THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'You know this book?'

'The Bible! Of course! Everybody knows it!'

'Pardon! It would be more correct to say nobody knows it! To read it is not always to understand. There are meanings and mysteries in it which have never yet been penetrated, and which only the highest and most spiritually gifted intellects can ever hope to unravel.'

Mr. Hugh Capron makes that quotation from Marie Corelli in order to introduce the twenty-seventh chapter of his new book on *The Conflict of Truth* (Hodder & Stoughton). He agrees with Marie Corelli. There are meanings and mysteries in the Bible which have never yet been penetrated. It is more correct to say that nobody knows it. But the immediate point he wishes to make is not that. He has been struck with the truth that lies hidden in the most familiar texts. We read them again and again, and think we know them. Then something turns our attention to them from another side, and their meaning flashes out upon us.

Mr. Capron has just had that experience. His mind had been full of the subject of the New Birth. He knew it was a doctrine of the Bible. He knew it was 'the very foundation of the whole fabric of religion.' He was considering how he could make known its condition. Its condition is simply 'trust in Christ.' He knew that, but he could not find a text to declare it. Then the original word in a familiar but mistranslated passage occurred to his mind, and he saw it all in a moment.

It is the passage which describes the healing of the paralytic who was 'borne of four.' Mr. Capron quotes it from St. Mark's Gospel. The scene is graphically and naturally described. We follow it by easy stages. Then we come upon the words, 'Son, thy sins have been forgiven,' and we are brought to a standstill. That was not what the man came there for. That was not what his four friends brought him for. The Jews themselves were startled. They asked the question, Who is this that forgiveth sins? We do not ask that question. We ask why the sins were forgiven before the man had fulfilled the condition of forgiveness.

But the man had fulfilled the condition of forgiveness. That is the discovery which Mr. Capron made. The condition is faith in Christ. He found the man's fulfilment in the one word, 'Son.'

That word is a mistranslation in our English versions. The Translators of the Revised Version acknowledge that it is a mistranslation. In their

text they say, 'Son, thy sins are forgiven'; but in their margin they say that the Greek word for 'son' means 'child.' And Mr. Capron believes that under the circumstances there is all the difference in the world between 'Son, thy sins are forgiven thee,' and 'Child, thy sins are forgiven thee.'

For, in the first place, it is then no longer a mere epithet of tenderness. Jesus was only thirty. The man was old, or at least of middle age, for was he not so heavy that four men were required to carry him? How could the youthful prophet of thirty speak to this man of middle age and call him 'Child'? It is not a mere epithet of tenderness. It has a definite meaning. It describes one who is just born. *Teknon*, from *tikto*, 'to bear'; it is equivalent, says Mr. Capron, to the Scotch word 'bairn.' It is used with special reference to birth. It is an indication, brief but pregnant, that the man had set his trust on Christ for the forgiveness of sins, and that in that moment he had been 'born again.'

But there is a difficulty. It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Capron. We wish it had, that he might have got us over it. This is not the only place in which this word 'child' (*τέκνον*) occurs. In particular, we remember that it is used in a passage in St. Luke, and is addressed there to a man who may be supposed to be of middle age, just as here. The passage is the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. And it is used by Abraham in addressing the Rich Man in hell.

The Conference on Confession and Absolution, which was held at Fulham Palace in December, and of which a *Report* has been published by Messrs. Longmans, opened with a discussion of the meaning of two familiar passages in the Gospels—Mt 18^{18} and Jn $20^{22.\ 23}$. It was felt by the Bishop of London, at whose invitation the Conference met, that the controversy regarding private confession and priestly absolution turned upon the interpretation of these passages. He assigned the duty of expounding them, and thereby of opening the Conference, to Professor Swete.

