could have. Health, strength, . . . a new field of work among men who are decidedly religious and simple-minded, left pretty much to my own ideas as to what is best to be done in the attempted evangelisation of Mongolia, friends in Britain praying for me, comfort and peace here in the prosecution of my present studies, the idea that what I do is for eternity . . . these thoughts and many others make my present life happy. . . ." That was the prospect. The world would say the mission was a failure. And in addition to all, he had to bear up against vexing, but very natural, discussions at home as to whether it was really worth while keeping up such a fruitless mission. There are many kinds of heroism, but, as Mr. Lovett says, it may be doubted whether any touches a higher level than that exhibited by this patient sower of the seed of life on the sterile field of Mongolia.

It was there especially that the nobility of Gilmour came out—in holding on and working on in a field that yielded such scant result, amid so many distressing circumstances. He did it because he believed in God. And so strong was that belief of his, so direct, so urgent, that it gave him, as it has given others, a kind of Christian fatalism in facing danger and death. It was not that he did not measure the fearfulness of death,—he had the usual battles men have with this,—but even here the sense of his mission overcame. "Our death might further the cause of Christ more than our life could," he says. It was enough. Gilmour went on with his work. Wife, children, every earthly joy, money, congenial society, literary chances (for his book, *Among the Mongols*, got a great name for him), were as nothing compared with winning the Mongols to Christianity. There was a strong other-worldliness about him. He died when scarcely forty-eight. But he touched men's hearts in that far-off land till, as they gathered round his grave, they sang of the "Christian's home in glory," and went back to their tents and huts never to forget "our Gilmour."

The great thing in life is, after all, to leave an impression of oneself. Gilmour did that. It was the impression of a splendid character, touched with fire and love, wonderfully full of transmissiveness, pouring itself out for others. And no good man will read the story of his life without a strong wish to possess the same spirit.

The Teaching of our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament.

By the Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

THE APPEAL TO CHRIST.

We now turn to an argument of a very different nature. Hitherto we have considered the details of opposing theories, and the facts on which the two modes of regarding the Old Testament claim respectively to be based. We now turn to a final Authority. We now make our appeal to the Great Teacher, and aver that the view which we have, thus far, shown to be the more probable of the two, on the merits of the case, can, with every appearance of probability, claim His approving authority, and that the Traditional view of the Old Testament can, for its justification, appeal to the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ.

But here, at the very outset, two of the gravest possible questions present themselves, and must, as far as we can do so, be answered in the present paper.

The first question is this—Have we a right to make such an appeal? Is the subject of the composition and of the historical credibility of the Books of the Old Testament a subject on which we can, with propriety, appeal to the teaching of our blessed Lord?

The second question is a more difficult one, and may be thus formulated — Does the doctrine of the Two Natures permit us to ascribe to our Lord in His human nature an intuitive and unerring knowledge in matters relating to the Old Testament which belong to the general domain of research and criticism? Or, to put this really momentous question in another form—Was the limitation of our Lord's humanity, and the degree of what is

technically called His *Kenosis*, of such a nature that His knowledge in regard of the authorship and composition of the Books of the Old Testament was no greater than that of the masters of Israel of His own time?

Till these two questions, the one relating to the rightfulness of the appeal, the other to the validity of the appeal, in reference to the Old Testament, are fully answered, it is waste of time for us to investigate those individual passages which may appear likely to form a secure basis for our inferences as to the teaching of our Lord on the nature and authority of the Old Testament. Let us begin, then, with the first question—Is such an appeal proper and permissible?

