from the substance of a virgin mother, He became a man, to be tempted in all points like as we are, yet to resist successfully every temptation, mental or bodily, with which the Devil was allowed to try Him.

This great truth is beautifully expressed in the hymn "Praise to the Holiest in the height" ("Hymns Ancient and Modern," No. 172):

"O loving wisdom of our God!
When all was sin and shame,
A second Adam to the fight
And to the rescue came.

"O wisest love! that flesh and blood,
Which did in Adam fail,
Should strive afresh against the foe,
Should strive and should prevail."

It was the work of Christ to vanquish the Devil. It was a moral battle, a battle in which the Devil was allowed to tempt, to persuade, or to compel our Lord to do his will, and to become his slave like every other human being.

It has been often observed that the temptations of Christ must have been greater than those of any mere man. Temptation is not sin. The will must consent before sin begins. But in most men the will consents before the extreme force of the temptation has been reached. It must have been otherwise in Christ, and the consciousness of power to relieve Himself at any moment must have inconceivably aggravated the painfulness of temptation. This helps us to realize how the agony in the garden must have wrung from His lips that cry for deliverance, to be followed immediately by the act of complete resignation to the Father's will.

And now let us consider how plainly this aspect of the work of Christ is taught in the New Testament.

It is presented to us as a moral struggle, similar to that of Adam, but ending in complete victory instead of defeat.

We know nothing of the ordinary temptations of childhood and youth to which He must have been exposed like any other human being. And there cannot be a question that these temptations must have been successfully resisted, resulting in great strengthening of character and preparation for the final struggles.

These began in the wilderness, and resembled in their principles that of Adam, though inconceivably greater and

more testing, aggravated, too, by the consciousness of power to relieve Himself at any moment.

It is not easy to see why, after a forty days' fast, He should not have satisfied the pangs of hunger by a miracle. Could not He who fed thousands with a few loaves have commanded the stones to become bread? But to have done so would have been to surrender to the enemy whose power He came to destroy.

Our Lord's answers from the Book of Deuteronomy to the three temptations of the wilderness resulted in the discomfiture of the great enemy in his first open encounter with the Second Adam. The Devil, we read, departed from Him, but only for a season, and all which his malice and power could bring to bear upon Him was to continue to test Him in every part of His complex nature, until the work of redemption was finished on the cross.

The two last and fiercest battles were fought out in the garden and on Calvary, the latter ending in that loud shout of victory, "It is finished!" In anticipation of which we read in St. John xii. 31: "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

Such was the personal work of Christ as the Son of man, and He stands before us as the one only Man of spotless purity who ever existed on the earth, and had perfect command over that complex nature which He assumed for our sakes, in spite of all the varied temptations by which the Devil was allowed to test Him.

There are other great truths connected with the work of Christ, some of them very mysterious and difficult to understand; nor is it easy to trace the connection between the suffering and death of our Lord and the pardon of our sins. He is indeed the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and so His complete victory over Satan must have in some way made the free pardon of sin consistent with the justice as well as the mercy of the great Ruler of the Universe.

But as far as we are personally concerned, nothing can be more plainly revealed than the great truth that Jesus is our Champion, that He has conquered where we have failed, and that as members of His kingdom we are soldiers in His army, to continue His work, and to fight out to the bitter end His battle with the god of this world.

It was natural that at such a time the Devil should have been allowed to reveal himself more clearly as the enemy of God and man, and to take possession of the bodies and minds of men. He is always working secretly, and will continue to do so unto the end. And we know not how far he is still the

secret cause of much mental and bodily sickness as well as sin; but he has not been allowed to show himself openly since the victory of Christ and His saints, which resulted in his expulsion from heaven and the establishment of the kingdom of God in the world. This is figuratively described in the great vision of Paradise Regained: "Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death" (Rev. xii. 10, 11).

Does not the obvious meaning of this passage, though highly figurative, throw some light upon that other side of Christ's work, the removal of the guilt as well as of the power of sin? That the death of Christ has abolished the guilt of sin in all believers, and we may hope in millions who have never heard of Him, is plainly revealed in Scripture, and was symbolized by the sacrifices of the law of Moses. He is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." But we get into hopeless moral difficulties when we attempt to trace clearly the connection between the death of Christ and the pardon of sin. One aspect of this important truth is plainly suggested by the above-cited passage of the unsealing book. Christ not only overcame the Devil in His own Person, as the Son of man, the Second Adam, but He shut the mouth of the accuser.

Our salvation through Christ requires for its completion the reversal of the original sentence of death as the punishment of disobedience. The laws of God cannot be broken with impunity either in the natural or the spiritual world. And they have not been broken in the case of the human race, for "death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them which had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. v. 14).

From the universal law of heredity the whole human race has suffered the penalty of death. This is a universally admitted fact. The reversal of that sentence can only be effected by another kind of heredity. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." As by our natural birth we are children of Adam, so by a new and spiritual birth we must be made partakers of the nature of the Second Adam.

Holy Scripture represents Christ as in the truest sense a Second Adam, a representative Man, and One from whom all other men, on certain conditions, should experience in their own individual persons the effect of His work, of His complete

victory over the Devil. By nature we are born in sin. Our ninth Article defines original sin to be not an individual act of disobedience, which is impossible in the new-born child, but to be "the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam."

Our state of moral weakness, which is universal, is obviously due to heredity. The recovery of each individual must be the effect of another and higher kind of heredity. We must be made the children of the Second Adam. This is the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. "He came to His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood (as natural children of Adam), nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (St. John i. 11-13). And so our Saviour plainly states this great truth to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God . . . except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (St. John iii. 3-7).

When we realize the truly representative character of Christ, that He really is a new Head of the whole human race, we find it easier to understand how fully He paid the penalty of our sins in His own Person on the cross. As sinners we suffer in our own persons the punishment of sin. Though sinless, Christ literally suffered in His own sinless Person the same punishment as the race of sinners whom He came to deliver from the power of the Devil. In bringing about His death, the Devil seemed after all to have gained the victory, and such, certainly, would have been the case if Christ had remained dead. But as He died for our sins, so He rose again for our justification, conquering Satan by overcoming death. Having resisted every temptation, and suffered the extreme penalty of sin in the death of His body, He rose again from the dead, raising with Himself all believers from the death of sin to the new life of righteousness, and from literal death and the grave to the resurrection to eternal life.

We need feel no anxiety about the ultimate fate of the millions who have lived on earth since the days of Adam, or of the millions who have never heard of Christ in heathen lands, or who in Christian lands have been, in consequence of their evil surroundings, in ignorance of Him. The great Atonement was made for the whole human race, and the parable of the sheep and goats teaches us that all will be judged according to their light and the way in which they

have behaved to one another. The principle of heredity has involved the whole human race in the miseries of sin and death.

Shall the efficacy of that higher and more spiritual heredity which comes from the fact that Christ is the Second Adam, the second Head of the whole human race, be less extensive?

It is the privilege of the converted Christian to enter at once, even in this life, into the kingdom of God, and it will be well for him if he continues faithful to the end. For there is great reason to fear that many of us Christians may be like those who thought they were safe because they were the children of Abraham. We must not trust to our mere spiritual heredity as the children of Christ, for the words of Jesus are full of warning: "I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down . . . in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness" (St. Matt. viii. 11). We shall be wise, therefore, to listen to the words of the Baptist: "Begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" (St. Luke iii. 8).

Let us not begin to say within ourselves, "We are quite safe, being the spiritual children of the Second Adam"; for God, we may be sure, will raise up many children of the Second Adam out of those millions who, without any fault of their own, and often from the neglect of the Christian Church, have lived in ignorance of Him who is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world."

E. HUNTINGFORD.

ART. V.—THE PROCESS OF INSPIRATION.

"ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. iii. 16). In this pregnant word of St. Paul there are indicated two lines of inquiry: first, as to the process, "given by inspiration," and, secondly, as to the product, "all Scripture," which we receive as God's Word written, the supreme and infallible rule of faith. In this paper I propose briefly to discuss the process, "given by inspiration." What is inspiration?

1. REVELATION AND INSPIRATION.

We must at the outset carefully distinguish between inspiration and revelation. The Bible is inspired; it contains a revelation. All is not revealed, but all is inspired. Revela-

tion, in its broadest sense, includes every manifestation of God to the perception and consciousness of man. God is self-manifested in the natural order of things, in the works of creation, in the processes of providence, and in the constitution of man's mind. Whatever might have been the case had the course of man's development been unbroken by sin, it is only too plain that, on account of human blindness and self-will, this general revelation is altogether inadequate. It fails, above all, in this, that it provides no pardon for the guilty, no recovery for the lost. Hence the necessity for that special revelation of which we have the record in the Holy Scriptures. When we speak of revelation without qualification, it is this special and written revelation which is meant. It is a self-manifestation of God as the God of grace. He reveals Himself by entering into relations with men. He enters into their life, calls them into fellowship with Himself, sends to them messages and promises and tokens from Himself, and condescends to a wonderful familiarity of intercourse with them. "In many parts and in many modes God spake unto the fathers in the prophets." It was a fragmentary and preliminary revelation of which the Old Testament is the record, the whole being preparatory to the supreme and complete self-revelation of God in His Son, which is recorded by chosen witnesses, Apostles, evangelists, and teachers in the New Testament. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the great exegete and interpreter of God. He is the outshining of His glory and the express Image of His substance, the visible Image of the invisible God. "He that hath seen Me," He declared, "hath seen the Father." "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Truth is the self-revelation of God. Grace is the self-giving of God. God revealed Himself by giving Himself. God is love. Love is self-sacrifice. Hence the gift of the only-begotten Son in the Incarnation and Atonement becomes the highest revelation of God. Through it God is revealed as He was not and could not be otherwise. In it not only is Divine wisdom displayed, but Divine power is manifested—power to forgive and heal, and restore fallen man to fellowship with the eternal Father. This revelation took the form of a historical movement which culminated in the coming of Jesus Christ. In it God dealt with men in the concrete, in the facts and transactions of life. He taught them through events. He did not reveal Himself in abstractions and general principles, but He manifested Himself in actual contact with men as One with whom they could become acquainted; He makes Himself personally known to men in a long succession of dealings with them, accompanied by His enlightening Word, unfolding His mind and purpose, while

men are brought into contact with Him on all sides of their being.

Such a historical revelation implies progress, growth, development. It began with primary truths conveyed in an elementary way through concrete examples. Gradually it became enlarged in its scope and more advanced and spiritual in its methods. The character of God is revealed, not abstractly, but in definite transactions which bring Him near to men, and which manifest His interest in them, and set forth His will for them. Thus His attributes of truth, faithfulness, power, mercy, were practically unfolded, and man learned what God is. So the evil of sin was brought out by the experience of its evil consequences, and in the Levitical system by the way in which men were compelled to approach God and to deal with Him about it. In like manner the coming Deliverer was set forth, point by point, in types and promises, and the outline gradually expanded and filled up. That which the Old Testament foreshadowed is realized and fulfilled in Him whose advent and life and teaching, as recorded by evangelists and illustrated and applied by Apostles, make up the substance and contents of the New Testament.

It is at once apparent that the record of such a revelation must contain the historical environment in which the revelation was presented. Besides the truths of natural religion, it must include many facts and truths which come within the ken of ordinary human intelligence, and which form no part of the revelation itself. Strictly speaking, revelation is the communication of truths concerning the Divine nature and the kingdom of God which could not otherwise be known. It is an *apokalupsis*—an unveiling of that which already exists in the world of unseen realities and in the Divine will and purpose, and which man could only know as God is pleased to disclose it.

Inspiration is that Divine influence by virtue of which inspired men were enabled to speak and to write truthfully and authoritatively both the truths given by revelation and other truths and facts relating to the kingdom of God, not forming part of the revelation, but constituting its necessary environment.

2. The Divine and Human Elements.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. iii. 16). The reading of the Revised Version leaves the meaning of the passage unchanged: "Every Scripture inspired by God"—that is, "inasmuch as it is inspired by God"—"is profitable." This statement does not distinguish between inspired Scripture and uninspired Scripture. The Jews of

our Lord's day believed, and our Lord Himself and His Apostles believed, that every part and portion of the Old Testament Scriptures was Divinely inspired. They could not conceive of uninspired Scripture, and the predicate is evidently applied to everything known and accepted as Scripture.

The Greek is equally susceptible of both renderings. The singular ἡ γραφή is frequently used to denote the Scriptures as a whole. Cremer gives at least ten instances of this use. While in most of these passages the article is added, there are several in which it is wanting; for example, in 1 Pet. ii. 6, on which Dr. Bigg[1] observes "that γραφή drops the article here just as Scripture does in English"—"there is contained in Scripture"; then follows, not a single quotation, but a cento of quotations, from the Old Testament. A similar use of γραφή without the article is found in 2 Pet. i. 20. Γραφή had come to have the force of a proper name, and as such may omit the article. Instead, therefore, of translating πᾶσα by "every," the force of the verse is more accurately given by "all" or "whole," as in all the English versions prior to the Revised Version, from Wycliffe downwards. Thus, in the Genevan it is rendered: "The whole Scripture is given by inspiration of God." It is of this version that Archbishop Trench affirms that in not a few instances it was "the first to seize the exact meaning which all the preceding versions had missed." Grimm gives it the same rendering, and states it to be nearly equivalent to ὅσα προεγράφη in Rom. xv. 4. He classifies it with collective terms such as "the whole house of Israel" (Acts ii. 36) and "the whole creation" (Col. i. 15).

If the term "Scripture" be uniformly and explicitly applied in the New Testament to the sacred writings, as without doubt it is, it makes little difference whether we read "every Scripture"—every part and portion of the inspired writings—or "all Scripture"—the whole sacred volume. All Scripture is θεόπνευστος because it is produced by the creative breath of the Almighty.[2] It does not, says Professor Warfield, express

---

[1] "Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude," p. 130.

[2] The significant word is θεόπνευστος, which, according to all authorities, means "God inspired," "inbreathed of God," "Divinely inspired" (compare the New Testament Lexicons of Robinson and Thayer-Grimm). Cremer, in the second edition of his "Biblico-Theological Dictionary of the New Testament," follows the other authorities, and renders "prompted by God," "Divinely inspired." But in his third edition he adopts a new view of the meaning of the word, according to which it defines Scripture, not according to its origin, but according to its form—not as "inspired of God," but as "inspiring its readers." Professor B. B. Warfield, in an exhaustive examination into the use of the word both in profane and ecclesiastical Greek, has conclusively shown that this new

a breathing into the Scriptures by God, but the production of the Scriptures by the creative activity of God the Holy Spirit. "Men spoke (not by their own will), but as they were moved (carried along, φερόμενοι) by the Holy Ghost." Even if, with Bishop Ellicott,[1] we adopt the rendering of the Revised Version, yet, as he observes, "it certainly seems definitely to *imply* (in the other version it is formally *enunciated*) the vital truth that every separate portion of the Holy Book is inspired, and forms a living portion of a living and organic whole."

"God," says the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "spake unto the fathers by (in) the prophets." Inspiration, then, implies a co-operation of the Divine Revealer with the human instrument. It is the contact and influence of the Divine Spirit upon the human spirit. The process lies beneath the consciousness. We cannot explain the mode of the Divine working, but we know its results. We can have no just conception of inspiration unless we take adequate account of the two factors. There is a striking analogy here between the constitution of the Scriptures and the constitution of the person of our blessed Lord. From a mistaken

---

view is absolutely without support. (See the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, January, 1900.)