The first passage refers to 'binding' and 'loosing,' the second to 'remitting' and 'retaining' men's sins. Dr. Swete found it necessary first of all to explain what 'binding' and 'loosing' mean. 'To bind and to loose,' he said, 'is a well-known Rabbinical formula, meaning to prohibit and to permit.' The synagogue claimed the office of acting as arbiter and judge in all questions of religious right and wrong. Our Lord committed this office to His Church, the new Israel. 'The Church is to exercise on earth a judicial authority in spiritual things, which, so far as she is true to Christ and guided by His Spirit, will be ratified in heaven.'

In other words, the commission given to the Church to bind and to loose, is the right and the duty of ecclesiastical discipline. In the passage in St. John one special application of this right is mentioned. It is the power to forgive or not to forgive sins. In the Old Testament this right is reserved for God in heaven: 'Then hear Thou in heaven Thy dwelling place, and forgive' (1 K 8^{39}). After the Incarnation it was exercised by our Lord upon the earth—exercised by Him *as Man*, in virtue of the authority so committed to Him by the Father: 'That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power (authority) on earth to forgive sins' (Mt 9^{6}). And then after the Resurrection and Ascension it was committed to men, as members of His body and partakers of His Spirit.

So now men have the right, Dr. Swete believes, to forgive other men's sins or refuse to forgive them. But they possess that right only as members of the body of Christ and as ruled by the Spirit of Christ. Then, and only then, is their action ratified in heaven.

But on whom was this right bestowed? On all the members of the body of Christ, or only on the

apostles and their successors? On all the members, says Professor Swete unreservedly. 'Like the wider authority to bind and loose, the forgiveness of sins is committed to the Church collectively.' Dr. Swete presumes that the Church may exercise her authority either in her corporate capacity or through duly qualified officers, but the authority belongs to the Church, and the Church cannot rid herself of the responsibility. If individual members of the Church exercise the authority, they do so in the name of the whole Christian society.

Thus Professor Swete interpreted the authority to forgive sins and to retain them as committed to the Church as a whole, and not to any individual or individuals within the Church. And all the members of the Conference agreed with him. When the Bishop of London entered the room at the close of the Conference to receive the report, the Chairman said: 'The members are agreed that our Lord's words in St. John's Gospel, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained," are not to be regarded as addressed only to the Apostles or the Clergy, but as a commission to the whole Church, and as conveying a summary of the message with which it is charged.' And the Bishop of London, when he wrote a Preface to the *Report* of the Conference, called it a most valuable point of agreement, and said: 'If once it is understood that the clergy are acting as organs of a priestly body, all the members of which are themselves in their measure kings and priests to God, more than half the misunderstanding which centres round the word Sacerdotalism would die away.'

It is curious to hear the Bishop of London speak of the members of the Church of Christ as kings and priests *in their measure*. Does he mean that after all they are kings and priests in a less measure than the clergy? or does he mean that they are kings and priests in the measure of their progress in grace? On either explanation the words are a mistake. On the first because the very point of the agreement was that the members of the Church have received everything from Christ, and if the clergy seem to receive anything further, it is only because the Church is pleased, for convenience of administration, to entrust them with the discharge of certain offices. And on the second because 'He hath *made* us kings and priests': it is not dependent on moral progress, it is a full and final gift of grace.

But there is a matter of yet greater consequence. The members of the Conference agreed that the authority to bind and loose was conferred upon the whole Church. They based their agreement on Mt 18^{18} and Jn $20^{22.23}$. They seem also to have agreed to ignore an earlier passage than either of these, which contains a greater difficulty.

