The allegoriser says that the sword in Christ's thought was not of steel, but referred rather to intellectual weapons. The missionary of the future would have to face antagonists, and must be prepared to do battle with them on their own ground. Education was henceforth essential for him. Rhetoric, oratory, philosophy, could not be dispensed with. A St. Paul would succeed where a St. Peter might fail to secure a hearing.

This is true, and contains a useful lesson for those who are preparing for holy orders. Let them as a matter of duty do their utmost to acquire the best possible training. Especially let them investigate the pressing questions of the day.

But this interpretation does not lie on the surface. It is an extension rather than the original meaning. We come therefore to the literal sense.

In the quiet easy times of prosperity Christ's messengers had had a simple task. Their glad tidings had found a way to ready minds and hearts. Loving disciples had vied with one another in supplying their bodily needs. But a different day was dawning now. The 53rd chapter of Isaiah, which says of the Messiah, "He was numbered with lawless men," and goes on to speak of death and burial, would soon be fulfilled. And "if they persecute me, they will also persecute you." You must take nothing from them. You must earn your own money and provide your own food. You will be brought before kings and rulers. You will encounter brigands and assassins. For your defence you must learn to wield a sword.

This is the only interpretation which satisfies the context. It was when the disciples understood Him too literally that He cut them short. Oriental figures of speech were not to be taken in their strict sense. No servant of Christ could really go forth with a sword. "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." Rather he must go expecting opposition, with the martyr spirit, but as a good soldier of the cross.

Does any one think it impossible that Christ could thus positively have made a command and then immediately on second thoughts explained it away by a kind of recantation? Let him beware of denying the reality of the Incarnation. That our Lord should have had a human mind is an essential part of that inexplicable mystery. And impossible though it be for us to understand the union of so finite and limited a thing with the fulness of the Godhead, we must not on that account deny it. And we have at least one, and that a more striking example of its presence, when Christ said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God," that is, "It is absolutely impossible for a rich man to be saved," and yet presently added, "With men this is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible" (Mark x. 27).

Professor Bruce's "Apologetics."[1]

By Alfred E. Garvie, M.A. (Glas.), B.A. (Oxon.).

The force and the freshness of all the writings that Dr. Bruce has hitherto published have doubtless led many to look forward with eager hope to this work; and there need not be any fear of disappointment. It has all the characteristics of the author's personality. Geniality in the conception of the truth to be defended, generosity towards opponents (except the self-satisfied and the dogmatic), and candour in the statement of objections and difficulties—these are here. The title of the work suggests what is the author's view of the task of Apologetics, and we are prepared for the formal statement of his purpose by the brief sketch of the history of Apologetics, with which the book opens. The definition of Apologetics as Christianity defensively stated, raises two questions—(1) What is the Christianity to be defended? and (2) How is it to be defended? The author's answer to the first question will seem to some doubtless rather subjective. He may appear to be limiting Christianity to those elements that have commended themselves to him as essential and vital in his own religious experience. This danger he himself recognises; but inasmuch as he conceives the function of Apologetics to be not the gratification of a speculative interest, but the satisfaction

[1] *Apologetics; or, Christianity Defensively Stated.* By A. B. Bruce, D.D. T. & T. Clark. 1892.

of a practical necessity, he appears altogether justified in seeking to secure the acceptance by others only of that which he himself approves. But if he thus chooses for himself the ground to be defended, he allows himself to be guided in his defence by the present and immediate attack of the enemy. He does not amuse himself with the safe slaughter of dead giants, but deals blow for blow with living foes. "Apologetic," he writes, "is a preparer of the way of faith, an aid to faith against doubts whencesoever arising, especially such as are engendered by philosophy and science" (p. 37).

The work falls into three books. Book I. deals with Theories of the Universe, Christian and anti-Christian; Book II. with the Historical Preparation for Christianity; and Book III. with the Christian Origins. It may seem ungracious, when there is so much of interest and importance given, to find fault that there is not more, yet the complete treatment of the subject even from the author's own point of view would appear to demand two other books. If it is needful to set side by side the Christian and anti-Christian theories of the universe, and in detail to vindicate the superiority of the Christian, it seems at the present equally needful to compare the Christian with the non-Christian religions. It is true that Dr. Bruce does by the way, in dealing with the religion of Israel, refer to other religions, and in his last chapter on "Christ as the Light of the World," he touches on Christ and other masters; yet this treatment does not seem to us adequate to the interest and the importance of the subject. In the next place, surely the book on the Origins of Christianity might have been followed by one in which the author clearly stated his own attitude, and the attitude which he would commend to others towards the subsequent development. Again, it has to be admitted that he does not altogether overlook this question, for he does refer to the authority of the Church as subordinate to the authority of Christ, and by his allusion to the school of Ritschl he affords a hint of his attitude; and yet such a work as the late Dr. Hatch's Hibbert Lecture, so ungenerously attacked by Mr. Gore in his Bampton Lecture (in which he mistakes a clever reply to an unfortunate phrase for a convincing disproof of an important argument)—such a work shows the apologetic value of a critical study of Church History. By availing himself of the results of this and kindred works, Dr. Bruce might have vindicated as objectively valid the subjective conception of Christianity which he defends. Is Mr. Gore right or wrong when he defends as permanently adequate the metaphysical categories of the creeds of Nicæa and Chalcedon? This it seems to us is a most urgent problem for Christian Apologetics.