"Since the breath of God is everywhere identified with His presence, the epithet as applied to the Scriptures can only mean that, written by holy men of old, borne on by the Holy Spirit, every Scripture has the presence and operation of God indissolubly connected with it." (Lilley, "The Pastoral Epistles," p. 210.)

[1] Bishop Ellicott, in his "Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles," discusses at some length the question whether θεόπνευστος is used as a qualifying adjective or a predicate. The reasons he alleges in favour of the former seem singularly inconclusive. For example, he says that if the και be merely taken as copulative, and not as ascensive, there will be associated "two predicates of Scripture, one relating to its essential character and the other to its practical applicabilities, which appear scarcely homogeneous." But I fail to see any incongruity between the inspiration and the profitableness of the Scriptures. Surely the two stand together. Their pre-eminent profitableness is at once the result and the proof of their inspiration.

Another reason he gives is to the effect that there is nothing in the text or in connection with Timothy, so far as appears, which seems to require a distinct statement of the inspiration of the Scriptures. Now, this is purely a matter of opinion. Such an explicit statement would strengthen Timothy's faith in the Scriptures, in which he had been nurtured, as St. Paul had just noted, and, in any case, we do not require to limit the purpose of the inspired epistles to the immediate requirements of Timothy. In these letters the outlook goes far beyond the environment of the writer and his son in the faith. Again, the suggestion that the word "Scripture" by itself is rather indefinite, and requires some qualifying epithet, is not borne out by the usage of the New Testament, and is opposed to the explicit reference to the Old Testament in the preceding verses.

reverence, His Divine nature has sometimes been so viewed and its relation to His humanity so explained as to virtually evacuate the Incarnation and divest His human nature of all reality, removing Him far from human sympathy and kinship, and thus contributing to the exaltation of a human creature—the mother of His humanity—to take His place as mediator and nearest of kin to us. This ignoring of the human nature worked almost as disastrously to Christianity as the opposite humanitarian tendency, which denied or detracted from the reality of His Godhead.

In the case of the Scriptures, we suffer most to-day from the belittling of the Divine element in them—the tendency to view and treat them as mere literature, perhaps the purest and most exalted in their ethical and religious contents, but still differing, only in degree, not in nature, from kindred productions of human genius and expressions of human thought and feeling. Yet we must not forget that this is partly a reaction against an opposite tendency, which so exalted the Divine in the Scriptures as to ignore their genuine human character and to deprive them of those human characteristics and limitations in which the personality of the writers finds expression.

1. We must, on the one hand, most strongly emphasize, most resolutely maintain, *the Divine origin and character of these sacred writings.* God "spake by the prophets" (Heb. i. 1), and, more than that, St. Paul declares (Rom. i. 2) that God spake "through the prophets *in the Holy Scriptures.*" Thus it is not only affirmed that the prophets spoke, but that they also wrote, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The limits of this brief paper do not admit of an exhaustive consideration of the Biblical teaching upon this subject. But it is self-evident that it is to the Bible itself we must go for a Biblical doctrine of inspiration; and there can be little doubt as to what it claims and affirms in regard to the Divine sanction and origin of its contents. The Jews contemporary with our Lord and with the writers of the New Testament held explicitly the Divine origin of every word of the Old Testament. It was affirmed—*e.g.*, by Philo, who set forth an elaborate theory of inspiration—that every portion of every book was written under Divine inspiration, and that knowledge of all matters which could not naturally be acquired by the prophets was communicated to them by direct revelation from God. Our Lord and His Apostles employed the same terms and expressions in regard to the Old Testament which were in contemporary use. "We find," says Rothe, "in the New Testament authors the same theoretical view of the Old

Testament and the same practice as to its use as among the Jews of the time in general." Again he says: "Our authors (of the New Testament) look upon the words of the Old Testament as immediate words of God, and adduce them expressly as such, even those of them which are not at all related as direct sayings of God. They see nothing at all in the sacred volume which is simply the word of its human author, and not, at the same time, the very word of God Himself. In all that stands 'written,' God Himself speaks to them, and so entirely are they habituated to think only of this that they receive the sacred Word, written itself as such, as God's Word, and hear God speaking in it immediately, without any thought of the human persons who appear in it as speaking and acting." He adds that they "refer the prophetic inspiration also to the *actus scribendi* of the Biblical authors. The whole style and method of their treatment of the Old Testament text manifestly presupposes in them this view of the matter, which was at the time the usual one in the Jewish schools." In his "Dogmatik," Tholuck states that the application of the Old Testament made in the Epistle to the Hebrews "rests on the strictest view of inspiration, since passages where God is not the speaker are cited as words of God or of the Holy Ghost." And he refers to Heb. i. 6-8; iii. 7; iv. 4, 7; vii. 21; x. 15. Pfleiderer ("Paulinism," I., 88) admits that St. Paul "fully shared the assumption of his opponents—namely, the irrefragable authority of the letter as the immediately revealed Word of God." In like manner, Archdeacon Farrar ("Life of St. Paul," 28) says that St. Paul "shared, doubtless, in the views of the later Jewish schools—the Tanaim and Amoraim—on the nature of inspiration. These views, which we find also in Philo, made the words of Scripture coextensive and identical with the words of God." Surely this is conclusive as to the New Testament doctrine of inspiration, as based upon the exegetical study of the New Testament by those who themselves do not accept this view. The plenary theory of the inspiration of the Scriptures was the theory of our Lord Himself and His Apostles, as men of all schools admit. The New Testament unmistakably teaches this doctrine; and if its teaching is not trustworthy in this regard, can it be trustworthy in any other? To question it is to overturn the foundations of the Christian faith. How, then, do those who adopt a lower view of inspiration than that of the New Testament justify their position?

Some assert as to our Lord that He really shared the view of His contemporaries, but that in this He displayed that fallibility and ignorance which constituted a portion of His humiliation in becoming man. If so, then Christ was not free

from error, and error affecting the very mission He came to discharge. He came to reveal the Father, and He claims to know the things of the Father, the whole compass and contents of the Father's will and character; and yet He is supposed ignorantly to ascribe to the Father what He never gave. Then, too, if Christ is not free from error, how can He be free from sin? The two are bound up together, as Gretillat observes ("Exposé de Théol. Syst.," iv. 288), "by reason of the relation which unites the intelligence with the will." Such a Christ as this theory would require is thereby proved absolutely incompetent for His work.

Others argue that our Lord did not share the views of His contemporaries, but spoke as He did by way of accommodation to Jewish prejudices. Was our Lord accustomed thus to defer to prejudice? The whole story of His lifelong conflict disproves this. Had He deferred a little to Jewish prejudice, He would not have been rejected and crucified by His own people. Our Lord's accommodation of His teaching to the capacity of His hearers, the method of the wise teacher, is not to be confounded with such a concession to, and adoption of, fundamental error as such a view as this asserts.

But another and equally formidable difficulty still remains. If our Lord did not share the views of His contemporaries, His Apostles did, and the advocates of this accommodation theory do not hesitate to assert this divergence between Him and them. But in discrediting the Apostles, they discredit Christ Himself; for He conveyed His authority to them. He not only accredited them as His agents and representatives, but He gave them the promise of His Spirit to lead them into all the truth; and certainly He did not exclude this primary truth as to the foundations of revelation, and the very source of the message they were to bear. The authority of the Spirit is His own authority; the teaching of the Spirit He identifies with His own teaching (John xvi. 12-18).