When Professor Swete began his interpretation of Mt 18^{18}, he said: 'We are thrown back by this passage upon a still earlier declaration closely resembling it, namely, Mt 16^{19}.' It is the passage which contains the commission given to St. Peter. Professor Swete mentioned it and then passed on, and the rest did not refer to it. But in this passage the commission is clearly given to a single individual in the Church, and it is the very commission to bind and to loose, together with the gift of the Keys and the promise of becoming the Foundation Stone of the Church. Dr. Swete understands that the metaphor of the Keys is the same as the metaphor of binding and loosing. The mention of Keys might have led our Lord to speak of opening and shutting. But He passes rather to the familiar figure of binding and loosing, His meaning being the same. We do not doubt that Dr. Swete is right. But then this very authority to bind and to loose was conferred on St. Peter, an 'individual officer of the Church.' and it is conferred before the Resurrection and Ascension. In what relation is St. Peter thus placed to the whole Church? Was his authority to be held in abeyance till after the Ascension?

And even then was he only to become the mouthpiece of the infant Church?

The Church of Rome does not so understand it. To St. Peter alone was this power granted, says the Church of Rome,—to St. Peter and to his successors in the Papal Chair in all time coming.

And it must be confessed that if the power thus conferred is the power of ecclesiastical discipline or of absolution, it is difficult to deny the claims of the Church of Rome. It is not only the right of binding and loosing that is conferred on St. Peter; he is also said to be the Rock on which the Church is built. The one declaration is as difficult to get over as the other. If St. Peter is to be but the mouthpiece of the Church in all matters of Church discipline, it is a striking thing of our Lord to say, 'Whatsoever *thou* shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever *thou* shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' And how then can it be said that St. Peter in particular is the Rock on which the Church is to be built?

A remarkable sermon on the passage has recently been published in Rome. It was also preached in Rome. It was preached by the Rev. J. Gordon Gray, D.D., who has added to his scholarship a residence of many years in the Eternal City, and is familiar with all the phases of the 'Roman question.' It is called 'The Rock on which Christ built His Church.'

It is remarkable that such a sermon can be preached in Rome at all. Dr. Gordon Gray says so himself. 'Fortunately,' he says, 'we now enjoy such liberty in this very city, where for centuries the papal claims could not be called in question without running the risk of fines, imprisonment, or even death itself, that we can bring them openly to the test of Scripture.' But the sermon itself is more remarkable.

For there in the city of Rome, under the shadow of St. Peter's, Dr. Gordon Gray will have none of the escapes from the meaning of this passage which Protestantism has so often had recourse to. The Rock is not Christ Himself, nor the words which Christ has spoken. St. Peter and no other is the Rock on which the Church of Christ is to be built. No doubt the other apostles are associated with him as the Rock; and not apostles only. St. Paul makes 'the temple,' which is 'the habitation of God through the Spirit,' rest on a foundation of apostles and prophets. But St. Peter was the first confessor of 'the Christ.' From that position no one could ever afterwards displace him. And as first confessor he has a place assigned to him which no other apostle or prophet shares with him.

But what is that place? What is the power of the Keys? What is the right to bind and loose which was thus uniquely conferred on St. Peter? Dr. Gordon Gray does not believe that it was ecclesiastical discipline or any power of absolution. He cannot conceive that such a thought was in the mind of our Lord when he handed the Keys to His confessor. It was not the after history of the Church that was occupying Him. It was not the way in which the Church would deal with offenders within her visible border. It was not the way in which she would take in or cast out. It was not the way in which she would exercise any judicial function whatever. It was the beginning of the Church. It was the opening of the Kingdom of Heaven to believers. St. Peter had 'confessed' that Jesus was the Christ. That confession will always be the entrance into the Kingdom. St. Peter has made it first, and he first will be the instrument through whom others will make it, when the time has come and the Spirit has been given. And it was so. It was St. Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost that opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers. He was the first stone laid in the foundation of the Christian Church. He and his words were the key which unlocked. He loosed and he bound, for some believed and some blasphemed.

And what he did on earth was done by God in heaven.

