

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

struction, seeing that the history of the small tribe of Dinah, which was lost far too soon, belongs to the earliest times of the Israelitic invasion of Palestine, at least before their emigration to Egypt. The sacred tree of Shechem was in the Canaanite period the middle point of a religious society, which stood under the protection of the god of covenants, Baal-berith, but it never possessed, so far as our sources allow a judgment, the political and legal signification which, according to Erbt's conjecture, belonged to it. The tribe of Manasseh, the representative of Gideon's kingdom, is, according to Erbt, the first forerunner of the 'Aramaic' Semites in Canaan, which overpowered the Reubenite kingdom, and crossed the Jordan. Abimelech is declared to have been a tyrant of the Shechem alliance,—another groundless conjecture, seeing Manasseh appears in the genealogical tree as a part of the lost tribe of Joseph, and its dispersion to the east and west of the Jordan proves that it had at a date considerably earlier been overtaken by a serious catastrophe, which had as a result the breaking-up of the clan into new tribes and sub-tribes. Abimelech is, however, a son of the Manassite Gideon, who perhaps ruled over Shechem, but at last destroyed it. His fall has absolutely no connexion with the supposed immigration of the tribe of Ephraim. Erbt sees an attempt at immigration in the incursions of the Moabites into the territory of Benjamin and Ephraim, to whom the judge Ehud had acted as leader, and he places the event about 1070 B.C. This conception may be correct, but the fixing of the culminating point of the power of the Philistines west of the Jordan \pm 1050 is undoubtedly incorrect, seeing that the beginning of the high-priesthood of Eli in Shiloh, which is contemporary with the high-water mark of Philistine power, must be dated as early as \pm 1090 B.C. In like manner,

we cannot, with Erbt, explain King Saul as the conqueror of the Shechem alliance, which at a much earlier date had ceased to exist.

Our author is more happy in his appreciation of the conditions produced by David's conquests. The welding together of the Canaanite survivals with the progressive Hebrew spirit is undoubtedly David's historical service, and the spiritual direction aiming at centralization of worship and the deepening of religious views is no less due to him. One cannot, however, agree with Erbt when he asserts that under the influence of Solomon a consolidation of Canaanite tendencies was produced, seeing that he built the imperial temple. The temple in Jerusalem was originally no imperial temple, but a sanctuary for the Jewish royal house, which only gradually gained the predominance over the ancient sanctuaries, and, so far as it has any signification whatever, it demonstrates just the positive decline of the Canaanite influence. The reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah aimed at the removal of all places of worship, high places, and sacred trees which were still of consideration.

In this way the history is construed, but it is neither investigated nor delineated. The extant sources must certainly be carefully weighed, judged, and classified; but it is unscientific to seek to read into them one's own conception of things, and on this slippery, baseless foundation to set up far-reaching conjectures, which in all probability are in the beginning made as pure conjecture in order to be regarded immediately afterwards as the common good of science and to serve as the immovable pillars of a further construction, which hangs in like manner in the air. Erbt's book, in spite of all the diligence and acuteness of its author, is to be regarded rather as a warning example of how scientific investigation can lose its way, than as an enrichment of our knowledge.

At the Literary Table.

ENGLISH RATIONALISM.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH RATIONALISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By Alfred William Benn. (*Longmans.* 2 vols. 21s. net.)

SHOULD the historian of Rationalism be himself a Rationalist? What is Rationalism?—it depends

upon that. The historian should be in sympathy with his subject. None but a Mystic can write sympathetically, and therefore truly, of Mysticism. But it does not follow that the historian of French poetry must be both a Frenchman and a poet. What is Rationalism?

'Rationalism,' says Mr. Benn, 'is the mental

habit of using reason for the destruction of religious belief.' Mr. Benn is himself a rationalist. He believes that he has no religious belief himself; and according to his ability, which is considerable, and his industry, which is greater, he uses reason for the destruction of the religious belief of others. Should he be the historian of rationalism? He should not. For rationalism, on his definition of it, is nothing but a weapon, and a destructive one. The historian of rationalism is the historian of religious belief, and ought to be a believer.