I. At first sight it might seem unnecessary to enter into such a question at all. Who could doubt that it is proper and permissible? When we pause for a moment to recall the plain fact that our blessed Lord either cites or refers to passages in the Old Testament Scriptures probably more than four hundred times, and when we further remember that in many of these He speaks of the Old Testament in a direct and definite manner, the question of St. Peter seems to rise to our lips, and we ask to whom can we go for guidance save to Him Who has the words of eternal life, and Who not only before His resurrection, but after it, in His holy risen body, made the Old Testament and its relation to Himself the subject of His inspired teaching. When we call this to mind it does seem strange that we should have to pause and vindicate the rightfulness of such an appeal as that which we are now preparing to make. If those that labour and are heavy laden are invited by Christ to come to Him, surely those who are in doubt and difficulty as to the nature of an integral portion of God's Holy Word may come to Him, nay, must come to Him, if they are to hope to find rest for their souls. I should hardly have dwelt on this had it not been stated by one of our bishops—that he objected on fundamental grounds to the argument that if our Lord Jesus Christ has virtually asserted a certain character for a certain writing, there is no appeal from His verdict. If the objection to the argument were really valid, then an appeal to the authority of our blessed Lord might be useless and out of place. But is not the argument objected to perfectly sound? It is not certain that in the case supposed there *is* no appeal. Surely there can be no appeal, unless we are prepared to take up the startling position that virtual assertions of Christ are to be considered open to challenge. . . . What is meant by a virtual assertion? If it means that it is an assertion in an indirect rather than a direct form, then, in the case of Jesus Christ, it plainly cannot be challenged, unless we can bring ourselves to believe (which God forbid) that the indirect assertions of Christ may involve fallibility owing to the limitations of His human nature. What *may* be challenged is whether, in what our Lord says, there is a virtual assertion at all. This, in any particular case, may be deemed fairly open to inquiry and investigation, and when we deal with particular cases, as we shall do in the two following articles, then the utmost care will be taken not to claim as virtual assertions what the words, critically examined, may not distinctly evince to be such. But if, on critical investigation, it seems beyond reasonable controversy that a virtual assertion *is* made, then that assertion, if we have every reason to believe that the words are correctly reported,—whether it relates to doctrine, ethics, or to questions relating to the authority or credibility of the Old Testament,—is certainly to be deemed conclusive and incontrovertible.

We cannot, then, consider that the exception taken to the argument above alluded to can in any degree affect the confidence with which we may appeal to Christ in reference to the nature and authority of the Old Testament. Not only may we appeal, but we ought to appeal. What we especially need in these complicated questions, and in the discussion of the subtleties of argument involved in the Analytical view, is the steadying element which a careful consideration of the tenor of our Lord's references to the Old Testament will always be found to impart. It is not pre-judgment that the appeal to Christ brings with it, but rather a due and wholesome reverence which it infuses in our investigations. It reminds us that the place we are entering is holy ground, and that we cannot treat the matter as a mere literary question, or leave it to be worked out by competent critics, and patiently wait for the result. We must go at once to Christ for guidance, and through the medium of His references to the Old Testament—references which one of our keenest opponents speak of as "furnishing ample material for admiration"—prepare ourselves for making our final choice between the two views of the Scriptures of the Old

Testament which we have analysed in the preceding article.

II. But here we pass into the second and graver question — Can we rely absolutely and unconditionally on the results of this appeal? Can we ascribe to our Lord in His human nature such an unerring knowledge, in regard of the details of the subject-matter of the controversy, as may enable us without a hesitation or a doubt to accept the conclusions which equitable criticism may deduce from His words? Or, to put the question in another form, and partially in the words of a direct opponent, are we, or are we not, prepared to admit the possibility, on the part of our Lord, of exegetical mistakes? This is really the momentous question. It has received recent answers from contemporary writers of our own Church that are very far from reassuring. One writer has contended for the possibility of "intellectual fallibility" on the part of our Lord, but has afterwards had the loyalty and good sense to withdraw words which, we are forced to say, ought never to have been written. Another has used language with regard to the circumscription, as it were, of the Word by the human body which opens a wide door to inferences of a somewhat similar nature, and, to say the least, cannot be harmonised with the teaching of St. Athanasius. Another form of the same tendency to minimise the knowledge of our Lord in His human nature is to be recognised in the attempt to place on a parallel the Lord's evincing of no more than the human knowledge of the time, in the realm of science, when he spoke of the sun "rising," with His supposed evincing of no more than the same limited knowledge in the realm of history. The comparison, however, is hardly even plausible. In the one member of the comparison, the Lord spoke from what the eye beheld, and as we, who know fully that the sun does not rise, speak to this very hour; according to the other member, the Lord would have to be supposed to have placed limits on His historical knowledge which *we* claim to have overstepped,—and, to use perfectly plain language, to be ignorant of that about which *we* use no conventional language, but distinctly assert that we know.

