
A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1879.

ART. I.—*Records of the General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China, held at Shanghai, May* 10—24, 1877. Published by the Shanghai Presbyterian Mission Press.

THE volume before us contains some twenty or thirty papers read before a Conference of Chinese Missionaries of all Protestant Denominations, at Shanghai in May, 1877. The idea of this gathering had been suggested by the very successful Conference of Indian Missionaries held at Allahabad some five years before, and the subjects treated cover very much the same ground. The striking similarity in the character of the problems discussed at the two Conferences, cannot fail to suggest to the reader the very close affinities existing between the Indian and the Chinese work. The palm of masterly exposition and treatment must, however, be given, we think, to the Allahabad essayists and disputants. Not that we would undervalue the painstaking work in the volume before us, for no one can read it without enhanced interest in Chinese Missions. But Indian questions lend themselves to more fascinating methods of treatment; and Indian Missions from the priority of their establishment, the completeness of their equipments, and the larger number of men who have been drawn into their service have necessarily developed minds of a devotion, a refinement, and a statesmanlike grasp and order of view it would be difficult to match elsewhere.

The subjects of the Shanghai Conference essays comprise, "Native Religions; Preaching; Medical Missions; Itineration; Foot-binding; Work amongst Women; Educa-

tion; Christian and Secular Literature; The Standard of Church Membership; The Native Pastorate; and some other matters." It will be impossible in the course of a short review to take up all the subjects discussed. It may perhaps be well to give a running sketch of the papers, pausing only on the subjects that seem to call for special comment or criticism.

The Conference proceedings were inaugurated by a good plain sermon on "The Missionary Commission," and an address on "The Work of the Holy Spirit," of more than ordinary vigour, beauty, and spiritual insight. The list of essays opens with one on "Entire Consecration Essential to Missionary Success." The most impressive points of the essay seem to be that "entire consecration does not mean celibacy," "that it is not good for man to be alone," and "that no more important influence can be exerted on heathen families than that of female married Missionaries." Entire consecration, we are further informed, means "a creed," and excludes "literary labour of great cost of time and strength." In dealing with the question of what constitutes Missionary success, the author of the essay tells us "that entire consecration is itself a great success," and "that not converts or gathering of congregations constitutes the highest Missionary success, but the thorough setting forth and holding up to the heathen of Jesus Christ and Him crucified." The means of securing the success thus defined are "mental training," "good manners," "Christian manliness," and "a holy life." We are next introduced to an essay on "The Field in its Magnitude," by a writer well known to the English public through an entertaining narrative of travels in North China and Manchuria. The title of the essay is made to cover sundry observations on "the vast mineral resources of the Chinese Empire," "the intellectual capacity of the Chinese people," and "the spiritual aspects of our work." Most of the essayists seem impatient of the texts to which they have been picketed by the committee of arrangements; and the lack of agreement between the papers and their titles, suggests the idea of a general stampede.

After "The Field in its Magnitude," came an essay on "Confucianism in its Relation to Christianity," from the pen of perhaps the most competent sinologue Chinese Missions have yet developed. The essay was excluded from the records of the Conference, on the ground that it

touched the question that has long divided Chinese Missionaries into three classes—the term to be used for God. In our judgment the treatment the essay received was a very serious blot upon the proceedings of the Conference, for the essays of several of the American Missionaries touched the question from their side, and that in a very objectionable form. To reconcile this inequality in the treatment of the different parties who introduced the subject, it is whispered that Dr. Legge's essay put Confucianism upon an equal platform with Judaism as a preparation for Christianity. From personal knowledge of the character of Dr. Legge's pulpit teaching and an intimate acquaintance with not a few converts he has trained, we do not suspect for one moment that the essay would put Confucianism upon the same level with Judaism as an *equally direct and inspired* preparation for Christianity; and those who would deny it the character of a providential preparation in any sense whatever, must either be discreditably ignorant of what its teachings really are, or belong to that narrow and purblind class that can see no Divine leading where its own special phrases are not yet current, and that still finds the fingers of one hand quite sufficient to count the census of "the elect." But the horror shown of Confucianism throughout the whole of the Conference proceedings fell little short of madness. Confucianism was the red rag of the Conference, and was no sooner waved in the air than somebody (generally an American) answered to the sign. The subject came up under preaching, schools, education of native agents, and never failed to elicit "foam." One speaker puts down the lack of feeling in the Chinese character to Confucianism. Objection is taken to a Chinese pastor saying that Christianity "supplements" Confucianism, a very harmless way surely of describing the relation of Christianity to any system that treats morality only on its human side. The same speaker says again "Confucianism destroys enthusiasm" (a statement very far from the fact), and that in our native preachers "there must be conversion from all other masters, particularly Confucius." An American lady who prepares an essay on "Woman's Work," goes out of her way to lecture the Missionaries, and tells them with that bouncing, didactic omniscience which seems to be the special product of American Female Colleges, "that it is the Confucian classics that mould the national character

as we see it,—non-religious, anti-progressive, self-conceited, narrow-minded." A godless Frenchman might just as well trace the insularity and grossness of John Bull to the New Testament. The same lady gives the gauge of her actual knowledge on these subjects in the next sentence, where she suggests that some competent person should prepare an epitome of Chinese history (!!) and literature (!!) for use in the schools." An able and experienced English Missionary, whilst ready to teach the Confucian classics in connection with Christian education, goes so far as to say that "Confucianism is the greatest enemy with which Christianity has to contend; but just as Mohammedanism is in Africa, because it contains so large an amount of truth." The last statement, of course, carries its own explanation, and is innocuous; but most of the preceding fulminations are obviously wild and ill-judged, and if at all common amongst the Missionaries must augur ill for the future of their work. There is no doubt that Confucianism is the predominating influence in shaping all Chinese modes of thought. Education is entirely Confucian, and the power of expression education confers is necessarily Confucian in its form. But it argues very imperfect methods of analysis to trace back the whole round of a Chinaman's sympathies and antipathies to the same source as the expression in which they are clothed. Nothing can fairly be called Confucian in Chinese character or belief that is not traceable to some particular precept or group of precepts in the Confucian classics. It would be just as reasonable to trace the hatred of the Moslem against the Frank to the monotheism of the Koran rather than to the rankling memories of the Crusades, as it is to trace what is unprogressive and anti-foreign in the Chinaman of to-day to the Confucian classics, rather than to race-prejudice, distrust of free-trade, and hatred of the war-waging barbarian. Most of the declaimers against Confucianism seem to ignore the distinction between strength and intelligent and necessary antagonism. Confucianism *is* the master force in all Chinese thought. But is it the greatest foe that Christianity has to confront? Certainly if its teachings are so hostile to the New Testament, that Christianity is compelled to threaten its very existence before it can hope to establish itself. Not, however, if its teachings are such that they will blend, and that without violence, into the moralities of the Gospel. Confucianism

is a system of ethical positivism from which the supernatural is excluded. It recognises the family, the community and the state, and the duties it teaches are duties growing up out of the relation of the individual to these three institutions. True we have embryonic nature and ancestral worships in the classics, but the classics themselves supply enough to counterbalance their own recognition of these things. When Confucius was questioned about paying religious rites at the grave of parents, he said, on the one hand our instincts protested against the idea of treating parents as dogs in their death, and on the other hand, if you were to say that parents were as conscious of these rites as though living, that would not be true, because they were not. We are told again that he rarely spoke of "spirits, and marvels, and feats of strength," that "life was not known, much less death," and that he accounted it "wisdom when he was really ignorant to know that he did not know," &c. Such admissions ought surely to be enough to enable the advocates of Christianity to limit the sphere of Confucian authority to teaching upon the subject of secular duties. Indeed Confucianism to a Chinese mind means mainly family, social, and state moralities, and the man who attacks Confucianism is always suspected of attacking these things, and put down as a Communist. Some who took part in the discussions of the Conference said they never referred to Confucianism in their preaching, but if the preacher does not start from a Confucian standpoint, a Chinese hearer will, and although the preacher, whose mind is running on one plane, may find great pleasure in his own exercise, the Chinese hearer, whose mind is running on an altogether different plane, will not be very sensibly affected. To ignore Confucianism and its phraseology means to ignore all existing ideas, and to try and create a new world of thought and feeling by beginning with the molecules of speech rather than with its organic forms. Our wise master-builders propose to pulverise their blocks of stone, and pile up their structures from atoms, rather than to shape and put into place the masses of solid thought already surrounding them. The stone is good although it may need many a toilsome stroke to bring into the lines of the Divine harmony. The way in which the strength of Confucianism has been misread into necessary antagonism to Christianity is lamentably childish. Because Con-

fucianism has a good deal of the kind of strength that silicates give to the wheat-stalk we must not class it with the nightshade. It may not need to be cut up root and branch. Confucianism will survive as a harmless form of social and political philosophy long after Christianity has overspread the eighteen provinces, just as in some of the states of America we see corn sown in amongst the oaks of the old forests. The oaks are picturesque, and although the agriculturist would gladly see them out of the way, they perhaps don't do very much harm. When Christianity has conquered all Chinese thought, "the Four Books" and "the Five Kings" will be read in Chinese schools just as the Greek and Latin classics are read in our schools to-day, and the germs of error they contain will be in as little danger of germinating in the young Chinese mind, as the references to the old mythologies found in our classics are of vivifying in the brains of healthy English schoolboys. The Chinese system of education is perfect as a classical education, and Christianity can consist just as well with a classical as with a scientific education. But we must not suspect the Missionaries of that chicken-heartedness in the presence of Confucianism that their words might seem to indicate. A good deal of the horror of Confucianism is dramatic and springs up out of the term "controversy." It is very clear what the inevitable settlement of the term question must be if that settlement is made upon a Confucian basis, and those who take the side that must lose by such a settlement, naturally wish to exclude the least tinge of Confucianism from the education of the native preachers and the children of the native churches. To make the native preachers mortify themselves upon the question of Confucian culture in the way advocated by some of the speakers, will be to turn the circle of the Chinese ministry into a prison-house, where every inmate is required to adorn himself with short-cropped hair and literary drab; and to set aside the Confucian classics in the instruction of native Christians and their children, will simply end in limiting the Gospel to the lowest of the rural populations, and constituting Christianity the matron of a day-nursery for peasant babies, rather than the crowned keeper of conquered "strongholds."

The episode to which the paper last referred to gave rise, was followed by a paper on "Buddhism and Tauism in

their Popular Aspects," from a pen that has already given to the public a painstaking and reliable delineation of "Religion in China." The paper points out the marked degeneracy in the popular forms of these faiths. The position won at first by teaching a high and inspiring philosophy is now retained by sheer priestcraft alone. There is one particular, however, in which the popular mind has reacted to advantage upon the Buddhist faith. "The people's craving for immortality" has given rise to the doctrine of "the Western Paradise," which has largely displaced "the legitimate Nirvana of Shakyamuni." The paper is of course right as to matter of fact, but we half suspect the explanation is rather too wide. At the time when Buddhism and its capital doctrine of the Nirvana first spread in India, the people's craving was evidently for annihilation rather than for a positive immortality. Brahmanism and Caste were in the full flower of their strength, and the life of the great masses of the people was so void of all social good, and so crushed out by towering oppressions and despotisms, that the complete termination of all existence appealed more forcibly than any other idea to the popular cravings and susceptibilities. In China, on the other hand, with a government based upon more generous ideas, a social system that, notwithstanding grave blemishes, was vastly more human than the social system of the Hindoos, and a more complete and wide-spread mastery of the science of getting out of the world all the enjoyment that has been put into it; good seemed to outweigh evil; life was more manifestly worth the living; existence was felt to be better than non-existence, and the idea of the Western Paradise came by-and-by to overshadow that of the orthodox Nirvana. Modern parallels might be brought to illustrate these modifications and the causes underlying them. In reading the biographies of Schopenhauer and the European pessimists, it is easy to see how the preponderance of vexation and disappointment in their lives gave rise to that craving for non-existence rather than immortality, which they boldly avowed, and which made them Buddhists in everything but name. Unless under the influence of profound religious conviction and principle, men crave annihilation or Paradise, according to the measure of joy in their lives. The paper next speaks of Taoism, showing how in its modern form it practises upon the popular dread of evil

spirits, and is little better than a system of magic. The Tauist priests are often responsible for those popular panics, which sometimes spread like epidemics from city to city, and not unfrequently end in revolt and massacre. The Tauists have appropriated the ideas of the Buddhist Purgatories and introduced them into their teachings about the future life. In the discussion that followed the paper, we are told how Buddhism arrested the materialistic tendencies to which the agnosticism of Confucius gave rise, and that it has been of no inconsiderable service in maintaining some sort of testimony to the vanity of the present life. The value of such a testimony, amongst a people who are apt to become so completely intoxicated by present and visible good as the Chinese, cannot be over-estimated.

In turning over the pages of the Conference report, we next come to a paper on "Preaching to the Heathen: Matter and Manner." The paper is void of any such speciality as its title and occasion might seem to promise. After telling us that it is "the Gospel in its authority, necessity, import, obligation," that we are to preach, we are informed that the style of preaching it must be "simple, clear and plain," "earnest and affectionate," "intelligent and appropriate," "direct, pointed, practical," "experimental, interesting and attractive," and "Scriptural," advices that may, perhaps, be as cogent in Bau, Honolulu, Timbuctoo, and Dunrossness, as in Shanghai. The triteness of the essay was redeemed by the discussion to which it gave rise. One speaker indicated his sense of the importance of preaching by saying that ninety-eight out of every hundred Missionaries should be preachers. Of the remaining two one might be a philologist, and the other a school-teacher. The influence of the recent revivalistic movements in England and America, was a noteworthy feature in the addresses of some of the speakers. It was urged that Christ should be preached as a present Saviour from sin, and that immediate conversions should be always aimed at. Perhaps the revivalistic spirit as it shows itself in some of the addresses, and whose presence we must of course all hail with delight, is, perhaps, in just a little danger of overlooking the necessity for preliminary ideas before conversion can take place. If great waves of religious feeling were to come, as some people almost seem to expect, before the ideas to which they are the true response were well and deeply settled in

the national mind, new and gigantic systems of error and fanaticism might arise that would need centuries to disintegrate and remove. The advocates of a revivalistic style of preaching to the Chinese, seemed to overlook the succession of truths in the Christian system. A speaker, who was alive to the omission, took occasion to quote a remark made by the apostolic Burns to a brother Missionary; and nobody will distrust the worth of the remark from a man who was crowned with such splendid success as an evangelist: "Your preaching is too evangelical," meaning that there could be no knowledge of Christ possible to the Chinese mind till there was some preliminary knowledge of the nature of God. The Chinese mind will not vibrate to evangelical interjections and expletives, till tempered and tuned by long and careful courses of previous instruction. One speaker is so far carried away by revivalistic ideas as to deprecate the use of ridicule. To abstain from occasional ridicule in preaching to heathen congregations, is to let a whole world of force lie waste; for the Chinese sense of the ridiculous is almost unequalled in its keenness, and, if wisely worked upon, may at times give more purchase than any other point of leverage in the whole round of the Chinese character. Indeed, a Missionary may produce a more solid and serious effect by using a little banter and pleasantry now and again, than by earnest logic; and the preacher who pulls a long face, and wears a solemn air, is, as a matter of fact, making the most formidable attack upon the gravity of a Chinese audience of which he is capable. Two admirable papers on "Itineration" next came before the Conference for discussion. It seemed to be accepted as a Missionary axiom that itineration should be first "near" and then "far," and there was a very general consensus of testimonies that colportage apart from preaching was of little practical benefit. Two papers by two excellent and successful Medical Missionaries, describe the openings for Medical Mission work amongst the Chinese, and define the conditions under which it can be best carried out. The native faculty is ignorant of anatomy and physiology, has no knowledge of the nature of disease and the properties of medicines, and abjures the simplest forms of surgery. A Chinese pictorial primer, just published, indicates the position of the native doctor, by placing him midway between a priest and a fortune-

teller. We are told that the working expenses of a Missionary hospital, apart from the salary of the medical officer, need not exceed £200 a year; that the Medical Missionary should not undertake private practice amongst Europeans, and should by all means interest himself in the religious work of the hospital.

Several essays by ladies who have been engaged in teaching, visitation, and other forms of Missionary work, will, of course, be read with interest, and judged as mildly as possible. A rhetorical disquisition on "Foot-binding" intimates that the abolition of the practice within Christian families ought to be made a test of Church-membership. This view, however, did not seem to meet with general acceptance. Although nobody dissented from the axiom of one of the speakers that "a Christian woman should have a Christian foot," it was thought that that happy consummation would be best brought about by moral influences rather than by the exercise of Church authority. It was mentioned in the course of the discussion that the Emperor Kang Hi of the present dynasty resolved to end the evil on his accession to the throne, and issued an edict forbidding it. He was about to issue a second edict, when his advisers warned him that the step might possibly provoke a revolution, and cost him his throne. The essays and conversations on "Female Education" were far from encouraging. It transpired that not only are the girls in boarding schools largely supported out of Mission funds, but that money is even paid to secure the attendance of girls in the day schools. No surer method of damaging the interests of female education with the respectable classes of the Chinese could possibly be adopted. One lady, in a well-written essay, pleads that a Chinese girl can be supported on £6 a year, and reminds us of the enormous sums spent on charity schools in England. The appeal is characterised by the impulsive generosity and the economical short-sightedness we should naturally expect from a female pen. The Chinese have managed to get on hitherto without a poor-law, and Christianity will not be the social gain it has been in other countries if it educates the people for that humiliating dispensation. We must protest, too, against the confusion between the conversion of Eastern woman and her education in a Missionary boarding school by which these appeals are so often characterised. England has

had generations of Christian women whose religion was not kindled in Christian boarding schools. If we are to take the ground of some of the papers before us, alas for the souls of the poor creatures who passed into eternity before the Pentecost of tatting and crochet burst upon the Church. It is a consolation, however, to remember after all that the Christian woman grows with the growth of Christianity, and is not the special creation of a Mission boarding school. A much more encouraging account is given of house-to-house visitation by European ladies and the Bible women under their direction than of "Female Education."

The subject of "Education as a Missionary Agency" naturally occupied an important place in the deliberations of the Conference. The papers read were prepared by Missionaries who had taken an active part in educational experiments amongst the Chinese, and naturally held to one side of the question. The argument of one of the essayists, that science has been providentially put into our hands for evangelistic ends, as the power of miracle was put into the hands of the first Apostles, is obviously strained, and ignores what, alas! has to be told on the other side about the disintegrating influence of science upon faith. High schools in which science should be taught, it was said, would give access to the upper classes of Chinese society. This can never be true till foreign science has a position equal to that of native literature, and the Chinese Government alone can give it that position. It is a constant complaint of the European professors in the Imperial College of Western Science in Pekin that whilst the Chinese Government is faithful to all its engagements with them, it puts no adequate seal of recognition upon the subjects they teach. Youths are sent to them who have been selected from the lower grades of native society, and who are destined for very subordinate appointments. In some of the entrance examinations for literary degrees the Chinese Government has given the alternative of mathematics instead of essay-writing to the competitors, and that is no slight step in advance; but till Western subjects are recognised in the examination for the higher degrees, it can scarcely be said that schools for instruction in Western science will give access to the better classes of the Chinese people. The Chinese youths who will by-and-by become the influential men of the empire

could only be reached by engaging famous native professors of Confucian literature at higher rates than they could command by their independent exertions, and establishing a system of colleges on purely native lines. Such a system would cost as much as a system of high schools manned by European professors, and would have this drawback, that it would subsidise what, after all, is not an ideal system of education. Missionaries might, perhaps, learn a lesson from a practice not unknown amongst Oriental races. When a man goes into the bazaar to make a purchase, he never fixes his eye at first upon the article he wants, or says a word about its price. If he were to make a prompt bid for the article he wants, the shopkeeper would make him pay in proportion to his eagerness, or perhaps even suspect an unknown value in the article, and absolutely refuse to sell. After deliberating over some dozen articles, he very incidentally lights upon the thing he has desired all along, asks the price in a tone of admirable indifference, and accomplishes the purchase at a minimum of both time and pence. If Western education is impatiently pressed upon the Chinese, it will be a very costly and difficult process to get it established: if the Missionaries wait with Oriental indifference and self-possession, and do not bid for the right of educating the Chinese youth, they may possibly soon have in their hands that very important force upon which their hearts are set. But whilst the idea of establishing high schools for heathen students did not seem to command very much support, the desirability of educating to the fullest possible extent *within* the Church was admitted on all sides. Native preachers were to have the widest and most liberal training the Missionaries were able to impart, and separate schools were to be formed for the children of native Christians, where they might be isolated from heathen influences, and trained upon methods in advance of the humdrum and old-world methods prevalent in the country at large.

Three essays deal with the subject of "Classical, Colloquial, and Secular Literature." The first gives an interesting view of the attempts that have been made to create a Christian literature in the current classical style. Some seven versions of the Bible, none of which will do more than just outlive the century, thirty or forty commentaries on different portions of the New Testament, and 521 publications in Theology and Narrative, besides hymn books and rituals, make up a fairly imposing list. The number

in the last division is surprisingly high, and shows what a large proportion must have disappeared from circulation almost as soon as published. With the exception of half a dozen tracts on current superstitions, a translation of the *Pilgrim's Progress* that is almost as piquant as the original, and one or two recent publications directed to the wants of the better educated amongst Chinese inquirers, very few of the Missionary publications seem to have so far hit the popular taste as to have any but the feeblest chances of survival. The essay on "Colloquial, or 'Vernacular,' Literature," as the writer prefers to call it, is full of special pleading, and assumes positions that, if in favour amongst the general body of the Missionaries, must irreparably discredit them as messengers to the educated classes of the Chinese. Versions of the New Testament, besides religious treatises of a more or less pretentious character, have already been published in eleven colloquial dialects. The aim of the paper on "Vernacular Christian Literature" is to establish some sort of parallel between classical Chinese and the Latin of the Middle Ages, and to show that the position of the men who are trying to give versions of the Scriptures in colloquial to the Chinese is identical with that of the first translators of the Bible into the common tongue of the people. The ambitiousness of the parallel is ahead of its accuracy. Had the power of reading Latin, in the days of the Tudors, been as common as the power of reading English now, had shopkeepers possessed such a mastery of Latin as to have written all their business letters in the language of the schools; and had the peasants, who could not even read, been in the habit of flinging off Latin quotations as freely as Baron Bradwardine in *Waverley*, the first translators of the Scriptures into the tongue of the people might not have felt the same crying need for their work they did. Not only does the production of colloquial versions involve a waste of strength, but in some cases it is a positive detriment to the progress of the work. In districts where the standard of education is uniformly low, they will be comparatively harmless. In districts, again, where the standard of education is high, and a colloquial literature of a respectable order exists, colloquial versions will be comparatively harmless. But in districts, again, where the standard of education is high, and where no native colloquial literature exists higher in character than the

literature of the London music halls, the dissemination of colloquial versions must prove an incalculable mischief. They provoke the scorn of the *literati*, and lower the standing ground of Christianity to that of the obscene publications that are issued in the same literary livery. If colloquial versions are to be published at all, they had better be published in Romanised character, as this keeps them beyond the notice of the Chinese *literati*. But a Romanised version is, after all, an inert and inanimate thing to the Chinese mind, and is a more than questionable investment of labour and money. Words are robbed of all their pictorial suggestiveness to the Chinese eye by being represented through the Roman character. The ideographic element in a Chinese character is a powerful stimulant of the imagination, and keeps reading from becoming leaden and insipid. The need for colloquial versions is very much exaggerated. The difference between learning to read a simple classical style and a colloquial is so slight that it may be fairly concluded the man who cannot succeed with the former will have to be taught through the ear altogether. Changes must come in the style of the written language of the Chinese. It is sure to burst its old bonds as scientific and theological ideas begin to germinate in the Chinese mind. But the Missionaries are misjudging their strength, and allowing themselves to be drawn aside from their true work to a profitless adventure, if they imagine they can anticipate, or help on, or determine these changes. In respect to Chinese literature, it may be said the whole country is "of one speech and of one language." The Missionaries who are toiling on colloquial versions, or rather whose teachers are translating them from classical versions under Missionary supervision, are but seeking to spread Babel into literature. We do not remember where it is predicted that the building up of the Christian Church should be connected with a new extension of the curses of the Confusion.

The essay on "Secular Literature" is a defence of the Missionaries who have left their first calling and taken lucrative positions as translators of European text-books on Law and Science under the Chinese Government. A story is told of a Missionary who spent some spare half-hours in talking geography to a Governor-General of the Fukien Province, and the Governor-General by-and-by published a very valuable book on the "Geography of Western

Countries." The essay does not scruple to intimate that the good done in these spare half-hours of conversation with the Mandarin was far greater than the good done by the Missionary in his more directly evangelistic efforts. The moral of the story seems to be that there are stronger and Diviner forces immanent in civilisation than in Christianity; that it would be well to put Jèsus Christ into a corner for two or three decades, and bestow upon Mr. Keith Johnstone the honours of temporary teacher, saviour, and regenerator of the Chinese; and that it is a sublimer stroke of work to put a few glimpses of Europe within the horizon of a man dressed in silks, and with a peacock's feather in his hat, than to fire the soul of a man who only wears cottons and a plain red-braid button at the top of his cap with the purity and love of Jesus Christ, and to light up his eye with the vision of the wonders that lie beyond the stars.

Several healthy Evangelical essays discuss "The Standard of Admission to Full Church Membership," and "The best means of Elevating the Moral and Spiritual Tone of the Native Church." A paper by the chaplain to the English community in Shanghai on "The Duty of Foreign Residents aiding in the Evangelisation of China, and the best Means of doing so," passes in review diplomatists and officials, sailors, medical men, journalists, merchants, and foreigners in the employ of the Chinese, and betrays, in conclusion, those exaggerated views about the evils of Missionary sects which have been brought on to merchants' dinner tables in the East with the dessert since the first Chinese war, but that are as baseless in actual fact as they are canting and conventional in their forms of expression. The essayist suggests that if "the mists of prejudice were cleared away," the Missionaries might, perhaps, all agree to accept the teachings of the Apostles' Creed! It is just possible they might be able to accept as much in common as the ministers of that dubious unity of the Church represented by the worthy chaplain.

Next come a group of essays on "Self-Support in the Native Churches," "The Native Pastorate," and "The Advantages and Disadvantages of the Employment of Native Assistants." The writer of the paper on "The Native Pastorate" complains that, although he has heard native preachers deliver "pleasing and instructive sermons," he has never heard "a native preacher who pro-

duced a profound impression." An equally sad lament might be uttered about the preaching of the Missionaries. The fault is one that should be charged against the congregations rather than against the preachers. No profound impression can be produced upon a congregation till it has been so far saturated with Christian ideas and sensibilities as to make it responsive to the preacher's words. The essayist wisely prefers "adult converts to school converts for preachers;" but, to balance the wisdom of his preference, tells us, alas, that he "would not spend much time in training outside the Bible." In reference to the training of native agents, a very successful Missionary observed that, "in the present state of the country, native scholarship is of far more importance than foreign scholarship. A high English education is not found to inspire the Chinese with any great respect for the native who possesses it, whilst a thorough native education never fails to do so." The essays on "The Advantages and Disadvantages of the Employment of Native Assistants" deals with the disadvantages only. The employment of native assistants out of Foreign Mission Funds is "contrary to mental philosophy," and "objectionable on purely ecclesiastical grounds," inasmuch as it subjects native assistants who are members of native churches to the jurisdiction of Missionaries and Missionary societies. The first point is one that may be allowed to pass in virtue of its amusing obscurity; the second will appeal to those only who are affected by such an overpowering mania for Independency that they will resent those very mild modifications in favour of Presbyterianism Congregationalist churches necessarily adopt when they form themselves into Missionary corporations. The argument against the employment of native assistants, drawn from the mercenary character of some who have been taken into the service of the Church, is rather an argument for the removal of the Missionaries who have been so overdriven by their own ambition, or so lacking in the discrimination of character, as to make these blunders. It is an argument against grants of money by Missionary societies for a native agency at a stage of the work when the money can only be used for drawing away the bribable converts from other Missions. It is an argument against the hasty employment of new and untried converts. But we cannot see that the argument is of force beyond these points, and discredits the judicious

employment of a well-selected native agency. A note is appended to the foot of the essays, that "they must not be looked upon as representing a majority of opinions in the Conference." One speaker draws a distinction between the payment of men out of Mission funds who are acting as native pastors only, and the payment of men who are acting as evangelists. The first case he would think reprehensible, the latter perfectly right in principle. An essay characterised by quiet Christian wisdom and thorough familiarity with Chinese character deals with the question: "How shall the Native Churches be stimulated to more aggressive Christian Work?" Highly encouraging testimonies to Chinese zeal for aggressive work followed the essay. A paper on "The Use of Opium and its Bearing on the Spread of Christianity in China" gives a concise sketch of the history and growth of the opium trade, and presses the crime home upon the English Government in a form from which there can be no appeal. The essay has already been published as a separate pamphlet, and ought to be in the hands of every British householder. We are sorry to see that one of the speakers complains of incautious statements issued by the British Anti-Opium Society. As far as our experience goes, its statements have been very much under rather than over the mark.

An essay on "Ancestral Worship" is characterised by a piquancy of language and a power of generalisation that place it many respects at the head of the whole collection; but it unfortunately rests upon an inaccurate basis, and leads up through underground passages to the proscribed "term" question. The essay opens with a statement that is a timely signal of the rashnesses we may expect on almost every page. "Of all the people of whom we have any knowledge, the sons of the Chinese are most unfilial, disobedient to parents, and pertinacious in having their own way from the time they are able to make known their wants." We are then told that ancestral worship rather than filial piety is the principal religion of the Chinese; that the worship springs not from honour but fear of the dead, and its object is to alleviate the condition of the spirits in Hades and ward off from the living the calamities with which the dead might avenge any omission or neglect. Two or three interesting facts are given to illustrate the practical influence of ancestral worship upon the different departments of Chinese life. If a magistrate finds a man

guilty of serious crime, and upon inquiry learns that his parents are dead and that he is an only son, he will pass a much lighter sentence upon him than otherwise. "Magistrates shrink from the responsibility of placing a man whose duty it is to sacrifice to the dead in a position where he would be forced to neglect those sacred offices." A provincial judge can never become prime minister, as it is feared the spirits of those he has sentenced to death might avenge themselves by bringing disaster upon his administration. A Chinese emperor must always have a successor younger than himself, who will render the customary worship, "for this homage is never rendered by the elder to the younger." The essay next defines at length the Chinese belief in regard to the state of the dead. They believe in two stages of existence: the world of light and the world of darkness. They believe that those who have passed into the world of darkness need houses and food and raiment as in life. They believe that those who are in the spirit-world can see their friends in the world of light, and it is within their power to influence for weal or woe the destiny of their descendants and survivors. They believe that the government in the spirit-world is an exact counterpart of the government that prevails throughout the empire of the living; that there are judgment-courts and purgatories corresponding in all respects to the Chinese yamens and prisons, and that there are ranks of spirits presiding over the judgment-courts and purgatories corresponding to the endless gradation of Chinese officials, with an emperor at the top whose spiritual counterpart it is insinuated is to be found in "the Supreme Ruler" of the Classics and the "God" of the English and German Missionaries. As a Chinese prisoner may sometimes secure his liberty, and always get his hardships tempered through the use of money, costly Buddhist masses for the dead, and the transmission of paper money to the spirits by burning, are supposed to exert a genialising influence upon the rulers of the under world. "Fung Shui," we are told, "is the *status quo* between the living and the dead," and is the essence of ancestral worship. These (says the essay) are the ideas upon which ancestral worship rests, and the system has been in existence more than two thousand years. The latter statement, if made good, of course shows that the term Sheung Tai (Supreme Ruler) had corrupt associations when the Chinese Classics were receiving their last

touches, and possibly never did express any purely theistic conception.

The simple and consistent system into which the writer of the essay on "Ancestral Worship" weaves the heterogeneous elements of Chinese superstition possesses an artistic completeness that cannot fail to win admiration, and make the subject eminently readable and interesting; but it is based upon very serious inaccuracies. The Chinese system of the supernatural possesses no such seamlessness as the essay before us depicts. It is a parti-coloured patchwork, and not the complete and lifelike reflection of the temporal government we are here told to believe. Confucianism, a system of practical ethics, and Taoism a tissue of astrological speculation, knew absolutely nothing of purgatories. The popular conceptions of purgatory, which the essayist makes the basis of ancestral worship, came in with Buddhism. In the course of time Confucianism winked at these conceptions, and Taoism boldly adopted them as its own. Buddhism did not gain any foothold in China till the time of the Christian era. It would take a century or two for the conceptions of the Buddhist purgatories to work themselves into the popular mind, and so modify their outward forms as to become exact reflections of the visible Chinese judicature. But ancestral worship had already been in existence in some form or other for centuries. To make the belief in the Buddhist purgatories an essential element in ancestral worship, and to say the present system has been in existence for two thousand years, is to ignore all Chinese history. The writer again defines the superstition of "Fung Shui" as "the *status quo* between the living and the dead," and says that it is "the essence of ancestral worship." The definition is inaccurate. As far as the superstition can be described, it is the belief in a semi-physical and semi-spiritual force that determines the health and happiness of all within its circle. The points of the compass are looked upon as far weightier factors in this mystic force than the wills of disembodied spirits. If "Fung Shui" is "the essence of ancestral worship," ancestral worship must have lived without an "essence" for nearly two thousand years; for "Fung Shui" is never mentioned in classical literature, and is not much more than a thousand years old.

The essay, again, completely ignores the different shades

of belief amongst the different classes of the Chinese people. The belief in the Buddhist purgatories and the sentiment of ancestral worship are very distinct things in the Chinese mind, as shown by the different degrees of sensitiveness existing in relation to them. A Missionary may attack the first in his preaching without provoking the least expression of dissent from his hearers. Let him lay irreverent hands on the second, and he will find that he has stirred up a swarm of wasps. The two things did not grow together, and are not vitally connected. Educated Chinese scorn the idea of attaching any importance to the popular conceptions of the Buddhist hells. Many of them do not even believe that the spirits of parents are in any degree conscious even of the worship paid at their graves. The worship is paid on the simple ground that it tends to nourish and strengthen the filial sentiment in the hearts of the survivors.

Two essays on "Questionable Practices in Connection with Marriage and Funeral Ceremonies," seem to deal with a somewhat superfluous topic. An enlightened Christian conscience will condemn the practices that are absolutely evil in their tendency, and social usages that may have originated in superstition will lose all their vitality as Christianity exhausts old ideas of their force, just as living things die when placed under a receiver from which the air has been withdrawn. How many idolatrous customs survive like tenantless shells on the sea-shore amongst us in England to-day! They have become innocuous through the growth of the spirit of Christianity, and not through some conclave of early Missionaries to Britain, that noted down the exhibitions of Plough-Monday, and the reprehensible superstition of pelting newly married couples with old shoes.

An essay on "The Treaty Rights of Native Christians, and the Duty of Missionaries in Regard to their Vindication," is clear in treatment and reasonable in demand: deprecating, on the one hand, the exercise of any such influence as that with which French priests have been accustomed to overshadow their converts; and deprecating, on the other hand, the cold-blooded policy of forgetting the Toleration Clause in the Treaty, and yielding up native converts to the will of mad and merciless persecution. The days of tooth and claw, and survival of the fittest in the carnivorous sense, are gone, and if we gauge

the judgment of the age aright, it is that there shall be a fair field for all systems alike, and that what dies shall die of its own moral and intellectual weakness, and what lives must live by its own spiritual force alone. Toleration is not the piteous plea of Christianity for its own existence, but a right that the modern conscience is agreed to guarantee wherever it can assert itself, to Christian, Mohammedan, and Positivist, without respect of person and creed. The essay passes by one of the practical difficulties of the Toleration Clause, a difficulty the Chinese government probably does not yet appreciate in its full magnitude,—the influence of the practical outworking of the Clause upon the existing institutions of the Chinese Empire. The patriarchal system of government prevails throughout all the Chinese villages, and the elders of a clan have the power of inflicting the punishment of death upon its members. The municipalities of the towns and cities have recognised functions that stop short of those possessed by the elders of a village, but that invest them with very formidable powers; and the mischief is that the decisions of these quasi-judicial bodies are not revised by superior courts. Now as most serious persecution may be carried on in perfectly legal form through these clans and municipalities, the Imperial Government may be ultimately compelled, in the fulfilment of its toleration pledge, to step in and limit these powers, or revolutionise the organisations in which they are lodged. Testimonies were given in the discussion that followed the essay to the effect that the Mandarins are beginning to distinguish between the methods of Protestant and Roman Catholic Missionaries; and that the proclamations issued in accordance with the Che Foo Convention have already exercised a favourable influence throughout the country.

An essay on "The Principles of Translation into Chinese" is an ambitious, Latinised hash of grammar, logic, and theology, served up in the well-known style of Dr. Samuel Johnson. The Chinese language is spoken of as "the medium of linguistic expression for this great people," and the fact that the Chinese language admits of long sentences, is announced to us in the statement that "Chinese is by no means devoid of lengthened and weary discourse, the members of which are skilfully braided together by various particles and shifting adjustments, the deft interchange of which present a chain of obverse,

reverse, and revolving phases of thought," &c., &c. The drift of the essay, as far as we are able to read between the lines, is to condemn the idiomatic, but recklessly free, translation of the Scriptures in use amongst English and German Missionaries, and to justify the literal but dismally unidiomatic translation of the Scriptures used by a majority of the American Missionaries. Neither side has cause to cast the first stone. If we were to express a choice between two evils, we should be disposed to say, we will take as our starting-point a version that, however imperfect as a translation, is at least intelligible and idiomatic Chinese, rather than a version which, however accurately it may try to render the original, retains the English idiom, and can only be described as "pigeon" Chinese. In the discussion that followed, a successful author in Chinese, whilst of course admitting the necessity for translations of the Bible, Confessions, and Church Standards, gave the very wise advice, "Don't translate at all. Master a subject, and then produce an original compilation."

An essay on the question "Should the Native Churches be United Ecclesiastically and Independent of Foreign Churches and Missionary Societies?" treats the general subject of Church unity, and seems almost to anticipate the fusion of all evangelical Protestant Churches. When the essayist comes to deal with the question allotted him he answers it in the affirmative. His view would seem to have received very general support, one speaker affirming that the relation of Chinese Churches to ecclesiastical bodies in England and America was a perilous thing, and that the jealousy of the Chinese Government would be excited, should questions in the Chinese Church be referred to these foreign bodies for settlement. The views advocated may be applicable a century hence. Native churches will need the authoritative instruction, and guidance, and oversight of home churches for some generations, and to reassert that relation after it has once been surrendered, will be a far more difficult thing than to cherish it now. Missionaries often feel that it would give them great leverage for good if they had a dogma like that of Apostolic Succession, through which they could continue their power over immature converts and churches with tendencies to vagrancy. Separations will come of themselves and quite fast enough.

A paper on "The Inadequacy of the Present Means for the Evangelisation of China, and the necessity for greater effort and more systematic co-operation on the part of the different Societies so as to occupy the whole field," exhibits an almost perfect mastery of the geography of the Chinese Empire, and lays down the points from which the different provinces and portions of provinces must be approached, with the skill of an accomplished general. The amount of work sketched out, and that has not yet been touched in any sense or degree, is enough to paralyse us with despair. A wise and earnest essay on "The Training of Native Agents" closes the series.

The essays are followed by statistics of the various Protestant Missions, and a series of maps showing the places in which work has been commenced. No more striking proof could perhaps be adduced of the Divine force still immanent in Christianity, than a comparison of the men as made known to us in these discussions, not uniformly as clear sighted, or far-seeing, or imbued with as much Chinese culture, or of such delicate sympathy with Chinese thought and life, or so free from narrow prejudices as we could wish, and the vast work they have done, as shown to us in the maps and tables of statistics. We hope, by-the-by, that none of the maps are less accurate than that of the Canton Province. From the map in question places are omitted where the English Wesleyan and American Presbyterian Missionary Societies have had organised churches for years, and a place is put down as a Church Missionary Society Station where not a single sermon has yet been preached, and to which an untried man taken from another church had been appointed, who has since proved, as men who are ready to move about from church to church for employment generally do prove, worthless.

The most notable and gratifying feature of the Conference, would seem to have been its remarkable spirit of catholicity and friendliness. Missionaries of different churches, different nationalities, and widely divergent notions, met and talked together for a fortnight; and, with the exception of the unfortunate episode springing out of the essay on Confucianism, not a bitter word would seem to have been spoken, nor an uncharitable passion stirred. Plans of practical co-operation, moreover, were devised that will bear solid fruit in future days.

ART. II.—*Reports of Proceedings of the Representative Body laid before the General Synod of the Church of Ireland*, 1871—1878. Dublin: Hodges, Foster and Figgis.

WHATEVER difference of opinion may exist regarding the policy of the most important Act of Parliament passed since the Revolution, there is nothing more remarkable at this hour than the manner in which the anticipations alike of friends and foes as to the effects of disestablishment in Ireland have been falsified by events. Perhaps the very swiftness and decisiveness of the blow enhanced the difficulties of a calm judgment on the changes that were inevitable in the constitution and position of a Church which had its roots in three hundred years of the national history. Ten years have passed away since Mr. Gladstone expressed his desire that the passage from Establishment to Disestablishment should be effected, not like the overthrow of a building, but like the launch of some goodly ship, which, constructed on the shore, makes, indeed, a great transition when it passes into the water, but yet makes that transition without loss of equilibrium, and then glides on its bosom calmly and even majestically. It was only natural that the members of the Church chiefly affected should regard the change with undisguised dismay. They declared that to throw Protestantism on its own resources in a country predominantly Romanist was to imperil its very existence, that the reduction of its finances necessarily involved a contraction of its operations, especially in extensive tracts of the south and west, where congregation after congregation would go out like dying lamps; that the clergy, insufficiently supported because left to the voluntary liberality of individual landlords and the local peasantry, would be recruited from the inferior ranks of society, and would therefore lose the respect of their flocks as well as their free and independent position, while they would be subjected to the control of a laity intensely Puritan and resolved upon putting an end to what they regarded as the illogical compromise between mediæval divinity and modern thought which characterised the formularies of the Church. This was the strain of lamentation, especially among the Irish bishops and clergy, who seemed to feel certainly

much more than the laity the violence of the shock which Disestablishment was expected to give to the framework of Protestant society. On the other hand, those who sought the abolition of the Irish Establishment argued that to represent Protestantism as dependent on State connection was to represent it as a mere political institution that had never taken root in the hearts of the people, and was itself a signal proof, not of the evil tendency, but of the justice and expediency of the measure. They agreed, further, that instead of weakening the energy of Protestantism, Disestablishment would place it in a stronger attitude than it had ever been towards the aggressive Romanism that surrounded it; that the new constitution that would be called into existence would place in the hands of the laity the power to hold in check the incipient Ritualism of the clergy; that all classes of Protestants would be brought into a stronger league of fraternity, and that the clergy, only partially dependent upon the voluntary contributions of the laity, would suffer no eventual loss either of income or independence.

How far these two sets of anticipations have been falsified or realised it will be the object of the present article to exhibit with all reasonable brevity. We shall only say at present that, in all the various and complicated exigencies of ecclesiastical life that have arisen since 1871, the Protestant Episcopal Church has manifested a power of dignified self-government and of genuine Protestant work which shows there is no need to despair of its future existence. Great changes have taken place in its constitution and in its financial position; but it has not lost its identity with the Church whose annals are bright with the names of apostolic pastors like Bedell, philosophers like Berkeley and Whately, preachers like Jeremy Taylor and William Archer Butler, and divines like James Ussher, Charles Leslie, and James Thomas O'Brien. There is something very interesting to us in the narrative of its reorganisation. The outside public looked on not unsympathisingly as it watched from 1871 the development of the systematic organisation of the parish, the higher administration of the Diocesan Synods and Councils, and the legislative functions of the General Synod; while it could not but admire the masculine directness and vigour with which the laity grappled with the most difficult problems of finance, and made its influence felt in the

protracted and exciting struggle to purify the Prayer Book. The Episcopal Church has not only successfully borne the sudden strain upon its energies, but has drawn fresh vigour from the late crisis for a new and expanding career of usefulness and power.

We shall first endeavour to exhibit a succinct view of the financial changes wrought by Disestablishment; then we shall examine the peculiarities of the new ecclesiastical constitution suddenly called into being by the wrench which separated the Church from the State; and afterwards we shall give some account of the doctrinal position of Irish Episcopacy and the effect that will probably be produced by the revision of its formularies.

It is necessary, then, that we should first understand the exact position of the Irish Church before Disestablishment, that we may be the better able to appreciate the financial changes that have flowed from that important event. Happily, a single table from Dr. Ball's *Blue Book* shows us at a glance the annual revenues of the Establishment before 1869:

	£	s.	d.
Bishoprics	74,524	7	10
Deans and Chapters	10,749	4	10
Minor Corporations	10,176	0	0
Cathedral Dignitaries	10,648	0	0
Beneficed Clergy	395,180	17	10
Ecclesiastical Commissioners	80,554	0	0
	£581,832	10	0*

When we add to this sum the estimated yearly value of see and glebe-houses, which is put down in the Report at £32,152 3s. 4d., we see that the Church of Ireland, containing by the last census rather more than 600,000 inhabitants, drew yearly from the State rather more than £600,000 a year. It is well known that the Episcopalians form nowhere an important element of the rural population of Ireland. They reside for the most part in towns, and there is no county in which they are not numerically inferior to the rest of the inhabitants. This fact is not without significance in estimating the efforts they have made to re-endow their Church. It must be remembered

* This total sum represents the annual revenues "after deducting poor rate, expenses of collection, and quit rents," and "is exclusive of the value of houses of residence and lands in the occupation of ecclesiastical persons" (p. xxv.).

that the clergy were not sent adrift with the bare satisfaction of life-interests, for, by arrangements to be presently explained, they were placed in a position, not exactly to save all the capital received from the State, but a large portion of it, and thus to form a scheme by which their successors will receive an average income of about £200 a year exclusive of the value of their parochial residences, so long as the laity shall maintain their present standard of liberality.