His method is biographical. Now, there is nothing in which sympathy is more essential to truth than in the writing of biography. How is it possible for Mr. Benn to be just to the religious belief of any man when his own avowed purpose is to destroy all religious belief? He is never just. He is not just even to Huxley or to Matthew Arnold. He is not just, he is very far from just, to Ruskin and to Robert Browning.

Browning will be a good example of his method.

But first of all, let a word be said here, lest it should be forgotten at the end, on the grace of the writing, the delightful clearness and simplicity with which every argument and every illustration is set before us. Again and again we have to reject the argument and deny the pertinence of the illustration. But we feel it is almost a crime to be at odds anywhere with so courteous and so confident a writer—a writer, too, whose command of his pen is as complete as his command of his temper. But to Browning.

Like Ruskin, Robert Browning came of a Puritan stock, and, like him, received a religious training of the orthodox type. Ruskin's primary religious interest, however, was in the presence and guidance of a personal Deity. He left immortality as an open question. Browning was preoccupied with immortality. He believed in God. He believed in God more than in immortality. But he was not content with God, as Ruskin was. And when, late in life, he rejected Christianity, the rejection was due to a recoil from the orthodox teaching on the future life.

Why did Browning remain a Christian so long? Because, although with the most of his admirers he passes for a great philosopher, his mind was neither logical nor scientific; and his reading, though wide, was not in religious criticism. Most of all, because he was absorbed in the society of

his wife, who was still more pietistically educated than himself.

The first poem looked at is 'Christmas Eve and Easter Day.' This poem is a screed of doggerel verse. Its only valuable element is a wealth of imagery alternately grotesque and sublime. Its object is a rather threadbare defence of orthodox Broad Church Christianity. Browning takes his views of the Gospel entirely from the Johannine writings. God is love, and has revealed Himself as such, most of all through the person of Jesus Christ, who showed the boundlessness of the love embodied in Him by giving His life for the world. He is not a mere moralist, nor a mere man. 'The silliest dissenting rant and the blindest Roman superstition are far preferable to the philosophy of Strauss. And so on, and so on.'

Browning found it hard to be a Christian. Why? Because of the difficulty of preserving the precise equilibrium between the Church and the world. His early training and his artistic temperament are already in competition. The former will be silently dropped as the years go on. He is still orthodox in 'Men and Women.' And in 'Karshish' he looks on the Fourth Gospel as an impregnable fortress of Christianity. But at this point his wife died. It is the year 1861.

In 1864 *Dramatis Personæ* appeared. One of the pieces is 'A Death in the Desert,' which clearly refers to the theological storm then raging, and especially to Renan's recently published *Vie de Jésus*. Browning is apparently still unshaken in his orthodoxy. Walter Bagehot, reviewing the book, says: 'He has battered his brain against his creed until he believes it.' But Mr. Benn thinks the creed has suffered more than the brain. There are incidental concessions to criticism. Miracles are not good evidence now. They may even have been no more than subjective appearances. And he quotes:

Whether a change were wrought i' the shows o' the world,
Whether the change came from our minds which see
Of shows o' the world so much as and no more
Than God wills for His purpose . . .
. . . I know not; such was the effect.

Five years later comes *The Ring and the Book*. Count Guido Franceschini is put to the torture in order to extract from him the confession of his guilt. 'I do not know,' says Mr. Benn, 'whether

it had ever before been made a matter of reproach to the Christian Churches that they never protested against this cruel and senseless practice inherited from the judicial procedure of heathen States, and finally abolished in deference to the arguments of freethinking eighteenth-century philosophers.' Browning goes out of his way to denounce the torture, and to denounce religion for not denouncing it, his feelings being so strong that his language is remarkably clumsy. And Mr. Benn observes that it is not the Roman Catholic Church he denounces, but religion.

In *The Inn Album* (1875) Browning satirises the doctrine of eternal damnation. It is not true, and it would be no use if it were.

They desire

Such Heaven and dread such Hell, whom every day
The ale-house tempts from one, a dog-fight bids
Defy the other?

In 1877 he publishes *La Saisiaz*. It is written in commemoration of his friend Miss Egerton-Smith, who died suddenly the morning after a walk with him up La Salève, near Geneva. It rejects immortality. A belief in future rewards and punishments would have a demoralizing influence. Good is just good, and evil is evil, and all is according to reason. 'He who could so write,' says Mr. Benn, 'had ceased to be a Christian.'