That is Dr. Gordon Gray's belief. That is also the belief of some of the men who sat in Conference at Fulham. Said Canon Hay Aitken: 'Our Lord rises from the dead, and meets His disciples with the burden of His great salvation on His heart. He communicates to them the capacity for remitting sins; makes them depositaries of the great secret, which had been hid from previous ages, that sins are to be forgiven, through the atoning blood of Calvary, by the union of sinners with the Saviour in that act of faith which makes the work of redemption their own. They thus received the Holy Spirit, revealing to them that in the application of this supreme truth lay the function of remitting and retaining sins. Then they went forth and preached, as in the day of Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins"; or again, "Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out," thus opening the door of salvation. This was just what our Lord needed to say, and what the world was waiting for.'

Before we pass from the Fulham Conference another matter may be touched upon. It is mentioned by Dr. Llewelyn Davies in a letter to the *Guardian*.

The Conference was almost at an end when Lord Halifax said: 'The necessary thing is to confess our sins, not our sinfulness.' Dr. Llewelyn Davies is arrested by the significance of this utterance, and wonders it was missed by the other members. He believes that the discipline of the Confessional is unevangelical and unspiritual, and in these words he finds a brief and succinct revelation of the fact.

For it is our sinfulness and not our sins that the New Testament urges us to confess. There are passages which seem to be on the other side, but Browning is in touch with all that makes the teaching of the New Testament distinctive when he says—

> Not on the vulgar mass
> Called *work* must sentence pass,
> Things done, which took the eye and had the price!

Robertson of Brighton also is in sympathy with the New Testament, and surely with unperverted human need: 'This is the sting of sinfulness, the wretched consciousness of an unclean heart. It is just this feeling, God is not my friend; I am going on to the grave, and no *man* can say aught against me, but my heart is not right. It is not so much what I have done, it is what I am. Who shall save me from myself?' (*Sermons*, iii. 219).

But Lord Halifax says, and Dr. Llewelyn Davies believes that he says quite truly, that at the Confessional it is just our sins and not ourselves, it is just things done which take the eye and have their price, that are spoken of. In saying that we should confess our sins and not our sinfulness, Dr. Davies believes that Lord Halifax ranges himself with the Pharisee of the parable, and separates himself from the publican, who would not so much as lift up his eyes to heaven, but smote upon his breast and said, 'God, be merciful to me the sinner.' The Pharisee thought he went home justified, but 'this man,' said the Lord, 'went home to his house justified rather than the other.'

'Except a man be born of water and the spirit' (Jn 3^5). We have not overcome the difficulty of these words yet, nor lost our interest in them. Last month there was mention made of Professor Wendt's way with them, and it has called forth further references and suggestions.

The difficulty is with the water. How can the material element of water be necessary to a process that is so absorbingly spiritual? Professor

Wendt's short way is to omit the word 'water.' It did not belong to the saying, he thinks, as it left the mouth of Jesus, or even as it was committed to writing by St. John. It was added by the redactor of the Fourth Gospel. But there are less drastic methods than that.

A well-known scholar has given us a reference to Dr. Taylor's *Pirqe Aboth; or, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (Camb. Press, 1897, p. 159). Dr. Taylor recalls the Old Birth, the Creation of material things, and what is said of it in Gn 1^2. It is there said that 'the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' Here also are the two elements, spirit and water. It is most probable that our Lord—or St. John, if you will, reporting Him—had the first Creation in mind when describing the second. The probability is expressed even by Clement of Alexandria. To be born of water and spirit, therefore, says Dr. Taylor, is to be born 'not of the one only, but also of the other.' *Ex nihilo nihil fit*, he seems to mean. There must be the element of 'water' to work upon. But the element of water which may be considered literal in the first Creation is figurative in the second. Expressing that nature in man which the Spirit works upon, it is taken up by the Spirit, is transformed, and becomes spiritual. As the spirit of God brooding upon the face of the watery waste brought forth order, so the same spirit brooding upon the watery waste of man's sinful nature brings forth spirit and life.