Some seek relief here by drawing a distinction between the views of the Apostles and their dogmatic teaching. They admit that the Apostles, notably St. Paul, did hold this plenary view of inspiration, but they assert that they did not dogmatically affirm it. Now, no doubt such a distinction might be made between the moral and spiritual truth taught by an Apostle and views he might hold as to questions relating to the science of his day—the extent and form of the world, and suchlike. But no such distinction can be drawn here, for the matter in question is a fundamental one, which underlies the whole of St. Paul's teaching. It is not merely expressed in isolated utterances, but it gives form and colour to all his teaching as to the Old Testament, the origin and

mission of Christ, and the work of redemption. If St. Paul be discredited in regard to these fundamental conceptions, what becomes of his trustworthiness as an inspired teacher generally? If he is in error here, he may be in error anywhere and everywhere.

Such, then, is the Divine origin of this wonderful book, or rather Bibliotheca Sacra. It is not a collection of miscellaneous literature, but a concrete organism, a living unity, in which each book and portion has its place; many members, but one body, pervaded by one spirit, having one object, setting forth one Divine-human Mediator and stamped with one authority: it is the Word of God.

2. On the other hand, we must with equal emphasis and distinctness affirm *the human character* of the sacred Scriptures. God in them speaks to men by the ministry of men. Sometimes the Divine element has been insisted upon to the depreciation or even the virtual obliteration of the human element. A mechanical theory of inspiration has been held in which the writers are reduced to mere automata, amanuenses writing at the dictation of the Spirit. Such a theory overlooks the most significant phenomena of the sacred volume. It is unable to account for the marked differences in style and method, and the distinctive characteristics of each writer impressed upon his own productions. It fails to appreciate or to utilize the designed diversity and manifoldness of teaching which is secured by a method which enshrines the Divine revelation in a wonderful variety of human gifts and experiences, and which thus secures for the Word of God its affluent many-sidedness, and its adaptation to the innumerable moods and wants of men, with all their differences of circumstance and of character.

The Divine influence does not obliterate the individuality of its instruments. It does not destroy personality, but strengthens, illumines, transforms it. The supernatural enters into the revolving cycles of the natural, so to speak, tangentially, so as not to oppose or confuse their motions, but to accelerate them, and impart the new and stronger impulses of a fresh Divine force and reinvigorating energy.

Inspiration implies a co-operation of the Divine with the human spirit. This co-operation is one of a series, and constitutes, I think we may say, the climax of that series. There is, first of all, that co-operation by which all life is sustained. God is neither to be confounded with the universe, after the fashion of the pantheist; nor, with the deist, is He to be relegated to some far-off remoteness, whence He regards His creatures with distant unconcern. While He abides in the marvellous transcendence of His holiness and might, exalted

far above the universe, yet is He at the same time immanent in it. For by Him it consists. No creature lives apart from Him. In Him we live, and move, and have our being. And still more vividly this immanence appears in the intellectual and moral life of man. Our reason is the reflection of the one Supreme Reason, and the gifts of genius the bestowal of His Spirit. His beneficent activities control and condition the workings of the human mind. Rising still higher, to the spiritual life of the Christian, we know that it is by His "holy inspiration we think those things that be good, and by His merciful guidance we perform the same." For, as St. Paul affirms, He effecteth in us both our willing and our working (Phil. ii. 13). Reaching beyond all these, and including them all, there is, for a special work and purpose, a very special Divine co-operation with chosen and prepared human instruments, which we call "inspiration" in its highest and strictest sense. In general the higher has, as I said, included the lower. It is true that God has occasionally dispensed with some of these. He could work altogether upon the basis of the lowest form of His Divine immanence, and make the dumb beast, as it were phonographically, give utterance to His rebukes. He could, upon the basis of a higher and intellectual immanence, make ungodly men, like Balaam and Caiaphas, the proclaimers of His Divine purpose. But ordinarily His spokesmen were prepared both intellectually and spiritually. The Divine co-operation runs through and calls into action the whole scope of their personality, and utilizes all their gifts and experience, whether it be the eloquence and lofty statesmanship of an Isaiah, the sharp-sighted shrewdness and bold energy of a St. Peter, the contemplative wisdom and sacred simplicity of a St. John, or the profound intellect and wonderful spiritual experiences of a St. Paul. In the case of the last-named Apostle, who can doubt but that he was fitted for his great work, not only by his intellectual gifts, but also by the extraordinary vicissitudes of experience and conflict through which he passed—from the proud self-confidence of a Pharisee into the humble faith of a disciple of the Crucified? It is significant that this converted Pharisee should have become the chosen champion of the truth and liberty of the Gospel, and the chief expounder of God's way of salvation by the righteousness of faith.

The Divine operation would necessarily manifest itself in various forms—*e.g.*, in illumination and enlightenment, communicating truth not discernible by man; in gifts of wisdom, logically developing truth, imparting a right judgment in all things, restraining from error; in invigoration of memory, securing accuracy in testimony, but working in accordance

with the laws of evidence, preserving the independence of the witnesses, and affording that diversity of individual testimony which is a mark of truth and genuineness; in editorial co-operation, securing discrimination in the use of pre-existing material, and guiding the writer in such work as St. Luke describes, when he traced down accurately the course of the events he was about to narrate; and in the suggestion of apt and fit words wherever needful for the more complete and accurate setting forth of revealed truth. For there is an inherent connection between word and thought, so that, as Beck observes, "this coalescence of the word with the thing, of the *continens* with the contents, in the one product of the revealing Spirit, lies in the nature of the case." In these and in other ways, which no analysis can completely distinguish, the inspiring Spirit wrought in and with the prophets and teachers, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Such, then, so far as we can follow it, is the process by which this Divine-human book has been produced. It is a truly human book, subject to all the laws which govern human language and literature—its words to be understood in their plain grammatical sense, and its contents to be studied and interpreted in accordance with the laws of thought and language, and by the methods used in all such studies. Those who forget or ignore this side of the truth run into all the follies of fanaticism and the absurdities of arbitrary interpretation; their piety, however sincere, becomes dwarfed and distorted, and degenerates into a weak pietism, and they fail to find and appropriate the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which disclose themselves only to the wise and patient searcher. It is, at the same time, a truly Divine book, the work of the Spirit, only to be rightly understood and truly appropriated by spiritual men. The guidance and enlightenment of the Holy Spirit is essential to the right understanding of revealed truth. Without it the most learned scholar will understand far less of the real meaning and power of the truth than the humble Christian who sits daily at the feet of Christ and drinks in the lessons of heavenly wisdom.

J. P. SHERATON.

Art. VI.—STUDIES ON ISAIAH.

THE notes on chap. i. may be supplemented by one additional thought, having regard to the way in which sin causes us to misuse and misread God's work in Nature. The trees of "Judah and Jerusalem," made by God "very good"—things of beauty and of usefulness, intended to minister to our needs in various ways, become a snare to the perverted mind. The spreading oak, with its welcome shade, the pleasant garden, with all its varieties of leaf and fruit, become, in the then condition of the Israelite mind, things which lead it astray, and of which those who take pleasure in them have need to be "ashamed." Thus "Nature worship," though originally the cult of that which God had made, has become the synonym for every possible abomination. The phrase "to follow Nature" is one which covers every abuse of the true nature of man. The Greek philosopher, the Indian Gymnosophist, the Gnostic, the Manichæan, the ascetic, the hermit, the Stylite, the cloistered monk or nun, the Puritan—at least in some portions of his stern theology—have, in spite of the great principle laid down by the Jewish lawgiver as the fundamental principle upon which his religious teaching was based, come to regard everything material as more or less essentially evil. And thus natural enjoyments have seemed to many pious souls to have upon them the brand of Satan and of sin. Not until man has regained his mastery over himself; not until he has learned to govern his undisciplined impulses by the true law of his being, imposed by his Creator, and made known to him through his conscience, will he be able to revel in the enjoyments which Nature provides for him. "To the pure all things are pure." He who is master of himself, he who lives the life that God would have him—such a man will find a never-failing source of delight in the bounteous and God-given profusion of good things around him, which are only a snare to the thoughtless and self-indulgent.