That is Mr. Benn's Browning. We have read histories of Browning's belief which went to the other extreme. Mr. Benn's history is something of a relief, but it is not true.

Mr. Benn rejoices to believe that rationalism is more prevalent in England to-day than it has ever been before. He rejoices to look forward to the time when religious beliefs shall have ceased altogether out of the land. He does not anticipate a reaction. He knows that Butler lamented the 'general decay of religion' in his day, and that a great religious reaction followed which culminated in the 'fanatical pietism of 1827.' But William Law and John Wesley were both inspired by German influences, and 'Germany has long ceased to be a focus of pietism.' He has forgotten how easy prophecy is, and how insecure.

As for Mr. Benn himself, we commend him now to the reading of a book, in two volumes, like his own, and published on the same day—Professor Gwatkin's *The Knowledge of God*. Mr. Benn says: 'There has been a steady accession of intellectual opinion to the side of those who hold that religious

belief, like all other beliefs, must ultimately be determined by pure reason, and that, judged by reason, the doctrines of what we call natural and revealed religion are no more than survivals of primitive superstition.' Professor Gwatkin says: 'Take a scientific student of a better sort. He has acuteness and learning, diligence and candour. His work is perfect of its kind, for all that intellect can do is done. What then is lacking? Just this: either he looks to intellect only for what intellect alone cannot give; or else he gives up the problem as hopeless, because he rightly sees that it cannot be solved by dint of intellect. Feeling he looks on as "mere subjectivity"; and he guards himself against it as an intruder on scientific processes and a disturber of scientific accuracy. Such of course it is, if we so define science as to shut it out. But the claim here made on behalf of feeling is not that it shall in any way encroach on the sovereign right of intellect to decide all questions of truth. Our demand is only that intellect shall have regard to all the facts of the case. The impressions of feeling are as much facts as those of sense. They may not be so easy to deal with, but there is no reason to suppose them less trustworthy; and at any rate they are facts, and we cannot hope to get at the whole truth without taking full account of them.'

THE NATURE OF TRUTH.

THE NATURE OF TRUTH. By Harold H. Joachim, Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford. (Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 6s. net.)

'What is truth? said jesting Pilate.' And we have not found the answer yet. Mr. Joachim writes to prove that we have not found the answer. The very purpose of his book is to examine the leading theories as to what truth is, and to prove that 'every one of these typical notions and accredited theories of truth fails sooner or later to maintain itself against critical investigation.'

When jesting Pilate asked, What is truth? he did not know, says the modern preacher, that the Truth stood there before him; for 'I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life' is true. But Mr. Joachim does not deal with that. His business is with our knowledge of the truth. It may be absolutely true that Christ is the Truth, being the express image of the Father. But how much do we apprehend of Christ?

Mr. Joachim does not admit that any fact of history is truth. Why? Because no fact of history stands isolated and alone. It is a fact that Cæsar crossed the Rubicon in 49 B.C. But that fact is not truth, because it is connected with other facts, which also must be proved to be true, and absolutely true. Cæsar crossed the Rubicon in 49 B.C. Here is Cæsar at the head of his army and animated by conflicting motives of patriotism and ambition. And here is the Rubicon in 49 B.C. Cæsar not only crossed the Rubicon, but he did so with a full consciousness of the effect of his action on the political crisis at Rome. The historical fact has a context. In the context of a biography of Cæsar the statement would express a fact revealing Cæsar's character; in the context of a history of the decline of the Roman Republic, it would express the death-knell of republican institutions.

Mr. Joachim discusses three great theories of truth—truth as correspondence, truth as a quality of independent entities, and truth as coherence. And as he discusses them he discusses all the popular philosophies of the day, except one. That one is Pragmatism. Mr. Joachim does not discuss Pragmatism because he does not think it worth discussing. He does not hide his contempt for Pragmatism and the Pragmatists. 'It is not easy to discern the meaning of its advocates through the noise of their advocacy.' So he says; and dismisses them with the remark, that if there is anything true in Pragmatism it is not new, and if there is anything new it is not true.

IDOLS OF THE THEATRE.

IDOLA THEATRĪ. By Henry Sturt. (*Macmillan*. 10s. net.)