All these varied attempts practically to reduce the knowledge of the Lord, in reference to the actual facts connected with the history of the Old Testament, to the level of the knowledge of the times in which He vouchsafed to "dwell among us," impose upon us the duty of attempting to return some definite answer to the general question we are now considering. We must face it humbly and reverently, but yet distinctly and without subterfuge, otherwise our appeal to Christ will be in vain; the counter-appeal from Christ's words to Christ's alleged ignorance will be made, and we shall be reminded, as we have been reminded by one of the most able supporters of the Analytical view, that "with regard to the revered Master must the right of criticism be maintained." In other words, the teaching of Him, "in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," must be subjected to the testing of the sin-clouded intellect of mortal man.

The confusion of thought on this subject is simply portentous. When, in this very passing year, a bishop preaching from a university pulpit, speaks in one portion of his sermon of the Lord's voluntarily leaving to His human nature its associated limitations, "its human weakness and ignorance"; and, in another, affirms "our Lord's human ignorance of natural science, historical criticism, and the like," but does not deny "the *possibility* of the miraculous communication of such knowledge"; and when, still further, he concludes with asserting "the reality of our Lord's human limitation as well in knowledge as *in moral energy*," —when we read such things, it does seem that the holy doctrine of the Two Natures does need reiteration and reinforcement.

Let us then again hear old truths, and for a brief space again tread in the old pathways of Catholic thought.

We may begin with this simple but most vital question—On what does modern thought base its imputation of ignorance to our blessed Lord in subjects such as we are now considering, viz. the real nature, texture, and historical trustworthiness of the Scriptures of the Old Testament? The answer of modern thought is promptly returned—On the experiences of *our own* human nature. As *we* cannot by intuition arrive at a knowledge of the age, authorship, and composition of these ancient writings, but can only hope to do so by patient investigation and long-continued critical research, so also must it have been with Christ; otherwise the humanity He vouchsafed to assume would not have been a true humanity, the Incarnation would not have been that true emptying Himself of His divine glories and prerogatives which is involved

in the apostle's significant term. In a word, the reasoning in this answer is from the characteristics of human nature, *as known to us by experience*, to the characteristics of the human nature of our Lord. If, to use the language of Athanasius, "ignorance is the property of man," so, it is contended, must it have been in the case of the human nature of Christ. But is such reasoning admissible? It is utterly inadmissible, and for these three weighty and most sufficient reasons.

1. We cannot, logically or theologically, reason from a nature which is confessedly *sinful* to a nature which was confessedly *sinless*. The Word truly became flesh, but it was sinless flesh, flesh such as that of Adam before the fall. If we knew the characteristics of the human nature of Adam when God created man in His own image, when He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul, then such reasoning might be valid; but, as it is, such reasoning is utterly invalid; and to say that the Lord in His human nature could not know, or rather did not know, what the modern critic claims to have discovered and substantiated, is simply an untenable assertion. What precisely the nature of Adam, before his fall, was, in respect of knowledge or nescience, we do not know; but this certainly we do know, that there is no belief vouched for by a greater unanimity of Catholic teaching—as may be seen in Bishop Bull's famous discourse on the State of Man before the Fall—than this, that our first parents, before their fall, were endowed "with certain gifts and powers supernatural," and that of these, "divine illumination or knowledge was a leading grace." Why, then, may we not believe that our dear Lord, in His purely human nature, had this divine illumination in everything that related to God's Holy Word, and that, in virtue of this nature, and apart from every other consideration, He had that enduring nearness and "assession" of God (to use the word of St. Basil in reference to our first parents) by which, on any movement of His will, the truth in all its details was at once present to Him. When, for example, He solemnly quoted Deuteronomy in His conflict with the Tempter, may we not believe, simply on the above grounds, that He *did* know the real nature of that which He was quoting?

If we cannot positively prove this from what has been said, may we not assert that we have shown very sufficient reason for not believing the contrary?