It was most natural that the first thought of Irish Episcopalians, after Disestablishment, was to found a Central Sustentation Fund, somewhat similar to that of the Free Church of Scotland, which might be the means of strengthening the Church in its extremest borders on the principle of the wealthier districts supplementing the wants of the poorer. There would thus be a thorough centralisation of finance. It was the natural course to take for a Church constituted organically like Irish Episcopacy. But its position was very different from the Free Church of Scotland, which, remarkably homogeneous in its theological opinions, was, besides, at its foundation welded together by passionate controversies and common sufferings. There was, so to speak, a greater accumulation of moral energy, a greater liberation of force, in connection with the Scottish movement, than was at all to be expected in connection with the circumstances of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. It was evident, however, at a very early stage, that the idea of a Central Sustentation Fund must be abandoned, however much it would have suited a Church which does not lie in a compact mass like Irish Presbyterianism in a single province, but drags its meagre length over the whole extent of the island and appears at a hundred points in detached fragments and unconnected outposts in the midst of the surrounding Romanism. In a word, the laity feared that a General Sustentation Fund would throw far too much power into the hands of the bishops and clergy, while their suspicions of the orthodoxy of many of their teachers were at the time greatly inflamed by the encouragement given to the circulation of Portal's Manual by some of the clergy in the Dublin parishes. There was a loud and instant demand for the revision of the Prayer Book. It was now clear that some other system of Church finance must be devised that would give the laity a more perfect and direct control over the support of their clergy. Many, at least, of the laity were disposed to suspend

their judgment with regard to what they ought to give till they could see what the Church was likely to become.

It was at length decided that, instead of a General Sustentation Fund, each diocese should provide a separate fund for itself, and that another fund, with the title of the "General Sustentation Fund," should be left in the hands of the Representative Body, to provide, not merely for the better support of poor parishes, but for the future endowment of the bishops. The scheme of Church finance, then, was to be diocesan. The system now established is worked in the following manner:—Each parish is assessed in a certain sum according to its ability, and that sum is paid to the Representative Body, and applied, partly to keep the capital received from the State intact, and partly returned in the form of stipends to the parish ministers. In other words, the Representative Body, who act as paymasters to the whole Church, give each clergyman his annuity together with his portion of supplemental stipend. We are now in a position to present two large figures which show at a glance the amount received by the Church from the State in satisfaction of life-interests, and the amount contributed by Irish Episcopalians during the last seven years to save their endowments and to provide for the future support of their clergy. Up till 31st December, 1877, the sum received from the State, along with a free present of the churches and cathedrals, was exactly £7,568,857 11s. 6d. The sum raised by the Church in seven years was £1,808,442, 15s. 1d., or, say, up till the end of 1878, though we have no statistics of that year, about Two Millions Sterling. This sum, which, no doubt, is swelled by generous contributions from England, is creditable to the hitherto unexercised liberality of Irish Episcopalians. The figures for each year are given in the last report of the Representative Body:

	£	s.	d.
1870	229,753	14	2
1871	214,709	8	4
1872	248,445	1	8
1873	230,179	11	0
1874	257,021	2	1
1875	218,499	3	8
1876	212,094	7	7
1877	197,739	6	7
	£1,808,442	15	1

There is a certain falling off in the last three years, but it is only right to explain that it does not arise from any decrease in the contributions to the stipend fund, which is the basis of the entire system of Church finance. It is due to the decline in legacies and in contributions from the London Sustentation Fund Committee, and to the fact that the last instalment of the large donations promised in 1869, and spread over five years, was paid off in 1874. There has, it is true, been a falling off in stipend in 1877 as compared with 1876. The figures are, for 1876, £124,424, and for 1877, £118,478. The Representative Body regret this decline, and point to the example of the Free Church of Scotland, which increased its yearly contributions from £68,704 14s. 8d. in 1844, to £172,641 18s. 3d. in 1877, as an instance of progressive growth in liberality eminently worthy of Irish imitation. Perhaps the depression of trade has had something to do with the slight falling off in the contributions of 1877.

We must now briefly notice the arrangement by which the yearly incomes of the clergy are secured in all time coming. The Representative Body were enabled by the Irish Church Act to accept from the Irish Commissioners a fixed sum in place of each annuity, and thus, on principles familiar to insurance societies, to create a fund for re-endowment out of the difference between the capital with its total interest, and the sum of the annual payment on each life. The results of this operation are as follows:—There were altogether, up to the latest recorded date, 2,380 annuities granted to 2,125 ecclesiastical persons, of whom twenty-one were laymen; that is, 2,104 incumbents and curates.* There were in all 101 non-commutants up till the latest printed return. Up till the 31st December, 1877, the commutation capital amounted to £3,146,403 16s. 11d., charged with annuities amounting to £236,007 10s. The Representative Body say this capital, improved at four per cent., would be sufficient to pay off all the annuitants with an average age of forty-six years and ten months.† Of course,

* There were 1,459 annuities granted to 1,406 incumbents, and 921 annuities granted to 921 curates. But 141 of these latter annuities were held by incumbents in addition to their incumbencies, and sixteen were held by curates in addition to their curacies. In these 921 were included 201 curates who had not served in the Irish Church previous to the passing of the Irish Church Act. The Church Commissioners rejected 310 claims from persons claiming annuities as permanent curates.

† The amount of the Commutation Fund must go on diminishing so long as

the commuting clergy have a lien, not only on the interest, but on the principal of the Commutation Fund for the amount of their former incomes as long as they live, and it is the opinion of experienced actuaries that the fund will pay the incomes and leave a surplus after the death of the last commutant, independently of any effect of compounding. The entire commutation capital has, of course, not been preserved, having been considerably diminished in the way explained in the last foot-note, and also during the first few years by compositions and advances, according to the system deliberately, and, on the whole, wisely, adopted by the Representative Body. It will be remembered that Mr. Gladstone introduced into his plan of commutation an arrangement called compounding, by which the Church was enabled to reduce the number of its staff of clergy and to save a considerable sum of money for re-endowing the smaller number who should remain in its service. The Representative Body agreed to give the commuting minister a lump-sum in hand in full discharge of his annuity, part for his own benefit, and part to be devoted to the permanent endowment of the Church. Under this arrangement, according to the latest published return, 753 clergymen—that is, less than a third of the whole number—compounded. Only one bishop (Dr. Alexander, of Derry) compounded; and 452 incumbents and 300 curates; making 753 in all. The great majority left the Church to take service in English parishes, but a number remained in the service of the Church in Ireland, but under a condition imposed by the Representative Body that a deduction should be made from their incomes on account of their composition. The result of this composition process up till 31st December, 1877, was that £1,218,804 18s. 5d. was paid to compounders, and that £1,357,340 8s. 7d. was left as a balance in the hands of the Church for the permanent

---

the Representative Body has to draw upon the principal to pay any portion of the annuities that will not be met by the interest. There will come a time when the interest alone will pay the annuities, but it would require an actuarial investigation to say when this time will come, and what balance will then be left. It is worth remarking that a great part of the success of the financial scheme of the Representative Body is due to commutation having been effected at three-and-a-half per cent., while the funds of the Representative Body have been invested at four-and-three-eighths per cent. The money market for the first few years after Disestablishment was much more favourable to investors than it is at present. The Commutation Fund and all the other funds in the hands of the Representative Body are credited with interest at four per cent., and the odd three-eighths pays expenses, and leaves a surplus every year.

support of its ministers. In order to assist in making up the difference between the interest of the commuted capital and the amount paid to the annuitants, and also to supplement their incomes, stipends to the amount of £134,559 19s. 11d. were raised under the diocesan scheme for the year ending 31st December, 1877. About this sum is raised every year for the same purpose.

It is now a matter of easy calculation to settle how much each minister of the Church will receive as his income through the operation of its several schemes. The reduction in the numbers of the clergy will naturally affect this calculation. The smaller the staff the higher the income. The number of clergy before Disestablishment was 2,104, if we may reckon by the number of annuitants. Their number now is 1,850—a diminution of 254, mostly in curates—but it is proposed to reduce the number still further till the staff consists of 1,438 clergymen, that is, 1,227 incumbents and 211 curates. This would involve a reduction from 1869 of 666 clergymen. Now, the incomes of the 1,850 clergy paid in 1877 amounted to a sum of £378,075 3s. 1d., that is, £243,515 3s. 2d. of annuities, and £134,559 19s. 11d. stipends under diocesan schemes. This gives each minister an average income of about £205, exclusive of a parochial residence. Of course, all the annuitants draw their old incomes for life, but on their death or retirement, the incomes will be more equalised over the whole Church than at present. Now, according to a return given in Charles's *Irish Church Directory*, there were only 111 clergymen before 1869 receiving less than £200 a year of income. We believe that the average incomes of the parish clergy were then about £240 a year, exclusive of the value of the glebes; so that the only change wrought by Disestablishment is a reduction in individual incomes of less than £40 a year. Mr. Gladstone was not far wrong, then, when he said that the change to be effected was "really only the fall of a few feet." But, then, if the number of the clergy is to be still further reduced to 1,438, the individual incomes will amount to about £263 per annum. All these various estimates, however, are conditioned upon the continued liberality of the laity. Any deficiency on their part will involve either the diminution of the staff of ministers or the lowering of their incomes. But in any case the clergy may be congratulated on still receiving a larger income

than is received by the ministers of any other Church in Ireland.

It is only necessary to add a few words concerning the value of the parish residences. In accordance with a proviso of the Church Act, certain portions of the glebe lands upon which the glebe houses stand were obtained at prices far under that for which they would sell in open market, and in many cases obtained for nothing, the incumbents, having previously to their purchase, received as compensation for their vested interests a sum exceeding the purchase-money itself. The Church received besides £23,000 for the dilapidation of glebe houses. This sum was insufficient, for the Representative Body have since laid out an additional £69,000 in repairs. Up till 31st December, 1877, they had paid for the purchase of the glebes £395,271 6s. 6d., contributed by various parishes and private donors. But then it was considered advisable to sell glebes unsuited to the present requirements of the Church, and the amount received for these was £68,961 11s., which, after deducting the price paid to the State for them—£34,846 15s. 4d.—left a profit of £31,036 14s. 6d., or, including dilapidation-money, £32,300 14s. to be placed to the credit of the parishes in which the glebes are situated, and to be used in purchasing or building more suitable dwellings. Up till 31st December, 1877, there were 710 glebes vested in the Representative Body by the Irish Church Commissioners—who seem to be very slow in their operations—out of 930 in all. Thus there was a nice provision in the matter of dwellings made for a large body of the Irish clergy out of the "glebe" arrangements.

We have now briefly to notice the provision made for the support of the two archbishops and twelve bishops who are to govern the new Church. It is the desire of the official body that the incomes of the bishops should not be dependent on annual subscriptions, but that they should be secured by means of a capital sum that is expected to yield £2,500 annually to each of the two archbishops, and £1500 at least to each of the twelve bishops. It was unfortunate for the prospects of this fund that two of the bishops (Drs. Verschoyle and Daly) should have died without commuting their annuities, and thus left the dioceses of Kilmore and Cashel without a shilling for re-endowment. Annuities were purchased for two of the bishops (Meath and Ossory) who have both since died. Very little commutation capital

remains to the credit of these two sees. The Bishop of Derry is the only compounder among the bishops, and has through an immediate sacrifice of income succeeded in endowing his see for ever with £2,000 per annum. The diocese of Down will soon be able to secure £2,000 to the successors of Bishop Knox. An effort is now being made in all the dioceses to raise a sum that will yield £17,500 a year. The amount required for this purpose, at 4 per cent., would be £437,500. But the amount actually raised so far, either by direct contributions or allocation from the General Sustentation Fund, which is far too heavily burdened already by the claims of poor parishes, is now only some £120,000. We cannot account for the backwardness of the laity in making a better provision for the support of their bishops. It is probably owing to the more pressing claims of the parish clergy than to any lurking jealousy which the laity may be supposed to entertain of the still considerable powers of the higher order of clergy.

We have already mentioned that the clerical staff of the Church has been considerably reduced, and that it is in contemplation to make a still further reduction. An apprehension very naturally exists lest this necessary process should involve the withdrawal of the parish clergy from extensive districts in the south and west, where isolated knots of Protestants are greatly exposed to the danger of being absorbed into the surrounding mass of Romanism. According to a return contained in the Report of 1877, there were 1,379 benefices before Disestablishment.* Since that event 36 unions of parishes have been dissolved, and 178 parishes have been united. The number of benefices proposed to be maintained in future is 1,144, to be served by 1,138 incumbents and 203 curates. A glance at the return shows that the districts in the south and west are exactly those which appear to have suffered most by this process of reduction. But the loss is more apparent than real. It must be remembered, in the first place, that there are few Episcopalians in the rural districts of the south or west, except landlords and agents. There are generally good congregations in the towns, such as—(to take an example from one locality)—Ennis, Kilrush, and Rathkeale; and Disestablishment has rather increased than diminished the regular

* Page 52. The figures in this return differ slightly from those we have already given. There is no explanation given of the disparity, which is not, however, a matter of much consequence.

church-going population. Besides, the parishes themselves were very small, and the union of parishes has enabled zealous clergymen to undertake larger work for better pay. The clergyman who gives an afternoon's service to an adjoining parish which, up till Disestablishment, had a clergyman of its own, receives £50 for his additional work, and finds, as several of them have admitted, advantage as well as delight in an increase to labours that were once far too light. In the diocese of Limerick, for example, where the number of parishes is reduced almost exactly one-half, each clergyman receives, on an average, £200 a year, besides a residence, and £50 for tending the wants of a neighbouring parish. Many churches have been shut up, but they had no parishioners, and in one parish in County Clare, the church was shut up because the people declined to make any effort to support a minister. Time will tell how these new arrangements will work, but it is necessary to remember that the Methodists and the Presbyterians appear in more or less strength at many detached points in the south and west, where the hold of Episcopacy has become weak, and will, no doubt, do their best to supplement the deficiencies of Episcopal administration.

This account of the financial efforts of Episcopacy would be imperfect if we did not mention that, in addition to a large expenditure in churches and glebe houses, there has been also a great amount expended in establishing a Good Service Fund, a Clergy Widows' and Daughters' Fund, and a Superannuation Fund to provide for the retirement of the aged clergy.

We must now very briefly notice the financial results of Disendowment to the Presbyterians of Ireland, who number rather more than half a million. As they had been already a self-governed community, it was not necessary, in their case, to have any readjustment, except in the single point of finance. The Irish Church Bill was originally drawn with the view of giving the 560 Presbyterian ministers compensation for existing life interests on the same principle as to the 2,000 ministers of the Established Church. But a great inequality was introduced into the terms of the final settlement by the House of Lords; for while the Episcopalians received about eight millions sterling, in addition to the churches, and, we may almost say, the glebes, the Presbyterians received barely £600,000. There

was nothing in the Act of Parliament to prevent the Presbyterian ministers from commuting their annuities for their own private benefit; but, by a resolution of the General Assembly, which was practically unanimous, the ministers resolved to commute their life interests for the benefit of the Church. All but ten have since commuted their annuities. The commutation capital on 31st March, 1878, amounted to £585,557 10s. 1d. It has been preserved intact and slightly increased. The interest of this sum has been, since 1871, applied to pay the annuities. Then a Sustentation Fund has been established to supplement the deficiency in the interest of the commutation capital, so as to bring it up to the amount of the old *Regium Donum*, which was about £70 to each minister, while an additional sum of £22 has been added to each income from the same source. Thus, the Presbyterian ministers are now paid £22 more than before Disendowment; and it is expected soon to be £30, in addition to the amount of their congregational stipend. Each minister receives an equal dividend; so the minister of the congregation which contributes £600 yearly to the Sustentation Fund receives no more than the minister whose congregation contributes only a few pounds. It is only fair to state that, for many years before 1869, the standard of ministerial support was steadily advancing among the Presbyterians. Indeed, their stipends are now one-half greater than in 1864, and their contributions to all religious objects, including stipend, are now about double those of the year in question. They raised last year (1877-78) for all purposes £154,953, which was £12,000 in advance of the income of the previous year. Their contributions to missions at home and abroad are larger than before. They have established a Presbyterian Orphan Society, which supports about 2,700 orphans, at a cost of about £10,000 a year; and they maintain a Bible and Colportage Society in connection with a system of colportage which is doing much to disseminate Bibles and religious literature through most of the counties of Ireland.

The Unitarians of Ireland lost their *Regium Donum*, like the Presbyterians, by the Irish Church Act. But they have taken no steps to re-endow their Church, and each minister has been allowed to commute in his own private interest. It is expected that the death or retirement of the existing ministers will involve the extinction

of Unitarianism in all the rural localities. This body is becoming less and less influential every day. Large numbers have joined the Episcopal Church, partly through intermarriages, partly from social considerations, and partly from a conviction that Episcopacy allows standing-room for a large amount of liberal speculation.

We shall next consider the *ecclesiastical* changes brought about by Disestablishment. It is an interesting fact that the Irish Church Act, in leaving the Protestants free to form a Synod, compelled the ecclesiastical authorities to admit the laity into their governing body. In this respect, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Miall had a direct hand in drawing up the first canon of the Free Episcopal Church of Ireland. It was, therefore, at once in her power to become a self-constituted, self-regulating, self-sustaining body, capable of framing her own laws, choosing her own policy, and appointing her own officers, with no other restrictions on her freedom than are common to all religious communities. Having lately ourselves adopted a principle which admits the laity to the deliberations of our Conference, not on questions of doctrine or worship, but of economics, we cannot be expected to approve a constitution which places the laity on a full equality with the clergy on all matters whatever. Our only concern, however, at present is to present an historic account of the remarkable change in the constitution of Irish Episcopacy wrought by the admission of the laity to the Synods, and by the famous vote by orders, without expressing any further opinion upon it. It was somewhat unfortunate that, through what Dr. Reichel, vicar of Mullingar, rightly calls the indiscretion of the bishops, who seemed to dread a too democratic constitution, lay jealousies were early aroused with effects that are still operating with more or less force inside the Church. It was the pedantry of Primate Beresford in calling a meeting of Convocation that did the mischief, especially as an impression immediately went abroad—undoubtedly mistaken—that it meant to settle for the laity the terms on which they would be admitted to future conventions. But what stimulated the jealousy of the laity still further was the fact that in the interval between the meeting of the Convocation in September, 1869, and the Lay Conference in the following month of October, the bishops assembled at the Primate's lodgings in Dublin, and passed

a resolution that no act of the General Convention that was to frame the new constitution should be valid without their concurrence. They claimed an absolute veto on all legislation. The laity were very indignant, for they remembered that when the existence of the Establishment was threatened in the previous year, the bishops made no effort to avert the danger, but declared to the laity that they would not undertake the responsibility of directing their action under the circumstances. Though incapable of leading, the laity said they were not incapable of obstruction.

This statement is necessary to explain the determination with which the laity insisted from the very first on their right to a double representation in the General Synod. It turned out, however, as they now admit, an unfortunate demand, for no sooner was it conceded by the clergy, than the laity in turn conceded the vote by orders which was claimed as a protection by the clergy. The two concessions were very different in their nature and results. The laity assented to a system that, while promising them the most extended privileges, effectively deprived them of almost all real power. There is no better illustration of what the laity describe as the vicious working of the vote by orders than we find in the revision debates. "The dominant third"—as the Anglo-Catholic section of the clergy were wittily named—held the key of the position, and almost dictated their own terms. When Mr. Brooke, an evangelical layman, proposed to insert an additional question in the Catechism, defining the manner of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper in the very words of one of the articles, it was lost because it could not command the support of two-thirds of the clergy, though 389 of all orders voted in its favour, and only 114 against it. When a motion was made—intended indirectly to repudiate sacerdotal authority—to allow the formula of absolution in the morning service to be used by the "deacon" as well as "the priest," 94 clergymen and 41 laymen voted for the exclusive prerogative of the priest, and 76 clergymen and 154 laymen against it. That is, there was an absolute majority of 95 members against it, and yet the vote by orders maintained the Roman Catholic distinction. Again, when an attempt was made in the committee of revision to substitute "presbyter" or "minister" for "priest," the bishops unanimously opposed the alteration, and though

the division was very close—23 to 25 votes—the sacerdotal party had a majority, and fixed down upon the Irish Episcopal clergy the character of a sacrificing priesthood. The concession became, in their judgment, still more fatal when it was agreed that no measure could be passed in the General Synod unless it was supported by a majority of two-thirds of each order—bishops, clergy, laity—present and voting, and that two-thirds of the bishops could throw out any measure, though supported by a majority of the clergy and the whole of the laity.

The government of the Church is based upon the parochial organisation. Every member of a congregation—not necessarily a communicant—has a right to choose twelve persons, who, together with the clergyman and two churchwardens, constitute the "select vestry." This body has no spiritual function whatever, but is wholly concerned with the temporal economy of the Church. The next council is the Diocesan Synod, consisting of the bishop as chairman, all the clergy of the diocese, and at least one lay-delegate from each congregation. The highest body is the General Synod, which always meets in Dublin, and consists of the two archbishops and twelve bishops of Ireland, of 208 clergymen—that is, about one in nine of the whole number—and 416 laymen chosen by the Diocesan Synods. It is evident from these facts that while the form of government is still nominally episcopal, the bishops have far less power than in the days of State connection. The highest court of appeal is no bishops' court, but the General Synod. The new constitution makes the bishops little more than the mere administrators of a few specific religious rites. An Irish Episcopalian lately said, "We have a lay-episcopacy now."

The three most important duties of Irish Churchmen are to elect their bishops and their clergy, and to legislate for the interests of the Church. In the crisis of the discussions of ten years ago, the laity saw that the privilege of electing their own ministers would be no inconsiderable compensation for the loss of their endowments, and they consequently tried in the Synod to have this privilege thoroughly secured by the constitution. But they were unsuccessful. While the Old Catholics of the Continent have restored to the laity the ancient right of choosing their own spiritual pastors, the General Synod placed restrictions upon the exercise of this right, which virtually

nullifies the voice of the congregation. When a parish becomes vacant, three persons belonging to the congregation appear as nominators before a diocesan committee of patronage, consisting of the bishop, two clergymen, and one layman. The seven persons present—the majority, it is seen, not belonging to the congregation, the body most deeply interested—form an election board, and nominate a minister whose name is then presented for approval to the bishop, who may have already given two votes for him. If the bishop is satisfied, the election is ended; if otherwise, his solitory veto overrules the action of the six other nominators. It is also competent to the congregational nominators to leave the appointment absolutely in the bishop's hands. It is evident that this scheme of election allows no check on the power of an outside majority to force an unacceptable minister on a congregation. Yet, it is a good point that the diocesan and parish nominators respectively are not chosen for each occasion on which they are to act, but at once for a period of three years. A case occurred soon after legislation on the subject which illustrated its vicious operation. When, for example, St. Bartholomew's Church, Dublin, was vacant through the resignation of a clergyman who had almost emptied the church by his Anglo-Catholic observances, the Rev. Travers Smith, a well-known Ritualist, was chosen in opposition to the declared wishes of a large majority of the congregation, and to the votes of two out of the three parish nominators. It was the clerical nominators who turned the scale and forced upon the congregation a pastor who had openly expressed his approval of *Portal's Manual.* In County Donegal there is a parish named Laghey, which waged a long battle against the Bishop of Derry in the matter of a disputed election. For months the people barricaded the church, and would not allow the obnoxious clergyman to enter. The bishop had eventually to yield. It would be a juster recognition of the rights of congregations, in a matter so vitally affecting themselves, to leave the matter entirely in their hands, subject to the approval of the bishop. It is an advantage, however, under the present system that the bishop is brought face to face with the people's representatives, and cannot act in the seclusion of his own study. We regret to observe that patronage is still recognised in the Church. But an unlimited exercise of it is not allowed unless in the case of a donor

or his heirs who shall give an endowment of at least £150 per annum. The bishop is, besides, to have a veto on all appointments made after the lifetime of the donor.

The election of the bishops is naturally left in the hands of the Diocesan Synods, with the single exception of that of the Primate of all Ireland, who is to be chosen, not by the Synod of Armagh, but by the bench of bishops, who are required, however, to select one out of four bishops nominated by the Synod in question. The *Quarterly Review* suggested that the Irish Church should continue to accept its bishops from the Crown, but the advice has not been followed. There was a time when the Crown made the very worst nominations to vacant sees in Ireland, when the bishops were politicians or worldlings or profligates, such as Dean Swift might satirise with the most just severity; but the Irish Protestants are now in a position to select for their chief pastors, not politicians or statesmen or even the scions of great houses, but men distinguished alone by learning, piety, and administrative energy. In point of fact, at every election some man of exceptional eminence is usually recognised as having an absolute and unchallenged superiority. There have been seven vacancies in Episcopal sees since Disestablishment, and the appointments made have been in every way worthy of a communion which understands the sacred responsibilities of its position. All the new bishops belong to the Evangelical party.

It is not necessary to enter at length into any statement concerning the arrangements under the new constitution for the maintenance and exercise of discipline. The Irish Church Act put an end to the old ecclesiastical courts which once carried terror through the land and set aside also all the old ecclesiastical laws which had a large share in increasing the odium that attached to a too political Christianity. The new courts and canons, though in some respects admirable in themselves, have been regulated rather more by civil traditions than by Apostolic precept or example. The lowest tribunal is the Diocesan Court, composed of the bishop and his assessor, who is to be a barrister of ten years' standing at the Irish bar, and also a clergyman and a layman summoned by the bishop from a select list of six. In cases of mutual assent, the bishop can hear a case alone. An appeal lies to the court of the General Synod, which consists of an archbishop, a bishop,

and three Protestant lay judges. So far as we know, there have been no cases of discipline as yet submitted to the adjudication of any of the tribunals. The canons of discipline are of great importance, and have a thoroughly Protestant tendency. It is now formally declared to be illegal to have lights on the communion table, to elevate the cup or paten in the hands of the officiating clergyman; to use incense at any time; to carry any cross, banner, or picture, or to form any procession as a part of divine service; or even a cross may not be fixed on the communion table or its cover, or on the wall behind the table. It is yet to be seen how far the discipline of the new Church will be effectual in repressing the nascent tendencies to Ritualism already observable in many parts of Ireland.

We shall now proceed to consider the *doctrinal* position of the Irish Episcopal Church, so far as it may have been in any degree affected by Disestablishment. Up till a comparatively recent period it was remarkably homogeneous in the range of its theological opinions. High Churchmen here regarded it, as they do still to a certain extent, as a fortress of Puritanism. It was, indeed, dominantly evangelical, Biblical rather than ecclesiastical, in the cast of its theology, with a tendency to low rather than high views of Church authority. Its clergy might have been Arminian or Calvinist, but they had no sympathies whatever with Anglo-Catholic or Broad Church speculations. Thus, up till forty years ago, we cannot discover in Ireland what we now see in England, a comprehensive Church, chequered by a wide variety of religious opinions, led by parties who never coalesced into actual union, yet never till lately seeking absolute dominion by the extrusion of the others. It might be alleged that the absence of parties inside the Irish Church only argued the want of intellectual activity and religious earnestness as well as the absence of that sympathetic expansiveness which enables a Church to take up and express the various and complex impulses of true Church life. There is probably some truth in this statement. There is nothing more remarkable in its history than the absence of serious controversy in matters of faith till a comparatively recent period. But when the frost of the eighteenth century began to disappear in the early decades of this century, and men like Peter Roe, of Kilkenny, began to stir the broad and placid surface of religious routine, aided

effectively by the ardour of Methodism outside, which all the repudiation and scorn of the clergy could not drive into hostility or hatred, strange to say, the first break in religious uniformity was caused by those separatists who founded the sects of Walkerism, Kellyism, and Plymouth Brethrenism. The Rev. John Walker, the Rev. Thomas Kelly, and the Rev. John Nelson Darby were once clergymen in the Irish Church, driven out by the hard attitude of the bishops and the general worldliness of the clergy. But the Church itself underwent a deep religious change from the period of the Union, and saw itself at the era of Catholic emancipation in a position to pursue a successfully aggressive policy toward the Church of Rome. It was then it gathered in a host of converts of all ranks in society, including such distinguished ornaments of the Irish pulpit as Whelan, Kirwan, Moriarty, Sullivan, and Archer Butler. That was the time when Archbishop Magee confessed that the Reformation had only begun in his own life-time. It is difficult to see how a Ritualist movement could have arisen at any earlier period, and, as a matter of fact, there was not a trace of it till Bishop Mant, of Down, about the year 1840, began to introduce what were known as Puseyite ideas and usages into the most influential and Puritan of Irish dioceses. There was, of course, a great religious ferment leading to the complete discomfiture of the bishop, who felt himself confronted by the whole strength of Protestant traditions and by the deep Orange feeling of the masses in Down and Antrim. Still, from that hour to this, though not very considerably in the northern province, but notably since the appointment of Dean Trench to the see of Dublin, there has been a perceptible growth of High Church and Ritualist feeling, and a small but persistent and powerful party has been struggling with unfailing energy to make Anglo-Catholicism universally and exclusively triumphant. It could hardly be otherwise when we think of the intimate connection existing between the Churches of England and Ireland. There is no longer any doubt now of the existence of three parties inside Irish Episcopacy—the Evangelicals, who are still the vast majority of the 1,850 clergy; the Ritualists, who are insignificant in point of numbers but resolute and united in policy, and advancing rapidly both in numbers and in courage under the favouring auspices of the Archbishop of Dublin; and the Broad Church party, which

numbers only a few highly intellectual representatives of culture, but without the courage or the opportunity to make a distinct stand for their opinions. The Ritualist party has its chief seat in the diocese of Dublin, and the Rev. Dr. Maturin, of Grangegorman parish church, is its leader. He is also president of the "Irish Church Society," which, with a membership of ninety clergymen, declares war against popular Protestantism in the interest of High Church principles and observances. It is not too much to say that if the Ritualist theology should strike its roots more deeply into the minds of the Irish clergy it will separate them by an ever-widening gulf from the sympathies of the laity with effects most injurious to their own influence and position.

The question of interest for our present consideration is —How far has the incipient Ritualism of the Church been affected by Disestablishment? Has it advanced or declined since 1871? And, if it has advanced, has Disestablishment helped or hindered its growth? or will it be likely to supply a future and permanent check to its progress? There cannot be the least doubt that Ritualism has advanced since Irish Episcopacy became a free, self-governing community. When we remember the transformations of Divine worship that have taken place within the last ten years in the great cathedrals and churches, especially in Dublin and Cork; the marvellously rapid multiplication of all sorts of church festivals; the proceedings of the retreat at Blackrock, near Dublin, attended by twenty-two Protestant ministers, met, as avowed, to practise auricular confession, mainly promoted by members of Archbishop Trench's family and believed to be under his sanction; the admission of Judge Warren in the Synod that secret confession existed in a modified way in the Church; the boldness with which men like Dr. Maturin and Canon Travers Smith declare their belief in the real presence, priestly absolution, sacramental grace, and Apostolic succession; and the extent to which clerical priestism is gaining ground even among those thought to be Evangelical, we can have no hesitation in acknowledging with Dr. Reichel, of Mullingar, that sacerdotalism has taken the place of State Churchmanship to the deep injury of Irish Protestant Christianity. Yet we believe, as we have already hinted, that the Ritualist party is very small, though not so small as Bishop Alexander represented in

the Synod when he said that the whole of them could be conveniently put into an omnibus or a four-post bed. The danger lies in their propagandist spirit. They have not certainly as yet given any but two clerical converts to Rome. The Rev. R. Brooke, late rector of Kingstown, cannot find any but two—one of them the Rev. W. Maziere Brady, the well-known annalist—on the long list of those secessions, which mark the melancholy but natural development of High Church Tractarianism.

We believe that if there had been no Disestablishment, Ritualism would have been, perhaps, pretty much what it is at the present hour. But we have some reason to believe, notwithstanding, that Disestablishment supplies the power by which its progress can be effectively checked, if the Protestant laity of Ireland are true to their old traditions and the Reformation theology. There are several distinct checks in existence. The present Ritualistic clergy, it may be remembered, cannot be affected greatly by fears of the laity, because their incomes are absolutely guaranteed for life under the scheme of commutation. They are not dependent upon lay-support as their successors will be in the next generation. Then, remember that the future archbishops and bishops will, if we may judge by past elections, be thoroughly Evangelical, and as such may be trusted, if not to put down Ritualism, at least to lend it no official countenance. The successors of the present Archbishop of Armagh and Dublin will, beyond all doubt, be, according to the very conditions of their appointment, as Evangelical as the six or seven bishops who have been elected by the Diocesan Synods to vacant sees since the year 1869. It is a very significant fact, in its bearing on the soundness of Irish Episcopacy, that all the new bishops—Lord Plunket, of Meath, Dr. Darley, of Kilmore, Dr. Walsh, of Ossory, Dr. Gregg, of Cork, and Dr. Maurice Day, of Cashel and Emly—belong to the most earnest section of the Evangelical school. It is no wonder, therefore, that a High Church journal has expressed its indignation at the growing Puritanism of the Irish Bench, while it complains that the bishops are in the habit of inquiring into the spiritual dispositions of candidates for orders after the manner of Methodist class-leaders. It is now universally understood that none but Evangelical divines will be able to command the two-thirds majority of the lay and clerical votes for the vacant bishoprics. Lord

Plunket himself said some years ago that under the existing system of election it would seem highly improbable that many clergymen holding Ritualistic views will be appointed in future to positions of influence within the Church. Now, the bishops have undoubtedly been shorn of many of their exclusive privileges, but, as chairmen of the Diocesan Committees of Patronage, invested both with a double vote and an absolute veto, they still have it in their power to favour the election of none but Evangelical clergymen. In the next place, the laity themselves are not without power to repress or discourage Ritualism. Their general soundness cannot be questioned. The "Irish Church Society," already referred to, deplores the fact that, owing to the adhesion of the great mass of the people to "Popular Protestantism," it is impossible "for Church principles to make rapid progress." The fact that the popular Protestantism is "responsible for driving many of the candidates for orders to England" is itself a tribute to lay orthodoxy. Now, even under all the restrictions imposed upon popular election by the new constitution, the laity will have a considerable voice in the result. It is true that the four diocesan nominators may out-vote the three parochial nominators; but, if the bishop chooses to give effect to his Evangelical sympathies, a majority can be easily obtained for an Evangelical pastor. The people are now taking a far deeper interest in Church affairs than formerly. Occasionally they have shown their independence in a very characteristic manner. A clergyman in County Derry declared his disbelief in eternal punishment, and for several months afterwards his parishioners kept him out of his pulpit by locking the church gates against him. The Orange feeling of the masses in Ulster will be a powerful obstacle to the success of Ritualism, or anything savouring of an approach to Romish superstition. The people can also refuse to pay their parochial assessments, or they may reduce the amount, so as to imperil the support of an obnoxious pastor. A clergyman has expressed the hope that "such rules will be devised that upon the pastor will not fall the penalty for the wilful withdrawal of parochial contributions." We know a case in which a clergyman's income, due in January, has not been paid till May, because his congregation neglected to forward its assessment to the Representative Body. The laity, therefore, may be justly regarded as holding the key of the position.

If they are true to themselves, they can stamp out Ritualism.

We have reserved to the last place the consideration of the Revision made in the Book of Common Prayer in its probable effects upon the growth of Ritualism. When the Church was about to be disestablished, the laity saw that an opportunity was at hand for vindicating the genuine Protestantism of their Church. Seeing that the Liturgy was the rampart behind which Ritualism defended itself, they resolved to remove from it those seeds of mischief which, at least in England, had grown up from age to age in so many harvests of bitterness, and, accordingly, soon after Disestablishment, they loudly demanded Revision. The Protestantism of Ireland was thrown into the crucible of organic change, and a strong effort was made to do the work of Revision in a way that would produce no reaction more mischievous than the evils it was intended to remedy. We have already briefly referred to the device of the vote by orders, which, to a large extent, neutralised all the reforming efforts of the laity. Let us now briefly understand the nature of those alterations made in the Liturgy, which have all, undoubtedly, been made in a Protestant sense. The question is, have they really gone far enough? We have already referred to the new Canons which regulate the worship and discipline of the Church as preeminently Protestant. The Ornaments Rubric, which has done so much mischief in England, is omitted. Several changes are made with the view of giving greater freedom to Divine Service, such as the shortening of the services, and the division of those separate forms, which were once read in combination on Sunday morning—that is, Morning Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion—into separate services, at the discretion of the clergyman. The new Table of Lessons significantly omits the Apocrypha and includes the whole of the Apocalypse. The Athanasian Creed is left in the Prayer Book, but the rubric directing its use on certain days is removed; so that, while the Creed as a standard of faith remains untouched, it is virtually banished as an element of worship. This is to revert to the general practice of Christendom, and even to the earlier practice of the Irish Church itself. There is an authentic story of a rector in County Armagh obliged by his bishop, at the instance of a complaining parishioner, to read the Creed to his congregation; but he practically

evaded the mandate by *singing* it along with the precentor. Then, the Form of Absolution used in the visitation of the sick, which says, in very sacerdotal language, "By Christ's authority, committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins"—is superseded by the ordinary Form of Absolution used in the Communion Service; and no change is made in the words of communion; but the Preface to the new Prayer Book, which came into use on the 7th of July, 1878, says: "As for the error of those who have taught that Christ has given Himself or His Body and Blood in this Sacrament, to be received, lifted up, carried about, or worshipped, under the veils of Bread and Wine, we have already, in the Canons, prohibited such acts and gestures as might be grounded on it or lead thereto; and it is sufficiently implied in the Note at the end of the Communion Service (and we now afresh declare) that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any purpose of such adoration." No change has been made in the formula of Ordination of Priests; for, as the Preface remarks: "We deem it plain, and here declare that, save in the matter of ecclesiastical censures, no power or authority is by them ascribed to the Church, or to any of its ministers, in respect of forgiveness of sins after baptism, other than that of declaring and pronouncing, on God's part, remission of sins to all that are truly penitent, to the quieting of their conscience and the removal of all doubt and scruple; nor is it anywhere in our formularies taught or implied that confession to, and absolution by, a priest are any conditions of God's pardon; but, on the contrary, it is fully taught that all Christians who sincerely repent and unfeignedly believe the Gospel, may draw nigh as worthy communicants to the Lord's Table, without any such confession or absolution." The new Liturgy makes no change in the Baptismal Service: in other words, it stands upon the Gorham judgment, or permits the same sort of freedom which that judgment permits in England. Therefore, an Irish clergyman may either affirm or deny baptismal regeneration without forfeiting his position. The Burial Service is still not to be used in case of those dying unbaptised or excommunicate; but a special burial service is provided for unbaptised infants and for adults who die after being prepared for baptism.

These are all the changes made in the Prayer Book, and it must be acknowledged that, with the exception of the

Baptismal Service and the use of the word "priest" to describe the minister of the Gospel, the amendments are all Protestant in their tendency. Some think the Church will be simpler and stronger from the cautious simplifications she has made in the Liturgy. The "Clerical and Lay Union" congratulate the Church upon the large measure of revision already effected, and consider that the three questions of the Real Presence, Auricular Confession, and Priestly Absolution, have been "set at rest" in a Protestant sense. The question then arises, How will the new Prayer Book affect the prospects of the Ritualist party? Opinions are much divided upon this point. We all know that Bishop Alexander of Derry had a temporary rupture with the Synod, and delivered a piece of severe invective against the Revisionists, partly for altering the Prayer Book at all, partly for the nature of the alterations made, but, most of all, for the new Preface, called sarcastically by the Ritualists "the Equivocation Clause," by which the range of interpretation is enlarged. He held that the effect of the changes is to lower the meaning of the Liturgy in the direction of Evangelical or, at least, anti-sacramental views. There can be little doubt upon this point. But the leaders of the Ritualist party do not seem to regard the new Prayer Book as offering any real obstruction to the propagation of their views. Canon Smith, of St. Bartholomew's, Dublin, has published a sermon on "Church Teaching under the Revised Prayer Book," in which he says that he accepts it on the ground that all the High Church teaching which he has been accustomed to dispense from his pulpit "is covered and granted by the new book." He shows, for example, how he can, consistently with it, teach the Real Presence, Priestly Absolution, and Baptismal Regeneration. Now, if this be so, the Bishop of Derry must have been needlessly concerned. It is also to be remembered that all the clergy ordained before Disestablishment have the right conceded to them of declining to recognise the Preface; and if, as Dr. Maturin says, it takes ten years to convert a congregation from Protestantism, the fear is that the Ritualists will have an opportunity sufficiently ample in point of time for establishing, if not extending, their operations within the Church. Canon Smith's view of the Prayer Book is confirmed by the secession of the Rev. St. George French, Incumbent of Stillorgan parish, Dublin, and of laymen like Lord James

Butler, on the ground of the remaining corruptions of the Prayer Book. It was a fatal mistake that the word "priest" was retained as the proper title of the clergy, for it contains in itself the germs of all the errors of Ritualism. The American Episcopal Church has a Prayer Book as Evangelical as any ever likely to be had in Ireland, yet, as it retains the vice of a clerical priesthood, there are churches in New York and other large cities as ritualistic as St. Alban's or All Saints', in London. It is not, perhaps, generally known that in translating the English Prayer Book into other languages, the High-Churchmen entrusted with the task took care to give expression to their peculiar theological ideas of the ministry. In the Latin version of the "Visitation of the Sick," the officiating minister is *Sacerdos*, in the Greek (1665) he is *Hiereus*, in the French, *Le Prêtre*, in the Hebrew, *Cohen*, "the priest," in the Welsh, *Yr Offeiriad*, and in Irish, *An Sagart*, the identical title of the Romanist clergyman. Comment is superfluous.

Now, when we consider that no attempts have been made since 1871 to bring offending Ritualists to trial—though, indeed, it is difficult to conceive how they could be convicted of heresy under the guarantees of the Irish Church Act, that clergymen ordained before it came into operation can contract themselves out of obedience to any new Articles or Canons framed by the Synod *—we cannot believe that the new Prayer Book will be any serious barrier to the progress of Ritualism. The temper of the synods is, besides, known to be very adverse to prosecutions. When we find Canon Dobbin appealing in vain to the Cork Diocesan Synod to suppress the full-blown Ritualism of the Military Chapel at Ballincolig, and Canon Marrable equally unsuccessful in his appeal to the Dublin Diocesan Synod to have the rood-screen removed from Christ Church Cathedral, the prospect is not hopeful. There is at present a temporary quiescence of parties within the Church, owing to the pressure of financial difficulties, but the Evangelical party declare that revision is not finished, and that it must be resumed under conditions more favourable to a thorough exclusion of all Romish elements from the Prayer Book. Perhaps, with a bench of bishops, wholly Evangelical, and lay-delegates chosen, not from the higher

* Article 20 of Irish Church Act.

classes, as at present, but from the middle classes who are thoroughly and universally Protestant in principle and in feeling, and with a more direct lay-influence in the regulation of Church funds, the work of revision may be resumed under more favourable conditions.

There is one thought worthy of consideration in connection with the growth of a sacramentarian theology in Ireland, and that is, that it is mainly due to the want of a proper theological training on the part of the clergy. The *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* significantly says that out of 335 men ordained since 1870, and now serving in the Church, only 99 had a divinity testimonium, and that one bishop, out of some twenty or thirty candidates whom he has ordained in his diocese in a short episcopate, numbered just two who had held the divinity testimonium at the time of ordination. Primate Beresford complained in 1877 that candidates for ordination were now worse prepared than formerly. If no check is to be put upon the creation of this sort of clergy, we may expect that, in the course of time, there will be 500 out of 1,800 clergymen without the least evidence of theological fitness for the ministry. While students of law and medicine must pass through a definite curriculum of professional training, the candidate for the ministry is left to gather the knowledge necessary to fulfil his momentous functions very much as he may, tested only by the precarious ordeal of an episcopal examination immediately before entering on holy orders. It is, indeed, to this cause we may mainly ascribe the melancholy defections that have weakened and distracted the Church of England, leaving candidates for the ministry entirely at sea on the most fundamental matters of the Christian faith, and so open to every wind of crude speculation that is abroad in an age of transition and change. An uneducated ministry, unskilled in theological science, cannot sustain the interest of congregations by jejune pulpit prelections, and feels the necessity of invoking the aid of an imposing and fascinating ritual. But we are happy to observe that the best friends of the Church recognise the necessity of a reform in the method of ministerial training. The Primate says this can only be done by means of a well-supported school of divinity. Bishop Knox, of Down, has been for years urging a project for establishing a divinity school in Belfast, similar to that of the Presbyterians, as supplemental to the very effective

literary training of the Queen's College in that town. We have no doubt the project, or some analogous one, will be successfully carried out in due time, and when Irish Episcopacy has filled its pulpits with men, no longer deficient in that fulness and thoroughness of Biblical instruction, and in that breadth of doctrinal exposition, which the exigencies of the times demand, there will be less Tractarian theology and less demand for copes, and albs, and birettas, and incense, and candles.