If that is Dr. Taylor's meaning,—and he must tell us if we have misunderstood him or carried him too far,—there is no reference in this significant saying to Baptism. And when we look at the examples of the New Birth, as they are recorded of the early years of Christianity in the Acts of the Apostles, do we not see that it is rather with the Laying on of Hands than with Baptism that the gift of the Spirit, the essential matter in regeneration, is received? The twelve Ephesian disciples had been baptized, but they had not received the gift of the Spirit. No doubt they had been baptized 'into John's baptism.' But even after they were baptized 'into the name of the Lord Jesus,' it was not until Paul had laid his hands on them that the Holy Ghost came on them (Ac 19^6). So also in that earlier incident, where Peter and John are the instruments (Ac 8^{16}). Samaria had received the word of God. The Samaritans had also been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. But, as yet, the Holy Ghost was fallen upon none of them. 'Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.'

And where water is mentioned in reference to the gift of the Spirit, is it not rather in contrast than concomitance? 'I indeed baptize you with water,' said John, 'but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.' 'For John indeed baptized with water,' said Jesus Himself, 'but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.' 'Then remembered I the word of the Lord,' said Peter, when the case of Cornelius and the Gentiles was before him, 'how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.'

The answer is made that in the examples referred to, the gift of the Holy Ghost is not the occasion of the New Birth. It may not be even coincident with it. And that answer is very popular just at present. But we find it rather the watchword of a party than a commonplace of exegesis. The most reliable expositors, indeed, either do not commit themselves to it, or else deliberately reject it.

But if the reference to Baptism is to be retained, there is no explanation of the words in Jn 3^5 so simple or so sufficient as that which is given by Mr. James Neil in his little book called *Figurative Language in the Bible* (Nisbet, 1s.). Mr. Neil's explanation was mentioned in an early volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (iii. 97), and need not be repeated at length. Its point is this. In Eastern tongues hendiadys is a common form of speech.

In hendiadys the qualifying adjective is turned into a substantive. Thus when St. Luke tells us (Ac 14^{3}) that the priest of Jupiter brought 'oxen and garlands,' with which to offer sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas, we understand that he means wreathed or garlanded oxen. So when St. Paul rejoices (in 2 Ti 1^{10}) that 'our Saviour Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel,' we may consider whether he means more or other than immortal or incorruptible life. And in like manner where our Lord says that except a man be born of water and spirit (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος) he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, Mr. Neil perceives the employment again of the figure of hendiadys, and says that in our Western tongues it should be rendered, 'Except a man be born of spiritual water'—the emphasis being strong on the adjective.

In the explanation of Jn 3^{5}, which has just been given, it will be observed that the word 'spirit' is spelt with a small *s*. That raises one of the difficulties of the passage. And not of this passage only. Even where the word 'holy' accompanies 'spirit' it is not always certain that 'spirit' should be spelt with a capital.

A series of small commentaries on the books of the New Testament is being issued by Messrs. Jack of Edinburgh, under the general editorship of Professor Adeney. In that series the Acts of the Apostles is edited by Mr. Bartlet of Mansfield College, Oxford. At the end of Mr. Bartlet's commentary there is an 'additional note' on the meaning of the phrase 'holy spirit' in the New Testament.

Mr. Bartlet believes in the grammar of the Greek New Testament. The question here turns on the presence or absence of the definite article. He holds that the definite article is present or absent not at haphazard, but from deliberate choice. He believes that when the article is present we should translate 'The Holy Spirit,' for then the reference is to a Person in action; and when the article is absent we should translate 'holy spirit,' the reference being then to an influence or force.