Chapter II.

This chapter, as well as the two following, is addressed to "Judah and Jerusalem." The present chapter displays all the alternations of hope and fear, all the alternation of dread of the punishment which men's misdeeds must necessarily bring down upon them, and the certainty of the ultimate triumph of good which is so common in the Old Testament Scriptures, and which, moreover, is indelibly imprinted on the history of Israel. Modern criticism struggles hopelessly to evade the fact, but a fact nevertheless it is, that the con-

fidence displayed by the prophets in the final victory of truth and right—that is, of the cause of God—is inextricably intertwined with the Person and work of One who is to come, by whom this victory will be achieved. *Why* the modern critic should strive so hard to efface the universal belief of the Jewish and Christian Churches in a Divine supernatural plan, running throughout all human history, and united indissolubly with the Person of the Eternal Word, it is difficult to say. But the result of modern scientific discovery has been to exalt an evolution on purely natural lines into the place of God. And just when men of science are learning that this view of the facts cannot possibly be sustained, when Lord Kelvin, the late Sir G. Stokes, and other lights of science are telling us that the witness of science to supernatural creation and direction cannot be denied, theologians, in the impatience of the hour, are making a sacrifice of supernatural, or, to avoid the ambiguity which lurks in the phrase "nature," let us call it *spiritual* religion, in order, as they say, "to effect a reconciliation between religion and science." Such a reconciliation is not necessary. In real truth it never was necessary. But for Latinism—an "Augustinianism," as it has been called, of which Augustine laid the foundations, but with which he never identified himself—on the one hand, and the undue impatience of men of science on the other, there would never have been any antagonism between them. In spite of the modern critic, we may safely declare the facts of our Divine origin and guidance to be ineffaceably stamped upon the history of religion. Nature and grace alike follow the laws of orderly, natural evolution, but not without Divine intervention whenever need so requires. Such interferences with purely natural law are what we mean when we use the word "supernatural." In that much-misconceived phrase neither less nor more is meant than this: that there are forces at work in the world, natural and spiritual, which man cannot measure, and the effects of which are beyond his calculation.

I. The first four verses of this chapter strike the note of *hope*—a hope in the prophet's day utterly unreasonable and ridiculous, save on the part of one who was under supernatural guidance—of a period of glory and triumph for God's chosen people. No purely human experience, foresight or insight, could enable a man in Isaiah's day to predict the state of things described in verse 4. As well might a man in those days have prophesied that rivers should run uphill or trees grow with their roots in the air! We have seen the possibility of such a day as is here predicted come sensibly and steadily nearer to us, though it is to be feared that it is still far off. We may be sure that He who has "begun" this

"good work among us will perform it unto the day of Jesus Christ."

1. The first thing to notice in this glorious picture of days to come is that it is connected with the "mountain of the house of Jahveh."[1] We are constantly told now that the idea of the Temple at Jerusalem being the centre of Israel's worship was due to Deuteronomy, and that Deuteronomy was probably not written, and certainly not published, until the reign of Josiah. But here—for this prophecy is admitted to be Isaiah's—we find this close connection between Israel's prosperity and the Temple worship distinctly laid down. That prosperity is indissolubly conjoined with the "mountain of the house of Jahveh." Of course, the "house of the God of Jacob" which the prophet sees with his mind's eye is ultimately the heavenly Jerusalem. His words, in all their fulness, must apply to "Jerusalem which is above," a "house not made with hands." Still, the prophet, writing as he does in the reign of Hezekiah, clearly recognises the fact that the religion of Israel is closely bound up with the worship at the Temple. Here, as elsewhere in Holy Writ, prophecy has its nearer foreground, as well as its more distant and fuller realization.[2] The faithfulness of the Jew to the Mosaic covenant is the foundation on which the hope of future glory rests.

2. The passage further predicts that the Law shall hereafter go forth from Jerusalem as it had formerly done from Mount Sinai. For Christ, in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere, distinctly abrogates some of the enactments of the Law, beside putting forth a higher and more spiritual conception of it. This teaching was first publicly and authoritatively taught in His Name after His death, "beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke xxiv. 47), as He had ordained.

3. We are all bound to labour strenuously and continuously for the suppression of war, but not, as some in these days are tempted by impatience to do, irrationally. War is not an unmixed evil. With all its horrors—and they have been much mitigated by greater humanity on the part of the combatants, and by the tender care of the wounded by the officers of the Red Cross, among whose ministrations the tender solicitude of woman has its full place—in the element of discipline, of obedience, of self-repression, of devotion to a

[1] It may be as well to note, as the reason of my preference of "Jahveh" over "Jehovah," (1) that the Jew never called God by the name of "Jehovah," and (2) that "Jahveh" expresses the original idea that the God of Israel was the eternally existent one, and Jehovah does not.

[2] See "Davison on Prophecy," p. 231 (sixth edition), a book which the modern critic will doubtless consider out of date, but which will possibly survive a good deal that is in fashion at present.

great cause, which is present in war in a higher degree than ever, the highest virtues of humanity are displayed. Readers of literature may remember how Lord Tennyson, in his "Maud," which was written in the time of the Crimean War, expresses eloquently and fervently the hope that society may rise to a higher level in consequence of the demands of men for self-effacement, and the opportunity given them of doing great and glorious deeds; how he hopes that the greed for gain which had seized on us, with all its degrading accompaniments, might be rendered as contemptible as it ought to be; how the man who "pestles a poisoned poison behind his crimson lights," as well as the other reptiles then preying on the vitals of English society, might be rendered ashamed of their degrading occupations.[1] Charles Kingsley, apropos of a shipwreck, remarks that, for whatever reasons, God takes less account of the mere animal lives of men than we should have been antecedently disposed to expect. Thackeray, too, in his "Denis Duval," puts the following words about war into the mouth of his good Dr. Barnard: "War is not altogether an evil; it is ordained of heaven, as our illnesses and fevers are, for our good. It teaches obedience and contentment under privations; it fortifies courage; it tests loyalty; it gives occasion for showing mercifulness of heart, moderation in victory, endurance and cheerfulness under defeat." When we have learned all these virtues, and a good many more, then, and then only, can the words be fulfilled, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

II. The next division of the chapter, verses 5-9, is an

---

[1] A less well-known passage in "Maud" is the one in which the poet rebukes the unbalanced utterances of the preacher who denounces *all* war, under whatever circumstances:

> "This broad-brimm'd hawker of holy things,
> Whose ear is crammed with his cotton, and rings
> Even in dreams to the chink of his pence,
> This huckster put down war! Can he tell
> Whether war be a cause or a consequence?
> *Put down the passions that make earth hell!*
> Down with ambition, avarice, pride,
> Jealousy, down! Cut off from the mind
> The bitter springs of anger and fear;
> Down, too, down at your own fireside
> With the evil tongue and the evil ear,
> For each is at war with mankind."
>
> TENNYSON: *Maud*, x. 3.