Coming now to the three books, which have been given us, it may be remarked that many readers will doubtless find the first of these less satisfactory than the two others. In the chapter on "The Christian Theory of the Universe," we have rather a statement of the postulates (to use a phrase of Kant) of the Christian experience than a rigorously consistent philosophical interpretation of nature and history. It should not be forgotten that, as Hegel himself claimed, and his English interpreter Professor Edward Caird maintains, the Hegelian philosophy professes to be the philosophical counterpart of the Christian religious consciousness. This philosophy is not treated with fairness when it is put in the same class as Spinoza's pantheism. Whether the Hegelian philosophy has or has not failed in solving the problem set by the antecedent development of philosophy is not here the question; but it is surely a confusion of differences to regard the definitions of God as substance and of God as subject as equally opposed to the Christian definition of God as ethical personality. While it may be admitted that the first excludes the last, that God as substance and God as ethical personality are inconsistent conceptions, yet the second God as subject can at least, so it seems to many thinkers, be harmonised with the last God as ethical personality. If Dr. Bruce had acquired more of the Hegelian faculty (some, perhaps, will prefer to say caught the Hegelian trick) of "thinking things together," he would have given to the "Christian Theory of the Universe," as he conceives it, a rational unity that would have been more satisfying to some minds. That Dr. Bruce is doubtful of the possibility, and does not recognise the necessity of such a complete synthesis, there are some indications in this work, and yet this is a demand that it will seem to some at least Christian Apologetics must attempt to meet more adequately than he has done.

An outline of Book I. may now be given. After a brief statement of the Christian facts, and

of the theory of the universe that may be extracted from these facts, pantheism, materialism, deism, modern speculative theism, and agnosticism are all passed in review, and are found wanting. Into the details of the criticism of each of them it is impossible here to enter. In dealing with agnosticism, the author well remarks that "not *that* God is, but *what* God is, is to be insisted on"; and yet he fails in his treatment of the theistic proofs in showing how the evidences of the existence of God and the conception of the nature of God mutually imply each other, the proofs being moments in the immanent development of the notion of God (compare Dorner's *System of Christian Doctrine*, vol. i.). A more definite philosophical position on the part of the author would, we feel convinced, have made this part of the work more satisfactory to some of his readers.

In the second book, dealing with the Historical Preparation for Christianity, we meet with what may be surely pronounced an unexpected feature in apologetic literature—the candid and cordial acceptance of critical results. Are we wrong in supposing that the author's decided preference, often expressed very vigorously for the ethical as contrasted with the ritual elements of religion, has led him so readily to acquiesce in the order "Prophets and Law," instead of "Law and Prophets?" Of the apologetic value of this new view, Dr. Bruce's treatment of the history gives satisfactory evidence. Noteworthy features of this treatment are the view held of Israel's election as an instance of "God's care for the interests of the true religion, not for a pet people," and so implying function rather than privilege; the assertion of the ethical monotheism of the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries; the defence of the Decalogue as "the great Mosaic institution"; the thoroughly modern estimate of the ethical rather than the evidential value of Hebrew prophecy; the frank acknowledgment of the injurious aspects of Judaism; the severe condemnation of later legalism; and the very courageous statement of "the defects of the Old Testament Religion and its Literature." On many minor points Old Testament scholars will differ from the author, yet this cannot be put down as a fault, for critics differ from one another. (This is not said to disparage criticism, but to emphasise the difficulties which the apologist who accepts critical results must meet with in determining his own position.) Many readers who are not informed nor interested in such details will be grateful to the author for the aid to faith afforded by his view of the Old Testament, yet there are some questions not fully answered that may very properly be asked. How far will the new apologetic defend prediction as a necessary element in Hebrew prophecy? What value must be set on the Old Testament evidence of the miraculous, and what is the relation of the ethical to the supernatural in these records? While it is doubtless an important part of the apologist's task to exhibit the moral and religious value of the Old Testament, yet the objections brought forward against the position regarding prophecy and miracles hitherto held by apologetics demand more attention than is here given them. The author sometimes seems content to dismiss some feature of fact or truth as inexplicable, when some of his readers will be inclined to think that the bounds of the intelligible might have been safely pushed further back.