'Beginning philosophy as an undergraduate, twenty-two years ago, I adopted at once the idealism currently taught in the University [of Oxford]. Nevertheless, before long, I came to feel that the teaching we got was hardly strong enough in the explanation of definite problems. Some such thought, I remember, haunted me in hearing, for example, the logic lectures of the late Lewis Nettleship. T. H. Green, whose *Prolegomena to Ethics* I read somewhat later, was much more definite than Nettleship; but even his great doctrine of the Spiritual Principle, though it gratified religious aspiration, did not seem to be clearly

reasoned out; nor could any one be sure how far it would go in explaining the religious consciousness. Meanwhile, no open-minded student, I am certain, was quite at ease about the attitude of the Oxford idealists to modern science. A book such as Herbert Spencer's *Data of Ethics*, though palpably deficient in philosophic culture, appeared to contain much that was based on the impregnable rock of experience. And yet, to all the new ideas that Spencer represented, Green's attitude was merely negative.

'In course of time the movement which began with Green produced its crop of literature—Mr. Bradley's *Ethical Studies* and *Principles of Logic* in 1876 and 1883 respectively, Mr. Bosanquet's *Logic* in 1888, Mr. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality* in 1893, and finally Professor Wallace's *Lectures and Essays* in 1898. To the later books of this series one looked for a new and comprehensive synthesis which would show adequate appreciation of personal life, together with assimilation of scientific ideas so far as they bore on philosophy. But the more the outcome of the idealist movement developed, the less prospect there appeared that these hopes would be fulfilled. The net result for Oxford was that philosophy went down seriously in academic consideration from the position which it held at Green's death. The man of average calibre took more and more to commentating: an Alexandrian period threatened to set in. To avert such a calamity, the joint volume which afterwards appeared as *Personal Idealism*, was projected six years ago. Of the essays there included, one by Mr. Canning Schiller startled the world by its advocacy of a principle which might have been traced already in the work of Professor William James and of several Continental writers, and has now become famous under the names of Pragmatism and Humanism. This essay appears to me to have opened a new chapter in British thought.'

That brief history (which we have given in Mr. Sturt's own words, though omitting some of them here and there) brings us to the book and its purpose. Mr. Sturt is a Pragmatist. Pragmatism appeals to him because it recognizes the place of *personal striving* in the universe. He believes that it carries all that Green contended for, and that it takes account of the doctrine of evolution and the demands of science. But Pragmatism is not accepted yet. It has still its way to

fight. Why? Because certain prejudices are in the way. These prejudices of the Hegelians, the present-day 'Idols of the Theatre,' Mr. Sturt has written his book to remove.

The 'Idola Theatri' are Intellectualism, Absolutism, and Subjectivism, and the book is an exposition and exposure of each of the three. It is written in a delightfully unphilosophical style. If Pragmatism should become the ruling philosophy of the future, the part that has been taken in its promotion by Mr. Sturt and this book will not be forgotten.

Books of the Month.

Keywords in the Teaching of Jesus is a taking idea for a course of sermons. Professor A. T. Robertson of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has hit upon it (Amer. Baptist Pub. Soc.). His keywords are Father, Son, Sin, Kingdom, Righteousness, Holy Spirit, and Future Life.

Mr. Joseph Bryant Rotherham, the translator of 'The Emphasized Bible,' has just published *Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1s. 6d. net). Each section of the Epistle is first quoted from the Emphasized Bible and then commented on. The purpose is simply to make the Epistle more intelligible to us, and that purpose is fulfilled.

'The Social Question of the present time,' says Professor Peabody, 'is an ethical question.' And whatever is ethical is ours. We cannot, therefore, afford to be ignorant of the attitude of Christianity to Socialism. The Rev. W. Edward Chadwick, B.D., B.Sc., has published a small volume on the *Social Teaching of St. Paul* (Cambridge Press; 3s. 6d.). It is the very book for a beginner in the study of Christian Socialism. It needs only a little knowledge of Greek and a little love for Christ. A little love for Christ, because St. Paul's social teaching is just some of the 'unsearchable riches' which he found in his Lord. But Mr. Chadwick traces the Apostle's Socialism first to his Rabbinical training; and then, when his ideas are fundamentally altered by his conversion, he finds all the rest that is distinctive in it in the Apostle's own wonderful personality and experience.