In contemplating the altered position of the Irish Episcopal Church, it is gratifying to think that she will be no longer obnoxious to the mass of Irishmen on political grounds. She is no longer the law-Church, incapacitated by her very safeguards from exercising her powers of usefulness. In old times the rector was often a police-magistrate—his dignity hedged in with all the *prestige* of State-connection—but now he is merely the pastor of a flock. The present Bishop of Ossory said many years ago that there never was a revival of spirituality in the Church that did not bring with it a repugnance to the semi-warlike and political garb in which religion had in time past arrayed itself. The Roman Catholics, too, had long been taught by their clergy that Protestantism was a mere creature of the State, and must perish if deprived of its endowments. But events have proved it to possess a vitality far stronger than any of its foes imagined. The Protestant Episcopal Church is now in a position partaking of every better influence around her, and strong in the affection of her children, to pour into Irish society a sweeter and happier influence than she ever exercised, and to help, side by side, with a strong, ardent, watchful Nonconformity, to evangelise the whole land. She will no longer lead the quiet and unimpressive life that lost her so much ground in past times, and unfitted her clergy for coping with the untiring zeal and transcendent energy of the Romish priesthood. She will be no longer what her enemies have called her, a religious nullity, but will no doubt resume the work she began so well fifty years ago, when she showed her Roman Catholic countrymen the way to a more Scriptural faith. It was expected by those who promoted the disestablishment of the Irish Church that it might possibly lead to a union of all the Protestants of Ireland, or, in any case, that it would promote an harmonious understanding among the different denominations of Protestantism.

Neither of these expectations is likely to be soon realised, though liberal-minded men, like Dr. Reichel, feel the importance of a better understanding between the "two main branches of the Protestant name in Ireland." It cannot be disguised that the assumption of the title "Church of Ireland"—which it would be impossible to justify on either Scriptural, or logical, or historical, or philological, or even legal grounds—presents an obstacle to kindly co-operation. The farther fact that the Episcopal clergy are still disposed, as we see by the thirty-fourth canon, to regard all the inhabitants of their parishes, Romanists, Presbyterians, Methodists, or Independents, as under their spiritual jurisdiction, and bound to perform for them the necessary functions of their office, will be a fresh point of exasperation, and a hindrance to union or co-operation.* It is not a good sign for secular rivalry to overrun the Church. Yet this course presents the danger that each party, in self-defence, eager to gain the ascendency, and disposed to regard the enlargement of its neighbours as its own limitation, will strive to augment its own numbers by subtracting from those of its rivals, to push its forces into their territories, and to eclipse them by its own superior name and attractions. It cannot be denied that, apart altogether from the influence of political exasperation, the sacerdotal spirit is the main cause of an increasing separation between the clergy of the Episcopal Church and those of other Protestant denominations. In former times the law of the land assigned them a higher ecclesiastical position. Now they assert a higher position for themselves. The spirit of Bedell and Usher is not that of the present hour.

In conclusion, when we weigh advantages against disadvantages, it must be admitted that Irish Episcopacy has gained rather than lost in all the elements of Church power and prosperity by the severance of its relations with the State. It has become a self-governing body, with still ample revenues, no longer to be squandered upon sinecurists and drones, while the working clergy were kept in a state approaching to starvation, but to be applied, equably yet proportionably, among the 1,850 clergy still retained in its

* The thirty-fourth canon prescribes that "when any person or persons are dangerously sick in any cure, the minister or curate, having knowledge thereof, shall visit them (although they have not previously resorted to the Church), in order to instruct and comfort them."

service. It has reduced its staff without diminishing its efficiency, borrowing the flexible and more unfettered energies of dissent. The bishops, withdrawn from the sphere of secular politics, are devoting their undivided energies to the advancement of the purely spiritual interests of the Church. There is no longer an absentee clergy. Rectors now, for the most part, do their own duty without the help of curates; they are no longer like the passive, easy-minded clergy of the last generation, but cultivate popular gifts, and are distinguished by the vigour and efficiency of their ministrations; while their dependence on their flocks for support has led to the most assiduous pastoral vigilance. Their successors will probably be drawn less from the higher orders and more from the middle classes, and will thus gain a readier access to the hearts of the people. It is a great point that Irish Episcopalians have thoroughly learned the lesson that the efficiency of an ecclesiastical body to grapple with systems of error and to maintain its own ground, depends not upon its political safeguards, but upon the efficiency, zeal, and piety of its clergy. The Church has shown its self-governing power in the wise and cautious manner in which it has readjusted all its parochial arrangements. We know how it was often paralysed by the want of elasticity in the parochial system arising out of the legal doctrine concerning the nature and rights of freehold tenure. Now, parishes can be divided, united, or modified at pleasure, and there is no longer any temptation to build churches where there are no worshippers. Altogether, then, the position of Irish Episcopacy is strong and hopeful, in spite of the incipient Ritualism which breaks its religious unity, and there is everything in its traditions to inspire the hope that it will become more than at present a great visible force, touching national life everywhere, and exercising a healing influence in a country distracted by the feuds of centuries.

ART. III.—*Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek.* By HERMANN CREMER, D.D. Translated from the German of the Second Edition by William Urwick, M.A. Second Edition. 1878. T. and T. Clark.

EVERY branch of human research demands before all things a clear definition of its terms. But theology demands much more than this. In other departments of research, writers may, to some extent, themselves choose the sense of their own terms: and if the sense be clearly defined, and maintained throughout, no confusion arises. But most of the words used in theology had a definite meaning in the minds of the sacred writers before systematic theology began. This meaning we must carefully seek for, and retain in our own use of the same terms. Else we shall be in danger of putting into the assertions of Holy Scripture a sense quite alien from the writers' intention, a sense derived from the modern associations of thought which have gathered round the English representatives of the original words. And we shall certainly lose much of the truth which the sacred writers designed their words to convey. Inattention to the meaning and use of Biblical words has been an abundant source of confusion and error.

Again, it is specially important to notice the gradual development of the significance of such words. All these were born on profane soil, and were servants once of the common things of common life. But, when they were called to enter the service of the temple of revealed truth, they were bidden to leave behind them, more or less, the associations of their earlier life; and were invested with a new significance. This significance became, in some cases, wider and deeper as the ages of the old covenant rolled by, until at last it received its full glory in the presence of the God-Man. Such words set forth, in their own history, the development of revealed truth. Therefore, not only as an essential condition of a clear and correct comprehension of the meaning of the sacred writers, but as a means of tracing the development of revelation, the study of the

words of the Bible has an importance which cannot be overestimated.

Dr. Trench was one of the first to direct the more special attention of English students to this matter. His *Synonyms of the New Testament*, and especially the preface, deserves the careful study of all who read New Testament Greek. But this work is confessedly fragmentary. It does not attempt to cover the whole field of New Testament words. Indeed, until the appearance, eleven years ago, of Dr. Cremer's work, we had no important theological dictionary of this kind. Nor can it be said that even this work is all we desire. The writer occasionally fails, as we think, to grasp the central idea of the word under review and the correct development of that idea. But he has done real service by gathering together various passages in which the words of the New Testament are used by sacred and profane writers, and others in which their Hebrew equivalents are used. With care and honesty he has sought for the conception embodied in each word. And, even when he has failed to find it, he has in not a few cases pointed to a path leading in the right direction. While we regret that some words, important in our judgment, are either passed over altogether or slightly touched, we do not hesitate to say that the work before us is one of exceeding value. A translation, somewhat imperfect, of the first German edition was published six years ago. But it was scarcely in the hands of English readers when there appeared a second German edition, greatly enlarged and improved. Of this second edition, an English translation, beautifully got up and, as far as we have been able to compare it, satisfactory at all points, has just come to our hand. It not only puts the German work fairly before the English reader, but corrects some four hundred errors in the German edition.

Of the general characteristics of Dr. Cremer's work, and of the greater value of the second, as compared with the first edition, no better illustration can be given than his article on the word HOLY. It is enlarged from two pages to twenty pages. And so full is the collection of examples from all sources, and so good are some of the generalisations, that no one will rise from a study of it without profit. But, at the same time, we think that Dr. Cremer has hardly done justice to one central idea which underlies the many and various uses of this all-

important word. The importance of the subject has prompted us to endeavour to bring out into more prominence that one aspect. We have freely used the materials which Cremer has collected: and we as freely admit that whatever success we may attain is in some degree a result of the labours of the man whose work we are attempting to amend.

The etymology of the Hebrew word translated "holy" is uncertain and unimportant. For, at the Exodus, the word came suddenly into very common use; and was applied to objects so numerous, and henceforth so familiar to the eyes and thought of Israel, that from these objects its meaning would be accurately, though perhaps unconsciously, fixed in the mind of every Israelite.

How closely connected with the Mosaic ritual was the idea of holiness, may be seen in the fact that in Genesis the word "holy" never occurs; and the word "sanctify" only once, in a passage which probably received its literary form from the voice of Sinai. This one passage, and others containing cognate words, will be discussed below.

In the solemn opening scene of the Mosaic covenant, from the lips of God, and in a connection of thought wonderfully indicative of the nature of the Covenant He had come down to make, we hear for the first time the great word henceforth to be so deeply interwoven with the religious thought of Israel. The words, "Draw not nigh hither: for the ground on which thou art standing is ground of holiness" (Ex. iii. 5), introduce a covenant of which one great feature was to be holiness embodied in visible places and things, a holiness which made the holy objects partly or altogether inaccessible to man. God evidently meant that the ground stood in special relation to Himself; and that, because it was God's ground, none could tread it except at His bidding.

The "convocation of holiness" (xii. 16) was a calling together of the people, not for some secular purpose, but at the bidding of God and to work out His purpose.

"Sanctify to me the firstborn" (xiii. 2), is explained at once by the words, "It is mine," and "Thou shalt make all that open the womb pass over to the Lord: the males are the Lord's" (*v.* 12). Compare: "I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of all the firstborn: and the Levites shall be mine. For mine are all the firstborn. For, in the day when I smote all

the firstborn in Egypt, I sanctified to myself every firstborn in Israel, from man to beast. Mine they shall be" (Num. iii. 12, 13). Also: "They are given entirely to Me from among the children of Israel instead of," &c. (viii. 16, 17). "Every firstborn male thou shalt sanctify to the Lord thy God: thou shalt do no work with the firstborn of thy ox, nor shear the firstborn of thy sheep" (Deut. xv. 19). These passages make quite certain the meaning of "sanctify" in Ex. xiii. 2. The firstborn were to stand in special relation to God as His property; and were to be touched by man only according to His bidding, and to work out His purposes. In this sense they were holy.

The meaning, in the song of Moses (Ex. xv. 11—13), of "glorious in holiness," "the dwelling place of Thy holiness," will be evident when we have completed our study of the Mosaic ritual.

The words, "Ye shall be to Me a holy nation" (xix. 6) solemnly declare that the whole nation must be holy; and are explained by, "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all people: for all the earth is Mine." "Set bounds about the mount and sanctify it" (*v.* 23), develops iii. 5.

And now, beneath the shadow of the holy mountain, there rises before us the complicated solemnity of the Mosaic ritual: and of that ritual every vessel and rite bears on its front in broad and deep characters the name of "holiness." The tabernacle is called the "sanctuary," or holy place (Ex. xxv. 8). The outer chamber bears the abstract title, "holiness;" the inner one has the superlative name, "holiness of holinesses," conveniently rendered "holy of holies" (xxvi. 33). The same august superlative title is given to the brazen altar (xxix. 37), to the vessels of the tabernacle (xxx. 29), to the bodies of animals offered in sacrifice (Lev. ii. 3). In the last passage it is explained by the words, "The remnant from the meat-offering is for Aaron and for his sons: it is holy of holies from the burnings of the Lord." So absolute was the holiness of the brazen altar that whatever touched it became holy (Ex. xxix. 37, xxx. 29; Lev. vi. 18); that is, whatever touched the altar ceased by that touch to be man's, and must henceforth be used only for the purposes, and to work out the will, of God. Aaron and his clothes, his sons and their clothes, were holy (Ex. xxix. 21). So was the oil: "Upon man's flesh it shall not be poured, neither shall ye make any like it: it is holy, and shall be holy to

you. Whoever compoundeth any like it, and whoever putteth any of it upon a stranger, shall even be cut off from his people" (Ex. xxx. 32). Houses, fields, and cattle, were made holy by consecration to God (Lev. xxvii. 9, 14). Their holiness is thus described, "The field shall be holy to the Lord, like the field of the Anathema: for the priest, the possession of it shall be" (*v.* 21). If a man wanted back an object he had sanctified, he must pay for it (*v.* 15). But some things were given to God by an irrevocable consecration, and were called "Anathema," and "holy of holies" (*vv.* 28, 29). The Nazarite was holy (Num. vi. 5, 8): and his sacrifice was "holiness for the priest" (*v.* 20). The censers of Korah were holy (Num. xvi. 37); and therefore could not be put to common use. The fourth year's fruit of Canaan was holy (Lev. xix. 24). The Sabbath is called holy: "Whoever doeth any work therein shall be cut off from his people" (Ex. xxxi. 14). Lastly, God says to Israel, "A holy people thou art to the Lord thy God: thee hath the Lord thy God chosen to be His, for a people of special possession beyond all the peoples which are upon the face of the earth" (Deut. vii. 6).

In all these passages, and in hundreds more, the meaning of the word "holy" is the same, and is clearly marked. These holy objects stood in a special relation to God as His property. Consequently, they were not man's. They had no human owner who could do with them what he pleased. To touch them, except at the bidding, and to work out the will, of God, was to rob God. The word "holiness," was the inviolable token of the Divine King of Israel.

The sanctification of the firstborn, the tabernacle and altar, Aaron and his sons, the Sabbath, and the people, is attributed to God (Num. iii. 13; Ex. xxix. 44, xx. 11; Lev. xxii. 32). For the devotion of these objects to God, originated, not in man, but in God. With very few limited exceptions, nothing could be given to God but what He had first claimed for Himself.

Moses also, as the minister through whom the devotion of these objects to God was brought about, is said to have sanctified Mount Sinai, Aaron, the tabernacle and its vessels (Ex. xix. 14, xxviii. 41, xxix. 1, xl. 9—13).

Since some of the objects claimed by God were themselves intelligent beings, and others were in the control of such beings, their devotion to God could take place only by man's

consent. Consequently, the priests and the people are said to sanctify themselves and some of their possessions (Ex. xix. 22, Lev. xi. 44, xxvii. 14). They did this, either by formally placing themselves or their goods at the disposal of God, or by separating themselves from whatever was inconsistent with the service of God. Hence, holiness implied renunciation of idolatry and of meats pronounced unclean (Lev. xx. 7, xi. 44, xx. 25, xxi. 1—8).

In Lev. xi. 45, xix. 2, xx. 26, xxi. 8, God solemnly declares that He is Himself holy. In two of these passages, the holiness of God is given as a reason for abstinence from unclean food; a third refers to the sanctity of the priests; the remaining one warns to honour parents, to keep the Sabbath, and to turn from idolatry.

It is quite certain that, in these four passages in which it is predicated of God, the word "holy" must represent the same idea as in the hundreds of passages surrounding them in which it is predicated of men and things. For, the number and variety and commonness of the concrete and visible objects to which the word was applied in the everyday life of Israel must have given to it a meaning clearly defined and well understood by every Israelite. By calling Himself holy, God plainly indicated that He possesses an attribute set forth by these holy objects. That the Creator could not be holy in precisely the same sense as the creature, was no disproof of this. For, an idea may be the same although its relation to the object in which it is embodied be different. Just so, when we speak of people as healthy and from this infer that their home is healthy, we have only one idea of health, although the one idea is differently embodied in a healthy man and a healthy place. We must therefore seek in the nature of God for an attribute which sets forth the idea already set forth in the priests, the tabernacle and its service, &c., and which bears to these created objects, rational and irrational, a relation similar to that of the Creator to the creature.

We have seen that "holiness" denotes God's claim to the exclusive use of various men and things; and that the objects thus claimed were called "holy." But, if so, the same word might also be correctly predicated of Him who claimed them. For His claim was a new revelation of His nature. The thoughts of Moses, Aaron, and Israel, about God must have been very different at Sinai from their

thoughts in former days. To Aaron, Jehovah was the God who had claimed from him a lifelong service. God's claim was a new era, not only in his everyday life, but in his conception of the nature of God. Therefore, the word "holy" which expressed Aaron's new relation to God, expressed also God's newly revealed relation to him. In other words, God was holy inasmuch as He claimed the exclusive ownership and use of the various holy objects, and thus claimed virtually the ownership of the entire nation. "Ye shall be to Me holy men: for holy am I, the Lord. And I have separated you from the nations to be Mine" (Lev. xx. 26). Since God's claim infinitely surpasses every claim ever put forth on behalf of the gods of heathendom, it reveals the majesty of God: and Moses could appropriately sing, "Who is like Thee among the gods, glorious in holiness?" (Ex. xv. 11). And Sinai, since there God solemnly announced His claim, was "the dwelling-place of His holiness" (*v.* 13). When the strictness of God's claim was manifested, he was said to "be sanctified;" as in the case of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 3). When men yielded to God the devotion He required, that is, when in the subjective world of their own inner and outer life they put Him in the place of honour as their master and owner, they were said to sanctify God. So we read, "because ye sanctified Me not in the midst of the children of Israel" (Deut. xxxii. 51; Num. xxvii. 14).

Dr. Cremer, in his exposition of the holiness of God, seems to us to fail utterly. Instead of beginning with the more frequent and familiar use of the word as an attribute of men and things and time, he takes for his starting point its much less frequent use as a predicate of God; and from this he seeks to obtain a conception of holiness as predicated of the people. And he gives to the word "holy" when applied to God a meaning which has little in common with the meaning made so familiar to the Israelites by the various holy objects ever before their eyes. Dr. Trench properly gives "devotion to the service of Deity" as the fundamental idea of holiness; but does not attempt to explain the meaning of the word when applied to God.

We have now learnt, by study of the four later books of the law, what every Israelite must have learnt unconsciously from objects around him, that the word "holiness" denotes God's claim to the absolute proprietorship and use of certain objects: and we have seen it applied both to the objects

claimed and to the Great Being who claimed them. We notice also that God's claim put a lofty barrier between the objects claimed and all others, a barrier which separated the sacred objects from the mass of the nation.

From this point let us look back upon the Book of Genesis. It is as likely as not that the words "God sanctified the seventh day" (Gen. ii. 3) were written after the giving of the law: and, if so, they may have taken their literary form from Ex. xx. 11. The words, "And God blessed," &c. (Gen. ii. 3), certainly suggest that at the creation God pronounced a blessing on the seventh day. And, if so, that blessing, looked upon in the light of Ex. xx. 11, "The Lord blessed the Sabbath day and sanctified it," might be correctly spoken of as a sanctification of the seventh day. But this is immaterial. The sense of the word here corresponds exactly with the sense determined above. God claimed the day to be specially His own. "Turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My day of holiness" (Is. lviii. 13).

In Gen. xxxviii. 21, as in Deut, xxiii. 17, a cognate word is applied to a profligate woman. This reminds us of the "sacred slaves" at Corinth, "whom both men and women presented to the goddess" (*Strabo*, b. 8, c. 378). The essential idea of holiness is found here, though in a peculiar form. Devotion to an impure idol brings with it impurity: whereas devotion to God implies separation from all impurity.

Another early trace of the word is found in the name Kadesh (Gen. xiv. 7, xvi. 14, xx. 1). This name, also given to other towns (Josh. xx. 7, xv. 23; 1 Chr. vi. 72), suggests that these towns were specially devoted to the worship of some deity. Compare the Greek name Hierapolis, given to a city in Phrygia celebrated for its temple of Cybele, and to another in the north-east of Syria, famous as one of the chief seats of the worship of Astarte.

Throughout the entire Old Testament the word "holy" has the sense determined above. Josh. iii. 5 recalls Ex. xix. 10; Josh. v. 15 points to Ex. iii. 5. In Josh. vi. 19 we read, "All the silver and gold, &c., is holiness to the Lord: into the treasury of the Lord it shall come." "They sanctified Kedesh in Galilee to be a city of refuge" (xx. 7): for the cities of refuge stood in a special relation to God. "A holy God is He, a jealous God is He" (xxiv. 19), reminds us of the close connection of the holiness and the jealousy

of God. For, the God who claimed the absolute proprietorship of Israel could tolerate no rival. Micah's mother said, "I have altogether sanctified the silver to the Lord" (Judges xvii. 3): for she supposed that by using the money to make an idol she was devoting it to the service of Jehovah.

In the Book of Psalms the word "sanctify" never occurs: only once in the other poetical books (Job i. 5), where it has its ritual sense. The word "holiness" is very frequently, "holy" sometimes, applied in the Psalms to God. He is the "holy one of Israel" (lxxi. 22), &c. In Ps. lxxxix. 5, 7, as in Job v. 1, xv. 15, the word "holy" or "saint" denotes an angel. And naturally so: for our chief thought of the angels is that they stand in special relation to God, and are working out His purposes. "Aaron, the holy one of the Lord" (Ps. cvi. 16), reminds us of the ritual phraseology of the law. Only twice in the poetical books—"The holy ones which are in the earth" (Ps. xvi. 3), "Fear the Lord, ye His holy ones" (xxxiv. 9)—is the word "holy" applied to good men. These passages were prompted by a consciousness that the good man stands in a special relation to God as His own; and are thus an approach to the New Testament use of the word. The rarity of this use in the Old Testament arose from the fact that as yet holiness was revealed only in symbolic form. The inward reality could not be clearly seen until the appearance of Him who embodied in human flesh and blood what the symbols dimly shadowed.

In the later books of the Old Testament, traces of this moral use of the word are occasionally found. The lady of Shunem observed that Elisha stood specially near to God; and she spoke of him as "a man of God, a holy man" (2 Kings iv. 9). In prophetic vision Isaiah saw the day when "all that are left in Jerusalem will be called holy" (iv. 3), "a people of holiness" (lxii. 12). In the Book of Daniel the word "holy" is a frequent designation of the future people of God (vii. 18, 22, 25, 27).

It is interesting to observe that the destroyers of Babylon are called "God's sanctified ones" (Isa. xiii. 3), because working out the purposes of God. So, "Sanctify against her the nations, the kings of the Medes" (Jer. li. 27, 28). Notice also, "He that putteth not into their mouth, they (the wicked priests) sanctify war against him" (Mic. iii. 5): they proclaim war against him, professedly to carry out the purposes of God. Also "Sanctify an assembly for Baal"

(2 Kings x. 20): the only passage in which the word is used for devotion to a false god. But it is used by one who for the moment professed to look upon Baal as the true God.

In the Books of Chronicles, and of Nehemiah, the words "holy" and "sanctify" are frequent, always in a ritual sense. Compare 2 Chr. xxiii. 6, "Let none enter the house of the Lord except the priests. They shall come in: for they are holy."

We will close our review of the Old Testament conception of holiness by quoting the last words of one of the latest and greatest of the prophets, who foresaw in the far future the realisation of the ancient symbols. "In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses Holiness to the Lord: and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness to the Lord of Hosts. And in that day there shall be no more a Canaanite in the house of the Lord of Hosts" (Zech. xiv. 20, 21).

The above quotations are a sample of some 800 passages in which the word "holy" and its cognates are found in the Old Testament. The number and variety of the passages make the meaning of the word perfectly clear and beyond doubt. In a great majority of them it is applied to creatures rational or irrational; and denotes that they stand in a special relation to God, as His possession, and that therefore man may not use or touch them except at His bidding and to do His word. This special relation to God arises from God's own claim, in consequence of which these objects stand, apart from anything man does or fails to do, in a new position. This may be called objective holiness. In this sense, God sanctified them for Himself. But since some of the objects thus claimed were intelligent beings, and others were under the control of such beings, the word "holiness" is used to denote the condition of those who surrender themselves or their possessions to the claim of God. We may speak of this as subjective holiness.

We have seen that, after God had stamped upon the word "holy" this unmistakable and important meaning by applying it to the objects claimed for His own, He solemnly applied it to Himself. This use, of which we found only six cases in the Book of the Law, becomes very common in the Book of Psalms and in the prophecies of Isaiah. God sanctified Himself by vindicating in word or deed the inviolability of His claim. Men sanctified

God and His name by rendering the devotion He claims. As the one Being who claims absolute ownership and supreme devotion, He is the Holy One.

We come now to the Translation of the Seventy, in which we see Hebrew thought robing itself in European language, and thus unconsciously equipping itself for the conquest of the West, a conquest destined to exercise so mighty an influence upon the history of the kingdom of God, and the fortunes of the world. A word was needed to receive, and to carry forth unalloyed to the nations who spoke Greek, the great truths wrapped up in the Hebrew word we have just been studying.

A very common word, an almost exact Greek counterpart of the Hebrew word, was ready for the translator's use. Whatever, man or thing, was supposed to stand in some special relation to a deity, was said, without consideration of its inherent quality, to be ἱερός. And we have seen that this was the radical Hebrew conception of holiness. It is, however, significant that the Greek word is never used, whereas the Hebrew often is, as an attribute of God. But, in a few passages, Greek writers assert the great truth that of all sacred objects the good man is the most sacred; and they thus approach the moral conception of holiness, of which we have found traces in the Old Testament, and which is so conspicuous a feature of the New. Therefore, in spite of the above-mentioned shortcoming, it might seem that the word ἱερός was no unworthy Greek representative of the Hebrew conception of holiness.

From this honour, however, the word was, by the Seventy Translators, with one consent, utterly and rudely thrust out. As a rendering of the adjective "holy," it never occurs. And only once is the substantive ἱερόν used in its frequent New Testament sense of "sanctuary," namely, in that one strange passage in which we read of the sanctuary, not of Jehovah, but of Tyre (Ezek. xxviii. 18). The reason is not far to seek. Ἱερός had been polluted by contact with the corruptions of idolatry; and was therefore unfit for service in the Temple of God. Of this we have had an illustration in the "sacred" prostitutes of Corinth. It is true that in the Hebrew language a similar corruption had defiled one member of the family of sacred words (Deut. xxiii. 17). But the defiled member was rigidly excluded from the service of God: and the defilement went no further. Whereas, in Greek, the defilement reached and

saturated every member. With the Hebrew word, as a result of its consecration to the service of Jehovah and in spite of the occasional profanation of sacred things, were associated ideas of purity and goodness. With the Greek word, in consequence of the fearful debasement of idolatry, were associated conceptions the vilest and worst. Another word must therefore be found to carry to the nations of the West, in its purity, the Hebrew conception of holiness.

This honourable office was conferred on the comparatively rare word, ἅγιος. Its rarity was a recommendation. For, that it had so few associations of its own, made it the fitter to take up the meaning and appropriate to itself the associations of the Hebrew word. And its associations, though few, were suitable. In classic Greek it is never found as a predicate of gods or men; and was therefore free from the ideas of imperfection and sin which belonged in the minds of idolaters both to gods and men. It is frequently used by Herodotus, and occasionally by other writers, to describe temples of special sacredness; and seems to denote the reverence which their connection with the deity, ἱερόν, gave them a right to claim. It is probably akin to ἄζομαι, used by Homer to denote reverence for the gods and for parents. Compare a well-known passage, *Iliad*, i. 21. It was evidently a nobler and purer word than ἱερός. The difference arose from the fact that, owing to the degradation of idolatry, there were objects supposed to stand in close relation to the gods, which had no claim whatever to man's real reverence. A very good instance of the distinction is quoted by Dr. Cremer, "Amorous and untamed men are unable to abstain even from the most holy bodies," Plutarch, *Conviv.* 5, 682, C; which Cremer properly contrasts with the "sacred" bodies of the "sacred slaves," Strabo, 6, 272.

Such being the associations of the words, the Seventy Translators, moved by a delicate appreciation of the difference between the gods of heathendom and the One God of Israel, rejected ἱερός, which was already occupied by conceptions partly impure, and chose ἅγιος, which was in part unoccupied and in part occupied by a pure conception, viz. reverence, to receive and bear to the nations of Europe the definite Mosaic conception of holiness. To represent the modifications of the Hebrew word, the Seventy thrust aside the existing though rare derivatives of ἅγος, and

derived directly from ἅγιος a family of words of which every member was altogether new in Greek literature.

The use, in the Apocrypha, of the word ἅγιος and its cognates, corresponds exactly with its use in the Septuagint, that is, with the use of the Hebrew word. The purely ritual use is found in Judith xi. 13, "The firstfruits of the corn, and the tithes of the wine and the oil, which they kept, having sanctified them for the priests who present themselves before the face of our God; and in 1 Mac. x. 39, "For the holy things which are at Jerusalem, for the expenses suitable to the holy things." Compare Sir. xlv. 4, "In his faith and meekness, He sanctified (Moses), He chose him out of all flesh; *v.* 6, He exalted Aaron to be holy like to him." In *v.* 10, we have Aaron's "holy robe." So xlix. 12, "A people holy to the Lord, prepared for glory of eternity." From the days of the week God "exalted and sanctified the Sabbath" (xxxiii. [xxxvi.] 9). God is "the Holy One from Heaven," who redeemed Judah from the hosts of Sennacherib (xlviii. 20). We read of "the holy book" (2 Mac. viii. 23). The word ἱερόν appears in the sense of "sanctuary" in 2 Mac. v. 15. This was now safe: for the conception of holiness was indissolubly linked to ἅγιος.

In the Apocrypha, as in the Septuagint, the word ἅγιος simply takes up the ideas associated with the Hebrew word; and passes them on unchanged, as an almost lifeless body, awaiting the new life soon to be breathed into it by a new and more glorious revelation.

The New Testament writers perpetuate and develop the Old Testament conception of holiness. It was still remembered that the firstborn was "holy to the Lord" (Luke ii. 23). The emphatic teaching of Ex. xxix. 37, &c., that "whatever toucheth the altar shall be holy," was not forgotten. For, our Lord appeals in argument to the truth that the temple had already sanctified (aorist) the gold used in its construction; and that the altar day by day sanctified (present) the gifts laid upon it (Matt. xxiii. 17, 19). As in the Septuagint translation of Neh. xi. 1, so in Matt. iv. 5, xxvii. 53, Jerusalem is called the holy city. For it stood in a special relation to God. The opening words of the Mosaic Revelation (Ex. iii. 5) still lived in the memory of the people (Acts vii. 33). The temple was still "the holy place" (Matt. xxiv. 15; Acts vi. 13, xxi. 28). The word "holy," which in Job v. 1, xv. 15, Dan. viii. 13 is a

designation of the angels, as of persons who stand in a special relation to God and do His bidding, is applied to them as an epithet in Matt. xxv. 31, Luke ix. 26, Acts x. 22. Similarly, though in lower degree, it is applied to the prophets (Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21), as in Jer. i. 5. Herod knew that the Baptist was a man whose conduct agreed with the Law, and who stood in a special relation to God, "a righteous and holy man" (Mark vi. 20).

Very conspicuous, especially in the writings of St. Luke, is the term "Holy Spirit," already used in the Septuagint as a translation of "Spirit of Holiness" (Psalm li. 11; Isaiah lxiii. 10). The Spirit of God claims the epithet as being in a very special manner the source of an influence of which God is the one and only aim. All other influences tend away from God. He is, therefore, in a sense shared by no other inward motive principle, "The Holy Spirit."

The holiness of God, so solemnly asserted in Leviticus, and so frequently in Isaiah, is mentioned in the New Testament only in John xvii. 11, Heb. xii. 10, 1 Peter i. 15, 16 (quoted from Lev. xi. 44), Rev. iv. 8 (a repetition of Isaiah vi. 3), and Rev. vi. 10. The meaning of 1 Peter iii. 15, "Sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts" (the reading is undoubted) is, "Render to Christ, in the inmost chamber of your being, the reverence which belongs to Him who claims to be your proprietor and master;" and is little or nothing less than a declaration that Christ is Divine. That the name of God may evoke such reverence in the hearts of those who speak or hear it, is the meaning of the prayer, "Thy name be sanctified" (Matt. vi. 9).

So far the conception of holiness has advanced little beyond the development attained in the Old Testament. The greater frequency of holiness as an attribute of the Spirit is, however, a mark of that better Covenant of which the indwelling and sanctifying presence of the Spirit is so conspicuous and glorious a feature. And, the similarity of the use of the word in the Old and the New Testament is a proof how fully the Old Testament conception of Holiness lived on in the minds of the people.

In the Person and Life of the Incarnate Son of God, the Biblical Idea of Holiness receives its full development and realisation. On the eve of His incarnation He was announced by the angel as "The Holy Thing" (Luke i. 35); the neuter form leaving out of sight all except that He would be an embodiment of holiness. He was acknow-

ledged, both by His disciples and by evil spirits, to be "The Holy One of God" (Mark i. 24, John vi. 69). Himself declared that the Father had "sanctified Him and sent Him into the world" (John x. 36); and that day by day "He sanctified Himself" (xvii. 19). The ascended Saviour is spoken of as "The Holy and Just One" (Acts iii. 14), "The Holy Servant" of God (iv. 27). He "was marked out as Son of God according to a Spirit of Holiness (Rom. i. 4). He is probably "The Holy One" of 1 John ii. 20; and is called "Holy and True" in Rev. iii. 7.

Since "holiness" is thus solemnly predicated of the Son of God, we expect to find in Him a perfect realisation of the idea imperfectly shadowed forth in the Mosaic ritual. We expect to find Him standing in a special relation to God, and living a life of which the one and only aim is to advance the purposes of God. Our expectation is realised. The Son of God declared, "It is My meat to do the will of Him that sent Me and to complete His work" (John iv. 34); "The Son cannot do anything of Himself, but what He seeth the Father doing" (v. 19); "I seek not My own will, but the will of Him that sent Me" (v. 30); "I came down from heaven not to do My own will but the will of Him that sent Me" (vi. 38); "I have glorified Thee on the earth, having finished the work which Thou gavest me to do" (xvii. 4). We read that, "The life which He liveth, He liveth for God" (Rom. vi. 10); "Christ did not please Himself" (xv. 2); "You are Christ's: and Christ is God's" (1 Cor. iii. 23); "Being faithful to Him that made Him" (Heb. iii. 2); "He offered Himself spotless to God" (ix. 14).

In Jesus we see a life, lived in human flesh and blood, of which God was the one and only aim. All the powers, time, and opportunities of Jesus were used, not to gratify self, but to work out the Father's purposes. And this devotion to the Father was rational. The human intelligence of the man Jesus, mysteriously informed by the Divine intelligence of the Eternal Son of God, comprehended and fully approved and appropriated the Father's eternal purpose to save mankind through the death of His Son: and of this intelligent approval every word and act of the human life of Jesus was a perfect outworking. And in this sense, in a degree infinitely surpassing whatever had been known before, the incarnate Son of God was holy. Consequently, His body was a temple (John ii. 21), and a sacrifice (Heb. x. 10); and Himself a high priest (iii. 1). Whatever holiness

belonged to the vessels and ritual of the Mosaic covenant, belonged to Him and to His life: whatever in them was imperfect, found in Him its full realisation.

We notice further that, under the old covenant, the holy men were separated by their holiness from the common work of common life. This was very conspicuous in the last of the prophets, in that "righteous and holy man" (Mark vi. 20), in whose person and teaching were summed up whatever had been revealed under the earlier dispensation. The contrast of John and Jesus is the contrast of holiness as revealed in the Law, and as revealed in the Gospel. John lived in the wilderness, away from the dwellings of men, and ate strange food. Jesus lived a common life, toiling at a trade, enjoying social intercourse, partaking of human hospitality, and eating the food set before Him. This teaches plainly that holiness in its highest degree, *i.e.* that the highest conceivable devotion to God and to the advancement of His kingdom, does not imply separation from the common business of life. And when we see Jesus using the opportunities afforded Him by this common intercourse with men to advance the interests of the kingdom of God, we learn that even the common things of daily life may be laid on the altar of God as a means of doing His holy work.

We saw that under the old covenant, devotion to God implied separation from whatever, in symbol or reality, was opposed to God. Now, all sin is opposed to God: for sin, in whatever form or degree, tends to misery and destruction, whereas God's purpose is life and happiness. Consequently, the holiness of Jesus involves His absolute separation from all sin.

Again, the only purpose of God which we can conceive of as having a practical bearing upon us, is God's purpose to save men from sin and death, and to set up the eternal kingdom of which Christ will be king and His people citizens. Consequently, to us, devotion to God implies devotion to this one purpose. And this one great Divine purpose is inseparably linked with our conception of holiness. Therefore, since to realise this purpose God sent His Son into the world, the Saviour spoke appropriately of Himself as He "whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world" (John x. 36). And, in reference to His own daily devotion of Himself to this enterprise, He said, "I sanctify myself" (xvii. 19).

From the great Author and Archetype of renewed

humanity, we have now obtained a complete conception of holiness. We have seen a man, though God yet perfect man, whose life was a perfect realisation of one purpose, viz., to use all His powers, time, opportunities, to advance the kingdom of God: and we have seen that this purpose was a result of an intelligent comprehension, and a full approval, of the Father's purpose. In virtue of this intelligent, hearty, continued appropriation of the Father's purpose, and in virtue of its realisation in all the details of the Saviour's life, He was called the "Holy One of God."

We now come to study the idea of holiness as embodied in redeemed mankind. A conspicuous difference of the Old and New Testament use of the word meets us at once, viz., that, in the Acts of the Apostles and elsewhere, all church members are indiscriminately called "saints," "holy persons" (Rom. i. 7, xv. 25, 31, &c.). This is a complete contrast with 2 Chr. xxiii. 6, "Let none come into the house of the Lord save the priests. They shall come in: for they are holy. But all the people shall keep the watch of the Lord." But it fulfils the prophecy of Daniel, who speaks of the future people of God as the "people of the saints of the Most High" (Dan. vii. 27, 18, 22, 25). We also notice that the New Testament writers call believers "saints" without thought of the degree of their Christian life or the worthiness of their conduct. This use may be explained by an Old Testament analogy. The priests were "holy" whatever might be their conduct. For, God's claim that they should be His, placed them in a new position; and could not be set aside by, although it greatly aggravated the guilt of, their unfaithfulness. Just so, God claims for Himself all those whom He rescues from the penalty of their sins. And, whatever they may do, His claim puts them in a new and very solemn position. They may be, like the Corinthians, "babes in Christ" and "carnal" (1 Cor. iii. 3): like the Corinthians, they are still "sanctified in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. i. 2). The word "saint" is therefore very appropriate as a designation of the followers of Christ: for it declares what God requires them to be. To admit sin or selfishness into their hearts is sacrilege. It also points out their privilege. By calling His people saints, God declares His will that we live a life of which He is the one and only aim. Therefore, since our own efforts have proved that such a life is utterly beyond our power, we may take back to God the name He gives us, and claim that that name be

realised by His power in our heart and life. This is the objective holiness of the Church of Christ.

But, although, as claimed by God, all the children of God are holy, it is evident that the full idea of holiness is realised in them only so far as they yield to God the devotion He claims. Consequently, the word "holy" also denotes actual and absolute devotion to God. And holiness is set before the people of God as a standard for their attainment. So 1 Cor. vii. 34, "That she may be holy both in body and spirit;" parallel with "How she may please the Lord:" Eph. i. 4, "That we may be holy and blameless:" v. 27; Col. i. 22; 1 Thess. v. 23, "May the God of peace sanctify you:" Heb. xii. 14, "Follow after holiness:" 1 Pet. i. 16, "Be yourselves holy in all behaviour." The sacred writers here urge their readers to claim a realisation in themselves of God's purpose that they live a life of which He is the one and only aim. This is the subjective holiness to which God calls His people.

We also notice that frequently in the New Testament the ideal life which Christ died to realise in His people is said to be a life in which all our powers are put forth to advance the purposes of God. So Rom. vi. 11, "Reckon yourselves to be living for God in Christ Jesus:" *v.* 19, "Present the members of your body, as servants, to righteousness, for sanctification: xiv. 7, "None of us liveth for himself; for, if we live, we live for the Lord:" 2 Cor. v. 15, "He died that they who live may no longer live for themselves but for Him who died for them:" "Ye are not your own" (1 Cor. vi. 20): but "Christ's" (iii. 23). The life here described is a life of holiness.

Since holiness denotes God's claim to the service of His creatures, it is predicated of both spirit and body (1 Cor. vii. 34; Rom. xii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 23). For God claims even our body, that its powers may work out His purposes.

Since holiness as set forth in the Mosaic ritual was a prophetic outline of the holiness required in us, the various holy objects of that ritual were types, as of Christ, so also of His followers. We are a temple (1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19), a priesthood (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9), a sacrifice (Rom. xii. 1). Our glorified life will be a Sabbath-keeping (Heb. iv. 9).

Very interesting is 1 Cor. vii. 14, "The unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife." Since the people of God are holy, it might be thought that, as in Ezra ix. 2, "the seed of holiness" ought to separate itself from contact with

the unholy. St. Paul says, No. The Christian wife, in virtue of the universal priesthood of believers, lays her husband upon the altar of God, and in all her treatment of him seeks to advance the purposes of God. Therefore, in the subjective world of the wife's inner life, the husband, unbeliever though he be, is a holy object, and the wife's intercourse with him is a service of God. St. Paul proves the correctness of this view by showing that if the principle of separation from the unbelieving were accepted it would in some cases compel the Christian mother to forsake her children, who evidently, in spite even of their possible rejection of Christianity, had a claim upon their mother's care. Whereas, he says, on the principle that to the Christian wife the heathen husband is a sacred object, the children also are sacred and therefore fit objects of a Christian mother's care. And if it be right for her to live with her children, some of whom may be adult idolaters, on the same principle it is right for her to live with her husband. Thus, from the case of the children, St. Paul proves the case of the husband.

Equally interesting is 1 Tim. iv. 5, "Every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be cast away, when received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified through the Word of God and prayer." The "Word of God" is the voice of God (Gen. i. 29, ix. 3), by which God devoted vegetables and animals to be food for His rational creatures. This universal word was for a time restricted by the Law, which declared that only certain specified animals were holy: but the restriction had been solemnly revoked (Acts x. 13), and the original word was again in force. Thus, by the Word of God, all manner of food was consecrated for the use of the sacred people. The general word "prayer" refers to the "thanksgiving" of *v.* 4. Our thanks to God is the testimony of our conscience that we believe our food to be His gift to us; and is therefore a proof that we eat it "for the Lord." "He eateth for the Lord: for he giveth thanks to God" (Rom. xiv. 6). Consequently, whatever food we eat with genuine thanksgiving, is, by God's original word, and by our thanks, which is a recognition of that original word, made holy food suitable for the holy people. But the same food, if eaten without this intelligent recognition of it as God's gift, would, in spite of its objective sanctification by God's original word, be unholy and defiling (Rom. xiv. 14).

Since the devotion to God of ourselves, our powers, and possessions, is a result not only of God's original purpose and claim, but also of His power working in us the devotion He requires, He is in every sense the Author of our holiness. Since our surrender to God's claim is the result of His claim, and since His claim is the immediate outworking of His inmost essence, the holy man is a "partaker of His holiness" (Heb. xii. 10). Since apart from the death of Christ it would be unjust (Rom. iii. 26), and therefore impossible, for God to bring near to Himself those who by their own choice and sin had separated themselves from Him, our sanctification comes through the death of Christ. "In the will of God we have been sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ" (Heb. x. 10): "That He might sanctify the people with His own blood" (xiii. 12). Since our holiness is wrought in us by the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, who becomes the soul of our soul, and leads out our thoughts, purposes, words, and actions, towards God, we read, "sanctified in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. xv. 16), "sanctification of the Spirit" (2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 2). But, although sanctification is thus entirely God's work in us, it is nevertheless to be an object of our effort, and in some sense our own work: for we must "follow after holiness" (Heb. xii. 14), and "cleanse ourselves, accomplishing holiness" (2 Cor. vii. 1). Since the Word of God is the instrument by which God puts before us holiness as an object of our effort, and calls forth in us faith, the one condition of all Gospel blessings, God "sanctifies us by the Truth" (Jno. xvii. 17). If, to-day, God is the one aim of our life, we "are clean because of the Word which Christ has spoken to us" (John xv. 3), and because, through His blood and death, in fulfilment of the Father's eternal purpose, we have received the Holy Spirit, who is given to be the personal directing principle of all who believe the spoken Word. Although we do not meet the exact phrase, "Sanctification through faith," we gather by sure inference from a great mass of Bible teaching that "belief of the Truth," *i.e.* belief of the Word spoken by Christ, is the one condition on which we obtain the "sanctification of the Spirit." We therefore venture to believe that God now works in us, and thus gives to us, the devotion He requires; and to expect that He will maintain it in us, by His own power, amid the enticements of the world, to the end of

life. And what we dare to believe, God works in us, "according to our faith."