2. But we may go further. Thus far we have only reasoned from the sinlessness of the Lord's human nature, from human nature as He had it in common with unfallen Adam. We may now ask if there was not a mysterious epoch when that human nature must have received a still higher illumination. When, by the banks of the Jordan, the Holy Spirit descended in bodily form on the baptized Lord, and the paternal voice declared that He was the beloved Son in whom the Father was well pleased, is it possible to conceive that in Him, Who the evangelist tells us, returned from the Jordan "full of the Holy Ghost," there could have been the faintest trace of any nescience with regard to the true nature of those Scriptures which He was about to set forth and to fulfil? Though we may not presume to dogmatise on the spiritual effects of this descent of the Holy Ghost, we may, at any rate, believe that the earthly elements which the Lord vouchsafed to wear received an unction (to use a simile of Athanasius), and that the Lord in His human nature, in addition to the increase in wisdom of which the evangelist speaks, did verily receive in His baptism a still fuller spiritual increase, that so, in His human nature, He might be more fully equipped for the conflict that followed, and for all things involved in His Messianic work and in the bringing of the gospel message to the hearing and to the hearts of mankind.

Without entering further into this profound subject, we may certainly consider this as beyond all reasonable controversy—that in the holy and mysterious circumstances connected with the Lord's baptism, we have no mere manifestations of divine glory simply to quicken the faith of the Baptist or of those that might have been around him—no miraculous incidents to shed a glory on the works and words of the great preacher of the wilderness—no simply inaugural signs of the Lord's entry into His Messianic ministry, but the visible tokens and accompaniments of an endowment of our Lord in His holy human nature for the Messianic office,—an endowment, real and measureless, by the gifts and illumination of the Holy Spirit of God.

If this be so—and who can fairly doubt it?—then have we not, as it were, a second guarantee that the knowledge of the Lord which we are assured by direct statement, and by many a verifying incident, extended to the then present thoughts and imaginations of men's hearts, included also the recorded thoughts of the past and all that apper-

tained, directly or indirectly, to the form in which they were expressed? Can we draw any imaginary lines of demarcation round these plenitudes of knowledge? Can any arguments drawn from the *Kenosis*, or, in simpler words, from our blessed Lord's vouchsafing to empty Himself of His divine glories and prerogatives, ever be found to justify us in saying in regard of the Scriptures He came to fulfil,—that though He might know, and even thus receive at His baptism a still further knowledge of the ethical and religious nature of the written Word, He could not, as man, know its literary nature and texture as it is now claimed to be known by the criticism and research of the nineteenth century?

If it be urged, and it *is* strongly urged, that unless we are prepared to say this, we are opening ourselves to the charge of denying the complete reality of the Lord's humanity, and, at the very least, of perilously approaching the margin of Apollinarian error, is not an answer, after what has been said, readily forthcoming? The charge against us is, that in thus attributing to our Lord, as man, a complete knowledge—literary, as well as ethical and religious—of the Scriptures which He referred to and expounded, we are ignoring the very conditions of our human nature, and infringing upon its reality. What is our answer? That we certainly may be ignoring the conditions of *our* human nature, and of human nature as now we find it, but that it is not human nature in this state which we attribute to the Lord Jesus Christ, or on which we are speaking when we refer to the Lord's humanity. We assert the great truth, which so many are now willing to evade, that our blessed Lord, verily and truly, is *perfect* Man, but perfect Man He would not be; Man in His perfection, as well as truly God He could not be, if we are to impute to Him our own imperfect and (so to speak) disillumined humanity, and do not steadily recognise the distinctions between the sinless and illumined and the sinful and darkened, which we have already drawn in preceding paragraphs. Our attitude verily is not Apollinarian, but Athanasian and Catholic. But to proceed.