A similar passage, inveighing against the philanthropist who strives to make men love one another by abusing his neighbours, will be found in Dickens's "Mystery of Edwin Drood," chap. xvii. It is remarkable that this is the last, unfinished novel by Dickens, as "Denis Duval," quoted above, is the last, unfinished novel by Thackeray.

indictment of a backsliding people. Instead of maintaining the manly vigour, the industry and frugality, the lofty morality, the pure faith of their fathers, they were ready to adopt the superstitions and fashions of their neighbours. "The east" was the home of sorcery—see Balaam's "enchantments" (Num. xxiv. 1). We learn about the soothsaying of the Philistines in 1 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings i. 2. The critics are puzzled by the denunciation of those who "please themselves" or "strike hands" with the children of strangers. But it is because they are bound hand and foot by their theories that Deuteronomy and what they call "the Priestly Code" were written subsequently to Isaiah's day. But if we adopt the view which, until quite lately, most critics have adopted, there is no difficulty whatever. The Israelites were to avoid too much intimacy with the "children of the stranger," lest they should be led astray by their false religion and loose morality. It was this "backsliding" which, as we have seen, had brought about the wretched condition which is described in chap. i. "Judah and Jerusalem" had multiplied riches, and riches, unless well and wisely used, are apt to bring luxury in their train. "Horses and chariots" are condemned, not in themselves, but as a form of personal display which contrasted with the simple habits of Israel in earlier days. It is difficult, once more, to see why Israel should *not* fill his land with horses and chariots, unless he had been forbidden to do so. Luxury might be rejected as contrasting with the sturdy simplicity of the past. But this particular form of it would not have been obvious, save for the prohibition in Deuteronomy, which was evidently known to Isaiah. It is noteworthy that in Deborah's song we find witness to that earlier simplicity of life. The great men of her day "ride on white asses." The horse was a rare thing. On the hills of Palestine chariots were unknown (Judg. i. 19; v. 10). The associations and habits of Israel in later times brought about their natural consequences. Growth in material prosperity tended, as it often does, to a materialistic religion, and materialistic religion is nearly allied to superstition, and superstition, as we often see, even in these days of boasted enlightenment, "meets" and touches its opposite "extreme," infidelity. Faith is allied to trust, superstition to fear, and fear is the opposite of trust. History is full of instances of all this. First and foremost there is the example of Solomon. Prosperity first of all produced luxury, and luxury self-indulgence. The habit of self-indulgence led to his multiplying wives and concubines. Alliances with foreign princesses undermined the simplicity of his faith. He first tolerated, then imitated, their errors. And so the pious founder of the Temple, the man who

crowned the edifice of Mosaism by making the capital the centre of worship as well as of government, became in his old age the patron of idolatry, the first to undermine the very system which his own hands had brought into being. Criticism is at present inclined to deny to him the authorship of Ecclesiastes. As has before been said, questions of authorship ought not to be made tests of orthodoxy, and critics at once sound and skilful have denied the Solomonic authorship of the book. But at least let it be remembered that it is certainly not *proved* that Solomon did not write Ecclesiastes. And if he did *not* write it, who did? If the modern critic be correct, the Jews were fonder of handing down anonymous writings than other nations seem to have been. Why this remarkable exception on their part to the ordinary practice of humanity? Moreover, so masterly an analysis of character as is found in the remarkable book of which we are speaking shows its author, if he be *not* Solomon, to have been some 2,500 years in advance of his age. No other such powerful dramatic conception saw the light until the time of Shakespeare. How self-indulgence produces a general scepticism, and how scepticism leads to a double life—a life of wild indulgence combined with an attitude of philosophic inquiry and doubt—is most wonderfully portrayed in that sketch of the wise king. And scepticism and superstition, as has just been remarked, go hand in hand. The sybarite and sceptic depicted in Ecclesiastes might well, as intellect and the capacity for enjoyment grew dulled, become the idolater of 1 Kings xi. 5. Other examples of the law laid down in the chapter of which we are speaking crowd on the mind of the student of history. The decay of morals in Imperial Rome; the degradation of the noble simplicity of the German and Gothic conquerors of the Roman Empire; the *noblesse* of France, eating and drinking and being merry, indulging in their hollow courtesies, their contempt of the *canaille* below them, on the eve of the French Revolution—these and many other instances (*cf.* Matt. xxiv. 37, 38) may be adduced of the same state of things as that which enervated and disunited the Jewish kingdom, and made it an easy prey to the Assyrian invader. All this should be a warning to ourselves. The rapid growth of luxury among all classes of society in this country during the last fifty years has tended to impair the manhood of the nation. Has *tended*, we say, for the tendency is kept in check by the leaven of Christianity which is still working in English society, as well as by the taste for manly sports which, when gratified in moderation, braces the body and gives tone to the mind. But an ominous softness, if not effeminacy, is nevertheless gaining ground among us,

and it is naturally most visible where wealth is greatest. Our *jeunesse dorée* care little for great causes or great thoughts. Their minds are filled with trifling matters. Their life is one long craving for, and indulgence in, excitement. Gambling, racing, and other occupations, some harmful, some merely foolish and childish, take up the whole of their time. The deep and earnest aspirations after truth and righteousness which occupied so many minds in the middle of the last century seem to have lost their savour for the great mass of the younger folk of to-day. If they have deeper aspirations, they are great adepts at concealing them. In politics, in religion, even in social questions, the cynical scepticism of "the Preacher" seems to have taken the place of the stern determination to face the problems of the age which some of us can remember. In art and literature sensation is the passion of the hour, not truth. And so a dangerous lassitude is creeping over English society. The great leaders of thought in the past—so people are confessing in every branch of thought except natural science—are one by one being withdrawn, and their places filled by men far their inferiors. Statesmen are being replaced by administrators, theologians by destructive critics, great thinkers by narrow specialists, leaders of men by panderers to the passion of the hour. The *Zeitgeist* has been diverted into a number of tiny gusts and eddies, each whirling its circle of dust and stubble around. Only by a determination to recur to first principles, to "ask for the old paths," to fall back on the essential truths of the Christian revelation, can we check the moral and spiritual paralysis which seems to be seizing on the nation. Yet, while we note and lament the dangers of the hour, while we brace our energies to resist them, let us not forget that our ultimate victory is certain, through "the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ." There are moments in human history in which the onward sweep of progress appears to be arrested. And the present, in spite of its boastfulness and self-satisfaction, is one of them, just as the fifteenth and, in some ways, the eighteenth centuries appear to have been. But "the hour will come, and the men" who will overcome the languor of the moment, and will once more impel us forward toward the ultimate goal of humanity.

III. The remainder of the chapter is one of the finest examples of the unparalleled eloquence of the great prophet. Other splendid word-pictures, such as we find in no other Old Testament author, will be found in chaps. xxxv., lx., lxiii., lxiv. 1-4. But nothing more finely illustrative of the majesty of God's Presence, and the awe which it inspires, can be found unless it be in our Lord's description of the awfulness of God's

judgment, in Matt. xxiv., or the sublime pictures of the same tremendous fact in Rev. vi. 12-14; xviii. 10-24. Save in these last, no such a picture of the greatness of God and the littleness of man can be found anywhere. It is strange—is it not?—that in these days, when science has revealed to us God's greatness in a way and to an extent of which no previous age had even dreamed, the "fear of Him, and the dread of Him," seem so entirely to have passed away. True, it has been the task of the Incarnate Word to reveal the Father as Love, and it has been the privilege of the present age to grasp that great fact as it has never been grasped before. But we must not forget that we cannot grasp that blessed truth aright unless we know that Infinite Love involves Infinite Wrath—the "Wrath of the Lamb" (Rev. vi. 16). There can be no love which does not burn like fire at cruelty, meanness, oppression, luxury, selfishness, cowardice, cold-heartedness, indifference to sorrow and suffering, sloth, frivolity, folly, neglect of what is earnest and serious, high and holy. These evils are present in every age; they are by no means absent in our own. There is need of One Who will arise and lay hands "upon all that is proud and haughty, and upon all that is lifted up." And *He will come.* He will come unto His own, and, unlike the Jews of old (John i. 11), they will eagerly and joyfully "receive Him." And then shall men fling the idols which they have loved "to the moles and to the bats," and shall "creep into the caverns of the rocks, and into the clefts of the ragged rocks, from before the terror of the Lord, and from the glory of His majesty, when He ariseth to shake mightily the earth."

J. J. Lias.

Art. VII.—THE MONTH.