In a very few cases there is difficulty, perhaps indecision. This is where the article may be due to some grammatical necessity, not to the Personal agency. Mr. Bartlet refers to Ac 8^{18}, 'Now when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) was given.' Here the article may be due to the previous mention of 'holy spirit' in verses 15 and 16 (both πνεῦμα ἅγιον without the article). The article would then be merely used for identification, and the proper translation would be 'holy spirit.' So would it be with Ac 4^{31} $19^{2\text{-}6}$, and possibly Ac 11^{15}. In these places it is not the Person working but the influence or power wrought that is in mind. Mr. Bartlet would therefore explain the presence of the article by some such grammatical rule as all students of the language are familiar with. Elsewhere he believes that there is no doubt of the meaning. Where the article is present emphasis lies on the divine energy involved, or on God as personally exercising power, indwelling and working in man; where the article is absent the emphasis is on the result of God's action, the 'divine enthusiasm,' as Mr. Bartlet would then translate the phrase, which belongs, as a fact of experience, to the elect souls in whom the Spirit of God thus dwells and works.

Mr. Murray has published a new *Lux Mundi*. Its title is *Contentio Veritatis*. It is written by six Oxford tutors. None of them wrote in *Lux Mundi* itself. Perhaps the new book is less the manifesto of a party in the Church than the old. Perhaps the writers are more scholars and less ecclesiastics. But *Contentio Veritatis* will do for the beginning of the Twentieth Century what *Lux Mundi* did for the end of the Nineteenth. It will mark the pace at which we are travelling and the progress we have made.

There are six writers and seven essays. Mr. Inge writes both on the Person of Christ and on the Sacraments. Mr. Wild writes on the Teaching of Christ, Mr. Burney on the Old Testament, and Mr. Allen on the New. The Church is Mr. Carlyle's subject. And Dr. Rashdall opens the book with a philosophical essay on 'The Ultimate Basis of Theism.'

Throughout the book, from Dr. Rashdall who opens to Mr. Inge who closes, the matter of most consideration is the miraculous. In that there lies the great distinction between the present writers and the authors of *Lux Mundi*. The authors of *Lux Mundi* were not disturbed by miracles. To the average High Churchman miracles are an everyday occurrence. He meets the Arnoldian dogmatism, 'But miracles do not occur,' with a flat denial. And thus he is delivered from the necessity of producing such overwhelming evidence as others demand for their occurrence in the past. But the new writers are scholars rather than Churchmen. They rest their case on evidence. As scholars, too, they feel the pressure from the side of physical science more. They see, they all see, that at the present moment the thing that most needs facing, and is most difficult to face, is the presence in the Word of God of the supernatural.

Now it is satisfactory to observe that none of these writers denies the possibility of miracles. It is satisfactory to observe that none of them denies their credibility. They feel the scientific pressure keenly; they know the relief that has come to some from criticism—criticism which finds various elements in the Gospels, for example, and the miracles always among the latest and least reliable, yet they never begin their business by saying that the miracles must be got rid of. They are tried by them, but they deal with them as subject to the rules of historical evidence.

Dr. Rashdall handles them philosophically. His position seems tentative, perhaps untenable, but it is significant. He says that there are some regions in which our knowledge of nature is so complete as practically to exclude the possibility of miracles; there are other regions where it is not complete, and the way is open to the introduction of an unsuspected law, to the occurrence of a miracle. We know the laws of the earth's motion, and we depend upon their regularity as an absolute necessity of thought. Therefore, he says, the 'stopping of the sun' (he is speaking of the miracle in Joshua) is simply unthinkable by us now. And this principle, he fears, cannot stop with the Old Testament. 'The rising of the saints out of the tomb with their bodies, and some of what are called the "nature-miracles," may surely, with tolerable confidence, be placed in this class.'

On the other hand, we know so little of the operations of the mind that it is questionable how far we can apply this idea of 'law' in its ordinary sense at all. 'To suppose that the most exceptionally endowed human soul could have stopped the motion of the sun would be to reject the assumptions upon which all historical research and all scientific reasoning proceed. But to suppose that some diseases can be healed by mental means, that some persons possess more power than others of such healing—this,' says Dr. Rashdall, 'is not opposed to, but in conformity with, what we know of the action of mind upon the physical organism; nor can our present knowledge be held to exclude the belief that one person may have had a power unparalleled in history of effecting such cures.'