We have now, by study of the Old and New Testaments, obtained a clear conception of holiness as understood by the writers of the Bible. It is God's claim that His creatures use all their powers and opportunities to work out His purposes. We have seen that holiness, thus understood, is an attribute of God. For, His claim springs from His Nature, even from that love which is the very essence of God. His love to us moves Him to claim our devotion: for only by absolute devotion to Him can we attain our highest happiness. We have also seen the idea of holiness realised in the Son of God, who took upon Him our flesh, lived a human life on earth, and now lives a glorified human life upon the throne of God, simply and only to accomplish the Father's purposes of mercy. We have seen the same idea realised in the Spirit of God, who ever goes forth from the Father that He may lead us to the Father, and whose every influence tends to accomplish the Father's purposes. The same idea is in part realised in all the adopted children of God. For God has claimed them to be His own: and His claim puts them, whatever they may do, in a new and solemn position. But the complete idea of holiness is realised in them only so far as their entire activity of body and mind are the outworking of a single purpose to accomplish the purposes of God.

The life just described is the ideal Christian life. And it is the noblest ideal we can conceive. For it sets before us an aim, the best possible aim, an aim which we can pursue at all times amid all the various and varying circumstances of life, and in the pursuit of which we can use all our powers. Now, all human effort receives its worth from the object aimed at. No act is trifling which tends to realise some great purpose: whereas the greatest effort which aims at nothing beyond itself is valueless. An aimless life is poor and worthless. But all self-chosen aims must needs be earthly and selfish. For the stream cannot rise above its source. Therefore, God, in order to ennoble even the humblest of His children, has given Himself and His own purpose of mercy to be their single aim; that they may thus, by directing their efforts towards the realisation of His purposes, themselves rise daily towards God.

Again, devotion to God implies complete victory over all sin: for all sin, in thought, word, or deed, tends to hinder God's purposes of mercy. Therefore, holiness implies purity. And we notice that complete victory over all sin is indissolubly connected in Scripture with that devotion to Himself which God requires. "Let us cleanse ourselves (aorist) from all defilement of flesh and spirit, accomplishing holiness" (2 Cor. vii. 1): "Reckon yourselves to be dead to sin, but living for God" (Rom. vi. 11). The exhortation in the former of these passages implies the possibility of that to which St. Paul exhorts. And the command to reckon ourselves dead to sin and living for God, implies that, in the moment we reckon it, God will realise in us by His power the reckoning which at His bidding we make. The words "dead to sin" express, in the strongest possible form, complete separation in purpose from all sin.

But purity is not holiness. For purity is a mere negative excellence; and might be conceived of as existing without activity. Indeed, a mere negative sinlessness has sometimes been the aim of mistaken effort. Holiness implies the most intense mental and bodily activity of which we are capable. For it is the employment of all our powers and opportunities to advance God's purposes: and this implies the use of our intelligence to learn how best to do His work, and the bodily effort which His work requires. Consequently, holiness sets to work all our powers, and sets them to work in the best direction. It gives to intellectual effort its noblest aim; and guards intellectual success from the perils which surround it. It gives the noblest motive for the care and development of the body: for it shows us that the powers even of our perishing body may work out eternal results. And it gives the only pure motive, and a very strong motive, for effort after material good: for it teaches that this world's wealth may be a means of laying up treasure in heaven. Thus holiness quickens, develops, and elevates all our powers.

Again, holiness not only develops, but satisfies, the intelligence. The mind of the holy man contemplates with full approval the one aim towards which his ceaseless efforts are directed. And his best judgment selects from the means at his disposal those which seem to him most fitted to attain this end. Thus the holy man, and he

only, lives a life strictly in accordance with the dictates of his reason. In him, that which is by nature highest, viz., the mind, actually rules; and that which is by nature lower, the body, attains its highest well-being by acting under the direction of that which is nobler than itself. Consequently, in him, there is perfect harmony, and perfect peace, combined with the highest activity.

Again, while we aim at the realisation of God's purposes, His purposes become our own. That which God desires, commends itself to us as worthy of our desire. But God's purpose is the salvation and well-being of mankind. This becomes, therefore, the one purpose of the holy man. But he cherishes this purpose, not merely from sympathy with those who are perishing—for some of them have few claims on his sympathy—but because, by devotion to God, he has felt the power of that love which moved the Father to give His only Son to save a ruined world.

We observe that this ideal life is practicable, in the highest degree, to all persons in all positions in life. The man who has fewest powers may use them all for God. And the man whose circumstances are most adverse may yet make it his single aim to do all he can to accomplish the purposes of God. And, if so, even adversity will show forth the glory, and thus help forward the work, of Him whose grace is ever sufficient. That holiness is possible to all men always, is some proof that the teaching which claims it is from God.

Another proof of the same is found in the fact that holiness is not only possible in, but fits a man for, every position in life. By making men right with God, it makes them right with each other. We have seen that the man who makes God's purpose his own will seek to do all possible good to those around him. He will therefore be a good father, a good citizen, a good neighbour, and a tradesman pleasant to deal with.

It has often been asked, What is religion? It is holiness. That man is most religious who most constantly and intelligently uses his various powers, and the opportunities which each day brings, to work out God's purpose of mercy to mankind. This is the end to which all the so-called means of Grace are subordinate. They are of value only as far as they attain this end in us.

It has been well said that Purpose is the autograph of Mind. Wherever purpose is, there is mind. And where-

ever mind is directed towards the Great Source of mind, there is holiness.

Holiness is capable of infinite growth. It is true that, when we learn that God claims to be the one aim of our every purpose and effort; and when, after fruitless personal efforts to render to God the devotion He requires, we learn for the first time that God will work in us by the agency of the Holy Spirit and by actual spiritual contact with Christ, the devotion He requires; and when we venture to believe that God does now and will henceforth work even in us this devotion to Himself; and when we find by happy experience that according to our faith it is done to us—it is true that, when we experience all this, the experience thus gained becomes an era in our spiritual life. We feel that we are then holy in a sense unknown to us before. But our holiness is still imperfect. At the end of every day we acknowlege that we have failed to work out fully into all the details of the day the one purpose which has by the grace of God been the mainspring of our action; and that we have often chosen unsuitable means. But each day we learn better what will, and what will not, advance the purposes of God; and each day our one great purpose permeates more fully our entire thoughts and more fully directs our entire activity. In this sense personal holiness is capable of infinite development.

In this article we have sought, by study of the Mosaic ritual, to understand the holiness which Christ came to realise in His people. This process may be profitably reversed. The holiness proclaimed by Christ explains, and is the only conceivable explanation of, a great part of the Mosaic ritual. It has frequently been observed that the only explanation of the Mosaic sacrifices, and of the prominence given to blood in the Mosaic ritual, is the great Truth that in later ages Christ came to save mankind by His own death; and that apart from the death of Christ the Old Testament sacrifices are meaningless, and therefore unaccountable. It is equally true that the prominence given in the Old Covenant to ceremonial holiness receives its only explanation from the holiness taught by Christ. For from the New Testament point of view we see that, in order to teach men, in the only way they could understand, that God claims that they look upon themselves as belonging to Him, and use all their powers and time to work out

His purposes—we see that, in order to teach men this, God set apart for Himself, in outward and visible and symbolic form, a certain place, and certain men, things, and periods of time. Afterwards when in this way men had become familiar with the idea of holiness, God proclaimed in Christ that this idea must be realised in every man, and place, and thing, and time. Thus in the Biblical conception of holiness, we have an explanation of a marked and otherwise inexplicable feature of the Old Covenant; we have a link binding the covenants together; and a light which each covenant reflects back on the other.

The results obtained above prove sufficiently the usefulness of a study of Bible words. And in this study Dr. Cremer's Lexicon renders valuable assistance.

We cannot, however, conclude this article without mentioning two great works without which this article, and probably the books of Trench and Cremer, would never have been written, viz. the Hebrew Concordance of Fuerst, and the Concordance of New Testament Greek by Bruder. These works bring before us the entire Bible use of the word we seek to understand; and thus enable us to observe the various objects to which it is applied, and the various connections of thought in which it occurs. They thus enable us to learn the meaning of Bible words in a way similar to that in which we learnt in childhood the meaning of the words of our mother tongue. It is to be regretted that these works are expensive. Fortunately, the Greek Concordance, which is by far the more important, is also much the cheaper, of the two. It is of greater real value than an ordinary theological library. For the Old Testament, an English Concordance will render good service. It is true that it fails us in a few interesting passages, such as Gen. xxxviii. 21, 2 Kings x. 20, Micah iii. 5, which because they contain the word in an unusual sense, cast special light upon its central idea; but in which, because of this unusual sense, it is rendered by an altogether different English word. In spite, however, of this drawback, the help of an English Concordance is not to be despised. But the possession of a concordance by no means sets aside the need for such a work as that of Dr. Cremer. The concordance gives us only the raw materials of our study. And every one who has honestly tried to grasp the central idea of a Bible word has felt the difficulty

of doing so, and is ready to welcome the aid of a fellow-traveller along this difficult road.

Our recommendation must be accompanied by a word of caution. The use neither of a concordance nor of a lexicon must ever supersede the careful consecutive study of Holy Scripture. This is the only safe method of obtaining a knowledge of the way of salvation as set forth in the Bible. To grasp the Truth as held and taught by the Sacred Writers, we must patiently follow their train of thought. But this can be done only by carefully seeking the meaning of the words they use. And as an aid in our search we warmly commend the honest and laborious New Testament Lexicon of Dr. Cremer.

ART. IV.—*The Life of Thomas Fuller, D.D., with Notices of his Books, his Kinsmen, and his Friends.* By JOHN EGLINGTON BAILEY. London: B. M. Pickering. Manchester: T. J. Day.

IT is little to the credit of English literature that no complete edition of such a classic as Fuller has ever appeared. Separate works have been published. The series issued by Tegg is the most extensive; but it is far from complete, and, however meritorious in some respects, falls far short of satisfying the requirements of a critical edition. That Fuller deserves the honour of such an edition needs no proof. He is the wittiest of divines and Church historians. His books are treasures of pithy wisdom. No author has contributed more to collections of gnomic sayings. His wit is always good-tempered, pure, and reverent. During life he was one of the most popular of preachers and writers, and his writings are just as well adapted for popularity of the best kind still. Yet, with the exceptions named, he is only to be had in the old folios, which are dear and hard to get. The very fact that even the folios are rare in sales and booksellers' catalogues is the result and evidence of their intrinsic worth. No one who has them parts with them save from necessity. They are books to be kept at one's elbow and dipped into in leisure moments. Fuller has always been a prime favourite with book-lovers. Coleridge says: "Shakespeare, Fuller, Milton, De Foe, Hogarth! As to the remaining mighty host of our great men, other countries have produced something like them; but these are uniques. England may challenge the world to show a correspondent name to either of the five. I do not say that, with the exception of the first, names of equal glory may not be produced, in a different kind. But these are *genera*, containing each only one individual." Lamb, Southey, Henry Rogers, are equally enthusiastic.

How is it that Cambridge University has never given the honour of such a memorial as we have spoken of to one of her most famous sons, and a son who wrote the first history of his *alma mater* in his most characteristic style?

Strange, too, that the Church of England has so forgotten one who was a typical Churchman, "a stout Church-and-King man," and that when the Church's fortunes were at their lowest ebb.

Mr. Bailey's *Life* is one that none but an enthusiast, full of an antiquarian and heraldic lore, like Fuller's own, could write. Its eight hundred pages contain everything ever likely to be known on the subject,—a perfect thesaurus of Fullerian knowledge. No point which travel, inquiry, and loving pains could illumine is left obscure. Like Masson's *Milton*, on a smaller scale, the *Life* is really a history of Fuller's times in so far as these bear on the subject. The history of every place, building, or person intimately associated with the subject is epitomised. Not the least portion of the labour expended on the work must have been consumed in collecting and verifying this subsidiary information about obscure scenes and persons. No better editor could be found for such a task as we have indicated than the author of this *Life*. We believe that Mr. Bailey has been long engaged on an edition of Fuller's sermons, which have hitherto existed only in a scattered form. We hope that lovers of "Good Old Fuller, the Worthy," will not have to wait much longer for the appearance of the work.

Some idea of the thoroughness of the *Life* may be gained from the fact that the first chapter of twenty-one pages deals only with Fuller's name and namesakes. Not only did friends and enemies ring the changes on his name, but he himself, with his inveterate love of punning, could no more resist the temptation than a kitten could refrain from playing with its own tail. One of the plates in his *Pisgah-Sight of Palestine*, bears the legend, "*Ager Fullonum*—Fuller's Field." In one of his latest works, written in self-defence, he says: "As for other stains and spots upon my soul, I hope that *He* (be it spoken without the least verbal reflection) who is the *Fuller's* sope, Mal. iii. 2, will scour them forth with His merit, that I may appear clean by God's mercy." One of his editors remarks, "Not only Fuller in useful matter and varied interest, but *fuller* in spirit, and *fuller* in wit, in fact, Fuller throughout." From the commonness of his name, Fuller has often been confounded with others. That he should be confounded with a Nonconformist, Andrew Fuller, is strange. The latter has often got the credit of one of his most pathetic sayings:

"Our captain counts the *image of God* nevertheless his image *cut in ebony*, as if done in ivory, and in the blackest Moors he sees the representation of the King of heaven,"—a powerful appeal for the negro slave. Less strange is the confusion with Thomas Fuller, M.D. (1654—1734), himself a wit and collector of proverbs. The only difference in name and title is that between M.D. and B.D. To the former, instead of the latter, has sometimes been attributed the couplet on a left-handed writing master:—

> "Though nature thee of thy right hand bereft,
> Right well thou writest with the hand that's left."

We wonder whether Thomas Fuller, M.D., answered to his namesake's ideal physician, "an eagle's eye, a lady's hand, and a lion's heart." The namesake of whom our Fuller is proudest is Nicholas Fuller (1557—1626), the scholar and divine, to whom he has given a place in the *Worthies of England*. Nicholas was one of our earliest Biblical critics, and his works gained the esteem of continental scholars. He was settled at Allington, Wiltshire, "a benefice rather than a living, so small the revenues thereof. But a contented mind extendeth the smallest parish into a diocese, and improveth the least benefice into a bishopric. Here a great candle was put under a bushel (or peck rather), so private his place and employment. Here he applied his studies in the tongues, and was happy in pitching on (not difficult trifles but) useful difficulties, tending to the understanding of Scripture. . . . He was the most eminent for that grace which is most worth, yet costeth the least to keep it; I mean humility, who in his writings doth as fairly dissent from, as freely concur with, any man's opinions" (*Worthies*). "He was the prince of all our English critics; and whereas men of that tribe are generally morose, so that they cannot dissent from another without disdaining, nor oppose without inveighing against him, it is hard to say whether more candour, learning, or judgment was blended in his *Miscellanies*. By discovering how much Hebrew there is in the New Testament Greek, he cleareth many real difficulties from his verbal observations." The chief home of the Fuller name and kin is in the south-east counties of Essex, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, the early seat of the woollen manufacture, with which fullers had much to do. To which branch of the race Fuller belonged, Mr. Bailey has failed to discover. He is

inclined to think that Fuller's father came from London, inasmuch as the son's acquaintance with the capital seems to go back to an early date. In 1660 he says: "I have known the city of London almost *forty* years; their shops did ever sing the same tune, that *Trading was dead*. Even in the reign of King James (when they wanted nothing but thankfulness) this was their complaint."

Fuller was born in 1608, in the Northamptonshire village of Aldwincle, between Oundle and Thrapston. Here his father was rector of St. Peter's Church. The same village was the birthplace of another great English classic. Dryden was born in the rectory of All Saints, in Aldwincle (Saxon = old shop). The rectory house of St. Peter's was pulled down eighty years ago. No doubt it was such a house as Fuller describes, "a substantive, able to stand by itself,—made to be lived in, not looked at." Of his native county, he writes: "If that county esteems me no *disgrace* to it, I esteem it an *honour* to me." And again of the county-town: "The air is clear, yet not over-sharp; the earth fruitful, yet not very dirty; water plentiful, yet free from any fennish annoyance; and wood, most wanting now of days, sufficient in that age." "What *reformation* of late hath been made in men's judgment and manners, I know not. Sure I am that *deformation* hath been great in trees and timber; who verily believe that the clearing of many *dark places*, where formerly plenty of wood, is all the *new light* this age hath produced. Pity it is no better provision is made for the preservation of woods, whose want will be soonest for our fire, but will be saddest for our water when our naval walls shall be decayed." In allusion to its manufacture of shoes and "stockens," he describes Northampton as "standing on other men's legs."

Son of a clergyman, he was early destined for the same profession. Sons of clergymen, he observes, have not been more *unfortunate* but more *observed* than others. Of Franciscus Junius, who devoted his son to the law, he says: "Like to many nowadays, who begrutch their pregnant children to God's service, reserving straight timber to be beams in other buildings, and only condemning crooked pieces for the temple; so that what is found unfit for city, camp, or court—not to add ship and shop—is valued of worth enough for the Church."

His maternal uncle was Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, of learned fame and Puritan leanings. He was a deputy

to the Synod of Dort, and author of several works which are read still. Mr. Bailey says of him, "He had strong Calvinistic leanings, but was supposed to have an inclination to Arminianism. He strongly advocated the doctrine of universal redemption," p. 77. We cannot reconcile these statements. No Calvinist, such as Davenant was, and no one of "strong Calvinistic leanings" could hold the doctrine of universal redemption. It was to the Bishop that Fuller was indebted for his two valuable preferments, a Salisbury prebend and the rectory of Broadwindsor. Bishop Davenant was anxious beyond measure to avoid the reproach of being "worse than an infidel," virtually using his episcopal patronage to portion off his nieces. There was evidently no press or public opinion to watch such things in those days. The bishop's will, given in full by Mr. Bailey, is a curious document in this respect.

It is indicative of Fuller's bias to ecclesiastical history that a favourite of his childhood was Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, to which English Protestantism owes so much, and which he vindicated against objectors. Fuller afterwards held a curacy in Waltham Abbey, where Foxe wrote his great work. He says: "When a child, I loved to look on the pictures in the *Book of Martyrs*." "It were a miracle if in so voluminous a work there were nothing to be justly reproved; so great a pomegranate not having any rotten kernel must only grow in Paradise. And though, perchance, he held the beam at the best advantage for the Protestant party to weigh down, yet generally he is a true writer, and never wilfully deceiveth, though he may sometimes be unwillingly deceived." His own racy English was also fed by early acquaintance with the Bible. Bible words are still common in Fuller's native district. Washerwomen call their tubs "vessels." A gardener wishes for rain to "mollify" the earth. "Disannul" is common. Cambridge was Fuller's school and university in one, as he was only twelve years old when he went there. His uncle Davenant was then President of Queen's College, to which he belonged. His tutors were his cousin, Edward Davenant, and John Thorpe, B.D. Among his contemporaries were Waller, Herbert, Milton, Taylor, Lightfoot. He proceeded B.A. 1625, M.A. 1628, B.D. 1635, and D.D. by royal command in 1660. In 1629 he became "Tanquam Socius" of Sidney Sussex College, of which Dr. Sam. Ward was Master. "A *Tanquam* it seems is a Fellow in all things

save the name thereof." He also defines him as "a Fellow's Fellow." Of Dr. Ward he writes: "He was counted a Puritan *before* these times, and Popish *in* these times; and yet being always the same, was a true Protestant at all times." He well describes him thus: "He turned with the times as a rock riseth with the tide," with him a favourite image of constancy. What Fuller says of Hebrew is well worth observation. "Skill in Hebrew will quickly go out, and burn no longer than 'tis blown." The reason of this is obvious. Greek and Latin are largely interwoven with English, and are therefore more or less constantly before us. But it is not so with Hebrew, and with respect to it the proverb holds good, "Out of sight, out of mind."

In 1630 he was made curate of St. Benet's (Benedict's) Church, Cambridge, by the authorities of Corpus Christi. The period of his curacy was remarkable for three things—a visitation of the plague, Hobson's death, and Fuller's first publication. The plague was brought by two soldiers, and wrought great havoc in the town with its uncleansed streets and heavy, fennish air. The University was broken up. One of its victims was Hobson, the London carrier, immortalised by Milton. In addition to his carrying business, he was farmer, innkeeper, maltster, and let out horses. He was greatly patronised by the University. He kept forty horses ready in his stables, but always compelled customers to take the one nearest the door. Hence the phrase, *Hobson's choice*. He was a parishioner of St. Benet's, and buried by the curate, Fuller. It was in St. Benet's that Fuller preached the sermons on *Ruth*, which were not published till 1654, as an antidote to their surreptitious publication by others. This is enough to show the attractiveness of his ministry even at this early time. His first publication was a poem entitled *David's Hainous Sinne, Heartie Repentance, Heavie Punishment.* While the work is not without indications of vigour both of thought and style, it bears on its face the faults which Fuller shared with the age, and would scarcely have survived if it had stood alone. Fuller's strength lay in prose, not poetry. In 1631 he was made Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral, and in 1634 rector of Broadwindsor, in Dorset. Between these two years he probably spent a good deal of time with his uncle at Salisbury. He writes afterwards: "Travelling on the Plain (which, notwithstanding, hath its risings and fallings), I discovered Salisbury Steeple

many miles off; coming to a declivity, I lost the sight thereof; but climbing up the next hill, the steeple grew out of the ground again. Yea, I often found it and lost it, till at last I came safely to it, and took my lodging near it. It fareth thus with us whilst we are wayfaring to heaven: mounted on the Pisgah-top of some good meditation we get a glimpse of our celestial Canaan (Deut. xxxiv. 1). But when, either on the flat of an ordinary temper, or in the fall of some extraordinary temptation, we lose the view thereof. Thus, in the sight of our soul, heaven is discovered, covered, and recovered; till, though late, at last, though slowly, surely, we arrive at the haven of our happiness."

Broadwindsor is a good living and wide parish. Lewesdon and Pilleadon Hills, of about equal height (960 and 940 feet), overlook it, and serve as landmarks to ships in the Channel. Sailors know them as the Cow and Calf. Fuller has not forgotten to record the local proverb, "As much akin as Lewson Hill to Pilsen Pen," i.e. none at all. Mr. Bailey asks, whether the view from Lewesdon suggested the idea or title of his "Pisgah-sight." In modern days, Archdeacon Denison and S. C. Malan have followed Fuller in the living. Wherever Fuller's home was, he surrounded himself with friends. At Broadwindsor he was intimate with the Rolles, Poulletts, Napiers, Drakes, Windhams, and others. He was eminently sociable, the soul of geniality, good at story-telling, in which his strong memory did him good service, and was, therefore, welcome at every table. The groups of friends, whom Mr. Bailey sketches for us, embrace much of the contemporary history of Fuller's days. We have no doubt that in these social intimacies Fuller realised his own ideal of a "Faithful Minister." *He is strict in ordering his conversation.* As for those who cleanse blurs with blotted fingers, they make it the worse. It was said of one who preached very well and lived very ill, 'That when he was out of the pulpit, it was pity he should ever go into it; and when he was in the pulpit, it was pity he should ever come out of it.' But our minister lives sermons."

The present Broadwindsor pulpit is the same one in which Fuller preached. Anent the belfry, a resort of birds, Mr. Bailey aptly quotes: "Birds, we see (Ps. lxxxiv. 3), may prescribe an ancient title to build in our steeples, having time out of mind taken the same privilege in the tabernacle

and temple. Yea, David in exile, debarred access to God's public service, doth pity his own, and prefer the condition of these fowls before him. And although no devotion (whereof they were uncapable), but the bare delight in fair fabrics, brought them hither, yet we may presume according to their kind they served God better than many men in that place, chirping forth morning and evening praises to the honour of their Maker."

His diligence in study during these years must have been great, for in 1639 appeared one of his best and most characteristic works, *The Historie of the Holy Warre*, a history of the Crusades. The frontispiece alone is a curious study. At the upper part is Europe, at the lower the holy sepulchre. *Towards* the latter is marching in state a procession of kings, knights, bishops, children, women, old and young. *From* it is returning a small remnant, fleeing before pestilence, the Saracen, and death, the rest lying slain on the ground. In the two upper corners are the portraits of Baldwin and Saladin, in the two lower the arms of Jerusalem and the Crescent. The picture is the crusade in epitome. The first four books contain the history itself, and conclude: "Thus, after an hundred, ninety, and four years, ended the Holy War; for continuance the longest, for money spent the costliest, for bloodshed the cruellest, for pretences the most pious, for the true intent the most politic the world ever saw. And at this day the Turks, to spare the Christians the pains of coming so long a journey to Palestine, have done them the unwelcome courtesy to come more than half way to give them a meeting." The fifth book is called a "Supplement," and it is added "only to hem the end of our history that it ravel not out;" but this is the most characteristic part of the work. Fuller pours out his stores of knowledge in the most delightful way on all manner of subjects—knights, templars, superstition, Jerusalem, the different crusading armies, heraldry, &c. He says, "The Turk's head is less than his turbant, and his turbant less than it seemeth; swelling without, hollow within. If more seriously it be considered, that state cannot be strong which is a pure and absolute tyranny. His subjects under him have nothing certain but this: that they have nothing certain, and may thank the Grand Signor for giving them whatsoever he taketh not away from them. . . . We have just cause to hope that the fall of this unwieldy empire

doth approach. It was high noon with it fifty years ago; we hope now it draweth near night. . . . Heaven can as easily blast an oak as trample a mushrome." Fuller's hope is, unfortunately, still deferred. On a curious map in the work he says: "Of thirty maps and descriptions of the Holy land, which I have perused, I never met with two in all considerables alike; some sink valleys where others raise mountains; yea, and end rivers where others begin them; and sometimes with a dash of their pen create a stream in land, a creek in sea, more than nature ever owned. In these differences we have followed nature as an impartial umpire." The *Holy War* at once established Fuller's position as a popular author. A second edition was issued the next year, and a third seven years later. Others followed, and in 1840 the Aldine edition.

In the celebrated Convocation of 1640 Fuller sat as proctor for the Bristol diocese. It was Charles's illegal attempt to prolong this Convocation after the dissolution of Parliament, in order that the clergy might vote the money which Parliament refused, that provoked extreme measures on the other side. All who took part in it were fined heavily, Fuller's fine being £200. Fuller acted with the moderate party, but he was in a minority, and had to suffer with the rest. Our interest, however, is not in the ecclesiastic, but in the preacher and author. It was at this time that he became known in London as a popular preacher. In 1640 his first volume of sermons was published under the title of *Joseph's Parti-coloured Coat*, in allusion to the variety of topics embraced—"Growth in Grace," "How Far Examples may be Followed," "An Ill Match Well Broken Off," "Good from Bad Friends," "A Glass for Gluttons," "How Far Grace may be Entailed," "A Christening Sermon," "Faction Confuted," besides a "Comment on 1 Cor. xv., in part." His quaint, homely style, practical dealing, outspokenness, antithetic sharpness, are here in all their strength. "Drunkards are distinguished from the king's sober subjects by clipping the coin of the tongue.—It is an old humour for men to love new things; and in this point even many barbarians are Athenians.—Esau went to kill his brother Jacob; but when he met him, his mind was altered: he fell a-kissing him, and so departed. Thus the waves of the sea march against the shore, as if they would eat it up; but when they have kissed the utmost brink of the sand, they melt

themselves away to nothing." The book has always been popular, and reappeared in 1867.

In 1641 he lost his rectory, under what circumstances we are not told, his place being taken by a parliamentary minister. We find him next as chaplain at the Savoy Chapel, in the Strand, where he acquired great influence as a preacher over the neighbouring nobility. His *Holy and Profane State* appeared in 1642. It consists of a series of sketches of character and qualities, the first four books delineating the good, the fifth the bad. The essays are after the pattern of Bacon and Feltham, and display great knowledge of human nature and power of description. Even the high doctrine laid down as to the rights of kings did not prevent the work becoming the favourite which it has remained ever since. Three editions appeared during the author's life; but Fuller asserted that both this and other works of his really passed through more editions, the publisher retaining the number on the title-page for purposes of his own. The *Holy State* was republished in 1840 and 1841.

Three sermons which Fuller not only preached but published at this time on the questions at issue between the king and Parliament led to his withdrawal from London to Oxford, where the king was then holding his court. The first, preached on the Fast-day, Dec. 28, 1642, was on *Peace*, its nature, the general and particular hindrances to it, the means for securing it. He denies that all the sins are on one side. "Think not that the king's army is like *Sodom*, not ten righteous men in it, and the other army like *Zion*, consisting all of saints. No. There be drunkards on both sides, and swearers on both sides, and whoremongers on both sides, pious on both sides, and profane on both sides. Like Jeremy's figs, those that are good are very good, and those that are bad are very bad, in both parties. I never knew nor heard of an army all of saints, save the *holy army of martyrs*, and those you know were dead first, for the last breath they sent forth proclaimed them to be martyrs. But it is not the sins of the army alone, but the sins of the whole kingdom which break off our hopes of peace; our nation is generally sinful. The city complains of the ambition and prodigality of the courtiers; the courtiers complain of the pride and covetousness of citizens; the laity complain of the laziness and state meddling of the clergy; the clergy complain of

the hard dealing and sacrilege of the laity; the rich complain of the murmuring and ingratitude of the poor; the poor complain of the oppression and extortion of the rich. Thus every one is more ready to throw dirt in another's face than to wash his own clean. And in all these, though malice may set the varnish, sure truth doth lay the groundwork." Among the means recommended is that of petitioning king and Parliament in the interest of peace. Accordingly we find a petition presented to the king the next month to this effect, and among the names of those who presented it is that of *Doctor Fuller*, who is generally identified with our Fuller. The presentation of these petitions gave great umbrage to the Parliamentary party. The next sermon, on 2 Sam. xix. 30, preached on March 27, 1643, was in a still bolder strain on the king's side. The monarchical bias running through it could not be mistaken. At the same time he does not advocate unconditional surrender. We doubt whether Charles would have negotiated on Fuller's basis of compromise and mutual concession. He says, "For our king's part, let us demand of his money what Christ asked of Cæsar's coin, Whose image is this? Charles. And what is the superscription? *Religio Protestantium, Leges Angliæ, Libertates Parliamenti.*" And again, "Nowadays all cry to have peace, and care not to have truth together with it. Yea, there be many silly Mephibosheths in our days that so adore peace that to attain it they care not what they give away to the malignant Zibas of our kingdom. These say, '*Yea, let them take all*, laws and liberties, and privileges, and properties, and Parliaments, and religion, and the Gospel, and godliness, and God Himself, so be it that the Lord our King may come to his house in peace.' But let us have peace and truth together, both, or neither; for if peace offer to come alone, we will do with it as Ezechiah did with the brazen serpent, even break it to pieces and stamp it to powder as the dangerous idol of ignorant people." His praise of the king would scarcely be grateful to most of the party that held London. "Look above him; to his God how he is pious! Look beneath to his subjects; how he is pitiful. Look about him; how he is constant to his wife, careful for his children! Look near him; how he is good to his servants! Look far from him; how he is just to foreign princes!" But the boldest note was struck in the third sermon preached in

July on Reformation, which throughout was a covert attack on much that passed under the name of reform.

It must not be forgotten that in those days the pulpit wielded the influence which now belongs to the press. The London ministers were powerful enough to reverse resolutions in Parliament (p. 264). It could scarcely be expected that the party in power would tolerate in the Savoy pulpit doctrine like that of the sermons quoted above. In June it had been decided to tender to every man in the parish churches an oath of allegiance to Parliament. Fuller had taken the oath with reservations; but after his third sermon it was re-presented to him to be taken without qualification. He felt that he could not comply, and in 1643 quietly withdrew to the king at Oxford. In his opinion, "a resolution is a free custody; but a vow is a kind of prison, which restrained nature hath the more desire to break."

For the next four years Fuller's was a wandering life, spent amid strife and the clang of arms. He did not stay more than a few months in Oxford. A sermon which he preached before the king, in which he advocated moderation and spoke freely about the sins of royalists, gave huge offence to the extreme spirits who formed the majority. His sincerity and loyalty were impugned. In this respect he shared the fate of Ussher and Chillingworth. Straitened means also compelled him to seek some means of livelihood. He therefore joined Sir Ralph Hopton's force as chaplain, accompanied it in its marches, and spent a short time in Basing House during the memorable siege. In 1644 we find him with the Royalist forces in Exeter, "the ever faithful city." Here the queen gave birth to a princess, Henrietta Anne, and then fled to France. Fuller was appointed chaplain on the establishment of the infant princess, an office which left him free to pursue his studies as far as war would permit. Beside producing several minor works, he was all this time collecting material for his two great works. He allowed no local antiquities to escape him, his enforced wanderings being thus turned to excellent account. The curious, anonymous *Life of Fuller*, published in 1661, says of him in this particular:—"With the progress of the war he marched from place to place; and wherever there happened (for the better accommodation of the army) any reasonable stay, he allotted it with great satisfaction to his beloved studies. . . . Indeed, his business and study then was a kind of errantry, having proposed to

himself (in addition to his *Ecclesiastical History*) a more exact collection of the *Worthies General of England*, in which others had waded before, but he resolved to go through. In what places soever therefore he came, of remark especially, he spent frequently most of his time in views and researches of their antiquities and church monuments; insinuating himself into the acquaintance (which frequently ended in a lasting friendship) of the learnedest and gravest persons residing within the place, thereby to inform himself fully of those things he thought worthy the commendation of his labours. It is an incredible thing to think what a numerous correspondence the doctor maintained and enjoyed by this means. Nor did the good doctor ever refuse to light his candle in investigating truth from the meanest person's discovery. He would endure contentedly an hour's or more impertinence from any aged church officer, or other superannuated people, for the gleaning of two lines to his purpose. And though his spirit was quick and nimble, and all the faculties of his mind ready and answerable to that activity of despatch; yet in these inquests he would stay and attend those *circular* rambles till they came to a *point*, so resolute was he bent to the sifting out of abstruse antiquity." Fuller himself in the *Holy State* thus pictures the *True Church Antiquary*:—"Some scour off the rust of old inscriptions into their own souls, contenting themselves with superstition, having read so often *Orate pro animâ*, that at last they fall a-praying for the departed; and they more lament the ruin of monasteries than the decay and ruin of monk's lives, degenerating from their ancient piety and painfulness. Indeed, a little skill in antiquity inclines a man to Popery; but depth in that study brings him about again to our religion. A nobleman who had heard of the extreme age of one dwelling not far off, made a journey to visit him, and finding an aged person sitting in a chimney corner, addressed himself unto him with admiration of his age, till his mistake was rectified; for 'Oh, sir,' said the young-old man, 'I am not he whom you seek for, but his son; my father is farther off in the field.' The same error is daily committed by the Romish Church, adoring the reverend brow and grey hairs of some ancient ceremonies, perchance of but some seven or eight hundred years' standing in the church, and mistake these for their fathers, of far greater age in the primitive times."

That these years of leisure from public work bore rich fruits in other respects is shown by the fact that between 1645 and 1647 four notable works appeared, *Good Thoughts in Bad Times*, *Andronicus*, *The Cause and Cure of a Wounded Conscience*, *Good Thoughts in Worse Times*. The first was sent forth in 1645, the year of Naseby. It was the first book printed in Exeter, and contains a century of meditations under the head of Personal Meditations, Scripture Observations, Historical Applications, Mixt Contemplations. In spirit and aim the work is akin to Taylor's *Golden Grove*, Thomas a Kempis, Browne's *Religio Medici* published two years previously. It was published in 32 mo., for portableness. The quiet air of brooding over its pages, and its seasonableness to the times, made it a favourite at once, and the success led Fuller afterwards to add two companion volumes. Here is one meditation: "Lord, when young, I have almost quarrelled with that petition in our (*ours* though proscribed) Liturgy, 'Give peace in our time, O Lord;' needless to wish for light at noonday; for then peace was so plentiful, no fear of famine, but suspicion of a surfeit thereof. And yet how many good comments was this prayer then capable of! 'Give peace,' that is, continue and preserve it; 'give peace,' that is, give us hearts worthy of it and thankful for it. 'In our time,' that is, all our time; for there is more besides a fair morning required to make a fair day. Now I see the mother had more wisdom than her son. The Church knew better than I how to pray. Now I am better informed of the necessity of that petition. Yea, with the daughters of the horse-leech, I have need to cry, 'Give, give peace in our time, O Lord.'" Up to 1680 the work had passed through nine editions, and there have been several modern editions.

The Cause and Cure of a Wounded Conscience, 1647, was written for the comfort of his own heart in times of distress. "There are twenty-one separate dialogues, admirably constructed and connected together." To the wounded in spirit, he says, "1. Constantly pray to God that in His doctrine He would speak peace unto thee. 2. Be diligent in reading the Word of God. 3. Avoid solitariness, and associate thyself with pious and godly company. 4. Be industrious in thy calling." The touching conclusion shows what depths of feeling there were in that genial soul. "And now God knows how soon it may be said unto

me, 'Physician, heal thyself,' and how quickly I shall stand in need of these counsels which I have prescribed to others. Herein I say with Eli to Samuel, 'It is the Lord, let Him do what seemeth Him good;' with David to Zadock, 'Behold, here I am, let Him do to me as seemeth good unto Him;' with the disciples to Paul, 'The will of the Lord be done.' But, oh! how easy it is for the mouth to pronounce, or the hand to subscribe these words! But how hard, yea, without God's grace how impossible, for the heart to submit thereunto! Only hereof I am confident, that the making of this treatise shall no ways cause or hasten a wounded conscience in me, but rather on the contrary (especially if as it is written *by* me, it were written *in* me) either prevent it that it come not at all, or defer it that it come not so soon, or lighten it that it fall not so heavy, or shorten it that it last not so long. And if God shall be pleased hereafter to write 'bitter things against me,' who have here written the sweetest comforts I could for others, let none insult on my sorrows; but whilst my wounded conscience shall lie like the cripple at the porch of the temple, may such as pass by be pleased to pity me, and permit this book to beg in my behalf the charitable prayers of well disposed people, till Divine Providence send some Peter, some pious minister, perfectly to restore my maimed soul to her former soundness. Amen."

Andronicus; or, The Unfortunate Politician. Shewing, sin; slowly punished. Right; surely rescued, 1646, is nominally a life of the Grecian Emperor Andronicus Comnenus, A.D. 1163—1185, but in reality a running satire on the men and events of Fuller's own day. It was published anonymously, and ran through four editions. It was also translated into Dutch. The fact of the book having been licensed for publication proves, at least, that considerable freedom of speech was allowed in the days of the Commonwealth.

Good Thoughts in Worse Times, 1647, follows the lines of its predecessors, but is more outspoken in its royalist sentiments. One meditation concludes with the wish: "May I die in that government, under which I was born, where a monarch doth command." "There was not long since, a devout, but ignorant Papist dwelling in Spain. He perceived a necessity of his own private prayers to God, besides the Pater-nosters, Ave-Maries, &c., used of course in the Romish Church. But so simple was he, that how

to pray he knew not. Only every morning, humbling, bending his knees, and lifting up his eyes and hands to heaven, he would deliberately repeat the alphabet. 'And now,' said he, 'O good God, put these letters together to spell syllables, to spell words, to make such sense as may be most to thy glory and my good.' In these distracted times I know what *generals* to pray for: God's glory, truth and peace, his Majesty's honour, privileges of Parliament, liberty of subjects, &c. But when I descend to *particulars*, when, how, by whom I should desire these things to be effected, I may fall to that poor pious man's A, B, C, D, E," &c.

But we have outrun the history. In April, 1646 Exeter surrendered on honourable terms, which, Fuller says, were well kept. The garrison and others were allowed to compound for their estates. Fuller made his peace with Government in a characteristic way. He happened to be staying at the Crown in Paul's Churchyard. In his petition to be allowed to compound he writes CROUNE in capital letters, and ends with "he shall, &c.," instead of "he shall ever pray."

After this we find him paying a long visit to Edward Montague (afterwards Lord Montague) at Boughton Park. Montague was an old college friend, and Boughton Park was near Aldwincle, so that Fuller was now among early friends and scenes. Here he translated Ussher's *Annales* into English. For some unknown reason, it was published anonymously. Montague was one of the patrons to whom the *Holy War* was dedicated. He belonged to the Parliamentary party. It is pleasant to see that the most bitter strife that has divided Englishmen within recent centuries did not extinguish private friendship or bar personal intercourse. Fuller was also intimate with the Earl of Warwick, a great favourer of the Puritans and champion of Parliament. Fuller's well-known moderation facilitated such intercourse. His fervid loyalty to Church and King never blinded him either to faults on his own side or virtues on the other. He, in common with many good Royalists, said that the King had the better cause, and the Parliament the better men. Nothing is more common in writers on the Royalist side than cheap jests at the expense of preaching tailors, weavers, cobblers, &c. Fuller says: "It seemeth marvellous to me that many mechanics (few able to read, and fewer to write their names), turning

soldiers and captains in our wars, should be so soon and so much improved. They seem to me to have commenced *per saltum* in their understandings. I profess, without flouting or flattering, I have much admired with what facility and fluentness, how pertinently and properly they have expressed themselves, in language which they were never born nor bred to, but have industriously acquired by conversing with their betters." But even on this subject he cannot repress his wit. "Not that I write this (God knoweth my heart) in disgrace of them because they were bred in so mean callings, which are both honest in themselves and useful in the commonwealth; yea, I am so far from thinking ill of them for being bred in so poor trades, that I should think better of them for returning unto them again." In the very year of the Restoration Fuller expresses himself thus of Cromwell: "Have we not seen O. Cromwell, from a private gentleman ascend by *gradation* to be a protector of three nations, and by his courage and wisdom, rather than any right; a more absolute power possessed by, and larger tribute paid unto him than unto any king in England?" Contrast this with the violent language on this subject of most of the writers on Fuller's side. South's references to Cromwell are among the bitterest paragraphs in the English language. He certainly forgot his own sermon on *Loving our Enemies*.

Indeed, Fuller's charity is carried so far that we find him in continuous intercourse with Sir John D'Anvers of Chelsea, one of the regicides. This is one of the points in Fuller's life which even Mr. Bailey does not fully elucidate. He tells us (p. 81) that while Fuller refers to John Goodwin and Milton, he avoids mentioning them by name because of their approval of the king's execution. He tells us also (p. 430) how the execution plunged Fuller into the profoundest grief. We should therefore at least have expected him to shrink from contact with one who took an active part in the condemnation and whose estates were confiscated at the Restoration. Yet no change comes over the intercourse. In 1654 Fuller preached a sermon in commemoration of Sir John's recovery from sickness. If there had been any explanation of the inconsistency, our biographer would doubtlessly have given it. He nowhere professes to claim perfect consistency for his hero.

Fuller dedicates two sermons on *Assurance* and *Contentment*, preached in 1647 and 1648, to "The Honourable

and truly noble Sir John D'Anvers, Knight." The latter sermon is of extreme rarity, no copy being found in the British Museum or the Bodleian. The only copy known belongs to Dr. Riggall, of Bayswater, a great lover of old English authors. The sermon will no doubt be included in Mr. Bailey's forthcoming volumes. The text is 1 Tim. vi. 6, which, he says, is an antidote to the former verse, wherein is set forth "the worldling's prayer, creed, and commandments, which is their daily desire, belief and practice; and all contained in three words, *Gain is Godliness.*" The divisions are, "(1) *A Bride:* Godliness. (2) With a *Bridemaid:* Contentment. (3) With her *great Portion:* Gain. (4) With the *present payment thereof:* down on the nail: is." Godliness and contentment are like Saul and Jonathan, "lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their deaths are not divided. These twin graces always go together." The following is truly Fullerian: "Ask the tenacious maintainer of some new upstart opinion what godliness is. And he will answer, It is the zealous defending with limb and life of such and such strange tenets, which our fathers perchance never heard of before; yea, which is worse, such a person will presume so to confine godliness to his opinion as to ungodly all others who in the least particular dissent from him. Oh, if God should have no more mercy on us than we have charity one to another, what would become of us? Indeed Christ termeth His own a little flock. But if some men's rash and cruel censures should be true, the number of the godly would be so little, it would not be a flock." And again: "It is a true but sad consideration how, in all ages, men with more vehemency of spirit have stickled about small and unimportant points than about such matters as most concern their salvation. So that I may say (these sorrowful times have turned all our tongues to military phrases) some men have lavished more powder and shot in the defence of some slight outworks which might well have been quitted without any loss to religion than in maintaining the main platform of piety, and making good that castle of God's service and their own salvation. Pride will be found upon serious inquiry the principal cause thereof."

During these wandering years Fuller held several Lectureships in London churches, among others one at St. Clement's, Eastcheap, where Pearson about the same time preached his sermons on the Creed. Fuller also preached

at St. Dunstan's East. He tells the following story: "I confess, some ten years since, when I came out of the pulpit of St. Dunstan's East, one (who since wrote a book thereof) told me in the vestry, before credible people, that he in Sydney College had taught me the art of memory. I returned unto him, that it was not so: *for I could not remember that I had ever seen his face;* which, I conceive, was a real refutation." The following story is as good. Once conversing with *a Committee of Sequestrators* at Waltham, "they fell into a discourse and commendation of his great memory; to which Mr. Fuller replied: 'Tis true, gentlemen, that fame has given me the report of a memorist, and if you please I will give you an experiment of it.' They all accepted the motion, and told him they should look upon it as an obligation; laid aside the business before them, and prayed him to begin. 'Gentlemen, your worships have thought fit to sequester an honest, poor, but Cavalier parson, my neighbour, from his living, and committed him to prison; he has a great charge of children, and his circumstances are but indifferent. If you please to release him out of prison and restore him to his living, I will never forget the kindness while I live.' 'Tis said the jest had such an influence upon the Committee that they immediately released and restored the poor clergyman." Echard speaks of Fuller's "prodigious memory." Fuller says in his *Holy State:* "Some say a pure and subtle air is best; another commends a thick and foggy air. For the Pisans, sited in the fen and marsh of Arnus, have excellent memories, as if the foggy air were a cap for their heads." Round his portrait in the *Worthies* are the words, "Methodus mater memoriæ." His rules are: "Soundly infix in thy mind what thou desirest to remember; overburthen not thy memory, to make so faithful a servant a slave; spoil not thy memory with thine own jealousy, nor make it bad by suspecting it; adventure not thy learning in one bottom, but divide it betwixt thy memory and thy note-books; moderate diet and good air preserve memory," &c. Pepys tells of Fuller dictating to "four eminently great scholars together in Latin, upon different subjects of their proposing, faster than they were able to write, till they were tired."