The two reasons and considerations which we have now stated and briefly discussed appear to be, both of them, valid and of real cogency. They seem to justify the assertion that a fulness of intuitional knowledge must be ascribed to our Lord in His human nature in reference to the Old Testament; and they seem further to show that any inferences that may be legitimately drawn from the declarations of Christ, or from His use in argument of the Scriptures of the Old Testament must, at the very least, strongly influence our judgment in deciding between the two views which we have stated and examined in the preceding articles. The more clear and legitimate the inference, the stronger will be the conviction that the decision has been fairly and rightfully made. But reasonable and cogent as the two foregoing considerations may be, there is a third, which to many minds will seem still more conclusive, and will go far to render it impossible to believe that in the Lord's holy and perfect human nature there could have been any shadows of nescience as to the true nature and characteristics of those Scriptures which He alluded to, cited, elucidated, and appealed to, during the whole course of His ministry, and even expounded after His resurrection.

3. This third reason is founded on the Catholic doctrine of the Two Natures and their relations the one to the other,—relations that are nowhere set forth more clearly or with more persuasive precision than by our own Hooker in the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*. The doctrine of the Two Natures, as we well know, is this—that in the unity of the person of Christ two whole and perfect natures are indivisibly, yet unconfusedly, united and coexistent. From the closeness, however, of this conjunction, though the properties of the one nature are never infused into the other, it is indisputable that both the body and soul of Christ did receive by the influence of Deity wherewith they were united qualities and powers above nature. "Surely," as Hooker says in his marvellous simile, "as the sword which is made fiery doth not only cut by reason of the sharpness which it simply hath, but also burn by means of that heat which it hath from the fire, so there is no doubt but the Deity of Christ hath enabled that nature which it took of man to do more than man in this world hath power to comprehend." We see this plainly enough in regard of the body of our Lord, in the walking on the water, in the healing virtue that flowed forth at the touch of faith, in the scene of the Transfiguration, and in many other illustrative incidents. We see it, too, in regard of the Lord's human soul—in His discerning the thoughts of those around Him, and in that knowledge of what was in man which the evangelist tells us was

present with the Lord in all its plenitude. If we admit this,—and not to admit it is to impugn the veracity of the gospel,—can we refuse to accept the conclusion of Hooker that the human soul of Christ must have had an ever-present illumination, and, to use his own words, "must of necessity be endued with knowledge so far forth universal, though not with infinite knowledge peculiar to Deity itself." When we add to this the variously-expressed, but distinctly accordant, testimony of all the Catholic writers on the Incarnation,—when Athanasius does not hesitate to assert that "Christ being in the flesh *deified the flesh*," and when Theodoret plainly says that in Christ "the human power is a partaker of the divine power,—and when these expressions find echoes in all the great writers of antiquity,—can we hesitate for a moment, on the one hand, to repudiate that odious form of modern teaching which tells us that in His human nature the Lord was nescient, if not fallible? Can we also, on the other hand, feel hesitation or difficulty in maintaining distinctly and firmly this most certain truth, that the Lord Jesus Christ did verily in His human nature not only know all that has been known or can be known as to those Holy Scriptures which He came to set forth and fulfil, but further, that owing to the union of the two Natures, and to the inflowing of divine gifts and powers into His sinless humanity, every question relating to the Scriptures must be considered as finally and for ever settled by Him, whensoever it can be shown, by the nature of His utterance, that the question must have been really before Him?

The attempt has sometimes been made to set aside these conclusions by the objection that they are but the *communicatio idiomatum* of Damascene in a more guarded form, and that if there is any substantial truth in such a doctrine, there ought to be some trace of some operation of the human in relation to the divine, and yet how can that be? How can the divine nature, of which the eternal attribute is the changeless and the unalterable, receive any impartation from the human and the alterable? Is not this simply unthinkable? It is *not* unthinkable. Scripture supplies us with one illustration of one communication,—of a form of knowledge, too, — of the human nature to the divine nature which, with all reverence we say it, that latter nature could not, in the way mentioned, have acquired. We allude to the mysterious declaration of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that our great High Priest, "though He was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered." Here it seems clearly revealed that the Son of God did, through His human nature, acquire a knowledge, experimentally, which as the eternal and impassible God it was not possible for Him *so* to have acquired. Other illustrations might be brought, but probably enough has been said to show that the doctrine on which we are relying cannot be set aside by an objection, plausible as it might seem at first sight, as that we have just been considering. No, the doctrine that by virtue of the union of natures the human nature has been replenished by all such perfections as that nature can receive stands firm and unshaken, and deserves from us, in these questions as to the amount or extent of our Lord's knowledge in His human nature, a far greater recognition and application than it has yet received from the theology of the nineteenth century.