This is as far as we should have expected Dr. Rashdall to go. But he goes a little further. He touches the Person of Christ before the essay closes. And then he says that historical criticism leaves 'the beliefs about Christ's Person which are most cherished among ordinary Christians' modified but still recognizable in two particulars. First, it admits the general fact that much of His time was spent in the healing of physical diseases

by means of extraordinary spiritual capacities. And, next, it acknowledges that after His death there occurred to His disciples visions of Himself which were not mere subjective delusions, and which confirm—for them and for us—the fact of His continued life and love for His followers.

Mr. Inge's paper is on the Person of Christ, and he has much to say about the miracles in the Gospels, but we pass him over for a moment. Mr. Wild writes on the Teaching of Christ.

Now in an essay on the Teaching of Christ Mr. Wild need not have touched the question of miracles. It would have been better, perhaps, if he had not touched it. But he cannot help himself. He is under the spell of the spirit of the age. He sees, as all the responsible exponents of the Teaching of Christ now see, that the teaching and the miracles are bound together. And yet he comes as near to separating them and then rejecting the miracles as it is possible for a scholar now to come.

Mr. Wild divides the miracles into classes. He places his different classes 'in a certain perspective.' In the dim background are some isolated actions, like the transference of the devils to the Gadarene swine and the cursing of the barren fig tree, which he cannot explain. Nearer the foreground are acts which seem more consistent with the character and personality of Christ, such as the raising of Lazarus from the dead, which demand more evidence for certainty than at present we possess. Finally, and in the forefront, the cases of spiritual healing. The last are in no sense inconceivable to modern thought or modern science. Possibly they are the foundation of all the other stories in a wondering age.

Mr. Inge, we have mentioned, has much to say about the miraculous. How could he avoid it in writing on the Person of Christ? And he sees, as the others we have mentioned scarcely see, or partly ignore, that the miracles cannot be separated from the Person of Christ. To separate them from His Teaching may be possible; from His Person, says Mr. Inge, it is not possible to separate them.

Mr. Inge admits that the miracles in the Gospels cannot be established upon historical evidence alone. There is not historical evidence for any past event that will make it impossible to deny that event. But the miracles of the Gospels do not rest upon historical evidence alone. Ultimately they rest upon the Person of Christ. And even as a historical critic Mr. Inge holds that belief in the Person of Christ, such belief as includes the Incarnation,—and the Incarnation includes all we consider miraculous,—is essential to the Christianity of history and of to-day.

The Priesthood without Pedigree.

By Professor the Rev. Benjamin W. Bacon, D.D., Yale University.

The author of Hebrews has two Psalms which form the foundation for his (or her?) argument in behalf of the supreme authority of Christ, and which are intermingled in the two preliminary chapters. That first developed is Ps 8, the use of which our author borrows from Paul, along with the doctrine of Christ as the 'appointed Heir of all things through whom God made the worlds'[1] (1^2; cf. Gal 4^{1-7}, Ro 4^{13} 8^{16-21}, 1 Co 8^6 15^{24-28}, Col 1^{16-19}, Eph 1^{22} 3^9, Ph 2^{10}; cf. Rev 21^{5-7}).

[1] On the Pauline doctrine of the κληρονομία resting on Gn 1^{26-28}, Ps 8^6, and Mk 12^{1-12}, identical with the contemporary doctrine of the Pharisees (cf. *Assumpt. Mos.* 1^{12-14}, *Apoc. Bar.* $14^{18f.}$ 15^7 21^{24}, 2 Es $6^{55.\ 59}$ 7^{11} $8^{1.\ 44}$ 9^{13}), and transmitted to the earliest Fathers in the form, 'God created the world on behalf of the Church' (Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4. 1; *Mand.* xii. 4; Justin, *Apol.* i. 10; ii. 4. 5, *Dial.* xli.; Irenæus,