In 1648 Fuller received the curacy of Waltham Abbey, Essex, from the Earl of Carlisle. Here Foxe wrote his Martyrology. Here also Bishop Hall had been curate

twenty-two years and preached his famous *Contemplations*. Fuller characterises his predecessor as "Not unhappy at controversies, more happy at comments, very good in his characters, better in his sermons, best in his meditations." Here, probably, Fuller began his acquaintance with another kindred spirit, Izaak Walton, who may often have angled in the Lea, which runs past the town. At Waltham he had a dangerous attack of small-pox, which was cured by the use of saffron from the neighbouring town of Saffron Walden. At Waltham, too, Fuller was near London, which he often visited, chiefly for the purpose of consulting the library at Sion College. The curacy was held in combination with London Lectureships. We find him lecturing at St. Bride's as well as at St. Clement's. He often made longer journeys in prosecution of historical and antiquarian inquiries. Mr. Bailey, a Manchester man, does not omit to note the indications of Fuller's visit to "our county" (p. 514).

At Waltham he fell into controversy both with Baptists and Quakers, saying of the latter, "such as now introduce *Thou* and *Thee*, will (if they can) expel *mine* and *thine*." George Fox replied with as much sharpness. Against the Baptists he wrote his *Infants' Advocate*, the conclusion of which is as admirable as it is quaint: "For mine own particular, because I have been challenged (how justly God and my own conscience knoweth) for some moroseness in my behaviour towards some dissenting brethren in my parish; this I do promise, and God giving me grace I will perform it. Suppose there be one *hundred* paces betwixt me and them in point of affection, I will go *ninety-nine* of them, on condition they will stir the one odd pace, to give an amicable meeting. But if the legs of their soul be so lame, or lazy, or sullen, as not to move that one pace towards our mutual love, we then must come to new propositions. Let them but promise to stand still and make good their station; let them not go backward and be more embittered against me than they have been, and of the *hundred paces* in point of affection, God willing, I'll go *twice fifty* to meet them."

From Waltham he issued, in 1650, one of his best and most characteristic works, *A Pisgah-Sight of Palestine, and the Confines thereof, with the History of the Old and New Testament acted thereon*. The work was a costly one, owing to the number of engravings and maps. The frontispiece,

designed by Klein, a native of Rostock, settled in London, is very elegant. Another plate contains the thirty-three shields of the patrons by whose help the work was published. As to contents, the work embodies all that was known in those days of the geography of Palestine. The first part gives a general description of Judæa, the second deals with the tribes, the third treats of Jerusalem and the temple, the fourth refers to surrounding nations, the tabernacle, garments, &c., of the Jews, while the fifth is one of Fuller's delightful miscellanies. The researches of former authors and travellers are digested, condensed, and duly arranged, and the whole illumined by the radiance of the author's quaint wit and comment. Every page is curious. The whole book is steeped in Scripture. Of Jerusalem he says: "As Jerusalem was the navel of Judæa, so the Fathers make Judæa the middest of the world, whereunto they bring (not to say *bow*) those places of Scripture, 'Thou hast wrought salvation in the midst of the earth.' Indeed, seeing the whole world is a *round table*, and the Gospel the *food* for men's souls, it was fitting that this *great dish* should be set in the midst of the *board*, that all the guests round about might equally reach unto it; and Jerusalem was the *center* whence the *lines of salvation* went out into all lands." He thus states and answers an objection made to the plates: "The faces of the men which bear the great bunch of grapes are *set the wrong way!* For being to go south-east to Kadesh-barnea, they look full *west* to the Mediterranean Sea. You put me in mind of a man who being sent for to pass his verdict on a picture, how like it was to the person whom it was to resemble, fell a-finding fault with the *frame* thereof (not the *limner's* but the *joiner's* work) that the same was not handsomely fashioned. Instead of giving your judgment on the map (how truly it is drawn to represent the tribe) you cavil at the *History-properties* therein—the act of the *graver*, not *geographer*. You know, sir, when I checkt the graver for the same, he answered me, that it was proper for *spies*, like *watermen* and *ropemakers*, for surety sake to look one way and work another!" The old editions of *Pisgah-Sight* are dated 1650, 1652, and 1662 respectively. Of Tegg's reprint, 1869, Mr. Bailey says: "This is a very faulty edition; printed, but not edited. The marginal notes and comments are omitted; and such spellings as *manumitted*, *array*, *knitted*, *gaiety*, &c., are

put in the stead of Fuller's *manumised, ray, notted, gayitry,* &c."

In 1651 appeared *Abel Redivivus*, a series of one hundred and seven lives of modern divines, of which Fuller contributed seven as well as the Epistle to the Reader. "He was not responsible for the Latinity of the title." One of Fuller's best, but least known, works is a series of twelve sermons on the *Temptations of Christ*, preached in St. Clement's Church, and published in 1652. There was only one edition. Three sermons are devoted to each temptation—to "Despair," "Presumption," "Idolatry," respectively. Under the first head he says: "He can, as extend the quantity, so improve the quality of meat, that coarse diet shall cause strength and health as well as dainties; as in the case of Daniel's pulse. 'Show me not the meat, but show me the man,' saith our English proverb. When I behold the children of poor people, I perceive a riddle and contradiction between their fare and their faces: lean meat and fat children; small beer and strong bodies; brown bread and fair complexions. Nor can I attribute it to any cause but this, that the rich folk generally make long meals and short graces, whilst poor men have short meals and long graces. I mean, that they rely more upon God's blessing than their own provisions." Under the second head: "Now, seeing the former temptation of Satan was to despair, this next to presumption, we learn, the devil will endeavour to make men reel from one extremity to another. The possessed man 'oft fell into the fire, and oft into the water.' (Satan's world hath no temperate climate, but either torrid or frozen zone.) Sometimes he casteth men into the fire of ill-tempered zeal; sometimes into the water of Acedia, or a carelessness what becomes of their soul; sometimes into the fire of over-activity, to do nothing just; sometimes into the water of too much idleness, to do just nothing." It is a pity that this work is so difficult to obtain.

A minor controversial work, *The Triple Reconciler*, was published in 1654. In it Fuller deals with three disputed questions of the day: Whether ministers alone can exclude from the Lord's Table; Whether unordained persons may preach; the use of the Lord's Prayer. While maintaining his own opinions, he does this in a moderate and peaceable temper. He says in the dedication: "I know what success commonly attends all umpires and arbitrators,

that often they lose one, and sometimes both of their friends betwixt whom they intercede. Meek Moses could not escape in this kind; but when seeking to atone two striving Israelites, the party who did the wrong fell with foul language upon him. I expect the like fate from that side which doth the most injury, and am prepared to undergo their censure."

Fuller's greatest works—those for which he had been preparing many years—were published last. In 1655 appeared his *Church History of Britain*, and connected with it *The History of the University of Cambridge*, and *The History of Waltham Abbey*. The Preface speaks of twelve books. The work contains only eleven, but *The History of Cambridge University* was meant as the twelfth. The old folio contains upwards of 1,100 pages, all running over with the richest humour. The history was the first of modern English Church histories, and subsequent writers have never failed to go to it for material. The dates are wonderfully exact. The judgments pronounced are sober and impartial. Even the innumerable digressions have a method and purpose of their own. Fuller mentions among his authorities the State records in the Tower, the journals of Convocation, Sir Thomas Cotton's Library, and the best antiquaries, among whom Ussher is specially mentioned. In another work he thus speaks of the labour bestowed on the history: "Give me leave to add that a greater volume of general church history might be made with less time, pains, and cost: for in the making thereof, I had straw provided me to burn my brick; I mean, could find what I needed in printed books. Whereas in this *British* Church history I must, as well as I could, provide my own straw; and my pains have been scattered all over the land by riding, writing, going, sending, chiding, begging, praying, and sometimes paying, too, to procure manuscript materials." In its own line, *i.e.* in all that is Fullerian, the work can never be superseded. The Dedications form a remarkable feature of Fuller's works, and contain some of his happiest writing. But those prefixed to the *Church History* excel all the rest in quantity and character. Not only has each book a long Dedication, but each century or section has its special patron. There are no fewer than seventy-five Dedications addressed to eighty-five patrons and patronesses. Coleridge wrote at the close of his copy of the history: "Wit was the stuff and substance of

Fuller's intellect. It was the element, the earthen base, the material which he worked in; and this very circumstance has defrauded him of his due praise for the practical wisdom of the thoughts, for the beauty and variety of the truths, into which he shaped the stuff." The dates of the old editions are 1655 and 1656. Of modern reprints the one published by Tegg has gone through four editions. But the best is the Oxford one, edited by Rev. J. S. Brewer, M.A. Mr. Brewer says: "A careful examination of Fuller's authorities, with the statements made in his narrative, has ended in a result favourable to his industry, judgment, and accuracy."

A year or two later Fuller had to appear before Cromwell's Commission of Tryers for "the approbation of public preachers." In his difficulty he waited on John Howe, to request his good offices, which were freely rendered. The interview between the stout Episcopalian and the spare Nonconformist is very interesting. Fuller said, "For you may observe that I am a pretty corpulent man, and I am to go through a Passage that is very strait; I beg you would be so good as to give me a shove, and help me through." On coming before the tribunal, he was asked, "Whether he ever had any experience of a work of grace in his heart," to which he replied, "That he could appeal to the Searcher of hearts that he made conscience of his very thoughts." The Tryers were quite satisfied.

In 1655 he became Rector of Cranford, Hounslow Heath, by the gift of Lord Berkley. Through all these distressing times Fuller was more fortunate than many of his brethren in having a settled home.

A work rarely met with is Fuller's *Appeal of Injured Innocence*, published in 1659, in reply to Peter Heylyn. It has only been reprinted in modern times in Tegg's edition of *Fuller's History of University of Cambridge*, 1840. Heylyn and Fuller were old opponents. Both were Royalists and Churchmen to the backbone; but the former was as extreme as the latter was moderate. Indeed, Fuller's sin in Heylyn's eyes was his moderation towards Dissenters. In 1659 Heylyn published his *Examen Historicum*, in which he animadverted on the mistakes, falsities, and defects of "some modern histories," Fuller's among the number. He no doubt hit some blots; but these were magnified and multiplied beyond all reason. From title-page to conclusion nothing was right. The title should have been

Church *Rhapsody*, instead of Church *History*. The dedications, heraldry, epitaphs, stories, are "impertinences." Above all, a "continual vein of Puritanism" runs through the book. To this attack the *Appeal* is the answer. Fuller is at first doubtful whether he should take up the challenge, and remembers the prohibition of revenge. But "the distinction came seasonably to my remembrance, of a man's *righting* and *revenging* himself." He next remembers that *mutes* at the bar are judged guilty. Still more, the credit of the ministry is at stake. He then replies *seriatim*. The whole piece is full of happy retort. He is fully Heylyn's equal in argument, and his superior in temper. As to the passages of heraldry, he says, they "are put in for variety and diversion, to refresh the wearied reader." His closing letter, "To my loving Friend, Doctor Peter Heylin," is nobly conceived and put. Fuller says: "Death has crept into both our clay cottages through the windows, your eyes being bad, mine not good; God mend them both, and sanctify unto us these monitors of mortality; and, however it fareth with our corporeal sight, send our souls that *collyrium* and heavenly eye-salve mentioned in Scripture! But indeed, sir, I conceive our time, pains, and parts may be better expended to God's glory, and the Church's good, than in these needless contentions. Why should PETER fall out with THOMAS, both being disciples to the same Lord and Master?" He then gives Heylyn another bit of heraldry: "Let me, therefore, tender unto you an expedient, in tendency to our mutual agreement. You know full well, sir, in heraldry two lioncels rampant endorsed are said to be the emblem of two valiant men, keeping appointment and meeting in the field, but either forbidden fight by their prince, or departing on terms of equality agreed betwixt themselves. Whereupon, turning back to back, neither conquerors nor conquered, they depart the field several ways (their stout stomachs not suffering them both to go the same way), lest it be accounted an injury one to precede the other. In like manner, I know you disdain to allow me your equal in this controversy betwixt us; and I will not allow you my superior. To prevent future trouble, let it be a drawn battle; and let both of us 'abound in our own sense,' severally persuaded in the truth of what we have written. Thus, parting and going out *back to back* here (to cut off all contest about precedency), I hope we shall meet in heaven face to face

hereafter. In order whereunto, God willing, I will give you a meeting, when and where you shall be pleased to appoint; that we, who have tilted pens, may shake hands together." The controversialists did meet and shake hands together.

In the train of the *Good Thoughts*—but scarcely with equal steps—follow the *Mixt Contemplations in Better Times*, published in 1660 amid the hopes of the Restoration. The motto prefixed is that of Fuller's whole life:—"Let your moderation be known to all men: the Lord is at hand." Would that this had been the spirit of the new order of things! What became of moderation when the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1662, with its baleful consequences descending and multiplying from generation to generation? But Fuller did not live to see those evil days of an arbitrary, high-handed policy. He worked with voice and pen for the Restoration. When it came, he returned to his old haunts in the Savoy and the prebend's stall at Salisbury. He might have resumed the rectory of Broadwindsor, but does not seem to have done so. He was also destined for a bishopric, but this design never took effect. On Sunday, August 12, he preached in the Savoy Chapel, although then a fatal sickness was on him. Malignant typhus soon appeared, and any chance of recovery was precluded by the barbarous surgery of the day, which drew from the sufferer twenty ounces of blood. He died on Thursday, August 16, 1661, at the age of fifty-three. In his delirium he talked of his books, called for pen and ink, and said that by-and-by he should be well and would write it out.

The book by which Fuller is perhaps best known was published posthumously. *The History of the Worthies of England* appeared in 1662. The work represents the collection and toil of a busy life. Though it wants the author's revising touches, it was left substantially complete. The plan is to go over England shire by shire, giving a life of the most notable characters that each one has produced. It is thus the first of English biographical dictionaries, but a biographical dictionary written by *Fuller*, with all his point and terseness and humour. It is no doubt the distinctly English flavour that has made the *Worthies* such a favourite with Englishmen, and especially with the English squires and gentry. Mr. Bailey says, "The contents of Fuller's last folio have always made it a favourite book. It has

ever been familiar to English gentlemen and country squires of the old school. A worthy clergyman of my acquaintance, who had loved and admired Fuller for over sixty years, was on one occasion asked by a country justice in the house of the latter, 'Do you know that book?' pointing to a copy of the *Worthies*. 'Yes,' said the minister, 'nearly every word of it.' Hereupon the squire remarked, 'I don't care much about books; but the Bible and Fuller's *Worthies* satisfy me in the matter of reading.'" The *Worthies* is a gallery of English portraits—portraits of all that is best and noblest in the land—done by a master-hand among word-painters. Fuller is as great a master as Reynolds or Gainsborough among portrait painters. That passionate love of England which lies so much deeper than all our differences, nowhere beats more strongly than in his last work. Here is one vignette: "James Cranford was born at Coventry in this county (where his father was a divine and schoolmaster of great note), bred at Oxford, beneficed in Northamptonshire, and afterwards removed to London, to St. Christopher's. A painful preacher, an exact linguist, subtil disputant, orthodox in his judgment, sound against sectaries, well acquainted with the Fathers, not unknown to the schoolsmen, and familiar with the modern divines. Much his humility, being James the Less in his own esteem, and therefore ought to be the greatest in ours. He had, as I may say, a broad-chested soul, favourable to such who differed from him. His moderation increased with his age, charity with his moderation; and had a *kindness* for all such who had any *goodness* in themselves. He had many choice books, and (not like to those who may lose themselves in their own libraries, being *owners* not *masters* of the books therein) had his books at such command as the captain has his soldiers; so that he could make them at pleasure go or come, or do what he desired. This lame and loyal Mephibosheth (as I may term him), sadly sympathising with the sufferings of Church and State, died rather infirm than old, Anno 1657." Of Henry de Essex, who, in a battle with the Welsh, "betwixt traitor and coward, cast away both his courage and banner together," he says, "He himself, partly thrust, partly going into a convent, hid his head in a cowl, under which, betwixt shame and sanctity, he blushed out the remainder of his life." On this Charles Lamb comments:—"The fine imagination of Fuller has done what might have been pronounced impossible; it has given an

interest and a holy character to coward infamy." Fuller enumerates five ends which he proposed to himself in the work. "First, to gain some glory to God; secondly, to preserve the memories of the dead; thirdly, to present examples to the living; fourthly, to entertain the reader with delight; and lastly (which I am not ashamed publicly to profess), to procure some honest profit to myself." The matter was drawn from printed books, records in public offices, private manuscripts, information from relatives of many of the worthies. The work is not, of course, without defects. The lives are mostly those of Fuller's own school of thought and view. There are large sections of English society which are not included in the picture. But we must rather be thankful for what we have than complain of what we have not. There are also many blanks, especially in the matter of dates, which we may attribute to Fuller's premature death. Beside the two impressions of 1662, there are two modern editions, one in 1811, in two vols., edited by John Nichols, F.S.A., the other in 1840, in three vols., by Dr. Nuttall, neither of which is very readily or cheaply met with.

This paper would be very incomplete if it omitted special reference to the grace of which Fuller was so distinguished a preacher and example—moderation. He has a choice essay on the subject in the *Holy State*, beginning with Hall's maxim, "Moderation is the silken string running through the pearl chain of all virtues." Another essay on the same subject might be constructed out of the scattered allusions and illustrations in his other writings. His birthplace lay between the birthplace of Brown, the Independent, and Tresham, a Papist. Hence he says, "My nativity may mind me of *moderation*, whose cradle was rocked between two rocks. Now, seeing I was never such a churl as to desire to eat my morsel alone, let such who like my prayer join with me therein:—God grant that we may hit the golden mean, and endeavour to avoid all extremes—the fanatic Anabaptist on the one side, and the fiery zeal of the *Jesuit* on the other, that so we may be true Protestants, or which is a far better name, *real Christians* indeed." In his *Pisgah-Sight* he mentions two springs in the tribe of Reuben, one sweet the other bitter, but which together made a sanative bath, and comments, "as if nature would thereby lesson us that moderation wherein extremities agree is the best cure for all distempers." A favourite

saying of his was, "The very work of moderation is the wages of moderation." Both in his essay and in *The Truth Maintained*, a controversial piece published during his stay in Oxford (pp. 244, 284), he is careful to distinguish between moderation and lukewarmness. In the former he says, "The lukewarm man eyes only his own ends and particular profit; the moderate man aims at the good of others and the unity of the Church." In the latter, "First, the lukewarm man (though it be hard to tell what he is who knows not what he is himself) is fixt to no one opinion, and hath no certain creed to believe; whereas the moderate man sticks to his principles, taking truth wheresoever he finds it, in the opinions of friend or foe; gathering an herb though in a ditch, and throwing away a weed though in a garden; secondly, the lukewarm man is both the archer and mark himself, aiming only at his own outward security; the moderate man levels at the glory of God, the quiet of the Church, the choosing of the truth, and contenting of his conscience; lastly, the lukewarm man, as he will live in any religion, so he will die for none; the moderate man what he hath warily chosen will valiantly maintain, at least wise intends and desires to defend it to the death. . . . And time will come when moderate men shall be honoured as God's doves, though now they be hooted as owls in the desert." The apostolic grace of moderation, so lacking in Fuller's days, is not too abundant in ours.

We ought not to omit mention of the excellent bibliography of Fuller's works, and the exact indices—Nominum, Rerum, Locorum, Verborum—which add so much to the comfort of a reviewer and to the value of Mr. Bailey's admirable *Life*.

ART. V.—1. *The Tripartite Nature of Man, Spirit, Soul and Body, Applied to Illustrate and Explain the Doctrines of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body.* By the Rev. J. B. HEARD, M.A. Fourth Edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, George Street. 1875.

2. *Outlines of Biblical Psychology.* By J. T. BECK, D.D., Prof. Ord. Theol., Tübingen. Translated from the Third Enlarged and Corrected German Edition, 1877. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38, George Street. 1877.

THE volume which stands first on our list is by no means new. It has passed through several editions, and has not been without a certain influence on the religious thought of the day. With the principle laid down at the outset we are in entire agreement, the principle namely that, whatever may be said of physical science, "psychology and ethics are the two subjects on which the Bible may be expected to speak with authority." There is a Biblical psychology, wider, deeper, nobler than the psychology of experience and observation, just as there is a Biblical system of ethics, wider, deeper, and nobler than any which has been propounded by uninspired men. The theology of the Bible must be based on its psychology. In writers specially inspired of God to communicate His mind to man, we naturally look for vivid and clear conceptions as to the nature, not only of the Being whose will they announce, but of the beings to whom they announce it. And we find accordingly that the Scriptures contain a revelation of man no less than a revelation of God.

So far we are in accord with the present writer. But having said thus much, we have said nearly all that we can bring ourselves to say in the way of approval of his work. He is a man of wide reading, and of an all too lively imagination: he is evidently a man of strong evangelical sympathies. His purpose in this book is to "underprop

our current evangelical theology with a sound psychological principle." By so doing, he would rescue theology at once from the assaults of a rationalism which denounces it as uncritical and superficial, and from a bondage to authority which trammels it as effectually as papal infallibility does the Church of Rome. From such evils, if they do indeed so grievously afflict us, we think the deliverance he promises is no salvation at all. It is always a signal for caution when the concocter of some new medicine proclaims it as a universal panacea. Men suspect enthusiasm at once. It is even so in the present instance. Accept Mr. Heard's tripartite theory, and the clouds that have so long obscured orthodoxy will clear away, and the controversies that have barred its progress and hindered its development will be laid to rest for ever. We fear the prospect is illusory. Before we can accept it, we must consent not only to violate but to annul all canons of criticism and all laws of thought. And after we have accepted it, our liberty will prove to be but an exchange of masters, and we shall have to appeal to our new and self-constituted "authority" to extricate us from the embarrassments into which his leadership has betrayed us. In short, we deem it unfortunate for the interests of the tripartite theory that it should have had for its advocate a genius so irrepressible as Mr. Heard's. These charges are sufficiently weighty: we must proceed to make them good. In doing so, it will be necessary to select a few points for consideration: a minute investigation of the whole work would be obviously impossible within our limits.

We must pass over his criticisms of the dichotomist view of human nature as commonly received in the Church from the beginning, and his explanations of the disappearance of the correct theory, which, as the teaching of Scripture, ought to have firmly held its ground. For that disappearance, we may observe in passing, he alleges two different reasons. "The Latin language wanted the precision of the Greek, and *spiritus* and *anima* never acquired the same precision of meaning as *pneuma* and *psyche*." Here the difficulty is a linguistic one. "With the error of Apollinaris, who denied to Christ a human pneuma, the reaction came, and trichotomy fell into disfavour, and was neglected even in the East. In the West it cannot be said to have ever received the attention it deserved. Tertullian opposed it from the first, and Augustine thought it safest to neglect

it." Here the difficulty is a theological one. Had there been no theological difficulty, the linguistic one would not have counted for much. But to pass from this.

In the third chapter we have a trichotomist version of the Biblical account of the creation of man. It is introduced by a significant caution, to the effect that, "revelation being a progressive manifestation of the truth of God, the discovery of man's nature must be also progressive." The reason for this we do not see, particularly as the revelation professes to carry us back to the birth of the race, and treats its first representatives as moral agents. The gradual revelation of the Trinity, quoted as a parallel, affords no analogy at all. The revelation of the Spirit did not wait for the incarnation of the Son. The Spirit of God is seen working (Gen. i. 2) before the creation of man. Mr. Heard himself unwittingly raises another presumption against this assumed reticence of Scripture. Of the two accounts of man's creation he passes over the first (Gen. i. 26), as describing rather "what man was intended to be than what he actually is." Supposing him correct in this explanation, it follows that the same revelation which, as being progressive only, does not declare to man all that he actually is, is nevertheless prophetic of what he is ultimately to become. Surely his present state is likely to be described with at least as much clearness as his future dignity. What Gen. i. 26 means is shown by Gen. v. 1, "*In the day* that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him."

Let us now, however, with Mr. Heard, address ourselves to the second of the two accounts of man's formation. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (or lives); and man became a living soul." Two distinct sources are here pointed out, the author tells us, from whence man "was taken," the dust, and the breath of lives. We should have thought two sources indicated a twofold nature, but we are wrong. The sources are two, but they give rise to a threefold nature. How are the two explicated into three? By means of the plural form of the word "lives," the uninstructed reader will say. In this he is mistaken. The plural form of "lives" is important, but the exact import of it Mr. Heard cannot determine. "It may or may not refer to the twofold division into the intellectual and active powers, or the natural and moral as generally

adopted by psychologists." It may be the plural of dignity. Or it may indicate the presence of God's Spirit with our own—as if the Divine Spirit must have been absent without a special inbreathing. In any case the secret of the trichotomy does not lie here. It lies in the fact that, upon the junction of the body and spirit, man "became a living soul." "The soul, which we may here provisionally describe as the *ego*, or the *nexus* between matter and mind—is the meeting point between the higher and the lower natures in man." This is a most disappointing explanation. We were looking for three natures, and we have only found two natures and a nexus or "meeting-point." A nexus is not a nature: it is only an adjustment of two things, which may be of the same or different nature, in a particular relation. But may not the union of two different things produce a third? They may, but in this case several difficulties present themselves. In the first place, the text does not say that the soul is the product of the spirit and the body. Mr. Heard himself tells us that the force of the Hebrew preposition—not rendered in English—is local. If local, it cannot be causative. The meeting-point is only a meeting-place. Secondly, the two natures here supposed to generate a third are diametrically opposed, the one having the properties of mind, the other the properties of matter. Of which will their issue, the soul, partake? If of the former, it is of the same nature as the spirit. If of the latter, it is of the same nature as the body. It cannot combine the two, for their properties are mutually incompatible, *e.g.*, it cannot be both extended and unextended, it cannot be both intelligent and unintelligent, and so on. Nor can this third nature be of some other complexion, different from either of its constituents, for no third substance is known. When we have enumerated the properties of matter and those of mind, we have exhausted all known properties, and there remain none to be attributed to the third substance, of which in fact, for want of such properties, we can form no conception. Thirdly, when we consider all the known elements of the human constitution, we find that they are accounted for already. The inbreathed lives include or may include the natural and moral powers, and the body is the animal nature. What room is there, then, for a third nature?

A fourth difficulty is one not at all essential to the con-

ception: it is of Mr. Heard's own importing. He illustrates the union of spirit and body from the marvels of chemical affinity. "Just as oxygen and hydrogen gas, when uniting in certain proportions, lose all the properties of gas and become water, a substance which seems to have nothing in common with its two constituent elements, so the animal and the spirit, combined in certain proportions, as definite as those of oxygen and hydrogen, though not as easily described by numerical ratios, produce a third and apparently distinct nature, which we call the soul." Has water nothing in common with hydrogen and oxygen, such as mass, volume, divisibility? Are its constituents opposed as spirit and body are? And must not the constituents vanish before the new third substance can appear? In all this we see nothing that reminds us of Mr. Heard's trichotomy. The chemist unites two substances into one, but confesses he has lost the two in doing so. Mr. Heard unites two into one, but will have it that all three exist severally in the mixture. In the course of the chapter from which we have been quoting, Mr. Heard condemns without giving reasons "the loose and unsatisfactory views of psychology for which our popular commentators are mainly responsible." Supposing our representation correct, we fear he must share this responsibility with them. And now, having made good this one position, we might thankfully rest from our labours. If the third nature be only the meeting-point of the other two, it will surely disappear from our reckonings, and a dichotomy will be established. If it be their chemical resultant, they will in like manner disappear, and the unity of human nature is established. But we should have under-estimated the ramifications of error if we were to suppose that our work is at an end. Error is like a banyan tree: though the parent trunk may be removed, there remain myriads of branches which, having rooted themselves in the earth, are become trunks in their turn, and require each its own special application of the axe.

It seems needful to caution the reader that he must forget Mr. Heard's account of the genesis of the soul, before he proceeds to the next two chapters. Their titles are, "The Relation of Body to Soul in Scripture," and "The Relation of Soul and Spirit in Scripture." The relations of body and spirit to each other are hard enough to conceive, but what shall we say of their relations to such an

unsubstantial thing as their "meeting point?" Dismissing from our minds the unsatisfactory mode of its production, and investing it, as desired, with the dignity of a separate nature, let us attend only to the distinctions drawn for us between the soul and its lower and higher companions, the body and spirit.

On the former of these distinctions, as found in Scripture, we need not dwell at any length. Mr. Heard rightly declines to claim for the sacred writers any pretensions to strict physiological accuracy. Not so with their psychology. "While Scripture assumes the connection between mind and body, it is everywhere silent as to the nature of that connection. . . . The Hebrews probably inclined to the opinion that the soul was diffused through the body, and that the whole body was an organ of intelligence, and was not localised in some one organ, as modern physiologists too much incline to think." From this Mr. Heard draws a strange conclusion. "Thus the nephesh (the word rendered 'soul' in Gen. ii. 7, and almost everywhere else) is not the *mind*, or soul, or spirit; but the man who thinks, wills, and acts." This is not a distinction between body and soul, but a fusion, or rather confusion, of the two. The word "soul," which in Gen. ii. 7 meant a third nature, is now asserted to mean throughout the Old Testament, "the entire nature of the mind breathing through the entire nature of the body." So that soul is neither the meeting point of body and spirit, nor a third nature engendered by body and spirit, but the identity, or at least the inter-penetration, of the two.

In the next chapter, "On the Relation of Soul and Spirit in Scripture," we have the following sample of Mr. Heard's reasoning. "It is said of the Word of God, that it pierces sharper than any two-edged sword: the proof of its power of piercing is this, that 'it divides and discerns between soul and spirit,' 'as if' (for the latter is not a fresh instance of its penetrative power, but a comparison by which we may judge of it) 'of joint and marrow.'" The "as if" is an interpolation. The doubled conjunction of the Greek is exactly rendered in the Authorised Version by "*and* of the joints and marrow," and indicates, not a comparison of one pair with another, but the continuation of a series. This Mr. Heard by implication admits on the next page, where he tells us that in this passage "we come to the important truth that the trichotomy of man's nature, body, soul, and spirit, is only discovered under the Spirit's convincing

power." Similar to this is his treatment of the words "dividing asunder." Penetration through the soul into the spirit is given as the rendering of it on page 63. Dividing between soul and spirit is the rendering of it on page 64. On page 79 it is added "all that ἄχρι μερισμοῦ (dividing asunder) implies is that the sword of the Spirit pierces through the soul of man into his spirit," and then, as if to clench the self-contradiction, "but penetration is not dissection." The meaning of this last no doubt is that there can be only an ideal and not a real separation of soul and spirit, and of the former part that even this ideal separation can only be effected, *i.e.* the distinction can only be made known, by the Holy Ghost. But the language is very misleading, and the sentiment evolved from it infers an identity between soul and spirit resembling that just asserted between soul and body, and equally destructive of a "distinct and separate nature."

On page 64, Mr. Heard criticises Plato's tripartite division as not corresponding with that of St. Paul. "Plato, as an intellectualist, assigned to reason or νοῦς the sovereign place. . . . In Scripture psychology the intellect holds the second place, not the first." Thus Mr. Heard differs from Plato. But it does not follow that he agrees with St. Paul. In a previous chapter, quoted above, he has already assigned to the pneuma the intellectual and active powers. Into this we cannot further enter.

Our readers must now prepare for an astounding discovery, one which they would never have made for themselves, and for which the interpretation of Heb. iv. 12 will hardly have paved the way, though seemingly designed to do so. The full meaning of the statement that "the trichotomy of man's nature is only discovered under the Spirit's convincing power," will be seen in the light of the following paragraph. "The true trichotomy of human nature is not to be sought, at least in any explicit form, in the Old Testament." How does this compare with the first passage quoted by us from our author? There it was stated that psychology was one of the two subjects on which the Bible might be expected to speak with authority. Now, one half "the book of knowledge fair" is for us "expunged and razed." On page 47 we are told that in Gen. ii. 7 "we cannot fail to see that an exact system of psychology is alluded to." And on this ground the following position is taken. "Whatever allowance may be made for the loose

and popular expressions of the Bible with regard to astronomy and the positive sciences generally, we neither expect nor desire such indulgence to be extended to its use of psychological terms." But on page 66 we read, "We cannot agree with those who would give the words ruach and nephesh a precise psychological meaning throughout the Old Testament." The first time that nephesh was used of man, viz., in Gen. ii. 7, it meant the third nature evolved from soul and body, and here we saw "the accuracy of Bible psychology." In opposition to this we now learn (p. 68) that "the Hebrew nephesh has a lower meaning than the English soul. The contrast that we express between soul and body, they expressed by spirit and soul. Ruach and nephesh had each a lower meaning than we now attach to them, ruach referring to what we should now call the soul, and nephesh referring to what we should now call the body." So a determinate meaning is alternately asserted and denied, and when these oscillations have subsided, we find there is a determinate meaning still, only a lower one than had been previously accepted!

The best way to remove this slur from the reputation of the Old Testament will be to quote its own utterances. There are cases in which, as being its instrument, the body is included with the spirit under the term soul. Thus Lev. v. 2, "if a soul touch any unclean thing;" 4, "if a soul swear;" 15, "if a soul commit a trespass." There are also cases in which the soul's relations with the body are adverted to, as Psalm cvii. 5, "hungry and thirsty, their soul fainted in them;" Prov. xix. 5, "an idle soul shall suffer hunger;" xxvii. 7, "the full soul loatheth the honeycomb," &c. But its most frequent use is of a loftier kind. It is used of the spiritual principle in circumstances which place it in direct contrast to the physical, the circumstances, namely, of dissolution, in Gen. xxxv. 18, "as her soul was in departing." It is used of the intelligence, pure and simple, in Prov. xix. 2, "that the soul be without knowledge, it is not good." It is used of the moral nature in man, the seat of moral responsibility, in Ez. xviii. 4, "the soul that sinneth it shall die." Beyond this we need not push our inquiries. We can very well believe that ruach, the word usually rendered spirit, refers to "what we should now call the soul," for in our opinion the two words can at most but represent different aspects of one indivisible substance. What we do not see is, how the convertibility of the two

terms should count as an argument for trichotomy. It is not simply that the Hebrew "spirit" stands for the English "soul." It stands just as suitably for the Hebrew "soul" too. Thus in Isa. lvii. 16, "For the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."

Let us next examine Mr. Heard's treatment of the New Testament. "With the teaching of our blessed Lord, the true psychology of Scripture begins to emerge from the mists and shadows of a carnal dispensation." "Begins to emerge:" we must mark that. No sudden illumination is to be expected even here. "We find the contrast between the worth of the soul and the body brought out by our Lord for the first time. The dimness that hung over the mental vision of Moses, David, Hezekiah is gone." We had always inferred that Moses showed some appreciation of the worth of the soul from the superior choice he made in Egypt, and from the whole course of his history. The sixteenth Psalm is alone sufficient to answer for David, or the twenty-third, or almost any other of the productions of his pen. And as to Hezekiah, we do not think the lament he uttered "in the cutting off of his days" should be taken to represent the views of a man who had heard the words, if not read the writings, of the evangelical prophet.

In what way did the true psychology begin to emerge? "The first step was to make the contrast clear between soul and body, and to distinguish the nephesh or psyche from the mere animal life, with which it is often confounded in the Old Testament." This task was a perfectly gratuitous one, by Mr. Heard's own admission. The distinction we make between soul and body the Hebrews were already competent to make, he says, and did make by the use of the terms ruach and nephesh. Our Lord did but express the same distinction by a new pair of terms. His teaching is as clearly dichotomist as that of the Old Testament. Mr. Heard's explanation of His meaning takes away that honour from the Old Testament which our Lord uniformly renders to it. It makes Him a feeble and halting expounder of truths which, on the theory, were of vital importance to man's salvation. It converts the conversation with Nicodemus—the clearest summary in Scripture of all that Christ came to do and to teach—into a bundle of paradoxical enigmas, themselves requiring a key.

It is worth while to dwell a little on Mr. Heard's statement of the relation of Christ to Nicodemus. According

to him all Nicodemus's difficulties about the new birth arose from his inability to divide between the soul and the spirit. According to him our Lord withheld the explanation because the Holy Ghost was not yet given. But if so, why did our Lord mention either the human spirit or the Divine? Why not have avoided all reference to them and their mysterious relations? If "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" means what the trichotomist says it means, what further explanation is there to be given? The mystery is no mystery at all, and does not require all this parade of preparatory mystification. All that our Lord needed to say was this: Man has two parts already, body and soul, but before he enters My kingdom he must have a third, namely, a spirit, and this he will receive from the Holy Ghost. We cannot but observe further Mr. Heard's curious inversion of the "earthly and heavenly things" of which our Lord speaks. Christ puts the doctrine of the new birth among the earthly things which it was a marvel that "a master in Israel" did not know. Mr. Heard says He spoke of it as one of the heavenly things, and, finding Nicodemus did not understand, "broke off" and turned to such earthly things as the brazen serpent, the type of His cross. We fear this slipshod method of handling Scripture will hardly commend itself to our readers.

For a full manifestation of the mystery of the spirit we must travel on beyond the Day of Pentecost. "With the gift of the Divine pneuma, the existence of a third or pneumatical part in man became as distinct as it was before obscure." Let us see, then, what happens upon the lifting of the veil. "The dying Stephen commends not his soul, or the rational and moral life, in God (*sic*); but the spirit, the Divine and regenerate nature quickened by the Holy Ghost, and created in the image of Him that formed it." For "in God" we should probably read "into the hands of God." But this is only a specimen of the innumerable typographical errors which Mr. Heard has allowed to remain uncorrected through four editions of his work. Why Mr. Heard should have overleaped another chapter subsequent to the one which narrates the story of the Pentecost, we do not know. He would have found recorded there the deaths of two other disciples quite as famous as Stephen, though not on similar grounds. Of Ananias and Sapphira it is severally stated that they "gave up the

ghost," and none knows better than Mr. Heard that the word rendered ghost is invariably "pneuma." What they gave up then, according to Mr. Heard, was "not the rational and moral life, but the spirit, the Divine and regenerate nature quickened by the Holy Ghost." But who, with the fifth chapter of the Acts before him, can believe this? If it were true, it would follow that they did not die at all. But, passing over this, let it be noted whose phraseology it is that Stephen uses. It is almost identical in form with our Lord's final invocation, which in its turn is borrowed from the thirty-first Psalm. Now the question arises whether Stephen did not mean the same by "spirit" that our Saviour did, and, if so, whether our Saviour did not mean the same by it that the Psalmist did? If he did, what becomes of the lower sense of the term "spirit" in the Old Testament as compared with the New? If he did not, how can it be maintained that either Christ or the protomartyr suffered death at all?

We are but on the threshold of the New Testament revelation of trichotomy, and have the strongholds of that doctrine yet to encounter. Before proceeding to them we must pause and consider how, in Mr. Heard's view, the New Testament throws back its light upon the Old. Our readers—those of them at least who are unfamiliar with trichotomy—must have been puzzled already to find that the pneuma needs imparting or developing no less than reve'ing by the Holy Ghost. Taught by Mr. Heard to regard the "spirit" as breathed into man at his creation, it was about the meaning of the "soul" alone that there could be any doubt. Now, however, the soul has, without any foregoing definition of its functions, usurped all power, place, and prerogative in the composite structure of our being. The soul is no longer the missing link between the spirit and the body. But something else is missing. One of the two main constituents which the soul had for its office to bind together has mysteriously disappeared. The pneuma has vanished, without, as it would seem, any such detriment either to the body or to the uniting soul as would threaten the integrity of the man. This demands some explanation.

The explanation we are looking for is to be found within the limits of the present chapter, but will need comparing with later statements if its precise significance is to be defined. Commenting on 1 Cor. xv., the author says, "The

psychic and pneumatic natures are next contrasted by the Apostle, as supplying, the one the centre of our present body of humiliation, the other, the centre of the glorified resurrection body. As there is, he says, 1 Cor. xv. 45, a natural body, so there is also a spiritual body. . . . That the first nature is a psychical nature only, he proves by the text in Gen. ii. 7, which is the ground text on which all Scripture psychology rests. The first Adam was made a living soul, the second Adam was made a life-giving spirit. Thus we have the text and its interpretation, and on the authority of the Apostle all question is set at rest as to the meaning of Gen. ii. 7. Adam, however he may have received the breath of lives, and became capable thus of becoming a spiritual being, was only at first a living soul or creature. The nephesh of the Hebrew, as we have seen, suggesting no higher thought than that he was a creature like others, albeit 'breathing thoughtful breath.' He was of the earth, earthy, and hence his name was Adam. In this case the soul and not the spirit was the centre of his personality."

We will not dwell upon the unfairness of referring to the whole man what is evidently applied only to his physico-spiritual relations. Nor will we do Mr. Heard the injustice of supposing him to have forgotten all he has said about the dignity of Adam's spiritual nature. But it is now plain under what very considerable reserves his former exposition of Gen. ii. 7 must have been written. It would seem as if that text, no less than Gen. i. 26, must have been meant to describe rather what man was intended to become than what he was actually made. His receiving the "breath of lives" is marked by the "plural of dignity," but it failed to make him a spiritual being. It only made him "capable of becoming a spiritual being." With the body formed out of the dust, and the soul—the joint product of the body and spirit—it is otherwise. Mr. Heard is not ashamed to avow it. "The first pair were created, as we have reason to suppose, adults in stature and intellect"—the intellect being now assigned to the soul—"but infants in spiritual growth and experience. . . . On this we may rest with some degree of confidence, that the pneuma in Adam was given in its rudimentary or infant stage of growth, and that he was placed in Eden for that very purpose, that he should grow in grace and in the knowledge of God, as he had no need to grow in bodily stature, or possibly even in in-

tellectual power." From all this we are compelled to draw some unfavourable inferences. One is that, of the three parts of Adam's nature, that alone was rudimentary which came direct from God. The body was formed out of the dust, and that was fully developed. The soul was the resultant of the spirit and the body, and it was replenished with needful vigour. The spirit was the very breath of God, was neither created nor engendered, was in fact an emanation of Deity, and yet "in spirit man was an infant." This is our first inference. Our second is equally absurd. It is that the infantile spirit, uniting with the mature body, could produce a fully developed soul. And where, after all, is the Scriptural warrant for Mr. Heard's assertion? What is the foundation on which he "rests with some degree of confidence" for the proof of a doctrine like this? There is none given, except the Apostle's statement that the first man as contrasted with the second was a living soul and not a quickening spirit—a statement reasonable enough in reference to the resurrection, but without any bearing on Adam's spiritual nature. If it proves anything in that connection, it proves his utter destitution of the spirit, not his possession of it in a rudimentary form.

It is easy to see how trichotomy will be brought to bear on original sin and original righteousness. Mr. Heard sets aside the theological text, Gen. i. 26, as prophetic of man's ultimate condition, in this respect making light of the Apostle's view of it as describing his original condition, and that to which the new man must be restored. Freed from the encumbrance of this hostile witness, Mr. Heard's next step is to assert that Adam's original righteousness was no righteousness at all. "He was born (!) innocent, and also endowed with inherent capacities for becoming spiritual. . . . By innocent we mean that negative kind of goodness which is distinct from holiness in that it lacks the sense of the presence of God. A lamb is innocent, for instance; it fulfils all the ends of its nature, and in the right order and way" (p. 167). Here we cannot but inquire whether Adam really did "lack the sense of the presence of God," and whether the first visit he received from his Maker is likely to have been that which took place on the day of the Fall? And if he lacked that sense of the Divine presence before the Fall, how did he become aware of it afterwards?

Let us make one more quotation. It opens in the usual style of those who are seeking to square the Bible with

hypotheses of their own invention. "When we turn from systems of theology to the fountain head of Scripture, we collect that Adam was not created innocent and holy, but innocent and capable of becoming holy; not holy and immortal, but capable of becoming holy by not eating of the one tree in the garden, and so of attaining immortality by having a right to eat of the other tree. He was innocent because he had a well-balanced nature, in which the passions had not got the mastery over reason, as they now have; but he was not created holy. We cannot indeed conceive of holiness as a thing created out of hand. . . . Inattention to this distinction between innocence and holiness, which is the same as the distinction between the psyche and the pneuma, has led to strange misrepresentations of the nature of Adam's probation, and the effect of his fall on us" (p. 173). Cannot conceive of holiness as a thing created out of hand? Can we not? Surely Mr. Heard unduly contracts the powers of the human mind. Of one thing we are certain, Mr. Heard's mind has entertained the conception. Let us turn back a few pages. "Of the second righteous Adam, the Lord from heaven, we read that He increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favour with God and man. The intellectual and physical growth are referred to in the first clause, the spiritual or moral (for they are two sides of the same thing) is referred to in the second. Thus the trichotomy of man is here distinctly referred to, and in the case of the holy child Jesus, spirit, soul, and body, all harmoniously grow and unfold, as bud, blossom, and fruit do in the living tree. We reject instinctively, in His case, the thought of anything prodigious or premature in the development of His faculties. We think of the blessed Spirit dwelling in Him (given, it is true, without measure), but still proportionate to His capacities and powers. As the intellect and stature were that of a child, so the spiritual receptivity. The pneuma in Him was beyond that of other ordinary children, but not disproportionate with what would have been the case had Adam reached the standard he was intended to attain to, and as a spiritual nature, and now adopted Son of God, had begotten a son in that likeness, and after that image. Christ, the second Adam, is rather thus the pattern of what Adam's children would have been, had he not sinned, than of what Adam was, when first made and put into Paradise. The distinction is important, as it enables us to see what

man has lost by the Fall. He has lost the power of propagating a spiritual progeny *ex traduce*."