In the third book, on the Origins of Christianity, the author very prudently transfers the normative authority from John's Gospel and Paul's Epistles to the Synoptic Gospels, the historicity of which he maintains as giving us a vivid and distinct portrait of Jesus. Regarding John's Gospel, he admits the subjective influence as regards order, form, matter, and is content with maintaining simply the possibility of its Johannean origin. Avoiding, on the one hand, the unwarranted disparagement of Paul, and, on the other, the exaggerated exaltation of him, both of which extremes we find in modern times, the author acknowledges his limitations, yet while deriving his teaching from, and subordinating it to the teaching of Jesus, he defends its leading features as a legitimate and in certain types of character as a necessary development of the Christian principle. Of the character of Primitive Christianity the view held is substantially that of Weizsäcker, that the universalism for which Paul contended was intended by Jesus, maintained, though not consistently nor vigorously, by the other apostles. This brief summary of the conclusions reached on these important questions must suffice; but, in closing, attention must be called to the five chapters in which the central fact and the supreme truth of the Christian faith—the person of the Lord Jesus Christ — is sketched with reverent affection. The charm and the claim of this

personality is clearly to the writer the most satisfying evidence that Christianity is "the power and the wisdom of God," and he will commend his view to many of his readers. The treatment is that of a biblical rather than of a constructive theologian. "The physical resurrection remains, but a mystery"—"Jesus has for the Christian consciousness the religious value of God." These may be the last words that can now be said on the Resurrection and the Divinity of our Lord, and it may be that it is the apologist's duty and wisdom to emphasise the historical and neglect the metaphysical aspects of Christianity, to urge its practical rather than its speculative claims; yet we may hope that the day will dawn when Christian Apologetics will be constructive as well as defensive; yet till then this work, which we most heartily commend to all, will hold a unique place, and render an inestimable service.

The Revised Version in Australia.

By the Right Rev. Samuel Thornton, D.D., Bishop of Ballarat.

You have published an abundance of opinions on the alleged failure of the Revised Version, and I am only induced to trouble you with mine by my Archdeacon,—your correspondent, Ven. H. E. Cooper of Hamilton,—who assures me you would like to have it.

As he mentioned in a letter printed in your August number, I took the step, last March, of publicly "advising" (as carefully distinguished from "ordering") the use of the Revised Version in reading Lessons, in this diocese; and the Diocesan Assembly unanimously passed a responsive resolution, expressing satisfaction at learning "that the Lessons may be read in Church from the Revised Version."

Since then fourteen or more of our sixty parishes have adopted it, and others will soon do so.

In advising as I did, I acted alone. Indeed, my next neighbour, the Bishop of Melbourne, has since given publicly the opposite advice, arguing that the Original Text was still uncertain, and that the Bible Society, which fairly represented English Christianity, had not accepted, nor the Church of England formally endorsed, the Revision.

Having previously weighed these considerations without being convinced by them, and perceiving that things were ripe for some diocese to essay the change, I felt impelled (being now the oldest in the See of the Australian Bishops) to do so myself. Nearly ten years of study of my "parallel Bible" having forced on me the conviction that the Unrevised Authorised Version is so full of small mistakes, and so discreditably wrong in some important details, that it is contrary to duty to encourage its use, where a corrected (albeit not perfect) form of it is available.

As a matter of conscience, I now never buy,—read in public (except as prescribed in the Prayer-Book),—or help in circulating, the Unrevised English Scriptures.

That the Revised Version is the less rhythmical of the two versions, in not a few passages, all agree; but rhythm is valueless where purchased—as often in the Authorised Version—at the expense of fidelity. And the complaint as regards many passages is fanciful, or born of the indolent Toryism of habit. "Use and wont," as one of your correspondents suggests, will soon reveal to the ear a rhythm of its own in the new version. Another of your correspondents points to the *improved* rhythm, in its corrected form, of Rev. vii. 9 *sqq.* in the New Testament; I venture to instance the same in Job xxii. 15 *sqq.* in the Old Testament.

That the Revised Version is the less idiomatic in some passages is also true; in a few, it seems forgotten that, after all, aorists are made for man, and not *vice versâ*. But I have been struck with the failure of most fault-finders to suggest real amendments where they point out deficiencies; and I gravely doubt whether most of them could improve, on the whole, the Revision they disparage.

Criticisms of the Revised Version on either ground are often met by the marginal reading, which, it is believed, commonly represents the mind of the best Revisers, though it may not have commanded a numerical sufficiency of votes to be admitted into the Text.

After all,—is *English style* a vitally important