In old times, these questions relating to our blessed Lord's alleged nescience or ignorance were keenly debated. Thomists and Scotists took their sides, and with but little practical result. We may see them all, and the singular questions which the acuteness of the disputants on both sides brought up for discussion, in any of the older treatises on dogmatic Theology.

Into these things, however, it is neither necessary nor desirable for us to enter. Two things we may claim to know, and for our present purpose these are enough; first, that in the one blessed Personality two whole and perfect natures, the divine and the human, were united; secondly, that some form of communication must have existed between the two natures in consequence of this union. The precise extent and amount of the communication between the divine and the human we cannot define: we can only say with Forbes—"Quænam autem et quousque voluerit Deus Christo viatori revelare, nemo mortalium assequi potest." Notwithstanding we may draw, in particular cases and with due regard to the subject-matter, very reasonable inferences as to the form the communication might be supposed to assume, and the sort of guarantee it would supply of the truth and trustworthiness of the declarations on the part of the humanity. We may reasonably believe, for example, that if there

were any subjects in which impartation of knowledge from the divine might be conceived to be certain and clear, it would be in matters connected with the Holy Scripture. To believe, on the contrary, that a pure and sinless human nature, so open as it would necessarily be to the inflowing of the divine nature, could know no more in regard of the true nature of the Scriptures of the Old Testament than was known by the most learned of the teachers of the time of our Lord, must surely, after what has been said, be regarded by any sober mind as simply impossible.

It is certain from Holy Scripture that there was one thing that, as man, our Lord knew not—the day and the hour of the final judgment. This, the Word, as "the voluntary mirror to Christ as Man" (to use the words of Scotus) did not will to reveal. It is, however, equally certain that there is no other passage in Holy Scripture in which nescience can be legitimately regarded as predicated of our blessed Lord, or by which the principle of the "communication" which we have discussed could be deemed to be set aside.

But to conclude. We are now, it would seem, in a position to return our answer to the second question — Whether we can, absolutely and unconditionally, rely on the results of our appeal to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ in regard to the Old Testament; and that not merely in its general aspects, but in details of authorship and composition, wherever it can be fairly shown that such details lie included in the Lord's utterances. And our answer must be, *that we can;* for it has been based on three solid considerations, which it may be convenient again finally to specify.

We have seen, in the first place, in reference to the alleged limitation of knowledge on the part of our Lord in consequence of His human nature, that we can draw no inference from *our* human nature as we know it by experience; and that we have not, and cannot have, any knowledge of those higher powers, qualities, and intuitions which essentially belong to human nature in its purity. We have further seen that, in the circumstances of the descent of the Holy Ghost immediately after our Lord's baptism, and in the endowment, as we have presumed to deem it, for His Messianic office, —we may reverently believe that His holy human nature received still fuller treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and still more vivid illumination. And, lastly, we have seen that the blessed doctrine of the union of the two natures in the one Person warrants the belief of an enhancement of the human nature by the divine, and such an enhancement, so steadfast and continuous, as makes it simply inconceivable that He who had "the words of eternal life," and had so often the words of the Holy Scriptures on His lips, could actually know less, as to the composition of those Scriptures, than the critic of our own times claims now to know, and to be able to set forth with all the certitude of science. With such cumulative proofs, who can for one moment doubt that our second question has been answered, and that in the following papers we may rightfully, and with the most enduring confidence, appeal to every utterance of the Lord, whether in reference to the Law or the Prophets, which, when accurately considered, can be shown to bear upon the trustworthiness of the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

Only one lingering objection, so far as I can see, can with any show of plausibility be urged against what has been said. And it is this, that our Lord never claimed to be an infallible or even special interpreter of the Holy Scriptures. It has been asserted, perhaps a little recklessly, that just as the Lord said to the man who came to Him about the division of the inheritance, "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" so the Lord would have said in reply to a question about the age or author of a passage in the Old Testament —"Who commissioned Me to resolve difficulties in historical criticism?" The assertion is scarcely even superficially plausible, as the questions on which we would fain receive the judgment of the Lord are as widely removed from the request of the "one out of the multitude" as can readily be conceived. Our questions, even if they may happen to relate to age or authorship, are really questions that go to the very heart of the matter. They are questions that relate not to the things of this world, but to the things that "belong to peace," here and hereafter — the trustworthiness of the Scriptures and their claims to be received as the inspired Word of Almighty God.