THE Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline has commenced its labours, and its first steps are satisfactory. It is ready to receive evidence of "breaches or neglect of the law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England and to the ornaments and fittings of churches prevalent within the last twelve months. In selecting the witnesses who will then be called to give evidence, special consideration will be given to those who are, or have been, Church officers of any parish, or are qualified to speak from wide or special knowledge." This will admit two classes of evidence, which are of equal importance—that of laity in the parishes in which such breaches or neglect of the law have

occurred, and that of what may be called expert witnesses, who are specially acquainted with the requirements of the law, and who have visited the churches in question as independent observers.

The Commissioners have also intimated that they will afford to the clergy who may be inculpated by such evidence an opportunity of replying to it; and no doubt, where they may think it desirable, they will allow the first witnesses to give rebutting evidence. We are disposed to think that the most valuable part of this procedure will be the examination of the clergy who are called upon to explain or defend the breaches of the law alleged against them. If the opportunity is duly turned to account, the principles on which these clergy are acting, and the real nature of the movement in which they are engaged, will be made plain in their own admissions; and the true character of the disorder under which the Church is suffering, and for which the Commissioners are to recommend a remedy, will be rendered unquestionable.

There ought to be no difficulty in eliciting those facts, and the real difficulty of the Commission will arise when they come to consider the remedy. The evil has been so long neglected that it is now very deep-seated, and the application of adequate measures for removing it will require a rare combination of wisdom and firmness.

The meetings of the Houses of Convocation were unusually interesting and important. The Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury considered the report of a committee on the proposed Representative Church Council, in which the most important point was a suggestion for the franchise of the electors of the Lay House of Representatives. It proposed that, "in the opinion of this House, the initial franchise of lay electors should be exercised in each ecclesiastical parish of such district by such male (or, if so decided, male and female) residents of full age as declare in writing at the time of voting either (1) that they are communicants in the Church of England, or that (2) they, having been baptized and confirmed, are members of the Church of England and of no other religious body not in full communion with that Church." It was felt by many members to be a very questionable proceeding for one of the Houses of which the representative body is to consist to come to conclusions respecting the constitution of another House in the absence of the members of that House and with no opportunity of hearing their views. Nevertheless, the clauses prescribing either a Communicant or a Confirmation franchise met with the approval of the House, and the recommendation would probably have been carried as a whole had not a question been raised respecting

the words which refer to the admission of women to the franchise. The Dean of Canterbury pointed out that the words "or, if so decided, male and female," might be taken to imply that the House was indifferent or neutral on the question, and he argued earnestly against the admission of women. Canon Tetley supported their claim in an able speech; but the opinion of the House was evidently much divided on the subject, and the Dean of Lincoln interposed opportunely with a motion to adjourn the debate until after the meeting of the Provisional Representative Council in July. It would seem very advantageous that a question which concerns the Lay Houses more directly than the others should be discussed without any prejudice which might have been created by a decision of the Lower House of the Clergy; but the discussion will have been of service in assisting to bring into notice the grave considerations which are involved in the question. That women should be given a vote in constituting the legislative assembly of the Church would, at all events, be unprecedented; and, to say the least, to commence the creation, as is intended, of a legislative assembly for the Church of England by such a departure from precedent would be a very grave step to take.

The other matter of first-rate importance in the meetings of the Canterbury Convocation was the discussion and the action of the Bishops in reference to the Athanasian Creed. After a careful and striking debate, the following resolution was carried by a majority of nine to eight:

"That this House is resolved to maintain unimpaired the Catholic faith in the Holy Trinity and in the Incarnation, as contained in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and in the *Quicunque Vult*, and regards the faith thus presented, both in statements of doctrine and in statements of fact, as the necessary basis on which the teaching of the Church reposes; but at the same time believing that the present manner of reciting the *Quicunque Vult* in public worship is open to serious objection, especially on the ground of the phraseology of the minatory clauses, this House respectfully requests his Grace the President to appoint a committee to consider in what way the present use of the *Quicunque Vult* may be modified, the document itself being retained in the formularies of the Church as an authoritative statement of the Church's faith."

We quote this resolution in full because it seems to us it must be regarded as having pronounced the doom of the Rubric requiring the recitation of the Athanasian Creed in public worship. Considering the deep aversion with which its public use is regarded by a vast number of laity and by

many clergy, the fact that a majority of the Bishops themselves, in Synod assembled, acknowledged it to be open to "serious objection" must be practically decisive. A practice against which such profound and widespread objection is felt cannot be maintained when a majority of the Bishops acknowledge the justice of the objection. We say "the Bishops," because in the Convocation of York also the Bishops expressed their desire that steps should be taken "to restore the Creed to its more ancient use as a document for the instruction of the faithful." Henceforth it is simply a question of how this change can be effected. It is a question which might perhaps engage the attention of the Royal Commission, for that Commission will doubtless have brought before it, as one instance of "neglect," the failure to use the Athanasian Creed on the prescribed days. Clergy who are incriminated on this point will now have a strong excuse in the resolution of the Bishops; and if the Commission were to recommend the adoption of any recommendation which may be made by the Committee of Convocation whom the President may appoint, it would doubtless facilitate the legislative authorization of such a proposal.

Notices of Books.

The Pope, the Kings, and the People. A History of the Movement to make the Pope Governor of the World by a Universal Reconstruction of Society, from the Issue of the Syllabus to the Close of the Vatican Council. By the late WILLIAM ARTHUR, A.M. Edited by W. BLAIR NEATBY, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. xlvii+758. Price 10s. 6d.

Readers of Dr. Mozley's "University Sermons" will recollect the first in the volume, preached just a month before the opening of the Vatican Council in the December of 1869. It contains the fine passage beginning, "Rome issues out of her gates, taking her history with her"; and Dr. Mozley compares the claim put forward by the Papacy to the act of a dispossessed monarch preparing on the eve of the crisis to quit his throne with a rigorous statement of his rights publicly made. The claim, he argued, might be valuable property, although obsolete, as representing former possession, and constituting a link with the past. Whether it is actually obsolete in this case may be doubted; and only a very rash person would at the present time venture to say that a revival of the power of the Papacy is impossible in the future. Pretensions believed in by millions of people, and championed by the most formidable organiza-

tion in the world, cannot be considered sentimental ideas. They are a standing menace to society. Mr. Arthur's book, originally published in 1877, makes this exceedingly plain. It was compiled from official documents and from the recognised organs of the Vatican in the press, with much help from Dr. von Döllinger, who placed his collection of pamphlets at the writer's disposal. The full text of the Syllabus of 1864 is given in an appendix, and an account of its reception in France and England will be found in some of the earlier chapters. Almost simultaneously with its issue preparations for a Council were set on foot, the settlement of the preliminaries occupying nearly five years. Mr. Arthur's description of the inaugural ceremony when at last the Council met will be read with interest; but the magnificence of the spectacle contrasted painfully with the sordid intrigues that were going on behind the scenes, and the tactics employed in silencing and browbeating all who dared to withstand the dominant party. It is a humiliating story, yet its study is necessary to anyone who would understand the position of modern Romanism, so that we welcome this new edition of Mr. Arthur's elaborate work. During the last thirty years the whole Roman Church has lain prostrate under the heels of the Jesuits, and their ambition to attain at all costs universal supremacy is a thing to be reckoned with. Even if it ultimately proves unsuccessful, its defeat may involve a severe struggle. An abundance of evidence from authentic sources is produced here, showing to what an extent the Jesuits count as factors in European politics, not excepting the politics of our own country. The book will help to disabuse easy-going optimists of the idea that they can compound with Rome on their own terms. That is just what they cannot do.

Alcuin: His Life and his Work. By C. J. B. Gaskoin, M.A., sometime Scholar of Jesus College, Cambridge. Cambridge: The University Press. Pp. xxii+275. Price 5s.