The distinction is also important as it enables us to see that Mr. Heard can conceive of "holiness as a thing created out of hand." He has no difficulty in conceiving of "the holy Child Jesus." He would doubtless have no difficulty in adopting the angel's description of Him as "that holy thing." Indeed, for Mr. Heard the conception should be easier than for most men. The distinction between innocence and holiness being the same as that between the psyche and pneuma, he has but to imagine a pneuma as fully developed as the psyche, and the conception is complete. Not only can he conceive of Christ as holy in a sense that Adam was not: he can conceive of every other human being—had Adam only become holy—as born with their pneumata as fully developed as was that of the Virgin's Son.

Adam's original righteousness being thus mere innocence, his probation was a probation *for*, but not *of*, righteousness. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil was to "test him for spiritual existence." "Without some such probation, it would be impossible for man at all to exercise the spiritual faculty of knowing and serving God." "There is no scaling a height without passing along the brink of deep precipices; so it was that with a possibility of failure man was permitted to make the attempt to rise from the animal to the spiritual, and to become in effect, as he was in idea, the image of God upon earth. Under that attempt he failed; and where Adam failed, all his posterity fail also." The Fall then was only a failure to rise. A test was provided for Adam, in the steadfast endurance of which he would have developed his pneumatical capacity, and attained the power to fulfil all righteousness. What was the alternative to such a course? Simply, an ordinary reader would suppose, that he would remain in his original undeveloped state. The penalty, we should imagine, would be his being confined to that state of mere innocence in which he was first formed. Adam would continue to be a more intelligent brute. But this is a mistake. "Not being holy, having only the germ of holiness, he was blinded by Satan. First the woman through lust, and then the man through pride, were in the transgression. Flattered and fooled by Satan, who was a liar from the beginning, they took of the tree and did eat.

That instant the spark of the Divine image in man was quenched."

This is very hard to understand. We had been told that moral and spiritual were two sides of the same pneumatical capacity, that the pneumatical capacity was undeveloped, and man by consequence only innocent and not holy. How then could he be "in the transgression?" If the absence of the moral faculty proves that Adam could not work righteousness, the absence of the same faculty must be taken to prove that he could not commit sin. This difficulty Mr. Heard appears to feel in the following passage. "It is futile to inquire what would have occurred had Adam's psychical nature withstood temptation and resisted the devil. That it did not resist, by no means implies that it could not, or lessens the guilt of our first parent. But, on the other hand, we should not describe his guilt as greater than it really was. How far the higher or pneumatical nature was in our first parent, whether as a germ only, or as so far grown as to give his transgression the character of a sin against light—a spiritual sin, as well as a sin of lust, such as St. John classifies these sins—it is impossible for us to say. . . . . But of this we may be sure, that as Adam's was a psychical nature, and angels' who kept not their first estate a pneumatical, so the sin of Adam was psychical, and that of angels pneumatical." This only complicates the question. If the pneumatical faculty—the moral and spiritual nature—was grown sufficiently to make Adam's transgression spiritual sin, then surely it was grown sufficiently to constitute him prior to the transgression righteous. If it was not so grown, it was not a spiritual sin, not a sin against light. How then could it be a sin at all? Is not every sin a sin against light? Mr. Heard suggests that it was a psychical sin, due to the failure of the psychical nature to withstand temptation. But if the psychical nature is not the moral nature, how can there be such a thing as psychical sin? Mr. Heard says Adam's sin was pride. Such also, the Scripture says, was the sin of the fallen angels. If pride was a spiritual sin in them, was it not a spiritual sin in him whom they tempted to transgress? One thing is clear, that the Divine Being addressed Adam as possessing a moral and spiritual nature, both when He gave him the command and when He came down to inquire as to its observance. The whole narrative

assumes a development of man's moral nature equal to that of his psychical and physical powers. The possibility of his violation of its laws is no greater difficulty on this supposition than on the other.

What now, we must ask, becomes of the pneuma thus thwarted in the first stages of its growth? To this question a variety of answers are given, which it is hard to reconcile with Scripture and experience, and harder still to harmonise among themselves. In a passage already quoted Mr. Heard, speaking of the transgression, has told us, "that instant the spark of the Divine image in man was quenched." This seems to have been felt to be too strong, for in the preface to the first edition he says that the pneuma is "dormant, though not quite dead." In the preface to the second this is explained to mean "dead as to its higher or spiritual functions, properly so called; while, at the same time, it is only dormant as the rule of right and wrong between man and man." And the harmony of this is seen from what follows: "Death and sleep are only differences of degree—in the one, there is the suspension of sense; in the other, of all the functions of life."

The pneuma of Adam, then, becomes the conscience of all his descendants. Three points for inquiry occur to us, viz., its sphere, its fidelity to its functions, and its power. As to the first, Mr. Heard makes a statement which is contradicted by the testimony of all mankind, himself included. Conscience is "only dormant," *i.e.*, it is feebly active, "as the rule of right between man and man." This is an undue limitation of its province. All admit that the authority of conscience extends equally to the relations between man and God, and that these form both the chief subjects of its witness and the norm by which its other utterances are regulated. Mr. Heard admits the same. On page 157 he says, "But though man has fallen, conscience nevertheless remains as the distinguishing faculty of man; the mark of his superiority lies in his sense of moral accountability to an unseen but righteous Judge. He is more excellent than the brute in other respects, but in one he stands out unique and peculiar. His thoughts 'the meanwhile accuse and excuse one another.' He has a conscience which tells him of a God and a hereafter. . . . It is a testimony to what God intended us to be." On page 169 Mr. Heard says, "He has instincts after God which nothing but God can satisfy,"

and these he distinctly calls "cravings of conscience." He also speaks of conscience as "the knowledge of good and evil" which is "our life and God's life," and therefore "God's life within us."

The same passages will illustrate the fidelity of conscience to its functions. Here, indeed, Mr. Heard expressly affirms and denies the same proposition. On page 102 he says, "Man is not born with a depraved, but a dormant spirit. This makes the saving difference between his case and that of devils. But he is a fallen man with a depraved sense-consciousness, a darkened self-consciousness, and a dead or dormant God-consciousness." In the original preface he says, "The pneuma is that part of man which is made in the image of God—it is the conscience, or faculty of God-consciousness which has been depraved by the Fall, and which is dormant, though not quite dead." On page 207, speaking of conversion, he says, "Conscience has hitherto turned us away from God instead of to God. . . . . Conscience in the unawakened man keeps him as far as it can at a distance from God. It witnesses to the holiness of God and approves His law as holy, and just, and good. But conscience, until convinced of sin, does not use the law lawfully. It lowers the standard of God's requirements, and accepts partial as a composition for entire obedience, for which there is no warrant in the Word of God, but quite the contrary. Thus it is by playing us false, and saying, Peace, peace, when there is no peace, that our conscience keeps us at a distance from God and God at a distance from us." Surely stronger testimony could hardly be given to the possible depravation even of God's monitor within the breast.

As to the energy with which conscience prosecutes its functions, the author's tones are equally various. In regard to its power to assert its dominion, he is consistent enough in denying it. But as to the loudness of its voice put the following statements side by side. On page 12, "All that remains of the pneuma is that feeble flutter of conscience which witnesses for God, not so much by approving, but by accusing and excusing our thoughts." On page 170, "In Tacitus' age men believed nothing about the old gods of Rome, but they could not disbelieve in the furies which tormented a Nero. Men lose all other belief in God but as an avenging Deity; but when they part with

this, then it is time to call in the sword of God, and save the world by destroying it."

The tripartite theory is next applied to explain original sin, and to solve all difficulties connected therewith. From what has been said on original righteousness it will be gathered that the explanation is not very satisfactory. Mr. Heard's objection to the ordinary view is thus stated. "If original sin were something positive, and which passed down as unsound states of the body are transmitted until either the taint was worn out or it wears out the race that suffers from it, we do not see how we can avoid the conclusion that God, who is the Author of nature, must be also the Author of sin." Whether Mr. Heard's own view will do more than shift the difficulty a step farther back, our readers will judge for themselves. Mr. Heard says, "God withdrew from Adam the presence of His Holy Spirit, and thus the pneuma fell back into a dim and depraved state of conscience toward God. We need not suppose more than this fatal defect allowed to continue, and Adam to propagate a race under the unspiritual condition into which he had fallen, and we have enough to account for the condition of man as we see him to this day. Original sin is thus a privation, judicial we admit; but a privation only of original righteousness, or the image of God in every man. Given this one fact, that man was intended to become spiritual and has failed of this end, and all that divines call original sin is easily explicable."

If all be true which we have quoted from Mr. Heard as to the manner in which conscience fulfils its functions, it is difficult not to recognise in this deprivation that very depravation which is all that divines contend for. What stronger evidence can there be of something positive in birth-sin than the fact that conscience itself may lead us away from God, and cry, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace? What greater difficulty can there be in the propagation of a moral taint in the human constitution than in the propagation of the constitution itself? And, if the facts of human wickedness be what they are, how does a small variation in the theory of its hereditary character relieve the difficulty which presses on the government of God? Mr. Heard himself admits that for man in the circumstances he describes not to decline to evil would suppose a continued miracle on God's part. And he has

the candour to add, "We dare not attempt a theodicy of evil in general."

Closely connected with this subject is the question of traducianism and creationism, which is also supposed to be solved by the distinction between soul and spirit. The author's view is expressed as follows: "We are on the side of Traducianism, so far as to hold that body and psyche, or the sum total of the powers of the natural man, are transmitted by generation. As to the pneuma, or Divine image in man, that we consider to be dormant since the Fall. The capacity is, we admit, transmitted, but it is a dead capacity." The traducianist theory here appears to be applied, not only to the natural powers, but also to the spiritual capacity. In fact, what Mr. Heard has said of original sin would have no meaning if it were not so. How are we astonished then, on turning a few pages, to come upon the following: "The ruach, or the pneuma, is that which comes from God, and is of God. Its etymology implies an inspiration or afflatus; it is 'the candle of the Lord' in the spirit of man." On first reading this we thought the reference must be to the formation of Adam in Paradise. But the next sentence undeceived us. "And we admit that the traducian hypothesis does not account for the transmission of this pneuma from father to son. For the pneumatical part of the tripartite nature of man, we revert to the creationist theory."

How then is the defectiveness of the pneuma as manifested in the unregenerate to be explained? This is accounted for by a new distinction. "The pneuma of all men comes from God at birth by a general creationist power, such as that which the risen Saviour breathed on His disciples. But the pneuma is quickened in the regenerate to a higher and Divine life by a special creationist power, such as the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, when it sat upon each of them. The first birth of the pneuma is general; the second, or new birth, is particular." Thus traducianism for the pneuma is done away, and creationism reigns in its stead. But this revolution is not accomplished without the sacrifice of two important principles. In the first place, if traducianism disappears, original sin disappears with it. And in the second, the responsibility for the defectiveness of the pneuma, instead of being laid to the account of Adam, is thrown upon the direct act of God. The fault in Mr.

Heard's account of man's creation is repeated in that of the continuation of the species. All that does not come from the hand of God is well-developed: that which does is maimed, powerless, and ready to vanish away.

Before taking leave of original sin we should like to quote a passage from the early part of this volume in which Mr. Heard unsays beforehand a good deal of what he has been saying in these later paragraphs. On page 15 we find the following: "If the first Adam was by his constitution psychical only, with a capacity however for becoming spiritual, then it is self-evident that when he fell he forfeited that capacity, and tended to become, first earthly, then psychical, and finally devilish or devil-inspired, since the pneuma, if it is no longer led of God, must be given over to the inspiration of the wicked one (Jas. iii. 15). Now since like produces like, fallen man could only transmit to his posterity the nature which he had." Here, first, traducianism is the prevailing theory: man could only transmit the nature which he had. Secondly, the nature which elsewhere is said to be an emanation of God, and to be deadened only and not depraved, is distinctly stated to be capable of becoming "devilish or devil-inspired," nay, to be under a necessity of becoming such if no longer led of God. Thirdly, since like produces like, and man can only transmit to his posterity the nature which he himself has, it follows that, if the pneuma in him should have become "devil-inspired," the nature he transmits to his posterity, so far from being faulty merely in a privative sense, is tainted with the very deadliest evil, that spiritual wickedness namely which is said to be the peculiar infamy of fallen angels. Nay, more than this. The evil transmitted must vary with the moral condition of the parent. If he is earthly, his offspring will be earthly; if psychical, psychical; if devilish, devilish. Truly we find it hard to realise the author's promise that if he can only induce us to change our point of view, and adopt his own, "original sin will then be seen in a new light, not as a hard and forbidding dogma, but as the simple and only way of accounting for the fact of sin abounding that grace may much more abound." Nothing can ever infuse a sweet expression into the "forbidding dogma" of original sin, for the reason that nothing can ever soften down the features of the carnal mind, which remains for us as for the world before the Flood a hideous

metamorphosis of the image of God into the image and likeness of His foe.

Our readers will not be surprised that the heading of the next chapter should be, "Conversion to God explained as the Quickening of the Pneuma." With a good deal that it contains we are in hearty agreement, because it is equally true on any hypothesis. Take for instance the following pithy sentences. Speaking of the contrast in many cultivated men between their spiritual and intellectual natures, Mr. Heard says that in them "the state of spiritual death is the more awful because it is conjoined with moral and intellectual life." And again: "Sensibility is not spiritual-mindedness." "The love of God and hatred of sin are inseparable, and when they are found together, as they invariably are in the case of the really awakened, there we may pronounce with the greatest confidence that a work of grace has begun." Many more such passages might be quoted, all indicative of keen insight into, and deep sympathy with, the struggles of a soul newly awakened to a sense of its misery and danger. But these are aside from the main scope of the argument. In this chapter Mr. Heard discovers two great faults in evangelical orthodoxy, for both of which he has the one remedy, viz., a return to what he conceives to be the Scriptural doctrine of the pneuma.

The first fault in evangelical orthodoxy is said to be—and we do not know that we can exculpate all of it from the charge—its magnifying the grace of God in our redemption to the neglect of the claims of His law. "The doctrine which is according to godliness is this, that Christ died for our sins to enable us to die unto sin, and to rise again unto righteousness. In dying He condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. Those who do not grasp the distinction between the psyche and pneuma fail to make clear to themselves, or at least to make clear to others, the connection between the justifying and sanctifying grace of Christ. Being justified freely, *i.e.*, forgiven freely by His blood, preachers tell us that we ought to give ourselves to Him who so freely gave Himself for us. Gratitude is thus called in as the motive which is to constrain us to live no longer to ourselves, but to Him who loved us, and gave Himself for us. I do not make little of gratitude as a constraining motive. But,

judging human nature by what I know it to be, I do not think that God would have entrusted the sanctification of His people to a single motive however strong. Besides, the force of gratitude or the remembrance of a past benefit, is apt to decline as time goes on. . . . . Thus it is that antinomianism is the bane attendant on so much of our popular preaching. The so-called forensic theology taken by itself must inevitably degenerate to this. . . . . The remedy for these mistakes of doctrine must be sought in a deeper study of the plan of salvation."

It is well that Mr. Heard does not "make little of gratitude as a constraining motive," because among the "preachers" who enforce it must be reckoned such princes in the art as the Apostles Peter, Paul, and John. Gratitude might fail if the boon were either finite in its nature, temporary in its duration, or unconditional in its bestowment. By no evangelical preachers is the free gift so described. Except that by thorough-going Calvinists the last of the three points would be maintained, and this is confessedly their weakness. But does evangelical orthodoxy universally "entrust the sanctification of God's people to a single motive?" In other words, is "forensic theology" everywhere found to degenerate because "taken by itself?" We think not. We know of Christian communities in which the "deeper study of the plan of salvation" has resulted, not in the discovery of Mr. Heard's tripartite theory, which forms no part of it, but in a full recognition of the doctrine of the new birth, as the necessary complement and counterpart to justification by faith. "The application of the atonement as a sanctifying power," says Mr. Heard, "is on this wise. There is in the regenerate pneuma a striving after holiness, as well as a thirst after God." Omitting the word pneuma, there is nothing in this which evangelical teachers have not always proclaimed. The only difference between Mr. Heard and them is a psychological one. His contention is of course that psychological inaccuracy must induce theological error, that regeneration cannot be rightly understood and taught in its practical claims and bearings, unless its original rise in the pneuma be scientifically explained. Why else the objurgations of this chapter? But Mr. Heard did not always think so. He did not think so at the beginning of this book. There he maintained that, their psychological deficiencies notwith-

standing, evangelical divines have elaborated a sound theological system. "The Lord does not give Nicodemus a psychological account of the difference between psyche and pneuma, which Nicodemus in all probability would not have understood, but passes on to a description of the new birth, instead of defining it by itself. It is the same with the majority of our evangelical teachers; they describe the results of the new birth correctly, and well. Newton's *Cardiphonia*, Romaine's *Letters*, Wesley and Toplady's *Sermons* are instances of this." If these evangelical teachers were theologically right, is it likely that they were psychologically wrong?

Mr. Heard maintains that dichotomy involves us in another difficulty, which trichotomy alone can remove, viz., the difficulty that regeneration, however well and carefully described by Newton, Romaine, Wesley, &c., is on their principles a thing impossible. Their teaching involved, notwithstanding all their care and clearness, a logical contradiction. "Evangelical preachers who describe human nature as made up of two parts only, body and soul, and who say, correctly enough, that the soul, as well as the body (!), is desperately wicked, are therefore in this dilemma—how can a good thing come out of an evil? 'Can a leopard change his spots or an Ethiopian his skin?' The psyche or heart of man, the fountain of his natural life, is poisoned and impure; can it send forth out of the same place sweet water and bitter? Hence, from not reserving a *nidus* in human nature, in which the Divine Spirit can descend and purify all from within, these accounts of Christian sanctification are often most lame and inconsistent. At one time they say that the heart is desperately wicked, and remains so, yea, even in the regenerate; while at another, men are said to be led of the Spirit of God, and to walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. How a heart that is desperately wicked can yet obey godly motions, is as unexplained as how a deaf man can hear or a lame man walk. Let but the distinction between the psyche and pneuma be seen, and all is clear and consistent. The psyche is like the flesh, prone to evil, and remains so, yea, even in the regenerate. But the pneuma or god-like in man is not prone to evil—indeed it cannot sin."

We will not rebut Mr. Heard's dilemma by propounding another: How can a clean thing become an unclean? If

we did, he might find some difficulty in accounting for Adam's lapse from what he allows to be a state of innocence, if not of holiness. But, instead of this, let us ask whether we are in a dilemma at all. If any evangelical teacher were to state that the same act of the soul is at one and the same time pleasing and displeasing to God, this would be to enunciate a contradiction. But the difficulty put by Mr. Heard is not this. The difficulty is—and he expresses it in terms taken from Scripture—as to the possibility of such a change in the motive-principles of the soul that from unclean it becomes clean in God's sight. And further, as to the possibility of such a change being gradual and progressive, so that it may be true that the heart is in one sense desperately wicked and in another led of the Spirit of God. Now as to the possibility of change both he and we are at one. The chief difference between us is as to its commencement and its consummation. He denies that the impurity ever was, or that the purity ever can become in this life, complete. He reserves a nidus of good in the god-like pneuma on which the Divine Spirit may work, and a nidus of evil in the carnal psyche which defies His attempts at renovation. But he admits the possibility of change. He likens it to the process of petrifaction, in which, "for every particle of wood washed away by the dropping well, another particle of stone is deposited in its place." This analogy is all against him. Does petrifaction require a "nidus" of stone in the wood as a foundation for its first operations? So with the soul's renewal. Our Lord does not say that the flesh has from the beginning a nidus of spirit, and that the spirit retains to the end a nidus of flesh. But the conversion of flesh into spirit He does most emphatically declare.

If then evangelical teachers are in a dilemma, Mr. Heard shares the situation, so far as concerns the possibility of change from evil to good. It is only as to the coexistence of the two that he shows to any advantage, and yet even here the advantage is not all on his side. How can the heart be desperately wicked and yet led of the Spirit of God? Now, we might reply that Scripture and experience both affirm it, and we might decline all further explanation. But this would be deemed unphilosophical. Let us hear Mr. Heard. "The pneuma," he says, "is god-like and not prone to evil; the psyche is

like the flesh, prone to evil, and remains so, yea, even in the regenerate." But if both pneuma and psyche are found in one and the same man, and that man be alike responsible for the good and for the evil, what have we gained by introducing this complexity into his internal constitution? Does the responsibility of the Christian cease because it is his psyche only that is defiled? If so, the responsibility of the sinner ceases, and with greater reason, because his pneuma is undeveloped. If it does not cease, we must still say of the man's will or ego, in which both psyche and pneuma unite, that it is inclined partly to good and partly to evil. This Mr. Heard himself admits, thus showing that his yea is not always yea, nor his nay always nay.

We have assumed throughout this reasoning that the pneuma is indeed god-like, and not prone to evil. But our readers know how plainly Mr. Heard has asserted the contrary. He does so again in a foot-note at this very place: "When we say that the spirit cannot sin, we are far from overlooking the possibility of the spirit becoming devil-possessed." Suppose it does become "devil-possessed," where will the nidus of good be then? This case however is now for the first time identified with the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost—and so made wholly exceptional—although previously described as a condition into which our first parent may have sunk. "It is true of the majority that the tendency of their pneuma is to God [compare p. 126 of our present number], but they are unable to break the chains of evil habit with which they are tied and bound, till the Holy Spirit brings deliverance." Our author will have to show how the pneuma, whose tendency toward good is so impotent, can without miracle be preserved from lapsing into a tendency toward evil, before we shall be able to discover in it a nidus of good. The Holy Spirit—an external agency—is after all resorted to for the explanation of the great change, which all must admit to be rather a supernatural transformation than a mere psychological development. And in this Divine agency, seldom wholly withdrawn from the hearts of men, we have that very nidus which Mr. Heard so severely blames divines for not maintaining and himself so feebly and inconsistently defends. Perhaps "nimbus" would be a better word than "nidus" to express our meaning,—a light shining into darkness which as yet comprehends it not. At any rate, if

evangelical teachers fail to reserve "a nidus in human nature in which the Divine Spirit can descend and purify all from within," their defence must be that the Scriptures fail too. To provide the nidus of Mr. Heard's imaginings would be to incur the condemnation of the men who "add to" those words which declare our utter unrighteousness and ungodliness of heart.

Moreover, when we consider the mode of the Divine Spirit's approach to the human, we shall see that Mr. Heard's hypothesis is encumbered with difficulties. The descent of the Spirit into the pneuma implies—notwithstanding the interpretation of Gen. ii. 7—His previous absence from it. How then, does He approach? The pneuma, be it remembered, is only the organ of our consciousness of God. Prior to regeneration the psyche is the centre of our being, and includes the whole range of our natural powers, that is, our intelligence, affections and will. How then, we repeat, does the Spirit approach the pneuma? Does He or does He not approach it through the medium of the intelligence, affections and will? The answer must be that He does, and that not occasionally and arbitrarily, but constantly and necessarily. Never yet has the Divine gained possession of the human but through the presentation of some truth to the intelligence, of some good to the affections, and of some motive to the will. Such has ever been the nature, and such, we may add, has ever been the order, of the Holy Spirit's operations on the heart. Whatever of supernatural there may have been in the light that has enlightened the understanding, in the life that has quickened the energies, in the love that has warmed the affections, the powers of the world to come have always respected the laws of our natural constitution. But this natural constitution is, on the hypothesis, embraced within the domain of the psyche. And the psyche is "poisoned and impure." It contains no nidus of good. How then can the Holy Spirit make use of it in His advances to the spirit within? How is it that those advances are not universally rejected, and the way into the inner citadel effectually barred? The principle of a nidus falls to the ground, and with it another of the supports of trichotomy. And the ground is cleared by the removal. For it must be obvious from the above that there is no spirit in man distinct—in any such sense as we have been considering—from the soul which the Holy

Spirit immediately addresses. It is in essence the same soul, that is to say the same spirit, which is conscious alike of mundane and supramundane verities, of earthly and heavenly good, of natural and supernatural influences.

The next chapter, on "The Natural Immortality of the Psyche," in which the author criticises the metaphysical, ontological and teleological arguments for a future existence, we may pass over. Those arguments are regarded, rightly perhaps, as presages rather than proofs. In the following chapter the doctrine of trichotomy is professedly applied to "discover the principle of final rewards and punishments." The application is as follows: "As there are three natures in man, so there are three degrees of sin. It seems to deepen in malignity as it rises from sins of the flesh to sins of temper and intellect, reaching at last to devilish sins." And the conclusion is that "there must be three different degrees of misery corresponding to these three degrees of wickedness. The earthly, the psychical, the devilish, are all punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, but may it not be with few stripes in one case and with many stripes in the other?" The doctrine of degrees in punishment is perfectly in accordance with Scripture, but not so the apportionment of these degrees to the so-called "three degrees of sin." These three degrees are not themselves established. It is a new thing to treat sins of the flesh as if they were but the small dust in the balance compared with sins of temper and intellect. It is a new thing to divide mankind into three classes of transgressors, according to the faculty they abuse, as if there were no secret chain running through the vices as strong though not as pure as that which binds the virtues together. It is a new thing to assert that the order of development is necessarily and always from the flesh to the soul, and from the soul to the spirit. What of those vices which partake of all three characteristics? Has the author forgotten the keen insight of the poet who placed Belial and Moloch side by side in Pandemonium—"lust hard by hate"? Or has he never read that scathing condemnation of sensuality by one who was no doubt depicting personal experience—

> "But oh! it hardens a' within
> And petrifies the feeling."

But the best confutation of Mr. Heard is, as usual,

supplied by himself. "Man, as far as we know at present, is as incapable of pure thoughts [pure thought ?] as he is of pure animalism. Even the sensualist idealises his indulgences, lest he should turn from them in utter disgust and loathing." How inseparable, then, must be carnal and psychical sin!

How the principle of trichotomy applies in the following instance, it is hard to see: "With good Dr. Watts we may suppose that the souls of little children may be annihilated." Small comfort this to bereaved parents who for so many ages have been pouring into their wounds the balm of that good hope through grace, held out to them even from the dimness of a "carnal dispensation" by another sweet singer of Israel—"I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." The hope which such an utterance is calculated to inspire, the author ruthlessly dashes down by the statement that the meaning of this passage is "equivocal."

The next chapter is entitled, "Of the Intermediate State." Trichotomy is the true key to the mysteries of Hades. "On the grounds of the common dichotomy of man into body and soul, we do not see how we could differ with those who hold that the intermediate state is one of entire unconsciousness." We have searched the chapter in vain for arguments tending to make good this position. The argument from physiology is adduced, which goes to show the dependence of the mind upon its physical organ. But, whether good for anything or good for nothing, this inference tells with just as much force against the tripartite, as against the bipartite theory. Of course, the answer is that "the Scriptures do not assume that man ceases to exist the instant that his brain has ceased to act. There are many passages which assert the contrary." So there are, but they do not rest the assertion on the threefold nature of man.

In the absence of much explicit Scripture teaching, we must see what light may be thrown upon the intermediate state by a skilful use of the tinder, flint and steel of the trichotomy. "We have seen that it is conceivable that any two of these forms of consciousness could exist without the presence and co-operation of the remaining third; the first and second without the third; or the second and third without the first. As two chords in music will make a harmony, but not less than two, so either the animal and

rational, or the rational and spiritual, will combine to sustain what we call life or consciousness in man. The loss of one will deprive him of part of his powers, and this is the first death. It is an instance of the first death when Adam transgressed, and, in consequence, the spirit or God-consciousness, died in man, leaving only the animal and rational life remaining. In this sense we are born into the world, dead in one sense though alive in a lower sense. Conversely, we can understand that though the body dies, yet, if the union of spirit and soul is still undissolved, there is ground for supposing that consciousness will survive this first death. We have only another instance, though a reverse one, of the first death, in the suspension of the animal life, which is the lowest of the three essential elements of human nature. The second death is, we suppose, when the capability of receiving spiritual life is at an end, and when there shall be no more place found for repentance. In that case, which Scripture speaks of as following, not as preceding the day of the general judgment, the final state of the lost will be sealed for ever. On this distinction, then, between the first and second death, we ground our views of the nature of the intermediate state. Man, in passing out of the body, becomes unclothed, but does not, therefore, pass away into entire insensibility. On the contrary, by being deprived of sense-consciousness, he is thrown in on himself, and so, during the intermediate state, attains to a higher consciousness than before of things unseen and eternal. Self-consciousness, and God-consciousness, the one the function of the pure reason, and the other of the spirit, are now exercised in a greater degree than ever." In this world, "the spirit's life is but a feeble one at best. The body must clearly die if the spirit would live."

To begin at the beginning of this long quotation, we may observe that the three natures have now become merely three forms of consciousness. For the purposes of this chapter the three organs, body, soul and spirit, are distinguished only by the three functions which they severally exercise. And it is said that the first and second together, or the second and third together, may by their union maintain a certain sort of life, while the withdrawal of the remaining member of this trinity would constitute a certain kind of death. Now we have to ask, is it not conceivable that both separations—both forms of the first death—might

take effect together? Why not? An unregenerate man living in the flesh is spiritually dead, "dead in one sense, though alive in a lower sense." Suppose him then to pass out of this world unchanged: this will be "only another instance, though a reverse one, of the first death." The whole drift of the chapter goes to show that this is possible, for the object of it is to prove the usefulness of the intermediate state, as affording the unregenerate another chance of being quickened unto the life eternal. The body may be dead and the spirit dead, and yet the soul may live the life of self-consciousness. It is unfortunate that Mr. Heard has disqualified himself for maintaining this opinion. In an earlier chapter he has said that "man is made up of three parts which we can ideally distinguish. But this does not imply that we can actually divide them, much less that any one of the three natures in one person can maintain an existence apart from the other two. Body without soul or spirit becomes a corpse, and, as such, is quickly resolved into its ultimate atoms. Soul, again, without spirit or body would pass into the universal soul or reason." Thus the existence of the soul without body or pneuma, which is virtually asserted in the later chapter, is as strenuously denied in the earlier.

There is of course an easy explanation at hand. It is that the pneuma in the unregenerate is not really dead, but dormant. But if the pneuma be only dormant, why speak of it as dead? Why class the loss of the pneuma and the loss of the animal existence together as two forms of the first death? In our last quotation Mr. Heard says we can "ideally distinguish" but not "actually divide" the three parts. Is not the severance of soul and body an instance of actual division? It is only between soul and spirit that such separation is impossible. And this being so, to put spiritual death and bodily death together as two forms of the same phenomenon, is to identify things in their nature as distinct as an "actual division" and an "ideal distinction." This double application of the term first death, and its consequent contrast with the second, are both of them arbitrary and unscriptural.

We need not dwell on the supposed uses of the intermediate state. They are said to be, for the regenerate, a perfecting of their sanctification necessarily unfinished in time through the distractions of sense. For the unregenerate, the offering of an opportunity in more suitable

circumstances of attaining the salvation they here despised. The difficulties of this position are insuperable. The intense earnestness of Scriptural admonitions to the ungodly is left unexplained. The grace and the providence of God are placed in conflict. Grace could redeem men from their iniquities, if Providence had otherwise determined the bounds of their habitations. The pneuma would have ruled the psyche but for the tyranny of the flesh. Again, an extension of probation for the ungodly into the next world implies an equal extension of it for the godly. Thus the added hope is counterbalanced by the added peril. Then, if a second probation be admitted, why not a third? If a third, why not a fourth, and so on *ad infinitum*? Probation must either be finite or infinite. If infinite, it is no longer probation: if finite, it will always be liable to the objection that a further prolongation might secure additional results.

Again, it is said that the soul, freed from its fleshly encumbrances and preoccupations, would be more at liberty to attend to the things that make for its peace. But without the quickening of the pneuma—a supernatural and not a natural process—such employment would be as unwelcome as ever. And the opportunity offered for pneumatical development would in all probability be turned to the account of "psychical sin." Farther, the opportunities afforded by the intermediate state would be continually abridged in duration as the world's history approached its close. And those whose hap it might be to be born in the last of the latter days would thus forego the second probation. The righteous who may be living when the last trumpet sounds—a class distinctly recognised by St. Paul—will miss the progressive development of the intermediate state: how then shall they be caught up to meet the Lord in the air? The wicked will in like manner lose the advantages enjoyed by their predecessors: where will be the justice of their fate? But indeed, so far as concerns the righteous, Mr. Heard himself shows that this protracted period is unnecessary. For to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord. And, Mr. Heard tells us, "One moment of the presence of Christ will do more to ripen our character than years of self-discipline here on earth." Finally, if, as stated in one of the above quotations, "the body must die if the spirit would live," it follows that salvation in this life is not merely imperfect, but im-

possible. In the midst of this pernicious speculation about the mysteries of futurity the author quotes a text which, duly pondered, would have prevented his indulging in it. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God."

The chapter on "The Resurrection-Body" contains a good deal more of speculation, not so dangerous perhaps as that of the preceding chapter, because unconnected with practice, but equally fruitless. The conjecture that the organs of our nutritive life will be discarded and the excito-motor system retained, is not without some countenance in Scripture. But Bichat's generalisation, which distinguishes the former as single and the latter as duplex, should not have been accepted as "correct in the main." Besides other important organs, the lungs may be mentioned as exceptions to the rule. To our minds the interest of the speculation as to the organs of nutrition and those of the excito-motor class, is connected rather with this world than the next. "As we might expect, the control of the will is more completely over the latter than over the former. . . . . It is because our control of the excito-motor system is not as strict as it ought to be, in consequence of the will being depraved by the Fall, that our nutritive system suffers from indulgences which are not called for by the wants of nature." What is the argument grounded on this? By the author the present practical lesson is very feebly urged, and the hope of a purity undefiled by the rebellion of the appetites and passions is postponed to a state in which appetites and passions no longer exist. "This is the discipline of life which teaches us the necessity of controlling our wills and appetites. But in a higher state of being, in which there shall be no unruly wills and affections, it is supposable that the excito-motor system may then be restored to us without those lower nutritive organs, which are like a dead weight at present to keep us in bounds, and to warn us against indulging our passions." So a double dishonour is done to the government of God. Our salvation in the present life is not complete, because the grace of God cannot enable us to master our appetites. And our safety in the next depends not on the maturity and perfection of our spiritual nature, but on the absence of temptations arising from the flesh. How much more glory would redound to the Author of salvation

were the possibility insisted on of a subjection in this life of the flesh to the spirit, and so of the fulfilment of the Apostle's prayer for the blamelessness of the Church throughout spirit, soul, and body.

Mr. Heard is careful to impress upon his readers that the dichotomist cannot hold the true doctrine of a resurrection-body. But the assertion remains without shadow of proof, and is, as we think, contradicted by the facts of the case. As far as we know, Mr. Heard's view of the resurrection-body does not differ from that held by the generality of divines. It is very rare to meet with the crude theory of an exact numerical identity between the particles of the body laid in the grave and those of the body which awakes in the morning of the resurrection. A substantial identity meets every necessity of Scriptural teaching, and multitudes maintain it who never knew that without the tripartite theory they could not consistently do so. The analogy of the chrysalis changed into the butterfly, as the larva is changed into the chrysalis, is one that had occurred to the minds of men long before our author paralleled these three conditions to "the natural body, the disembodied soul, and the spiritual body in man." Only to common apprehension the middle place of the three is more fitly occupied by the disensouled body than by the disembodied soul. But speculation of this kind also is sufficiently rebuked by a text quoted in this volume, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be."

We have now travelled over most of the ground occupied by Mr. Heard in the exposition of his theory. Into the summary with which the book concludes we cannot fully enter. If we did, it could only be to summarise our own objections. But one point we must dwell upon. Under the second head of the summary we have the following: "We have seen that out of the union of three natures in one person there result two tendencies, called in Scripture the flesh and the spirit. Soul or self-consciousness, as the union-point between spirit and body, was created free to choose to which of these two opposite poles it would be attracted. This equilibrium between flesh and spirit is the state of innocence in which Adam was created and which he lost by the Fall." By the "two tendencies" does the author mean tendencies to good and evil, right and wrong? And does he mean that the tendency to good is in the spirit, and the tendency to evil in the flesh? No doubt

he does. The Scriptures likewise admit the distinction between good and evil, and sometimes signalise the distinction as that between spirit and flesh. But we deny that in thus signalising this distinction the Scriptures intend to locate the tendency to good in the spirit, and the tendency to evil in the flesh viewed as synonymous with sense-consciousness. Their use of the opposed terms to denote these opposite tendencies is theological, not psychological. Were it otherwise, the Scriptures would sanction the doctrine of the essential sinfulness of matter which has wrought so much mischief in the world, and which pervades the teaching of our author.

Perhaps it may be asked what the alternative is, and whether the doctrine of an opposition between good and evil, apart from any connection with matter or sense, does not necessitate the hypothesis of two eternal spiritual Beings representative of the two tendencies respectively. We are not aware that such an hypothesis is necessary. Our conceptions of good are derived undoubtedly from a Supreme Being in whom they are realised to a degree that surpasses all finite understanding. To us His enjoined will is identical with right. There is no need of another will identical with wrong to make wrong conceivable to us. The conception is already involved in the limitations prescribed to us by the Divine will. To disregard those limitations is to pursue evil. And though evil may not have the same kind of unity in it which, as the will of the Supreme, we find in righteousness, yet that there is an underlying unity in it is proved by the affinity that subsists among the vices. Evil may be undefinable, but so also, apart from its reference to the Divine will, is good. Undefinable and inconceivable are two different things. The same moral consciousness that apprehends good teaches us also to apprehend evil. And this we may do without being able to analyse them into elements more simple than themselves. However this may be, it must be admitted that sin and righteousness are the same principles in us as in the angels. Now, if the tendency to evil be only a natural tendency to earthly things in the flesh which has to do with them, what is the tendency to evil as manifested in the fallen angels? No one attributes their fall to the prevalence of carnal over spiritual desires. Again, if the tendency to good be the natural tendency of

the spirit, how can there be either in angels or men such a thing as pneumatical sin? Mr. Heard has told us of three degrees of sin, carnal, psychical, and pneumatical. Since there are two tendencies in man, toward good and toward evil, must we also believe in pneumatical, psychical, and carnal righteousness?

It seems unfair to combat one theory without proposing another in its stead. We will therefore devote our remaining space to the consideration of a doctrine which we deem adequate to the explanation of Scripture teaching on the subject. We must premise that the barest outline is all that our limits will allow. To sum up in one sentence, we believe in a true dichotomy of man into a material part and an immaterial part, either of which may subsist without the other; and we also believe that the immaterial part, though simple and uncompounded in its essence, manifests its energies in the forms of sense-consciousness, self-consciousness, and consciousness of the supernatural, corresponding to the relationships it sustains to objects in the outer, the inner, and the unseen worlds. This statement obviously requires some exposition. In the course of it we shall be found to agree with some propositions defended by Mr. Heard. Indeed, it cannot be otherwise. For he has sometimes maintained propositions diametrically opposed, one or other of which must be chosen if any opinion at all is expressed. We only wish we could agree with him at every point, so much do we admire the spirit in which most of the book is written.

Our first position is tolerably clear. As regards his relations to matter and mind, man is not a complex but a compound being. However true it may be that matter is modified in its arrangements by the spirit that vivifies it, or that spirit is circumscribed in some sort by the body it inhabits, we must hold that matter in man is still matter, and mind in man is still mind. A tertium quid is impossible. And the two, being thus distinct, are separable. Separated from the soul, the body ceases to be the soul's organ; but however affected by the change, each retains its distinctive characteristics. Thus we agree with the dichotomy of Scripture and of the schools. We must say that Mr. Heard misrepresents that doctrine. He speaks as if those who regard man as made up of body and soul denied all spiritual relationships. "Suppose man a bipartite nature only of body and soul, appetite and

intellect," &c. (p. 179). Here he speaks of the soul as comprehending nothing but intellect, and of the appetite as located in the body.

We must pass on to our second point, and here our last observation will help us. The immaterial part in man has three forms of consciousness. Sense-consciousness belongs to it as much as the other two: its seat is, not in matter, but in mind. This Mr. Heard overlooks. He speaks of spirit, soul and body as if they were identical with the three forms of consciousness. We do not deny that there are passages in Scripture in which, where the body is spoken of, sense-consciousness is meant. Thus we should interpret 1 Thess. v. 23 as referring to the sanctification of man in his three relationships. In what other way can the body be sanctified, in what other way can it become the temple of the Holy Ghost, than by the man's relations to his body being under the perfect control of a regenerate will? No doubt the body itself as a rule becomes the healthier for such subjection, but not always. No doubt also it becomes a more tractable instrument, as the man progresses in purity; and when the purifying process is complete, the lust of the flesh ceases to trouble and defile. But the sanctification even of the body belongs to the immaterial part in man.

Let the principle we have enunciated—a dichotomy between the material and the immaterial, and in the latter a threefold consciousness which is not trichotomy—be applied to Scripture. Our position is that—omitting for the present those passages in which they are used metaphorically for the sinful or the regenerate state—Scripture frequently employs two terms to denote two separable essences, and sometimes employs three terms to denote the threefold consciousness of one of them. We have illustrated the latter already from 1 Thess. v. 23. The former is exemplified in numerous instances. In them the terms spirit and soul are used interchangeably to express the immaterial, and body and flesh to express the material part. The following pairs of antitheses may easily be verified. Between them they make up the whole man. Soul and body, Matt. x. 28. Soul and flesh, Acts ii. 31. Spirit and body, Jas. ii. 26, 1 Cor. v. 3. Spirit and flesh, Matt. xxvi. 41, Mark xiv. 38, Col. ii. 5, 1 Cor. v. 5. Again, for the identity in the sense now being considered of soul and spirit, see Luke i. 46, 47. Passages

in which soul alone stands for the immaterial part are Rom. ii. 9, Heb. vi. 19, x. 39, James v. 20, 2 Pet. ii. 8. Passages in which soul stands for the personality, surely including the immaterial, Acts ii. 41—43, iii. 23 (quoted from the Old Testament), xxvii. 37, Rom. ii. 9, xiii. 1, 1 Pet. iii. 20, Rev. xvi. 3. Passages in which spirit alone stands for the immaterial part, Luke viii. 55, xxiii. 46, xxiv. 37—39, Acts vii. 59, xxiii. 8, 9, 1 Cor. ii. 11. In John xii. 27, Christ's soul is troubled: in xiii. 21, He is troubled in spirit. In the garden, where He endured His deepest anguish, it is His soul that is exceeding sorrowful, Matt. xxvi. 38, Mark xiv. 34. On another occasion He rejoices in spirit, Luke x. 21. Another case in which soul is used in a deeper sense than spirit is Matt. xi. 29, "Ye shall find rest unto your souls," as compared with 2 Cor. ii. 13, "I had no rest in my spirit."

We have quoted a variety of passages in which soul and spirit are used interchangeably for the incorporeal essence in contrast with the body or flesh. Let us now consider those in which soul and spirit are contrasted with each other. They are very few. One has been mentioned, and an interpretation offered. Another is Heb. iv. 12. Whatever be the meaning of the "dividing asunder of soul and spirit," it cannot be that which Mr. Heard puts upon it, viz., the making known to men the fact that they possess a spirit. Nor is it that other meaning which he suggests by an afterthonght, "penetration, not dissection." If it mean a discovery made to men at all, it must be a discovery that enables them to distinguish between those internal motions which their own spirits receive from the Divino and those internal motions which are of a purely natural origin. Thus the distinction between the consciousness of self and that of the supernatural is maintained.

The remaining passages on which Mr. Heard relies for the establishment of his theory are those in which, not the nouns psyche and pneuma, but the adjectives formed from them, are employed. Before proceeding to consider them, we may observe that these adjectives are here employed, as the nouns frequently are, to denote human nature as sinful or renewed. This use we have above characterised as a metaphorical one, and we think we are warranted in doing so. We maintain that the change brought about in regeneration is not organic, but functional. The converted man has no more organs, and no less, than the unconverted

man. The difference between them is a difference not in the possession of energies but in the direction of them. True, this change is not self-wrought. The Divine Spirit effects it, and effects it through the pneuma, which needs and receives His purifying influence as well as the soul and the sense. They are all renewed together, though not perfectly, and it may be not all in the same degree in the same man, and much less in different men.