This certainly we may concede, that critical inquiries, to use the words of Professor Ladd, "rarely appear to have entered the horizon" of the teaching of our Lord. The passages, however, as we shall see from the two articles that will follow, are by no means few in which, though there may be no special and direct teaching on the

subject, there is often an inferential teaching of a very suggestive and even conclusive character. It will be seen that our Lord does, from time to time, inferentially return such answers to our inquiries in reference to the Old Testament as may equitably be claimed to be authoritative, and as justifying us in arriving at definite conclusions as to the tenor of His teaching. We cannot, then, assign to the objection any greater weight than this—that it correctly states an admitted fact, viz. that the questions relative to the composition and structure of the Old Testament, which are the subjects now mainly before us, did not form any special and defined part of our Lord's teaching. This comparative silence, however, is no warrant whatever for affirming that our Lord would not have entertained such questions if they had been definitely brought before Him: still less will it justify the denial that His teaching does, from time to time, involve inferences and even opinions as to matters of Biblical criticism which have the closest possible relation to our present controversies. More need not now be said. The passages in which such inferences or opinions are supposed to be involved will be specified and carefully analysed, and then be left to speak for themselves.

The question, also, whether Christ may not in some instances have spoken, either by way of accommodation, or only seemingly, and not actually, on our present questions, must not be summarily dismissed. The dulness or hardness of the hearts of those to whom He was speaking may be thought to have necessitated forms of expression which may be claimed as resulting from some principle of accommodation; but here, again, each place and each passage must speak for itself. This only do we unhesitatingly deny, that the Lord's general teaching as to the Old Testament, and those characteristics of His teaching on the subject which all reasonable interpreters would be willing to recognise, could by any possibility be attributed to any principle of accommodation, in the ordinary sense of the words. That He who was the Truth and the Light, as well as the Way, could have systematically so taught in reference to God's Holy Word, out of deference to the prejudices or the ignorance of His hearers, is utterly inconceivable.

The teaching of Christ on the subject of the Holy Scriptures must now be ascertained in detail. We have proved that such an appeal as we are about to make to Him is rightful, and that the results can be unconditionally relied on. To that appeal we devote the following articles.

Archangels.

By the Rev. Principal G. C. M. Douglas, D.D., Glasgow.

1. I must start from the basis that angels do really exist. "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both" (Acts xxiii. 8). Some writers are so keen in their polemic against the Pharisees, that they forget to say a word against the much worse positions of the Sadducees; in this point we hold with the Pharisees. And I believe in the existence of angels, in the plural, as Scripture often speaks in this way, and as plurality is necessarily implied in many of its statements; see, for instance, Gen. xxviii. 12 (with John i. 51), xxxii. 1; Matt. xiii. 39, 49, xxii. 30. In Matt. xxv. 31, there is emphasis put on "all the angels with Him," when the Son of Man shall come in His glory; and it can scarcely be doubted that an army of angels is at least included in the meaning of a favourite title of God in the Old Testament, Jehovah of hosts. In Heb. xii. 22, the Revised Version notes that the original speaks of "myriads of angels." And in Rev. v. 11, John speaks of those whom he saw and heard, as in number "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands;" with which compare Ps. lxviii. 17, though the original is somewhat obscure.

2. Among these multitudes there certainly exist varieties; for we read of "a strong angel" again and again (Rev. v. 2, x. 1, xviii. 1, 2; compare Ps. ciii. 20, 21; 2 Thess. i. 7). It is an old and common opinion, not to be easily disproved, that there are different classes of angels, which Paul enumerates, Col. i. 16, as "thrones," "dominions," "principalities," "powers" (compare Eph. i. 21); and in Eph. vi. 12, he uses similar language in