A small book has been prepared for missionary students entitled *Notes on Africa* (Church Mis-

sonary Society; 1s.). It only opens the door into its subject, but it gives a good list of books for further reading.

The Church Missionary Society has also published a small volume in which missionaries in various fields of work record some of their experiences. *Contrasts in the Campaign* is the title (1s. 6d.).

Read Plutarch in Sir Thomas North's translation. Read him in the original if you can. But if you cannot, then in North. For although Sir Thomas North is three times removed from Plutarch—first the Latin translation of 1470, next Amyot's French version of that translation of 1559, and then North's English translation of Amyot—yet 'these successive processes have not impaired the vitality or dulled the brilliance of the original work.' Now Mr. R. H. Carr, B.A., of Trinity College, Oxford, has prepared for the Clarendon Press an edition of North's *Coriolanus, Cæsar, Brutus, and Antonius*, with an Introduction and Notes which not only explain North's Plutarch, but show how much it had to do with Shakespeare's plays.

Messrs. Constable have secured the very best men in each department for their little books on Religion. Dr. Alfred C. Haddon writes on *Magic and Fetishism* (1s. net).

Is revelation one thing, and discovery another? When you are looking for God there is a better antithesis than that. It is Atonement and Prayer. For, in the words of Professor Rufus M. Jones, Atonement is God's search for us, and Prayer is our search for Him. Professor Jones has written a little volume of studies in Atonement and Prayer, calling it *The Double Search* (Headley; 2s. net). It has all the charm of Quaker spirituality and waiting upon God, which makes criticism that is false no hindrance, and scholarship that is true a help.

The Rev. G. Waller, M.A., lately published a volume on the *Biblical View of the Soul*. He has now gone on from that and published *A Biblical Concordance on the Soul, the Intermediate State and the Resurrection* (Simpkin; 2s. 6d. net). It is a collection of material on these topics more serviceable far than any other concordance can give us.

Professor J. H. Ropes, of Harvard, has made a name for himself by his studies in the Agrapha, upon which he wrote an article in the Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible*. He has now published a volume on *The Apostolic Age* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It consists of Lectures delivered in March 1904 at the Lowell Institute. The book is therefore popular in style. It is also, on the whole, conservative in its position, the conversion of St. Paul, for example, being accepted without hesitation, and no difficulty being found with the different versions of it. But it is the kind of popularity that we cannot have too much of. For there is abundant knowledge at the back of it, and a fearless acceptance of the rights of criticism.

Professor Alexander M'Nair has written a prose 'In Memoriam.' If the imagination is less than in the 'In Memoriam' we know, the faith is more. If there is less variety of tone, there is more tenderness and more power to soothe and bless. For the memory is of a beloved wife, and the thoughts are of a true woman, what she 'may be, hath been, indeed, and is.' *The Hunger of the Heart* is the title (Inglis Ker; 2s. 6d.).

The new missionary added to Mr. Kelly's Library of Missionary Biography is *John Hunt* (1s. net). The writer is the Rev. Joseph Nettleton. Who else should have written it? 'I entered into his labours. I landed first on Viwa in 1860, and went straight from the ship's boat to his grave. There under the palm-trees, on bended knees, I consecrated myself to carry on the work which he commenced with so much heroism and devotion.' No doubt the life of John Hunt has been written already by Mr. Stringer Rowe, and Mr. Nettleton calls it inimitable and a model biography. Yet this little book had to be written, and no one else could have written it.

What is the modern doctrine of the Trinity—the modern orthodox and scientific doctrine? It has been stated with perfect plainness by the Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D., in a new book called *The Mission of the Holy Ghost* (Longmans; 2s. net). Let his own words be the best notice of his little book. Here they are—

In the Unity of the Eternal Godhead we are taught to recognize three distinctions—distinctions

so clear and separate that we ascribe to them Personality. And by this we mean what we ordinarily understand by Personality, *i.e.* a Being with self-consciousness and free determination. In the Divine Nature, then, we believe that there exist, inseparable and indivisible, and yet clear and definite, Three Persons, a Father with the consciousness of Eternal Fatherhood, a Son with the consciousness of Eternal Sonship, and a Spirit with the consciousness of proceeding from Both. So intimate is the indwelling of the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, and of Both in the Holy Spirit, that it would be as false to say there be three gods, as to say that a father, mother, and daughter constitute three families. There 'is Unity of Substance and distinction in Person.