But now comes the question of theological terminology. By what terms is the unregenerate man to be distinguished from the regenerate? And in the regenerate by what terms is the lingering tendency to evil to be distinguished from the prevailing tendency to good? The answer is easy. Since the pneuma is the proper organ of Divine relations, although once defiled it gives its name to the nature as renewed. In like manner, the adjective formed from it gives its name to the regenerate man by way of distinction from the unregenerate. The term like the thing it denotes, is washed from its filthiness, and consecrated to the service of God. On the other hand, since the unregenerate man is occupied mainly with the sphere of self and sense, it follows that the term flesh and the adjectives formed both from soul and flesh are employed, in a corresponding manner, to denote the unregenerate man and the sinful tendency in the regenerate man. Thus our Lord says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," *i.e.* sinful, and "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," *i.e.* pure. More frequently no doubt the term Spirit denotes the renewing Agent than the renewed subject. But flesh is often used in the senses indicated. For the unregenerate, "they that are in the flesh cannot please God; but ye are not in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 8, 9). "Now the works of the flesh are manifest" (Gal. v. 19). "He that soweth to his flesh" (vi. 8). For the evil tendency in the regenerate, "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh" (Gal. v. 17). "With the flesh the law of sin" (Rom. vii. 45). "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die" (Rom. viii. 13).

The same opposition will be found between spiritual, *i.e.* pneumatical, on the one hand, and both carnal and psychical (A.V. natural) on the other. It is worthy of note that the very opposition expressed in Rom. vii. 14 by spiritual and carnal, is expressed in 1 Cor. ii. by spiritual

and psychical or natural. And in 1 Cor. iii. St. Paul says, "And I brethren could not speak unto you as unto spiritual but as unto carnal," using the lowest term for those who nevertheless were "babes in Christ," not because they were not indeed spiritual, but because the carnal had so prevailed among them that they scarcely deserved the name. In James iii. 15 we have the defilement of fallen man in each of his three relationships very strongly marked. "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual [margin, or natural, *i.e.* psychical], devilish." This is spoken of the wisdom of fallen human nature as such, and not of any exceptional wickedness. It shows that the pneuma itself may be defiled. In Jude 19 scoffers are said to be "sensual," or psychical, "not having the spirit," *i.e.* absorbed in the pursuits of self, and not having the regenerate spirit.

There only remains the contrast between natural and spiritual in 1 Cor. xv. After what we have said this can present no difficulty. The antithesis which St. Paul draws out between Christ and Adam, as the one a "living soul" and the other a "quickening spirit," rests quite as much on the contrast between living and life-giving, as between soul and spirit. And let us remember that in the contrast between natural and spiritual which follows, the reference is to material organisms and not to psychological states. Adam's body was earthly and psychical, not because he had not a spirit or was not pure, but because he was to be a denizen of this lower world. The spiritual body will be a fit vehicle for inhabitants of the unseen world. Adam could not have secured for his descendants the glorified spiritual body, even if he had abode in the truth: but this for His spiritual seed Christ can and does.

There are yet many points which it would be interesting to discuss. Among them may be mentioned the connexion of intelligence, feeling and will with the three forms of consciousness respectively; the meaning of the term heart in Scripture, which Mr. Heard appears to have overlooked, and which we believe to be the true nexus of spirit, soul and sense, lying back behind all conscious manifestations and constituting the real self or ego, which God alone knows and those to whom His Spirit reveals it; the relations of ancient philosophers and mediæval doctors to our theological creeds; the influence both of the schools of philosophy and of the creeds of the Church on the minds

of men, and whether it is so cramping as Mr. Heard would have us believe; the question whether the pneuma be not the organ of fellowship among individual members of the Church—a fellowship truly supernatural—as well as between the Church and its Head; the reason why Christ is nowhere spoken of as having a conscience, and whether it be that in Him the pneuma was fully developed, or not rather because He was exempt from probation; and, finally, the bearing of Mr. Heard's doctrine on theology in general. As to theology, it is certain that the teachers of conditional immortality have known how to make use of his theory, and so have the sacramentarians (see Blunt's *Dictionary*, under the head of "Spirit"). And as for the Evangelical teachers whose tenets he embraces and whose slowness of heart he deplores, it is plain that, if they adopt his tripartite theory, they must henceforth change their note, and, instead of calling men to repentance, must cry, "Develop your pneumata."

For a truly profound analysis of Biblical psychology, see the second volume at the head of this paper. We are sorry we cannot give our readers some idea of its contents, although, as we have not borrowed from it, so neither can we express an unqualified approval of its teachings. It is a small book, and one which those interested in the subject may easily procure for themselves.

ART. VI.—1. *Instrucçao Pastoral sobre o Protestantismo. Dirigida aos seus Diocesanos pelo Bispo do Porto, D. Americo.* Porto. 1878. ["Pastoral Instruction concerning Protestantism. Addressed to his Diocesans by the Bishop of Porto, DON AMERICO."]

2. *Resposta que á Instrucçao Pastoral do Exmo Bispo do Porto, D. Americo, dá o Padre Guilherme Dias.* Porto. 1879. ["Answer given to the Pastoral Instruction of His Excellency the Bishop of Porto, Don Americo." By FATHER WILLIAM DIAS.]

THE general adoption of the principle of religious liberty as an essential element of constitutional government by European States, not excepting those which, but a few years ago, were subject to absolute government, and where absolutism was made yet more oppressive by intimate league with the Papacy and its priesthood, is the grandest and most hopeful sign of our time. Among the emancipated, or half-emancipated countries is the little kingdom of Portugal, whose inhabitants for nearly four centuries were spared from those excesses of intolerance which, in the provinces now included in France and Spain, took the forms of crusade and inquisition. Here, when elsewhere friendless, Jews and New Christians found strong protectors in the State against their relentless destroyers in the Church, until the civil power was overwhelmed by the persevering hate of the ecclesiastical, and the decease of King Manoel, with the accession of John III., marked the beginning of an era of oppression which has but recently expired. Here it was that Saavedra, the amateur Inquisitor General and mock Nuncio of Portugal, by favour of the childish ignorance of king, courtiers, and bishops, enacted his original romance, and did penance for it in the galleys. Here the first reformers of the sixteenth century encountered fiercest opposition from King John III. and his new inquisitors. Here the remaining Jews and New Christians were consumed in flames. Here began the propagandist labours of Ignatius of Loyola, Francisco Xavier, the whole scheme of Jesuits' missions was concerted, and the most famous missionaries in South America, India, and Abyssinia went out hence. Nowhere did they

burn Englishmen and Scotchmen more zealously than in the chief towns of Portugal. English commerce, to which this little nation owes so much, and is at this moment so much indebted, yielded numerous victims. Here were the horrible spectacles of inquisition made yet more horrible, more fiend-like in brutality, than even in Spain; and now, strange to tell, the last penal statutes, which contain the severest penalties on account of religion, are not yet repealed, although, by a happy contempt of law on the part of a more enlightened government, they are laid aside as a dead letter, and what is even more, a recent act of the Cortes, which was to come into effect on the first day of this present year, to provide Protestants with legal marriage, relieves their children henceforth from the brand of illegitimacy, and, in fact, repeals that article of the Penal Code of 1852, which says, "Every Portuguese who, professing the religion of the kingdom, shall fail in respect of the same religion, by apostatising, or renouncing it publicly, shall be condemned to the loss of his political rights."

All this invests with no common interest the two pamphlets before us. A few years ago, very few indeed, an English gentleman, born in this country, and having an important business as merchant in the Porto [Oporto], and possessing a factory on the other side the Douro, had, by good example and occasional readings of the Portuguese Bible to a few of his workmen, communicated to their mind some knowledge of Bible truth. For this, under that law, he was prosecuted. At the trial he was treated with cruel indignity; the judge, another Jeffrey, added to much insolence towards himself a charge to the jury, bidding them not to be altogether governed by the *facts* that might come before them, but remember that they were Catholics, and do their duty. They did their duty, certainly, in that peculiar capacity. They promptly declared Mr. Cassels guilty, and he was forthwith sentenced to six months' imprisonment, with costs, of course. But he appealed to a higher court, and there intelligence, humanity, and justice, prevailed for him. He was declared innocent, and, with the spirit of a Christian man, persevered all the more in efforts to do good, and, amidst the respect and gratulation of Portuguese of the present generation, became almost imperceptibly the founder of Protestant congregations. The first Protestant communion for Portuguese was held in his own drawing-room, and the sacrament administered in the Portuguese language by the late Angel

Herreros de Mora, a man of historic name in Spain, once a prisoner of the tribunal of the faith in a dungeon in Madrid, but at that time officiating in Lisbon, a reformed minister, under the express recognition of the Portuguese Government, emerging, as it then was, from darkness towards light. De Mora is gone to his rest, leaving blessed memories behind him. His once persecuted friend is rejoicing in the steady and peaceful growth of a tree of the Lord's right hand planting, in his native city.

More might be said, but perhaps these few notes may be accepted as a fit introduction to our account of the Bishop's *Pastoral Instruction concerning Protestantism*, intended as a check to its progress, and the answer it has drawn forth—publications which make us aware of the happy change from times when dissentients from Romanism were imprisoned, or banished, or tormented to death by cruel punishments, or roasted to death over slow fires, or entombed alive within brick walls. Within so short a time has it come to pass that the Bishop of the diocese, and one of the Wesleyan ministers, can freely carry on a controversy through the Press, and, on the side usually so intemperate, would evidently desire to avoid discreditable personal vituperations, but finds a few hard words indispensable just now.

Now, first, the Bishop. He begins his Pastoral in these words: "There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (Gal i. 7, 8). The quotation is neatly followed by a few expository sentences, closing with another verse from St. Paul, dilated beyond the original for the occasion: "I will very gladly give what is mine, and I would give myself for your souls, although, while I am loving you more, I be loved less" (2 Cor. xii. 15). He puts his flock on their guard against the false prophets in sheep's clothing that come to devour them, and then unfolds his grief:

"Yes, my dear diocesans, now we may not dissemble. Protestantism has come in among us, and one of its sects, protected by the complicity of some, favoured by the ignorance or indifference of many, and under the shadow of the natural tolerance of others, goes on little by little, and, with hand concealed, sows its errors in this land which, until to-day, was virgin soil. We, less happy than our predecessors (in the bishopric), cannot now, as they could, count as many diocesans, children of the Catholic Church, as there

are sheep in our folds; and it pleases God to try us, and permit the incessant labours of the diocese of Porto to aggravate the moral tribulation of seeing that the invidious and unwearying adversary comes robbing us already of a great number of the faithful, some led away without meaning any ill, others stolen, God knows by what means! . . . ."

The means are all well known, as is evident from the pamphlets that are open before us, and certainly the hand is not concealed.

"A most staunch Catholic, first of all by birth from Portuguese parents; then by the education they and our masters gave us; lastly, and chiefly, by the grace of God, who called us and raised us to His own priesthood; ours is the affliction of the Church for the children who renounce it, as also is our detestation of the heresy which robs us of them. The Church bewails, there is no doubt, the blindness of those who, impelled by passion, or seduced by the attractions of the world, forget her precepts; she bears with the profane sacrilege of that which she holds to be most sacred; she suffers, perhaps she is resigned that some ingrate absents himself for many years from her altars; but, however great may be their wickedness, she does not lose the hope of some day embracing such as children, inasmuch as they have not yet disowned her as their mother, by passing away to take some sect for stepmother. If, however, in contradiction to her doctrine, another sect arises to proudly contradict her truths, attack her belief, and corrupt the sacred deposit of the Faith which she received from the Son of God, there are then no terms to be kept, and in the heart that has a will to wound her, it is her very life that has to be defended. She marks the error, and because the salvation of the people is in question, a supreme law of society, whatever may be the cost, imprints on this error the stigma of heresy, for a maternal warning of the submissive children, or perpetual condemnation of the rebellious, clasping to her bosom those who remain faithful, prosecutes as ever the mission she has received from Jesus Christ; teaches them to observe all that He commands, and rears aloft, yet higher, her standard as the Church ONLY, HOLY, CATHOLIC, AND APOSTOLIC.

"And let us not think that in this unity of all spirits through belief in the same doctrine, with participation in the same sacraments and obedience to the same lawful pastors, it is religion only that is concerned—for as much, and much more, too, is the State; and whoever agrees that the children of the same country shall be children also of the same Church, renders to both Church and State a signal service, and this is recognised by the fundamental law of our country when it declares that the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion is the religion of the State. For our own part we are not

ignorant that this (statutory) appointment contains as much a concession of privilege in exchange for the peculiar rights (*regalias*) which have been ceded (to the State), as it is yet more a recognition of the right which the Portuguese have that their beliefs be treated with respect; and it no less acknowledges the obligation which the authorities accept to maintain their religion, and cause it to be maintained, and we know that it is with the condition of swearing so to fulfil their duty that the State confers their powers on them."

But this law of 1852, to which we have adverted above, is no longer practicable; for it is the opinion of statesmen, as it is the conviction of all just and reasonable Christian men, that to make the enjoyment of civil rights in Portugal, or in any other country, contingent on the profession of a particular form of religion, is contrary to the spirit, and letter also, of the Christian faith. But *non nobis est componere litem;* that is already settled, and cannot be altered by the repugnance of those who wish to have it otherwise.

"Sometimes the idea passed through our mind that, whether as a citizen, or as an authority legally constituted, it was our duty to call upon the State for the observance of this law; and it would not have been much that it should come at once to the defence of religion, when it had been so often called on to its detriment. Thus, however, this idea passed away; that the feeling only of a prelate might remain, in whose heart should prevail the spirit of the Church; and the Church, ardent as is her desire to preserve all men under obedience to the true Shepherd, desires no other weapon than fervent prayer, nor any other way than persuasion; neither is homage to God and His worship to be other than voluntary and free. This (conclusion) is also strengthened by the weighty consideration that the adversary, entrenching himself behind the presumed bulwark of liberty of belief and the inviolable right of human reason, the employment of such coercion would certainly be hazardous, and that its failure would but encourage him the more. And at last, we must confess it with sincerity, without failing to pray God as a special mercy, for the return of those who had separated themselves, which at this moment more moves us to the hope of preserving from the contagion those who have stood firm to Him, animating them to good will, and enlightening their understanding to repel every insidious attempt."

Here, then, is a candid confession that if legal persecution were practicable it would be tried. And so the Church reluctantly betakes herself to prayer, being no longer able to engage the civil power to employ force on her behalf.

"When an ambassador is received, before he opens the mission which he comes to discharge, it is but just to ask him for the title under which he presents himself, and that he should say whence he comes, who he is, and what he wants. It will certainly not be these new emissaries who have to answer boldly when they have disguised themselves with the ambitious pretence of being God's envoys, and His chosen ministers. Then we will speak for them, and have to tell you what perhaps they will not venture to declare; that they come from a foreign country, are Protestants, and wish to destroy our holy religion. This Portuguese nation is always famed for generous hospitality, and at most times it welcomes foreigners with more open arms than they have found at home, although the payment hitherto received counsels some reserve of that which it is so free in giving. But, perhaps, because formerly they got so cheaply all that we had to give, some of them venture to think that with the same facility we would let go the precious patrimony of our universal and ancient belief, to accept in stead thereof the decrepit doctrines which they praise up as new maxims. So ignorant are they of our language, of our manners and customs, and not less of our genius, our character, and our immovable fidelity.

"These are the Protestants who had their beginning three centuries ago. During the first, in which they encountered opposition, they sowed discord in the nations where they gained an entrance; they spread desolation with intestine wars, until they attained the rank of citizens, a concession sometimes imposed by violence, sometimes extorted by force, never merited by virtue. In the second, when they enjoyed in peace the conquests so badly won, they thought themselves happy in preserving them, thanks to the protection of the rulers who appointed their spiritual chiefs. In the third, it is now a long time since they have had life enough to gain more proselytes by persuasion; they are wasting away little by little, and see with astonishment that souls of most elevated religious sentiment go in search of the truth which they despaired to find among them, until at last they find it in the bosom of the Catholic Church. And it is now that they remember us!

"Portugal, that by virtue of good sense stood firm in Catholic truth, and, aided by the grace of God, always resisted the efforts of error; Portugal, that for the love of her religion went on conquering land from the infidels span by span, and afterwards, wherever her name was carried, never saw it separated from her faith; Portugal, at last, although it may be accounted small among temporal kingdoms, yet now, as ever, is held to be one of the first and most worthy before God and the Church, and this is the land which after all excites them to covet. There are counted by thousands every year in the last half century persons converted to Catholicism in Germany, in England, in the United States of

America, where Protestantism once bore rule proudly; and so it comes to try if it can indemnify itself at our cost, and thinks it a fair reprisal on the Church to steal her faithful Portuguese."

With a few sentences of commonplace concludes the introductory portion of the Pastoral. The Bishop professes "much confidence in God, and in the powerful intercession of the Virgin Mary, especial protectress of the diocese." But he exhorts the people to be diligent in self-defence against Protestant aggression, while he professes much kindliness towards the Protestants, and does not withhold good-will from honest dissidents, whom the Catholic Church still claims as her own children. "Finally," says he, "as regards those few unhappy perjurers who have carried away into the enemy's camp the priesthood they received from us, it is not consistent with our faith that we should give any credit to their conviction. The baseness of their motives in such procedure matters not to us. The loss of those deserters gives us no trouble, nor do we envy any one who has got them. They bear within themselves the contempt of their own conscience, and even that of those who have caught them. It only remains for us to pray God to enlighten them for so long as they may live, and beseech Him to use His infinite mercy afterwards."

"Self-respect," says Father Dias, "and obligations inseparable from my position as one of the most humble preachers of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ in this city, force me to reply to the *Pastoral Instruction* which his Excellency the Bishop of this diocese has addressed to his diocesans concerning Protestantism. Silence on my part might be ill interpreted, and arguments drawn from it that would make me appear pusillanimous, or even seem to be bought over at the last hour. Now there is nothing of the sort. It shall be for this that God will call me to account in His tremendous judgment. Placed in the field of labour where I find myself this day, in the same field on which the Son of God once cast the seed, the duty devolves on me to watch lest the enemy should come and cast tares into the midst of it, and also to warn those who corrupt the sense of Holy Scripture, adapting it to their own particular interest or convenience, in order that the faithful may stand on their guard and be aware of them, as of ravening wolves (John x. 12). This is my duty, and the duty of all who serve in the ranks of the true Church of Jesus Christ. Some may think me forward, if not rash, in venturing to enter into a contest with the most excellent Bishop of this diocese. Not so. The single motive which induces me to write these unpresuming pages is nothing more than that I may make a legitimate and just defence. His Excellency intended to fulfil his duty as the spiritual shepherd of this diocese, in address-

ing his diocesans through the Press to guard them against 'the errors of Protestantism,' and I, for my part, fulfil my duty when I avail myself of the same means in order to confute his arguments, and prove the contrary of his assertions by the evidence of the Old and New Testament, and authorities that are above suspicion. As he has flung the gauntlet into the field of discussion, I come to take it up so far as I am able, and so far as I am taught by the Divine Gospel of Jesus. I shall consider myself well rewarded for this labour if I can convince some of the diocesans of my Lord Bishop of the errors of Romanism and the truths of Protestantism, and I am not seeking for renown or glory when I send this little work into the world. Like the Apostle St. Paul, I only glory in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; and as he expressed himself in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (xii. 11), I also confess that I am nothing. Will this work of mine bring me into any trouble hereafter? Will it bring down on me calumny or persecution? Let it come. Let it all come. Unmoved I await the action of all or any ecclesiastical superior power, in the certainty, however, that it will have no power to overcome me, because I can do all through Christ, and can say with St. Paul in the Epistle above cited (xii. 10), 'I take pleasure . . . in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake; for when I am weak, then I am strong.' And now, since it behoves me to do this, may I be permitted to make my profession of Christian faith, and give the reasons of my separation from the Church of Rome.

"Meditating seriously one day on those words of St. Paul to the Corinthians with which his Excellency Don Americo opens the introduction to his *Pastoral Instruction*, and comparing the teaching of that Church with the Gospel of Jesus Christ, I arrived at a profound conviction that in reality some words addressed to the Galatians in another place were very applicable to the Church of Rome, because this Church professes and teaches a Gospel completely different from the Gospel of Christ; and I felt that it was my duty, with the conviction that entirely possessed my mind, to look for a Church where the Gospel of Jesus Christ was taught just as He gave it, and as the Apostle preached it, and not utterly different, as will be proved when we allude to the Supremacy of the Pope, and his Infallibility—the right of the Church of Rome to interpret the Bible; tradition in proof of the truths to be believed; apocryphal, or deutero-canonical books, accepted as inspired; adoration and reverence (*culto*) of images; seven sacraments; justification by works; alienation from the atonement made by Christ; purgatory and indulgences; ecclesiastical celibacy, &c., &c., &c. None of these things which the Church of Rome now professes, not to mention other abuses which she has made her own, are found in the Gospel of Jesus; therefore the Gospel of this Church is perfectly human, and has scarcely anything Divine except the name. Could I, in con-

science, remain any longer in the Church which has departed so far from the way traced out by Jesus, and has followed crooked paths, without bringing condemnation on my soul? Enlightened by the grace of God, who in the study of His holy Word pointed out to me the true way of salvation by means of Jesus, could I shut my eyes to this light? When I turned over the pages of history, which spoke to me of the usuries, the avarice, the licentiousness and dissoluteness of some of those who assumed the title of Vicars of Jesus Christ; could I tear those pages out, and appeal for a retroactive infallibility as the only means of absolution by those chiefs of Romanism? Is it not true that the Roman Church, to borrow a saying of Cardinal Baronius (Sæc. ix.), was changed into the witchcraft of Simon Magus? Can the Roman Church, then, represent the simplicity of Apostolic times? Do churches founded by the Lord's messengers possess masses, purgatory, indulgences, half-idolatrous forms of worship, Popes, St. Peter's patrimony, infallibilism, immaculatism, as the Church of Rome has at this time? Then, and yet again, Rome shall be anything they please, except an orthodox Church. Therefore I came out of her; not only because my conscience so advised me, but because the beloved disciple so called on me to do, in his Book of Revelation (xviii. 4), 'Come out of her, my people.' And what should I do next? Should I leave my brethren to lie still in the bonds which held me fast so many years? Oh, no. I should bring them the light; I should lead them to Christ; I should preach to them His Gospel of love, simple, pure, without fiction, without disguise: this was my duty from the moment when, by the efficacious grace of God, I was made a minister of His Word, and saw that to give this call belonged to Him, and not to men. Then if any one says that I am in error, let him show me that by the Gospel. If he says that I committed a crime, I tell him that I did no more than make use of a right. If he says that I scandalised society by my proceeding, I have to tell him that I gave society an example of courage and abnegation. And if any one says that I am a renegade from the religion of my fathers, I must answer that they are renegades, and that I, in my conscience, did no more than render a tribute of respect to that very religion, by vindicating it from the impostures and falsehoods which men have added to it.

"Besides, I have not abandoned a religion. I have abandoned a sect: a sect that for ages past has lied to the world in the name of Christ. The religion of Christ was never the religion of worldly interests, nor was it made to pander to mean and sordid passions. And now that I have found this true religion which has Christ for foundation and heaven for summit, I will die clinging to His standard; I will fight for Him and with Him; and O that, when this fight is over, I may receive the palm of victory.

"And to the matter before us: I must object, once for all, to the gratuitous assertions of my Lord Don Americo which are made in

the fourth section of his introduction to the *Pastoral Instruction*, concerning the attempts of Protestantism in this country, and to his general idea of it. I see with extreme regret that in this part of the Pastoral, as well as in many other parts, which I shall have occasion to notice as we proceed, his Excellency has only been careful to dilate on certain commonplaces, without remembering to prove what he has written. On that page and half of the work, there is not found a single quotation from the Gospel, nor even the least fact of history. Yet the subject was not one to be treated lightly, and it was exactly in this part of the Pastoral that he should have adduced the greatest number of evident, palpable, concurrent proofs, to confirm whatever he might write concerning the attempt of Protestantism in this country, and his idea of it. Did not good logic and the necessity of the extraordinary circumstances on account of which his Excellency addressed himself to his diocesans require that, when endeavouring to arm them against the ideas of Protestantism, he should tell them, producing proofs, whence it came, what was its mission, and what its objects?

"His Excellency says, and presents the following as a thesis: *The Protestants come from a foreign country, and wish to destroy our holy religion.* The Protestants began in Rome when Rome began to fall away from the true Christian faith. Therefore they are not foreigners, neither did they spring up or take beginning three centuries ago, as he says they did. Neither did the Reformation come first from Luther, as his Excellency pretends. To suppose this is a great mistake, and it is necessary to make a few observations for the information of all such as regard them as innovators."

Here Father Dins quotes Mezcray, and he might have added Bellarmine:

"The Jesuit Mariana, in his *History of Spain*, who says the truth is that many years before Luther the people of Germany were scandalised with abuses and vices consequent on the licentiousness of the clergy. The Council of Trent, in its fourth session, *De Reformatione* (cap. i.), expresses itself most clearly on the same subject. These authorities, which cannot be suspected, demonstrate, contrary to the Bishop's assertion, that what is now called Protestantism arose many more than three centuries ago. The Culdees in Scotland, for example, knew no other religion than that of the Gospel; they did not acknowledge the doctrine of purgatory, nor transubstantiation, nor celibacy, &c. The Church of Rome, however, unable to tolerate this simplicity, employed coercive measures, dexterously managed, until the Culdees, in the twelfth century, were totally overwhelmed. We then see the Waldenses, of whom Mosheim gives a full account.... Protestantism is therefore coetaneous with the Apostles; always, amidst the corrupt Babylon of Popery, there existed pious men of great celebrity, and, better still, religious com-

munities founded by them, that with the firmness of character which the grace of God alone inspires, refused to bend their neck to the yoke of falsehood, and always continued witnesses to the true doctrine against the errors of new Catholicism. My Lord Bishop was therefore very unfortunate in advancing such a proposition, and trying to derive Protestantism from the sixteenth century.

"Now, with regard to the objects of Protestantism, which are fully justified by the proofs already indicated, and are to oppose barriers to the ever increasing invasion of false doctrines in religion; to contend for the purity of Gospel truth, leading men to Jesus, without whom there is no salvation; to encourage and teach them the law of God, directing them to the Holy Scriptures, which is the only foundation and rule of faith; to give the world the primitive Gospel as the only means for the salvation of our souls, and teaching whence only can be formed good fathers, good children, good mothers, and good citizens—in a word, to rear up the Gospel again. See, then, the ends after which Protestantism aims: ends that, humanly speaking, are most noble, and will come to be realised, because this work is not of man, but of God."

After disposing of some local matters which need not be noticed here, Father Dias hastens to conclude his personal defence.

"Two words more, and enough of introduction. If Portugal would take a place in the great company of civilised nations it is necessary that she should shake off the Roman yoke. Only so, by decreeing liberty of worship, will she become eminently great. I know that there are politicians in this country who, wedded to the absurd ideas of the past, have no desire to satisfy this aspiration of modern society, and consider clericalism as a supporter of the throne. I cease not to pray God for them, that, by His grace, He would convert them from such an error. As for the Evangelic Church of Jesus Christ in this country, the *Pastoral Instruction* of the Bishop should not trouble it, nor yet the sermons of his preachers in this city, but only for this reason, that the Gospel of the Son of God is the impregnable citadel within whose walls we abide, and if He is for us, as the Apostle says, who shall be against us? For myself, I am in the midst of life. The hand which this day holds the pen to write this answer to the *Pastoral Instruction* of Don Americo will to-morrow be frozen in the cold of death, and so the tongues of those who now direct the greatest insults against the Gospel will be put to silence, paralysed for ever by the angel of death. Then we and they, Protestants and Romanists, will all appear before the tribunal of the Lord, and I, as in the presence of that dreadful judgment, forgive Senhor Don Americo his blasphemies against the Gospel of Jesus, and I pray to God that He would pardon him for them in His great and infinite mercy."

The Bishop's Pastoral chiefly consists of a commonplace exhibition of the articles of Protestant belief, as usually represented to young men preparing for the priesthood; necessarily partial and imperfect, and therefore on many points untrue. In such form he learned them in his day and teaches them now, as it is expedient they should be reproduced in popular declamation when the "faithful" have to be warned, or when it is thought expedient to excite contempt and aversion in the people. The present Protestant minister, who once learned the same, frames his answers accordingly, so that there is no set argument on either side; but in the rejoinders we find sharp appeals *ad hominem*, which must somewhat disconcert the prelate, who affirms in the full confidence of dignified authority, as one who calculates, as well he may, on the ignorance of his diocesans in general; and a perusal of the two pamphlets shows that the respective authors need, both of them, a larger stock of literature, ecclesiastical and theological, in the vernacular of their country, and that Portugal needs a literature that must in due time arise from the necessities of controversy, and will be demanded by men who begin to study, rather than receive passively, a few dogmatic propositions which they have to accept and promise to believe. In short, more learning must be imported into the country before the clergy will be able to read their own books, even if written but in Latin; while, even now, it is affirmed by those who ought to know the men of Porto, that there is not one of them capable of deciphering a Greek sentence, much less of lecturing on the Greek Testament. And only by an extraordinary effort could an aspiring priest master a study in any branch of ecclesiastical history. Therefore no ecclesiastical controversy can be carried on thoroughly until well-educated men arise, free from the old restrictions upon study, with ability and leisure to read their Bible in the original, and peruse historians in their original texts, and shall find readers trained up in better schools than, so far as we can hear, any yet existing on the Peninsula. Without, therefore, expecting too much, we are quite satisfied with the Bishop that he is sincerely earnest, and deserves credit for doing his best; while the converted priest, struggling for conscience' sake for some years, has honourably passed through such a test as must be utterly unknown to his antagonist.

Taken together, the *Pastoral* and the *Answer* provide the Portuguese with material for entering into most of the

questions which for ever divide Romanism and Protestantism; but the Bishop was not sagacious in provoking popular discussion. It is at once apparent that there are two antagonistic authorities, the Bible and the Church of Rome. But this Church professes to acknowledge the Divine authority of the Bible, and the recently adopted Apocryphal books and fragments are not of sufficient weight to give much help to Romanism, and people will certainly suspect the honesty of any controversialist who from dislike or fear endeavours to depreciate the sacred volume, and presumes to warn Christians against reading it, or exercising their own judgment in the perusal and interpretation; using, of course, such helps as Protestants always have at hand. Yet this is what Don Americo has done, while Father Dias relies unreservedly on the authority of holy men of old inspired by the Holy Ghost, and inquirers must decide between the two.

Don Americo thinks that on this occasion it is part of his pastoral duty to associate himself with the supreme pontiffs, Pius VII., Leo XII., Gregory XVI., and Pius IX., who have so energetically censured the so-called Bible Societies, and he puts his diocesans on their guard against the same, forgetting that in the present state of political feeling all over Europe, such a hint as this is quite sufficient to commend the Bible to multitudes who might not otherwise think of reading it. He reminds his people that these societies have their seat or centre in London, the capital of the nation which they had considered as their ancient ally, but whose subjects now come to rob them of their faith. He wonders at the wealth of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the zeal it employs in the worst of causes, *em pessima causa*, and using the worst of means, *com pessimos meios*. Ignorant or negligent of all the evidence of history, blind to the universal practice of the chief Christian fathers for many centuries, who never appealed to any uninspired writer as a theological authority, but whose quotations in proof are taken from the Canonical Scriptures, with the rarest possible exception, if any, he endeavours to persuade them that the Apostles make no mention of the Bible! St. Paul, he says, "does not mention the Bible, not even his own Epistles: rather indeed he seems to caution against the imprudent reading of them, which, experience shows, is made use of by malignant and cunning men to lead the faithful into error, and to be carried about with every wind of doctrine; and that this may not

happen, he informs them that the persons appointed by the Apostles for the work of the ministry in the Church, and they only, were their pastors and doctors." He protests at length against all the operations of the society, condemns Bible-reading as if it were substituted for preaching, and boasts that among the heathen, his own Portuguese, led on by Francisco Xavier, converted millions without requiring for the purpose so much as one single Bible. So far as their own reports go this is true enough. Crowds of heathens would come at the sound of a bell, repeat a sentence which they did not understand, proceeding from the lips of Xavier, or one of his missionaries, and would then stand up in rows to be sprinkled with a few dops of holy water; which little ceremony, on the pronouncing of the baptismal form of words, was considered to be Holy Baptism, but with no teaching, no conversion, no faith, nor any verbal profession, by the millions of heathens now counted as converted to Christianity without either pastors or doctors, and certainly without giving them a single Bible, which might have undeceived the whole of them. How far the inhabitants of Porto may value such mechanical methods of conversion it is not for us to say, but we are credibly informed that the answer to these allegations has drawn forth much applause from the Portuguese in general, and specially from the diocesans of Don Americo. The last section of the Bishop's *Pastoral Instruction* challenges their decision in the terms following:

"Such is the gulf that separates the Catholic Church from Protestantism: One is Divine truth, and has words of eternal life; the other is error, and has words of eternal death. *That* is charity, full of consolations, already in this life. *This* disheartens, drawing after it despair. Protestantism thought it little to deprive the Christian of the protection of the Mother of God, to rob him during life and in the hour of death of the nourishment of the Eucharistic bread [the Bishop ought to know that in the Eucharist we receive both bread and wine, which, in the Church of Rome, the people do not], and the help of extreme unction. It is not even content with refusing confession to the conscience troubled with remorse, and the help of the gifts of the Holy Spirit to youth, and the blessing of Heaven to the newly-married couples, and even of Divine mission to its own ministers. After filling the living with bitterness, it yet remained for it to torment the dead, and rob them of the relief of prayers, and of the suffrages of this world for the souls in Purgatory. Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion, holy religion of ourselves

and our fathers, which they, and all the Portuguese, our ancestors, always professed! You it is that have the words of Eternal life. It is you that give us consolations and hopes for the next. It is you that, with our dear diocesans, confess and believe the only truth. In your holy Church we were born, and all we have lived, and in it will we remain immovable until our death!"

To this declamatory close of the *Pastoral Instruction* Father Dias returns the following temperate reply, which we translate, not omitting the various forms of courtesy:

"*Such is the gulf that separates the Catholic Church from Protestantism.* As His Excellency reserves these words for the last section of his *Pastoral Instruction*, it is the prelate, not I, who by a cruel fatality, sums up the critical portion of his writing. Certainly the Roman Church separated herself; and by this fact alone, so clearly and spontaneously expressed by His Most Reverend Excellency, no one should be surprised at the theological aberrations of Romanism, its disciplinary wanderings, and the excesses of power which, in the exercise of authority, have brought down thereon discredit and contempt. If, however, the Lord Bishop of Porto had confined himself to a confession of this separation, and of the schism which characterises it, and deprives it of legitimate communion with true believers in Jesus Christ, no one would have been in the least surprised, inasmuch as it has been made plain enough in what he has written. Protestantism, conscientiously convinced that it maintains the purity and simplicity of the religion of Jesus, does not accuse, much less persecute, those who have departed from the way of the Lord: it pities them indeed, and supplicates Divine Providence for the conversion of sinners like them. But now that the Lord Bishop of Porto sets about glossing our faith and the morality of our religion at his pleasure, founded, as they are, on the word and the death of Jesus and the example of the Apostles, and of so many other illustrious men of Christendom, he imposes on us the duty of replying to so great an error, and such a want of charity as is apparent in his *Pastoral*. So, then, this being understood, if in the answer which I give, and in the endeavours which I make to expose the errors of Romanism, such as His Reverend Excellency enumerates and tries to define, if any phrase or any idea in what I have written be considered less worthy of this purely doctrinal polemic, or less respectful to the elevated sacerdotal character of the Portuguese prelate, I withdraw it at once, as foreign from the impartiality which I desire to observe in this discussion, and opposed to the desire which I have always entertained not to be wanting in due consideration towards His Most Reverend Excellency.

"Differences of faith do not authorise neglect of civil duties; and even if the official position of His Most Reverend Excellency did not impose on me the obligation to respect him, the consideration due to my own position as the son of parents whose religious belief is still confined and limited unhappily within the sphere of the Roman Church, would determine the freedom of this my sincere and honest declaration. And as His Excellency, in closing his *Pastoral Instruction*, places it under the auspices and protection of the Mother of Jesus, I—who, from Biblical testimonies and after the critical study of the history of Christianity, cannot recognise, much less accept, any other mediation than that of Jesus our Saviour and our Master—to Him, whose unbounded sight reaches the inmost conscience, commit not only the intention of this modest labour, but, above all, I consecrate to Him the most earnest desire which I cherish, to see one day the walls torn down which divide the religious beliefs of mankind; the truth of doctrine being restored entire, her most holy law safe guarded, and thus, according to the most positive and most salutary of her precepts, all men consecrated in one only faith, one only baptism, and one only Shepherd."

ART. VII.—*Der erste Brief Johannis praktisch erklaert von Dr. Richard Rothe. Herausgegeben von Dr. K. Mühlhäusser.* ["Practical Exposition of the First Epistle of St. John."] Willenberg: Koelling. 1878.

THOSE who know anything of Rothe as a profound theologian and an influential Christian speculative philosopher will be prepared to hear that St. John's Epistle had great attraction to his mind, and made a deep impression on his heart. The evidence of this lies in the present volume, which is edited by one of his pupils from the notes of a series of lectures delivered many years ago in Heidelberg. The grammatical and philological criticisms which accompanied them are omitted, as it is supposed that they have been rendered obsolete by a quarter of a century of later investigations. This we think on the whole is to be regretted, as Rothe's occasional discussions of the grammar of the Greek Testament generally, and of certain new terms introduced by Christianity in particular, are always deeply interesting. Moreover, we have observed occasionally on reading the volume that the exposition is at a disadvantage for want of them. However, the result is that we have before us a theological and practical commentary which has intense spiritual interest from beginning to end. In reading it we are not embarrassed and distracted by polemics or refutation of others' views: we have simply the reflection of St. John's deep thoughts from a mind congenial with his own. Some points in the exposition we shall select for observation, chiefly as bearing on the doctrines of sin and the atonement for sin: in continuation, it may be added, of one or two papers of our journal already devoted to the study of this Epistle as the final document of revelation. And, as the work is not likely to be translated, we shall make more copious extracts than otherwise would be desirable. But, before doing so, we cannot resist the temptation to insert a glowing passage from the Editor's Preface, giving his account of the Christianity taught by Rothe to his students, and treasured by them among their most grateful memories:

"Gathering up the impressions which we there received from our teacher, leading us as he did directly to the fresh and living

source of faith, I may say that it was above all things that of the imposing glory, sublimity, and sanctity of Christianity as a new Divine life, which, as it demands our most absolute consecration, so it is alone worthy of what it demands. But the whole rich fulness of life which Christianity has brought proceeds from one centre, from Jesus Christ, who is Himself the Eternal life, and in Whom the glory, holiness, and love of God are manifested. He is for us as well the Object most worthy of love, dedication of the heart to Whom brings the profoundest peace and satisfaction, as also the Holy One who alone has no fellowship with sin, and therefore alone makes free from sin. The greater our Redeemer is to us, the more mighty and true is our own Christian life. In the Divine-human personality of the Redeemer Christianity possesses its ideal glory: it is therefore not only the highest and most perfect revelation of God, but also the highest manifestation of human life for all ages. The world never deduced it from its own resources; but it was implanted into sinful human nature by God Himself. But, while man through Christ finds God again, he at the same time finds himself again, and is placed at the consummation of his own human vocation. The requirements of Christ in themselves lie really in the depths of our human race and origin; but they are also in Him new requirements. The supernatural character of Christendom forms the most decisive contrast to all that is of this world, and demands from us unconditional faith; but this faith is nothing unnatural, it responds to our own true nature, and is demanded by the attraction to truth indwelling in us. The natural life, and the life of regeneration, are sharply distinguished from each other; but the Gospel lays hold of the noblest motives in the natural man, and binds him by its own internal truth and its own irrefragable and uncontradicted purity, loveliness, and beauty. It gives him the confidence and the power for the fulfilment of the Divine law. It opens up the Divine fountain of brotherly love, and places a goal of perfection before every one, which is the most worthy object of the struggle of life. For to aspire after that which is highest, not contented with half measures, is the calling of the Christian. This goal of perfection, far removed from being anything repulsive, has in it the most mighty stimulant to set about Christianity with the most perfect and absolute earnestness. Christ demands no more from us than what is found in our own original destination; but He demands it absolutely; and what He demands He Himself communicates. This new life from God, in which man through the atonement and the impartation of the Spirit is actually separated from sin and has actual fellowship with God, possesses alone a perfect reality and is absolute certainty: everything else is surrendered to transitoriness. But this new life takes up all into itself which man possesses of true spiritual good, while it

sanctifies all that it takes up. The world out of Christ has not life in itself; but the Gospel, with the mind of love, seeks out all the points of contact which universal human sentiment has with it, and which should lead the human spirit to Christ. The rights of personality are defended in all their comprehensiveness by Rothe. With absolute reverence for Scripture, in which the permanent norm of all is found, there is connected in his view a very decided recognition of the independence of the individual believing Christian; its justification, in the presence of the historical development of Christianity; and its demand of a personal experienced faith."

Three points are made prominent here, as illustrated by our Epistle: the new life manifested in Christ; the preparation for it in human nature; and the individual verification of it by personal faith. The first and third are indisputably taught with more fulness by St. John than by any other writer; the intermediate one may be brought into question. That our Epistle lays a strong emphasis on the absolute supernaturalness and direct descent from heaven of the life which is pre-eminently Christian is evident from beginning to end. Nowhere is the gulf between the old life and the new more deep and clear; nowhere, indeed, is it so deep and clear. It is the difference between light and darkness, between Satan and God, between a nature lying in the wicked one and a nature with the Divine infused into it. The process of becoming Christian is hardly touched. Though there are children and young men and fathers, the very lowest stage is so high that it leaves the common life far below. To have once seen and known Christ is to have come out from the transitory world and forsaken sin for ever. From that moment perfection is the object ever to be kept in view: a perfection which, however relative in some respects, is absolute as to the supremacy of the new nature of love and the extinction of sin. The exhortations to avoid sin, and renounce the world, and cultivate brotherly love, show that the Apostle contemplates the possibility of an imperfect religion; but he writes as if those who need such exhortations are not as yet really Christians at all. Indeed, his high ideal of the Christian life, which is however not an ideal but a reality, is one of the main embarrassments of the expositor. There is a world in Satan, and a Church in God: a middle term, or an intermediate state, is hardly within the Apostle's sphere of thought. Hence, it is not to this Epistle that we should go for evidence that Christianity appeals to

the instincts of human nature, however true that may be. Nowhere does it speak with any respect of the vestiges of good left by the Fall, or preserved by the universal influence of the Spirit. Its doctrine is that of regeneration pure and simple rather than of renewal: for the latter we must go to St. Paul. But Rothe is undoubtedly right in laying so much stress on its teaching as to the self-evidencing witness of interior truth. All Christians have, and every Christian has the unction from the Holy One, and appears not to need any external teaching, or any external preservation, from error. Taking this Epistle alone, and supposing it to be the only exponent of Christianity, there is no doubt that we should have a theory of the religious life which would seem at least to conflict at many points with the facts of the Christian experience.

This, however, only shows the great importance of studying every document of Christianity in the light of all the rest. The New Testament is one organic whole, and no writer alone gives the full and finished exhibition of truth as truth is in Jesus. St. John evidently was reserved to crown the edifice, and to put the final touches on every doctrine; but he presupposes familiarity with all that has gone before. His perpetual reference to what his readers already had heard, the assumption everywhere of an actual knowledge on their part, which gives the Epistle one of its formulas, proves that. The mistake of many expositors is to forget this. It is not enough that they bring the Epistle into comparison with the Gospel, and even regard it as its supplement, if they omit to remember that every line was written and must be read with the entire New Testament open for collation. Then we understand how it is that many aspects of the atonement, both objective and subjective, are left out; that justification by faith is untouched; that the Church, with all its array of doctrine, and ethics, and the sacrament, finds no place; that its eschatology is so limited in its range. Its lines have almost everywhere reached the point of perfection; but the intermediate course is sometimes pretermitted. But on this we need not now enlarge.

Rothe's exposition of the Introduction or Prologue of the Epistle is exceedingly impressive. He views it with the eye of a philosopher, of a German philosopher; and, however strange it may at first appear to find St. John made an exponent of what in modern times is called Ontology, it is not possible to doubt the substantial truth of the following

extract, or to be insensible to its sublimity. There is little in the transcendental philosophy of modern times as to the relation between being and phenomena which the Gnostic speculations of the end of the last century did not make familiar to Christian thinkers. St. John was the Apostle of profound contemplation as well as of love; and we have no objection whatever to find him made the father of the true philosophy which reconciles Idealism and Realism. For this reason we give the passage in full. But also for another. It will be found that Rothe lays great stress upon the reality of the manifestation of God in the flesh, and in such a way as to commit himself, one would think, to a high principle that draws after it many irresistible conclusions; such, for instance, as the reality and abiding continuance of the phenomenal world in which the Eternal life appeared; the essential impossibility of sin in Him; and the indestructibility He gave to the human nature He assumed. But we shall see that the high principle is not at all points consistently maintained.