An essay which gained the Hulsean Prize at Cambridge was the basis of this volume. Though the story of Alcuin's career has been told by French and German writers, we have not had a good English work on the subject, and he can scarcely be said to have received due honour in his own country. Articles in dictionaries and scattered notices in histories of the period contain much valuable information about him, but prove inconvenient substitutes for a formal biography. Mr. Gaskoin gives us a carefully-written study, enabling us to picture Alcuin in the midst of his surroundings at York, Aix-la-Chapelle, and Tours; and the book is furnished with a large collection of useful notes and references. Born, as is supposed (for of his birth and parentage we know but little), in A.D. 735 —the year of Bede's death—Alcuin became in early boyhood a pupil in the school at York newly founded by Archbishop Egbert, with which he remained connected in various capacities until the age of thirty-seven, when he accepted the invitation of Charles the Great. For fourteen years he ruled over the Palace school in Charlemagne's capital, and for the last

eight years of his life was Abbot of the great monastery of St. Martin at Tours, dying on the morning of Whit Sunday, A.D. 803. While at York he received deacon's orders, but never became a priest; and whether he was a monk is still a contested question. Bishop Stubbs held that he was not. He could, indeed, lay no claim to a place among the great leaders of thought who have influenced the world. His work was practical rather than speculative, and in the second part of his life he was as much a man of affairs as a scholar and teacher. It should not be forgotten that he took an active share in reforming the abuses that prevailed in the Gallican Church of his day; while the revision of the Liturgy and ecclesiastical offices was largely due to his labours. In helping us to become better acquainted with him, Mr. Gaskoin has rendered a real service.

Twentieth-Century Papers. No. 5. Christianized Rationalism and the Higher Criticism. A Reply to Harnack's "What is Christianity?" By Sir ROBERT ANDERSON, K.C.B., LL.D. London: John F. Shaw and Co. Pp. 78. 1s.

A well-known writer who died some years ago used to say that he "did the thinking" for his readers. Just at present Harnack is doing much the same for a large number of English, if not German, readers. Many people, instead of examining the New Testament for themselves, take their conceptions of our Lord's doctrine and work from the representations given of them by the Berlin professor. For persons of this description no better mental exercise can be recommended than a study of Sir R. Anderson's rejoinder, while others may gain from it a clear notion of the questions at issue. The main positions taken up in Harnack's widely circulated work are lucidly stated and subjected to a close examination. Sir R. Anderson notes in his opening paragraphs the misleading use of New Testament and Christian terminology now current in various quarters, Christian words and phrases being employed to express non-Christian ideas, by attaching to them a sense widely different from their accepted meaning. He proceeds to point out that to make "the teaching of Jesus" the basis of a system, and at the same time to deny the authenticity of the Gospels, is to cut away the ground from underneath the system altogether. If the Gospels are not to be trusted, nobody can tell what "the teaching of Jesus" was. Not the least useful parts of the paper are the pages in which Harnack's ideas regarding the originality of our Lord's message are criticised. The real nature of the revelation made by Christ is demonstrated in these sections with great force and power. Sir R. Anderson by no means goes too far in saying that, had Dr. Harnack "lived in the first century, he would have taught the Jews that there was no 'offence,' and the Greek that there was no 'foolishness,' in the cross." The last sentences in "What is Christianity?" are set side by side in another place with a passage from Cicero's "De Senectute," that the reader may "judge between the Roman paganism of two thousand years ago and the German 'Christianity' of to-day." The comparison of the two passages is highly instructive. We hardly think that Churchpeople

are sufficiently aware of the value of the well-written and well-printed tracts on questions of the day which Mr. Shaw is publishing. They will do well in procuring them.

Handbooks for the Clergy. The Study of Ecclesiastical History. By the Right Rev. WILLIAM EDWARD COLLINS, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Pp. xv+166. 2s. 6d.

The new Bishop of Gibraltar has left this manual behind him as a parting gift, but we hope it is not his last, and that in his altered surroundings he may still find time to write upon his special subject. The handbook was published only a few weeks before his elevation to the episcopate. It contains an excellent bibliography, arranged according to periods, though there are some rather unaccountable omissions, and a good chapter on the choice of books. The series of which the volume forms a part is intended principally for the help of the younger clergy engaged in parochial work, and it must be confessed that few of them are in a position to act up to the author's counsels of perfection. The examination of documents and comparison of authorities, on which he lays much stress, require leisure and opportunity as well as skill; and the means of access to original sources are out of the reach of town and country curates far away from our great libraries. There can be no question as to the need for encouraging the study of ecclesiastical history, ignorance of which is, to a large extent, a contributory cause of some of the evils in the Church. But a simpler introduction to the study is wanted. Professor Bury's nervous dread lest history should be classed as literature seems to have infected the Bishop, and he must pardon us for chafing a little at his insistence on the latest scientific methods. A judicious combination of the sixth and eighth chapters in this book with Dean Stanley's inaugural lectures, prefixed to his course on the Eastern Church, would perhaps be found as useful by a beginner as anything that could be suggested. Bishop Collins would teach him the value of accuracy, and guide him to the standard literature on various branches of the subject. Dean Stanley's glowing descriptions of the great turning-points in the annals of Christendom would inspire him with the necessary enthusiasm. Between the two there would be more of an approximation to the golden mean. One section in the seventh chapter, on the connection of Christianity with Judaism, is very unsatisfactory. It is to be regretted that the author goes unnecessarily out of his way to dilate upon the merits of the Higher Criticism, saying that a student "cannot hesitate to accept its results." Amongst these results he mentions the priority of the Prophets to the Law, and the theory that much of the contents of the earlier Old Testament books "must be regarded as ethnic traditions, rather than as true history." As the Mosaic period is not the one with which the Bishop is best acquainted, and his contributions to our knowledge of it have been infinitesimal, the extreme confidence of his language is out of place.

The Story of the Nations. Mediæval England, 1066-1350. By MARY BATESON, Associate and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge. London: T. Fisher Unwin. Pp. xxviii + 448. 5s.

We are distinctly indebted to Miss Bateson for giving us such a good book. She has set herself to describe the social life and manners of mediæval England, leaving to others the task of relating its political history. Her book is more or less a "florilegium," compiled from many different sources, and its originality lies in the excellent arrangement of its contents. The ordinary historian does not usually condescend to those minor details that help us more than anything else to form an idea of the surroundings of a bygone generation. For these we have to depend upon the good people who extract for our benefit unconsidered trifles from records and letters of the time, and the use of rescuing them from oblivion is shown by the profusion of miscellaneous information provided for us in these lively pages. We should like to have seen a little more about the mediæval lawyers and courts of law, for there are only a few passing allusions here to the growth of the legal profession, but every other class of the community is well represented. In an indirect way the book serves as a useful contribution to Church history, since it contains much ecclesiastical lore of the lighter sort, and not easily accessible to general readers. Miss Bateson gossips learnedly about the domestic arrangements of episcopal and monastic houses, and the daily life of the parochial clergy. The latter sometimes fared very badly, for the provision of a suitable vicarage was often a matter of difficulty, and the priest was obliged to sleep *minus honeste* in the church. The notices of some of the great prelates of the period, whose personal tastes and habits are incidentally pictured, will be found interesting. Even down to the time of Edward III. most of the higher ecclesiastics were either of French extraction or had received their education in France, and French was the common language of the upper classes. Within a few years after the date at which this volume closes—the year following 1349, when England was desolated by the scourge of the Black Death—the use of English, previously reckoned a mark of vulgarity, came into fashion owing to the wave of patriotism passing over the country in consequence of the long war with France. This change largely contributed to render the Church a national, instead of a half foreign, institution. Those who think that the age of the Henrys and the Edwards was a rude or illiterate one will be disabused of that notion by Miss Bateson's chapters. On p. 305 there is an odd mistranslation of "cruralia," and in the case of certain names and words it would have been better to retain the popular spelling. We must not omit to mention that the book is beautifully illustrated.