The new volume of the 'Wisdom of the East' series is *Musings of a Chinese Mystic* (Murray; 2s. net), being selections from the philosophy of Chuang Tzu, with an Introduction by Professor Giles.

For some time the favourite biography has been psychological. The biography of *John Witherspoon*, by David Walker Woods, jun., M.A., is not psychological (Revell; 5s. net). It is ecclesiastical if you like, and it is political. For John Witherspoon was a great force in the ecclesiastical life, first of Scotland in the middle of the eighteenth century, and next of America in the early days of Presbyterianism and Princeton. And he was a still greater force in the political life of America in those most momentous days when America was breaking away from the tyranny of the mother country.

So it is not merely a biography. As biography, there is no great fascination about the book. For the character of John Witherspoon was of primitive simplicity. It is a chapter in history. And as a chapter in history its interest and importance could scarcely be overestimated. For here we have just those things which the professional historian omits, although they are the things of most importance and of most interest—the private letters and the private talk of the men who make history, their doubts and hesitations, their fears, their heroic resolves. Mr. Woods has written the book plainly and popularly, as he should have done.

Twenty years ago, the newspapers tell us, Dr. R. F. Horton was asked to cancel a promise to preach at the Annual Conference of a certain denomination because he had published a book called *Inspiration of the Bible*, and it was not

supposed to be sound. This year Dr. Horton has been invited again, and he will not be asked to cancel the engagement. This year also he has issued a new edition of *Inspiration of the Bible* (Fisher Unwin; 1s. net).

The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, JUN., M.A., EDINBURGH.

The House Beautiful—(continued).

ON the second and third days the Pilgrim receives from the Church three different kinds of preparation for the journey of the Christian life that lies before him. The three are, like so many of Bunyan's symbols, admirably chosen, and together they present a very complete view of 'the preparation of the Gospel of Peace' with which the apostles would have the feet of all pilgrims shod. The three are—(1) Intellectual study; (2) Spiritual realization; (3) Armour.

Study.

The Protestant Church has always laid great stress on this. However earnest and whole-hearted in his devotion a man may be, however rich in spiritual experience, however quick with those instincts which go to make what is called religious genius, yet this further preparation is required. Religion is and ought to be a thing of knowledge, and the more thorough the intellectual labour of faith is, the more effective will the believer be in the world. Consequently the Church must ever put in the forefront of her responsibilities the question of religious instruction both for her ministers and for laymen.

Naturally, the great subject of such study is the Bible—those 'records of the greatest antiquity,' which are the first things shown to Christian. In *Grace Abounding* we read in one place: 'The Bible was precious to me in those days. And now methought I began to look into the Bible with new eyes, and read as I never read before; . . . and, indeed, then I was never out of the Bible.' Every reader of that book will remember the re-

curing phrase, 'to be set down in the Scriptures by the Spirit of God.' Bunyan's was a simple way of Bible study. At times, indeed, we find the suggestion of modern questions which have perplexed the student, but these are generally brushed aside as temptations of Satan, and the spirit of the study is that of childlike simplicity of faith.

The order in which the various subjects are taken is not without significance. First comes the person of Christ; second, the saints and heroes of the faith; third, the message of the Gospel, confirmed by prophecy. It is not until the next day, and then not until after he has seen the weapons of defence and attack with which a man must be endued, that he looks into those curiosities which too often have a more important place assigned to them.

Christ is first, and in that we have John Bunyan's great secret. There is a royalist ring in the first words of this passage, as of one appealing from the cruel and perverse government of the English kings of his day, not to a republic, but to the King of kings. It is probable that Bunyan's fighting was done on the royalist side of the English struggles, and certainly there is in all his views of Christ the feeling of hereditary and exultant allegiance. It may be that this partly explains the fact which he shares with all contemporary theologians, that the study of the doctrine of the person of Christ precedes that of his 'recorded acts.' No change is more significant than this, that while the older theology came down upon the record of Christ's words and deeds from a doctrine of His person found in the region bordering upon Metaphysics, the modern order is from the human Christ to the divine.