"The thought of a primal, original Being, which has its ground in itself, is indeed the most abstract conception which the human consciousness generally can reach; but it is one that lies infinitely near, which no one can avoid or pass by who throws an observing glance into himself or around himself. For that which falls directly under our sensuous perception shows itself to him who is in any sense reflective to be in itself not true. The whole material world taken in and for itself must to the tranquil understanding, as well as to the clear feeling of the soul, appear as nothing in itself, which does not truly deserve the name of being. But this thought, of being surrounded by pure nothingness, is intolerable to the mind not entirely unreflecting; it must beget the longing to find somewhere a being which experience may lay hold on that did not first become, but is self-existent and primitive, and which may become a sure foundation. And this primal Being, eternally grounded in itself, the Apostle has found. He triumphantly appeals to his hearers: he knows of a Being which, withdrawn from all transitoriness, is the ground of all merely passing and perishing existence. The idealism of Christianity comes here in all its strength into prominence. The idea that all mere sensible existence is not true Being, that the material is only the appearance of something else which lies behind it, is inseparable from Christian devotion. Hence, in this point of view, philosophy, especially that of Fichte, is a good preliminary school of Christianity. Such a true Being is sought, longed for, hoped for most assuredly by every human consciousness; but

found, it can be only in as far as it manifests itself to us and enters sensibly into this sensible world. And that this has taken place is what the Apostle knows and announces. It has taken place in Christ. In Christ he has seen a Being who incontrovertibly approved Himself as not belonging to *this* world, not having His origin and His root in sensible things, but as being eternal Existence. The personal manifestation of the Redeemer made upon him this immediate impression; and therefore he can regard Him as no other than the manifestation of God Himself. But at the same time he learned to know this manifestation of God in the flesh in the methods of sensible experience of a reality; for he was an eyewitness of it, heard it, saw it, beheld it, touched it. These words give prominence to a perfect empirical experience concerning this Being, eternal and absolutely real in itself: certainly in opposition to the Docetism of his time; but this Docetism is always rising in the midst of Christianity, as is seen in the attempts to discriminate between the so-called historical and the so-called ideal Christ. The human-sensible appearance of Jesus in its entire humanisation brought to the Apostle's contemplation in this Christ the eternal primal Being and source of all being."

The ideal Christ of modern fiction is, as Rothe hints, a reproduction of Docetism which takes away the essence of Christianity. The incarnate Jesus was really a being of flesh and blood, as He was the Eternal Son of God. In His one person we must not separate the Divine from the human. But it is equally important that we should remember to give the Divine in all things the pre-eminence; and it belongs to that pre-eminence that the revelation should be always and everywhere, in the humbled as in the exalted estate, the revelation of God. It is not said, however true it may be in a certain sense, that the true humanity was manifested in Christ, that the flesh was manifest in God; but that God was manifest in the flesh. Whatever the redemption of mankind required to be suffered and done must be regarded as suffered and done by God, using a human bodily organisation. The exigency of atonement demanded suffering, and temptation in the sense of inscrutable trial; but the personal God is the never-failing subject of every predicate and agent of every act and object of every infliction. It makes an immense difference to all our views of Christianity whether we give or give not the eternal Divine personality in all things its essential and necessary pre-eminence. Generally speaking, there are two starting points in the consideration of Jesus. The one ascends from His humanity to His Divinity; regards Him as

perfectly man in all the essentials of humanity, including its liability to temptation and sin, its law of probation, with the Divinity sustaining Him in the process and crowning it with eternal honour. This view carries with it from beginning to end a certain undefinable but most real dishonour to the Son of God: the Docetism affects His Divinity and makes that unreal, while vainly and needlessly aiming to rescue His humanity from Docetic perversion. Needlessly, we say; for it is not essential to human nature to be liable to sin, and to be in a state of probation; still less is it essential to human nature in this world to have the seed of passive evil within. The other view descends with the Beloved Son from heaven, and throws around all His manifestation the glory of the Godhead, so far as it regards its eternal sanctity and sinlessness. It involves difficulties, no doubt; for the Christ of redemption is the mystery of God pre-eminently. But it avoids what is far worse than difficulty, the unimaginable thought that the Son of God incarnate is on probation; must take His trial for life or death, is set for His own fall or rising again, and has to succeed in an experiment in which man, without God incarnate in him, failed. We might have expected, after the extract just given, that our expositor would take the latter view of the real, historical Christ. But we shall see in his doctrine of the atonement, which is otherwise of great value, especially as coming from him, that he does not.

The Epistle soon comes to that doctrine, which is essential to the manifestation of Christ. And there is something almost startling in the emphasis with which it speaks of the "blood of Jesus, His Son," at the very threshold. Rothe does full justice to the full significance of this word. He shows clearly that the blood of Jesus is a definition of the death of Christ, but distinctly as atoning death, and that as a sacrificial death of expiation. Of the death of Christ simply (without the close definition of sacrificial atonement) this expression is never used in the New Testament. But he thinks that we need not on that account limit this cleansing exclusively to the propitiatory cleansing which takes away guilt; the idea that the expiation and forgiveness of sin in its very nature effects actual cleansing from it by sanctification is included in the term here, as almost everywhere (Rev. vii. 14; Acts xv. 9). He adduces verse 9 as making this very prominent. But he does not enter into the vexed question as to the specific efficacy of the blood of atonement in purifying the nature from evil. It is well known that there are three

views on this subject. Some maintain that the cleansing is only another word for remission: viewing it levitically as removing the stain of sin, and leaving the extirpation of evil to the Holy Spirit. Others regard it as meaning the removal of sin from the nature, but only as a subsequent fruit of the atonement. And others again think that the blood refers to the mission of Christ's life, in His blood, into the soul. To us there seems strong reason for adopting the first view, with certain modifications that have been dwelt upon elsewhere. As the author does not raise the discussion we shall not do so; but pass on to his striking exposition of the nature of the atonement, which the student of theology must read with more than ordinary care, if not suspicion.

"The mystery of the expiation of sin through the sacrificial death of Christ consists generally in this, that God through Christ has effected the actual removal of the contradiction between these two propositions: first, that God in virtue of His holiness cannot enter into a friendly relation with the creature, so long as he is actually sinful; and, secondly, that the actual removal of sin is not possible saving as far as God has previously entered into that friendly relation through forgiveness of the sin. Only in this way can also the need of sinful man, in relation to God, be actually satisfied. It is equally important to him that God's holiness be kept inviolate as that he should receive God's grace. A grace which should cast a shade on the Divine holiness would take away just as much from man. For to desire that God should be indulgent to his sin would be unholy: we have only an idol, if we have not a God of pure *holiness*. God can have no relation with the sinner; for the Divine consciousness is absolutely negative towards sin, and it is the same with the Divine act as manifested in His righteousness. The Deity can stand towards guilt only in the attitude of wrath. The common notion is that God as respects sin merely leaves it unpunished. But He must actually take it away. By the punishment of the sinner the sin is not done away; but the Divine holiness must extend to the removal of the evil. Hence the Church rightly declares that justification is the fundamental condition of sanctification. So long as God is angry with us we must flee from Him. If therefore in the sinner sin is to be actually abolished, the relation of amity between God and the sinner must by all means be re-established: God must forgive the sinner his sin before its actual destruction in him. This is certainly an antinomy; but the ground of it and the key to its solution are already given in the fact of redemption itself. Such a case is imaginable by us only by considering that God receives an unambiguous pledge that by His preceding pardon of the sin the real removal of it would be

wrought as an effect on the sinner. In such a case God, without impeachment of His holiness, would forgive the sin; indeed He must do so then, in virtue of His holiness and righteousness itself. For otherwise He would pass by the means at His disposal for the actual abolition of the sin. To bring this about has been the problem of all that men call expiation, which among all nations has been aimed at. Only in the New Testament and through Christ has it been actually realised. . . . . In Christ there is given to God the sure pledge that, to those who believe in Him, His preliminary forgiveness of our sin is its actual removal. It is forgiven in Christ, inasmuch as in Him the power dwells actually to take away sin in mankind. Only so far as He has this power is He a Redeemer generally; and by this, that in Christ this power is actually present in humanity, is there the possibility of forgiveness on the part of God. On this side the Redeemer is the *Surety* for mankind as over against God. Only, when the individual man is concerned, this suretyship is not yet sufficient. The Redeemer possesses this power for the individual only on the condition that he is actually in a moral personal relation with Himself. And this takes place through faith: by faith we receive that forgiveness of sins. And in him who enters into living fellowship with Christ by faith, the crisis of the forgiveness of sins is at the same time the crisis when the actual abolition of sin begins, which then continually goes on. On the basis of this reality of a Redeemer, and our fellowship with Him, God forgives sin and calls into existence a process of continuous destruction of sin. But now, if Christ is actually thus the Redeemer, in what relation to this does His accomplished *atonement* stand? He became the Redeemer through His own act, not in a natural manner, but by means of His own religious-moral development. He prepared Himself to be a Redeemer, and earned for Himself this power of redemption. It is this which the expiation accomplished by Him includes and involves. His death is the main element in this development, and that definitely His sacrificial death. This is indeed not the only element in His work of expiation, but it is nevertheless the decisive one."

If this exhaustive passage is read in the light of the last sentence, it will become clear that, with all its noble truth, there is mixed an error which a sound theology of the atonement must repudiate. The theory—if it may be so called—seems to be this, that the expiation of sin has been effected by Christ in His entire manifestation as a holy Representative of the human race who unites in Himself two things: the endurance of the penalty of sin in His passion, and the rooting out of sin in the discipline of His holy life. In other words, He presents Himself to the God of holiness in a

human nature which has at once endured its punishment and recovered its purity. There lies the virtue of His propitiation for the whole world; the justice of God sees in Him the race of Adam restored; the Pledge on the one hand that sin is not unpunished or the law dishonoured when the sinner is forgiven, and the Pledge on the other that the forgiven sinner shall hereafter be fully sanctified. This objective expiation renders it possible that the holy God should receive back again the family of Adam; and every one who is united to Christ by living faith receives the atonement. Thus stated, and going no further than this, the doctrine is in our judgment unexceptionable. It is unsatisfactory indeed in its careful avoidance of the fundamental idea of substitutionary suffering in the sacrificial death. But it is otherwise strictly true. It distinguishes rightly between the atonement once offered for all, and for all available, and the same atonement applied to the believer. It gives faith its right place, and renders impossible the gratuitous fiction that the Redeemer has taken the place of the elect in satisfying the law for them both as a condemning sentence and a requirement of holiness. It does justice to the eternal truth that there can be no expiation of sin, or cancelling of its penalty, which does not provide for the future holiness of the sinner. But its error lies in this, that the self-sanctification of Jesus in the whole of His voluntary obedience earned for Him as the conqueror of sin the right to deliver believers: that in fact His expiatory passion was a suffering victory over sin inhering in the nature He assumed, which only culminated on the cross. It might seem on a superficial glance that the true relation between the active and the passive righteousness of Christ is here very nearly expressed; for it cannot be gainsaid that the Redeemer at once paid the penalty of sin in Himself, and in Himself negatived sin by a perfect holiness. But there is a vast difference between the presentation of a perfectly holy humanity enduring the sentence of the law vicariously for a world of transgressors and the sacrificial offering of a Redeemer who had first vanquished sin in Himself. This latter notion may be disguised in many ways; it may be stated cloudily, as in the passage above; it may support itself by passages of Scripture vaguely expounded; but in no form can it be made consistent with the Scriptural doctrine that all through His manifestation the Saviour of mankind was no other than the Eternal and

Beloved and Spotless Son of God, in whom is no sin, as St. John tells us with reference to this very subject. But another extract will make this plainer:

"Now in what sense is the Redeemer the propitiation in regard to our sins? In this respect, that He, specially in the consummation or *perfecting* of His own moral development (Heb. ii. 10, v. 8, 9), was exactly adapted to be the effective causality of an actual perfect removal of sin in humanity. For only under *this* condition can God, without detriment to His holiness, enter into a positive fellowship with the sinner (forgiving, that is, his sin): that is, if there is a full guarantee of the removal of his sin. The guarantee of this is a Redeemer (Heb. vii. 23); that is, a Person perfectly qualified to effect the destruction of sin through the faith which is the absolute condition of pardon and means of vital fellowship with Christ. Through this, therefore, that the Redeemer perfectly sanctified Himself, is He the sufficient power for the effectual destruction of sin in the world. John expressly points to the fact that our trust in Christ, even in reference to our continual sins, rests upon the assurance of an accomplished propitiation. Faith in the forgiveness of sins cannot be devoid of religious-moral peril if it is not bound up with faith in expiation."

Here it is obvious that the expiation of Christ has its virtue in His own personal sanctification. He thus qualified Himself to be our Deliverer, because our faith unites us to One in whose power and after whose example we also may vanquish sin. But in no passage is the Redeemer's sanctification said to be His cleansing Himself from the spot of the race. It is true that "both He that sanctifieth and they that are in process of sanctification are all of one;" but if that unity were a unity of the process, what meaning would the sequel have, "He is not ashamed to call them brethren?" It is true that He was "made perfect by suffering" as a Redeemer; but where is it said, or hinted, or implied, that He was made morally perfect? "In Him is no sin:" this unlimited IS refers not to a state of consummation which He has reached, but is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The simple fact is, that the habitual conventional use of the term sanctification to signify an internal process of deliverance from sin, and that exclusively, is fruitful in theological error. But its greatest offence is here. St. John refutes every such notion by telling us that we have in heaven an advocate "Who is the Propitiation for our sins:" according to the doctrine we condemn it should have been "He was

the Propitiation;" for that doctrine makes the victory over sin of the very essence of expiation. It is the doctrine of the New Testament, however, that the Eternal was *sent* as the propitiation before He took flesh at all, that it was in His blood He *became* the propitiation, and that in His Divine-human righteousness He *is* the propitiation to the end. But Rothe reads this passage otherwise. He sees the grandeur of the truth that St. John rises above every former representation when he says that the Righteous Jesus in His own Person is the propitiation; but he forgets that the same Jesus had been on the cross, and was there set forth as the propitiatory in His blood through faith.

"John gives now an explanation *in what sense* Christians have in the righteous Jesus Christ an intercessor with God. It is so far as He Himself is the propitiation for their sins, and thus makes them pardonable. There is a plain emphasis on the 'Who is Himself:' He in His own person. John brings it into prominence that here, in Christ, the Advocate and the means of expiation on which the intercession is grounded concur in one: not as in the Old Testament (to which there is manifest allusion, as to a typical institute), where the interceding high priest and the means of expiation (the sin-offering) were different. Christ is Himself the Propitiation. 'To expiate' means, in Scriptural language, to effect the *moral* possibility of a fellowship of God with anything sinful: that is the possibility that, *notwithstanding His holiness*, and without disparaging it, He can forgive the sinner his sins, and admit him again to His fellowship (so also in chap. iv. 10). Thus expiation is here the means through which there is the (moral) possibility of a positive fellowship with sinners, and of the turning away of the Divine wrath. . . . . But 'propitiation' is not simply 'expiatory offering.' In the word 'propitiation,' in our passage, there is no express reference to the death of Christ, that is, as a sin-offering, like that of Rom. iii. 25. For it is here the Redeemer Himself, the whole Jesus Christ, not merely one act of His (such as His death) which is exhibited as the propitiation in respect of sins."

For ourselves, we rest assured that the exalted Saviour is the propitiation in heaven because the virtue of His atoning death has followed Him thither, or gone with Him; and that the progressive sanctification of our nature is not the result of our union with His process of victory over sin, but of our union with His Divine-human life through His Spirit. Our fellowship with his sufferings is indeed an essential element in our purification; but it is not in any sense, as

Rothe would have it, and many like him, a fellowship with His expiatory sufferings. The distinction is broad and clear throughout the New Testament. We are never said to be abolishing our sins as He did. He is never said to have set us an example of interior wrestling with evil. His atoning suffering was in a sphere altogether His own and unshared. In accomplishing redemption He presented a sacrifice of perfect submission under pressure that no words can describe, but which the infinite might of the Son of God incarnate allowed no possibility of sin to mar. When He triumphantly said, "I have overcome the world," He did not add, "Overcome it as I have overcome:" not in the manner that He overcame do we overcome; only in His Divine strength. We rise through faith in Him to a victory over sin which He never had to achieve. He atoned for it in His death alone; by a vicarious death which would not have been vicarious if He had condemned His own sin in the reality and not in the likeness of sinful flesh.

We now pass from the expiation of sin by Christ to the question of its perfect destruction in the believer: the second of the three salient points concerning sin in this Epistle. The following words are of very great importance, as touching a subject on which the Christian consciousness always needs to be stimulated, and needs it especially in our own day. The true conception of sin lies at the foundation of all sacred views as to the atonement, and the infinite solemnity of probation, and the issues to which it leads. A low estimate of sin is really at the basis of most of the errors that have prevalence among us.

"To the *Christian* sin and death are in and for themselves interchangeable ideas. Sin is to him the opposite of life; its natural and necessary effect is death. The *natural* view of sin always regards it pre-eminently as weakness, as something which indeed ought to be otherwise than it is, but cannot really be otherwise, and even in its consequences is not further perilous. The Christian cannot think of the true life of man save as being in fellowship with God; but sin utterly excludes this. The natural man regards life not first of all in the relation of man to God, but predominantly in its relation to himself and the world around him. Therefore he can think of that which he calls life, without internal contradiction, as necessarily affected with sin. But, while the Christian deals with sin in an incomparably more solemn and earnest manner, the natural man on the other hand thinks of it in a much more hypochondriacal manner: he regards it as some-

thing absolutely unconquerable. He regards anything like a real release from it, even as from its guilt, as a fanatical hope. He thinks himself in some way of necessity encumbered and endowed with evil. The Christian, on the contrary, has the firm assurance that he can be altogether healed of it, and that absolutely and for ever. With the sin that still remains in himself he certainly does not deal lightly; but yet he knows that this his sin is not a sin unto death, that the sin of the truly converted should not be matter of despair to him, and that the power of the new life which is revealed in him through Christ will finally swallow it up for ever. By the side therefore of his deep anxiety against sin there runs consequently a confident joy. It does not in his consciousness sever him from his Father. Even with reference to this he can pray to God, and ask of Him its forgiveness as well as the abolition of its power."

Here there seems to be a noble protest against two errors: that of the undervaluation of sin as remaining in the regenerate nature, and that of a despondent submission to it as a necessity in the present life. But when we examine the words carefully they give a view of indwelling sin that cannot be accepted. The ground of the Christian's confidence, as touching the remainder of sin in his nature, is not the assurance that in the present life it shall be utterly destroyed, but that it will be taken away hereafter. Meanwhile, he has the consciousness that whatever of evil remains in him cannot alienate the favour of God. And why is this? Because he knows that it is not a sin unto death, but venial sin, or sin of infirmity, which is not reckoned to the true personality of the regenerate. Rothe's interpretation of the passages which again and again declare that the regenerate cannot sin is simply this, that the seed of God, the good Spirit, is in him, and is therefore the acting subject of his new being. The impossibility of which he here speaks is obviously an internal and moral one. The regenerate cannot sin "with his own proper and true personality," and therefore what sin is in him cannot be sin in the proper and full sense of the word; it is only the overpowering of his true personality by the power of evil, and only, therefore, sin of infirmity. That this doctrine has been perverted Rothe admits. "Because the proper personality of the regenerate cannot sin, it has been supposed that sin touches him not in his individual life, but is something alien to him. But John does not speak his word for this Satanic spiritualism; for wherever there is indifference to sin there can be no regeneration. The toleration

of sin as not being our own is really the love of it. Wherever the sin is other than a sin of infirmity our regeneration is only a seeming one." This is a hard doctrine, and as dangerous as it is hard. For where is the line to be drawn between sin of infirmity and the sin of deliberation? The expression here used, and often employed by those who take this view, that of "being overpowered" by evil, robs the Apostle's glorious word of its strength. Its meaning, then, becomes simply this, that no sin is inconsistent with regeneration against which the better self remonstrates; in which case all true conviction of sin would be regeneration. That is the experience of the seventh chapter of the Romans, but not that of the eighth. The true personality is behind both the new man and the old, and is responsible for the deeds done in the body, whether they be good or evil. It is a bold thing to say, but it is perfectly true, that the personality of the regenerate is not the Holy Spirit but the renewed man: we receive the Spirit as the Spirit of life, and have Him as ours. The Holy Ghost does not possess us, but we possess Him, in regeneration. There is, indeed, a later stage, of which this exposition knows nothing, when the order may be said to be reversed: when sin is utterly destroyed, and the crucified flesh has ceased to live, then indeed we are "filled with the fulness of God." But till then, as St. Paul teaches us, we are only "strengthened with might by the Spirit poured into the inner man."

In connection with the words following the reference to the sin unto death, "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not," Rothe gives another and an indefensible and misleading view. The commentary on ver. 18 we must give entire, as it involves points of critical importance.

"After John has shown in ver. 17 that certainly there are in the life of Christians sins not unto death, which may be the object of Christian intercession, he now calls attention to the fact that, when he spoke of intercession for sinning fellow-Christians, he *could* not have thought of intercession in reference to sins unto death generally, because such sins could not occur in the Christian (the brother of ver. 16) as one born of God. But he does not actually say that in his assertion above he could not have thought of these sins; he only lays down the principle from which that follows, namely, that the Christian in such a manner cannot possibly sin. This, however, he does affirm, as his own clear and certain consciousness and that of all true Christians, by an express '*we know*.' The '*not sinning*' must, that is, in strict conformity with the usual Johannean phraseolgy (ch. iii. 6—9), be taken in its pregnant and absolute sense, precisely as the 'sinning unto

death.' For that the Christian can generally no more sin John could not have intended to say; for he expressly asserts the direct opposite of this in chapter i. 5—8, ii. 1. Nor does he say it in chapter iii. 6—9, passages which are in strict harmony with ours. In these also he denies that the Christian can sin, on the same ground as that given here, because he is born of God, that is, of his regeneration. The psychological reason why the Christian cannot, in the manner referred to, sin, is given in the words: he that is born of God *keepeth himself*, holds himself in that wakefulness and care through which in regard to him temptation to sin cannot find entrance, so that Satan toucheth him not: he cannot seduce him to sin, because he can find on him nothing to lay hold on. For the presupposition and condition of temptation on the part of Satan is the own lust in a man (Jas. i. 14, 15)."

Here we have the doctrine that the regenerate can never fall from grace, can never commit the sin which is unto death, in what seems to us plain contradiction of the Apostle's word, that a brother sinning unto death is not to be prayed for with confidence. But, leaving that question at present, let us mark the strange inconsistency into which this profound thinker falls. St. John is made to say that "he who is born of God sinneth not unto death; he may be impressed into sin, and need an advocate, and shall surely be forgiven if he confess his sins. Meanwhile, he does not sin at all; for he keepeth himself, and Satan finds no point of attack. Yet not so; for there is in him, as regenerate, no concupiscence that temptation may court, and with which or in which it may engender sin." This is said to be the psychological reason of regenerate sinlessness; but it is utterly unscriptural and at all points inconsistent. When the Apostle says, "If any man sin," does he mean "If any man suffer sin in that part of him which is not himself, then that part must confess and be forgiven?" But this is not the Apostle's teaching: "if we confess." Nor is it St. James's teaching in the passage quoted: the lust which conceives sin is the man's "own lust," though it belongs to his body of sin not yet destroyed.

As to the impossibility of sin in the regenerate, expositors have always differed according to their views of the nature of the Christian redemption. The classification of these several hypotheses furnishes a deeply interesting theological study. There are two which have held most sway: one which makes regenerate sinlessness an actual present fact, but then it is the sinlessness of the better self within the sinning man; the other which makes it not a reality, but an ideal, ever floating

before the Christian consciousness, but never to be realised in the present life. There is a measure of truth in both these, but neither of them satisfies St. John's meaning, and they must both be discarded before we can arrive at a satisfactory solution. That solution seems to be simply this, that the Apostle describes a present fact of holy experience, which, every time he asserts it, he himself most clearly explains.

The first above alluded to is that held by Rothe, though in his own peculiar fashion. The variety of applications and uses to which this hypothesis is made subservient sufficiently refutes it. Some say, as our expositor here, that it is really the Spirit of Christ in the regenerate who cannot sin, which of course is true; but the Spirit of Christ in the regenerate man is not the regenerate man himself, but, as the Apostle Paul says, *the Spirit in his own mind.* He may lust against that Spirit, and surely that lusting against the Spirit is treated by the Apostle as sin, and, if not, it is supposed that it may lead to sin, which therefore denies that it is impossible for the regenerate to sin. That cannot be, therefore, St. John's meaning. He cannot signify that no amount of internal remissness and yielding to temptation tarnishes the sinlessness of the man in whom Christ has been found. This would be the most refined and therefore the worst Antinomianism. From this, of course, our pure-minded expositor, like multitudes who, on other grounds, maintain the same theory, shrinks. Hence his most unskilful and unsatisfactory reservation, that the regenerate does not sin unto death: surely the sin which is saved from its last and eternal consequences is nevertheless sin. Hence his fluttering about the perilous notion that the regenerate only suffers sin but does not commit it. It is obvious that the danger which he himself deprecates is such, that we cannot suppose the ethical teaching of the New Testament to afford it any the least encouragement. In fact, some of the worst Antinomian developments of the Brethren of the Free Spirit and the fanatical Antinomians of modern times sprang from precisely this principle.

The second is apparently similar, but really very different. It represents St. John as holding up an ideal estate to which the Christian should aspire, after by regeneration he has become capable of elevating his mind to it. He is actually a sinner, and if he thinks he is or may be free from sin he deceives himself; but the thought of the glorious purpose of his regeneration should animate him to cheerful endeavours to avoid sin, trusting to the virtue of the atonement to cleanse

him from the sin he must commit, and to the power of the Spirit finally to deliver him from every trace of his evil. Of course there is in this, as in the former, some measure of truth; otherwise it could not be held by so many earnest expositors. A Christian man may evermore rejoice in thinking of the perfection which is before him and above him in the future, guaranteed to him by the holiness of his Lord and the power of His Spirit, which also has been reached by the spirits of the just made perfect. This ideal is the light and glory of the Christian life, and a vigorous Christian pursuit of holiness cannot exist without it. A man may measure his present imperfect self with the sacred self made perfect, and derive from the comparison a strong incentive. He may impute to himself, as if it were present, an entire redemption, and reckon himself dead unto sin; even as God Himself imputes to us, in the foreknowledge and intention of His grace, our finished sanctity, and waits in forbearance until His end is attained. But the most cursory examination of St. John's words puts to flight this solution of the difficulty in his Epistle. Nothing is or can be more practical than his allusion to the unsinning character of the regenerate. He makes it the plain distinction between believers and unbelievers, between those who are of God and those who are of the devil. It might as well be said that he is describing the ideal of the sinner when he describes him as doing unrighteousness, as that he is describing the ideal of the saint when he describes him as doing righteousness.

A third interpretation, closely allied to the two former, lays the emphasis on the perfect participle: "he that is fully and entirely born of God sinneth not," whereas he who has only been, in the aorist, begotten of God may, until his regeneration is perfected, or regarding it as imperfect, still sin. The link between this and the two former interpretatations is found in this, that all three appeal to the experience of St. Paul in the seventh chapter of the Romans. There, says the first theory, the Apostle is describing his better self struggling against his worse self; and disavowing the sin this worse self commits. It is hardly necessary to say that this cannot be true. The "wretched man" who cries out for deliverance cannot be as yet regenerate; every sentence he uses shows that he is in bondage to sin, and the only distinction he draws between his better and worse self is between the "mind" convinced of the Divine claims and of its own sinfulness, and the flesh that renders that conviction

impotent until a higher grace shall come. Then, says the second theory, St. Paul is depicting the common estate of the Christian man, sinning yet hating his sins, and comforting his heart with the thought of the perfect law which his whole being delights in after the inner man, and longs to realise. But it is enough to say that the Apostle makes no allusion whatever to the spirit of regeneration as giving him his high ideal: the utmost he says is that his rational mind approves of holiness. Moreover, the ideal that irradiates the prison-house of a man in bondage and sold under sin is not the ideal set before us in the New Testament of our sitting in heavenly places in unity with Christ. The same may be said as to the third theory. The Apostle never once speaks in that chapter of his being begotten or born of God and awaiting a more full regeneration. He has not "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," and without that there is no new birth from above. It is not true that Rom. vii. describes an imperfect regeneration, made perfect in Rom. viii. The struggle of the regenerate life is in Gal. v., where it is no longer the νοῦς or mind that wrestles with the flesh, but the "Spirit" of the mind, or the Holy Ghost, which is a very different matter. For the rest, there is a measure of truth in this last hypothesis, as there is in the other two. There is a perfected regeneration as there is a perfected righteousness and a perfected sanctification provided for in the scheme of the Gospel; though of that perfected regeneration St. John does not specifically treat. It cannot be sustained that he lays so much stress on the perfect participle, as if he meant to indicate by it that the regenerate is one who has been born and is perfectly born of God; for in ch. xxix. he says quite generally, and in the same perfect tense, that every one who has been born of God "doeth righteousness," which is much more indefinite than not sinning at all. There is, we repeat, such an estate as perfected regeneration as distinguished from an imperfect. It is wrong to link the idea of Christian perfection only to sanctification. There is a relative perfection of the justified state, when in love the whole law is said to be fulfilled, and the righteousness of the law is so accomplished that it is satisfied in the evangelical obedience of the saint united to Christ and filled with His Spirit of obedience. There is a relative perfection of the sanctified state, when the whole man is purified from indwelling sin and filled with consecrating love. And there is a relative perfection of the regenerate state, conformed to the

image of the Son: relative only, because the adoption waits for the redemption of the body, and the likeness to the Son to which we are predestinated is to be found in the saint as a whole, in body and soul and spirit. A devout and earnest Christian may combine the three theories in his habitual thought as he is born of God. He may mourn over and disavow and hate and renounce the remainder of sin which is alien to his new nature, while, alas, it is still his; he may cherish the blessed ideal of perfect likeness to Christ, and be transformed into that likeness while he beholds it in adoring contemplation; and he may make it his constant endeavour to bring his sonship to perfection by keeping the flesh with its affection and lusts crucified with Christ, and yielding himself up to the full power of the quickening Spirit. But St. John in this Epistle does not, in conclusion, distinguish formally between an inchoate and a finished regeneration.

It is not our purpose to present any detailed exposition of our own. Suffice to say, that there are two things necessary for the clear apprehension of what the Apostle means when he so unequivocally declares the impossibility of sin in the believer: first, we have to mark the explanation he himself gives in each case; and, secondly, we must make that meaning consistent with what he elsewhere says.

The declaration in question is made twice; and each time in connection with the relation of sin both to God and to Satan. In the former of the two instances, the Apostle's true object is to mark the absolute contrariety between the children of God and the children of the devil: it is the outgrowth of the nature of the latter to sin, it is the essential characteristic of the former not to sin. He does not say that "he that is born of Satan must sin," because it is not true of Satan that his seed is any sinful man: "whosoever doeth not righteous is not of God" is the exquisite change in the sentence; and this turn of the phrase sufficiently explains St. John's meaning in the case of those in whom the seed of God, the Holy Spirit of the new life, abideth. Their characteristic is that they are turned from sin to holiness. There is a moral impossibility of their sinning; it is contrary to their new nature to do iniquity: there is no physical, metaphysical, or absolute impossibility of their sinning again. This latter the Apostle could not mean; and it is idle to force a sense upon the word "cannot" which contradicts his own testimony, that of the whole of Scripture, and that of universal Christian experience. "How can I

do this thing and sin against God" said one, in the very spirit and the very letter of St. John's word; another saint of God did that thing, was chastised, and regained God's favour. This passage is altogether positive: it declares the eternal contrariety between the regenerate and the unregenerate life. The other passage is more negative. "He that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." Again we have the birth of God, and the watchful wicked one. But it is most obvious that the inability to sin is still only a moral one; for it is implied that, unless the regenerate keeps himself, the wicked one may touch him to his hurt. Neither of the passages gives any sanction to the idea of an absolute impossibility of sinning.

But the expression is very strong; and certainly implies that the life of the Christian may be spent without sin. He who doubts this has not entered into the spirit of the Apostle's teaching. To this we shall return presently. Meanwhile, it is important to observe that this must have been part of his meaning: if he had not included this, there were many phrases that might have been used to express the moral impossibility of sinning. Intending only to signify this, the Apostle nevertheless adopted the most absolute terms; and that he did so makes it very plain that he deemed it possible that a believer should lead a life without sin. How then is this reconciled with his teaching that the truth is not in us if we say that we have no sin?

One method adopts a compromise, to the effect that, while original sin evermore remains in the Christian, he does not sin so long as he abides in Christ, or so long as the seed of God, the Divine word or promise, remains actively in him, appropriated by faith. But we cannot consent to either of these suppositions. St. John makes no distinction between original and actual sin: the sin that he supposes to be in the Christian is a sin to be confessed as sins committed, "if we confess our sins." And, with regard to the other assertion, it is dangerous to speak of our not sinning only while the Word of God abideth in us, or we abide in it or Him. This is a favourite solution with many in our own day. But it altogether misses the point of St. John's assertion, that the seed of God abideth in us: that seed is not the Word, but the Holy Spirit as the indwelling principle of a new life, and we cannot suppose that He takes His departure on the commission of every sin. This would contradict our Lord's word

that he that is washed needeth only to wash his feet. Surely every lapse through surprise or infirmity does not defeat regeneration: the Holy Spirit may be easily grieved, and His influences easily lowered or quenched, but He is not easily driven from the soul as the Spirit of regeneration. It has a very specious sound that the regenerate cannot sin while his faith is active and his union with Christ intimately felt; but that when his spiritual eye is obscured, and his faith grows languid, he is shorn of his strength, and may fall into sin. However true that may be, it does not touch St. John's assertion. He simply says that the regenerate cannot be a sinner; and that if he sins, or his character is sinful, he has neither seen nor known Christ. The interpretation we refer to says that, having seen and known Christ, he may cease to see Him and know Him as often as he commits sin. This notion makes the being in Christ and out of Christ too precarious a matter; a matter liable to constant fluctuation. Certainly, the Apostle declares, however hard his saying may be, that he who can sin has never seen or known Christ at all. This is true on the more limited theory of impossibility we adopt; but on that theory alone.

As to the other point, St. John's assurance that we all sin, there seems to be a very general consent among interpreters in understanding this to mean that the annihilation of sin in the regenerate nature is not to be expected in the present life. But a high and generous estimate of the provision of the Gospel and the power of the Spirit must hesitate before such an interpretation. Those who believe that the body of sin may be not only crucified, but destroyed or abolished, must reconcile their doctrine with this clear expression of St. John. And how can they do this? There are three possible methods, which we can now only indicate.

One is to regard the Apostle as interpreting his own earlier words by his later: "if we say that we have not sinned." Strange as it may seem, there were seducers who taught in those days that the spirit in man, being a portion of the Divine essence, could not really sin; that what was called sin was merely the consequence of alliance with matter and the phenomenal world; and that the redemption of Christ had for its aim rather the deliverance of the soul from the fetters of material nature than from the penalty and pollution that the Gospel was thought to connect with the idea of sin. Such resources have been found in every age. Wherever the Pantheistic or the Dualistic theory of the universe reigns it

more or less infects all thinking. The Pantheist, and all who are swayed, consciously or unconsciously, by the Panthesistic conception, thinks that sin is at worst a great unreality, a phenomenal something that cannot be explained, which will be lost in a greater good. To all such thinkers the Gospel would say: "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." And the same language would it use to the Gnostics, such as those against whom the Apostle is quietly warning the Church from beginning to end: "If you say that you have no sin, but only the accident of sense, which God may pity in you and from which He will rescue you; if you say that you have not sinned, that the evil you have known and felt has never been your personal guilt but only your mischance, then you show that the fundamentals of the truth are wanting, and that your whole being is a delusion and a lie." There is much to recommend such a view of the Apostle's words. It justifies the extreme vehemence of the language just referred to; and, further, explains the fact that there were, that there could have been, any people in the congregation who needed to be reminded that they *had sinned* in the past. Surely this kind of remembrancer implied something abnormal, something with which we nowadays are not familiar, something that helps us to understand the extreme urgency with which the Apostle presses a fact that might seem to be the very first fundamental of Christian knowledge. It is customary with the commentators to argue that the Apostle is evidently writing to regenerate Christians, already in the light, and therefore that he explicitly teaches that in every Christian, at all times, and to the end, there must be sin. But it is plain that this argument may be carried too far. At any rate it may be urged with too much confidence. The Apostle invites his readers into a fellowship with God which some of them evidently have not. He supposes that some of them may deny that they had ever sinned. And what is to hinder us from assuming that the two sentences refer to the same utter falsehood, inconsistent with the first elements of Christian truth?

If there were no other method of saving the doctrine of St. John from the perversion that he teaches the necessary indwelling of sin in the Christian, we should unhesitatingly adopt this one. There are those, however, who prefer to think that the Apostle speaks in a general and indeterminate manner of the fact that sin remains in the regenerate, with-

out, as yet at least, saying anything about the sanctifying possibility of the future. Just as St. Paul says, that the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, this internal warfare being a general fact, before he goes on to speak of the crucifixion of that flesh unto death, so St. John is supposed to lay down a general principle only, which afterwards will be subjected to its limitation. Certainly, he very soon declares that the blood of Jesus cleanses from all sin, from all that is called sin; he expressly says that his Lord's will is that we "sin not;" and the close of his Epistle represents the love of God as perfected in our nature, even to the extinction and suppression of all fear in the judgment. And, if there were no other method of saving the Apostle's doctrine from the appearance of inconsistency, we should at once adopt this one.

Still we cannot but think that this declaration agrees with the whole of Scripture, in forbidding mortal man from ever saying while he lives upon earth that he has no sin. And no statement of Christian doctrine can be correct that would encourage any one to use such language. Every instinct of the new nature recoils from such an utterance. Even if through the omnipotent power of Divine grace the soul can truthfully avow that, keeping itself and kept by God, it is living an unsinning life, it can never say that it is sinless, or without sin: that it has no sin. The most sanctified spirit, that from which is expelled the very principle of sin, nevertheless inherits the result of the past, and is compassed about with infirmities which, though they are not reckoned as guilt in the merciful imputation of heaven, nevertheless make the Spirit mourn. But, not to dwell upon this, the more general fact remains that every man is and will ever be the inheritor of his past, and call himself a sinner to the end: certainly to the end of life, and if not in eternity only because the definitive judgment shall have fixed an eternal gulf between his glorified being and his former sinful self. "Of whom I am chief," was St. Paul's testimony when he had finished his course and was ready to be offered a spotless sacrifice. This is in our judgment the best commentary on St. John's words. The saint never forgets the sinner, always retains the spirit and language of confession, and, to speak paradoxically, appropriates his sin and sinfulness more and more tenaciously in proportion as it ceases to be his character.

But those who insist with such vehemence that sin must as a principle exist in every Christian, and plead this word of the Apostle for their doctrine, are unjust to other sayings of

his which must have their rights. Not to speak of the "not sinning" and "cannot sin," which have been discussed already, it is enough to point to the triple reiteration of the truth that in the believer obeying the commandments, renouncing himself for his brethren, and dwelling in God, the love of God has its perfected operation. We have no space to examine the passages closely and in order, but it will be found by the student of the Epistle that such is the threefold gradation of the Apostle's assurance. And the last is the most forcible, for it literally speaks of our love being perfected towards God as His is perfected in us, of our being on earth what Christ is in heaven, and of the last vestige of fear being expelled from the nature. Surely there should be some tolerance shown towards those who take these words in their clear fulness of meaning and give them a large acceptance. No artifice of exposition can avail to soften them down or explain them away. There they stand on the last page of the Bible: a rebuke to all doubt and fear, and an encouragement to the loftiest hopes which the Spirit of holiness can excite in the believing heart. The Son of God was manifested not only to bear sin, but to bear it away; "and in Him is no sin." What can these words mean but that the purpose of His first manifestation is to make us like Himself now in purity, even as the purpose of His final manifestation will be to make us like Himself in glory? The final sayings of the Word of God on this subject are the best wine reserved for the last.

But here comes in the idealist scheme to contradict the blessed realism of these truths. Those who deny that the Apostle is setting up an ideal when he speaks of the regenerate impossibility of sinning, nevertheless themselves resort to it when they treat of the express promises of a finished holiness. Rothe is an eminent instance of this. Nothing can surpass his confidence in denying the ideal theory when it suits him to do so. The regenerate man in his view is the Spirit of God in man who cannot sin. But when that same Spirit proclaims that the righteous man is he who doeth righteousness "even as He is righteous," Rothe gives full swing in his turn to the ideal theory, but in a singular way contradicts himself in doing so.

"The exhortation to deny righteousness is repeated in the form of a warning; against deceivers who would persuade them that moral laxity was reconcilable with Christianity. . . . How does that false principle contradict their own salvation? It has a sweet sound, but it is a sweet poison, a most perilous deception,

. . . only he who doeth righteousness is righteous even as Christ is. Tolerance towards sin is absolutely excluded from Christianity, which requires such a righteousness as is consistent with the new power given in Christ through grace. Christ demands this righteousness in its utmost severity, as we find it in Christ Himself. If the world lays down the principle that a perfectly pure and entire morality is not possible for man, the whole Christian system protests against that most urgently. He who would measure his morality according to a lower standard has thereby fallen into that lax principle. Only when we place the requirement high is it possible to work out with love and zeal our sanctification; while the ordinary so-called human righteousness of conduct can never exhaust such zeal."

This is a typical passage, as showing the confusion into which those must fall who will bring down the standard of the possible actual life of the believer. Here there is a strange, unphilosophical, and certainly unscriptural distinction between the requirement of Christianity as an ideal and its practical requirement. What can that standard be to which we are not to be conformed? Christ's righteousness is plainly revealed, especially as the perfect love to man that utterly renounced self. Is that standard to be reached only in another world, where self-renunciation will have lost its opportunity for ever? Can anything be plainer than that we are required to be as our Master even now, amidst all the blessed occasions of love and self-denial? What He is we are to become. He is without sin, by the infinite necessity of His pesonal Godhead; we are to become such by the infinite power of His Spirit, imprinting His example on our hearts and His holiness on our lives. But the thought of perfected love still hovers over us. Let us see how Rothe deals with that. We shall find that he has missed the entire conception, and wandered hopelesaly from the point.

"Fear hath torment: it is from the self which lies at the root of all fear that this torment flows, which all experience shows to be bound up with this fear. The state of fear is more painful than the experience of the evil feared. This anxiety is however quite inseparable from the position of self-regard. He who is limited in his little I to himself, separating himself from the great world around him in enmity, not devoting himself to it, but maintaining himself against it and repelling its influences, undertakes a work the delusion of which he must find out. The disproportion of his own power against the boundless power of this world must fall upon his own soul as a fearful trial. In this

isolation of his being, surrounded by powers which he has made his enemies, his life can be only one of unbroken tribulation and fear. On the contrary, love is blessedness; for it stands in profound peace with the collective world around. As it lives in friendship with all, all things co-operate with it; everything subserves its interest, and it subserves the interest of all. It exists in the midst of a fulness of life, which streams on it from every side. It finds satisfaction for every need, while selfishness is wounded in its impotence. In such blessedness as this of love that torment cannot be thought of which is inseparable from fear.

"But indeed this perfect love is not yet given to us. In the measure in which we still mourn over the pressures of our life we are far from being perfected in love. It is profitable to measure the degree of our love by this standard. We often think that the feeling of disquiet in life is a sign of advanced religious sentiment; it is rather a proof of the weakness of our love. Thereby John shows us the only way which surely leads to the goal. We must learn to love, and labour for the continual perfection of our love. This universal experience confirms. There is no truly loving heart that can be unhappy; and no truly happy soul that does not love. Thus love is the one properly beatifying good of our human existence. We forget too easily that the measure of our happiness can only be the measure of our love; and that we must not only in general learn to love, but that our loving only then gives us blessedness and peace when we fix our thoughts upon the perfecting of love in us. Only pure and perfect love makes purely and perfectly blessed; and about this we too seldom concern ourselves. Therefore among men there is so little steadfast faith in the principle that there is no other blessedness than this. There are only a few truly happy men."

There is much beauty in these utterances of Christian philosophy. But they do not touch the essential principle that the love of God perfected within us destroys the sin that causes all unquietness in the heart. Its highest achievement is, not to harmonise us with the nature of things and the course of Providence, but with the nature of God Himself, who is love. It makes us, or may make us, its object is to make us, what Christ is, who is the living manifestation of eternal love and eternal life. And the transformation of the Christian character through the ascendency of this most mighty principle is not deferred to another world. Every word indicates that its triumphs are in time and amidst the scenes of this world: not reserved for eternity as the destroyer of sin, nor postponed to the hour of death, but displayed in

this scene of human probation. Our commentator tells us that "this perfect love is not yet given to us," and his proof is that we still feel the world's pressure and disquiet in the present life. But St. John says the exact reverse, using terms as nearly as possible the direct contradictories of his expositor's. The love of God is perfected in us, and our love perfected towards Him. The fear is gone, and perfected joy and confidence have taken its place. Surely the text and the commentary are in plain antagonism here. To the commentator it is an ideal Christians must aspire to: given as a standard by which they are to measure their deficiencies. He frankly admits his despair, for himself and others, of ever reaching it in this life. St. John, on the contrary, speaks of an experience attainable and attained. It is true that he does not, in so many words, say that the supremacy of love destroys the principle of sin, but it is scarcely possible to doubt that this is his meaning. What Rothe erroneously assigns to the new nature in the Christian, the absence of the lust which might conceive and bring forth sin, we may venture to think that the Apostle sets before us as the aim of a mature Christian life. Desire in man for physical gratification is not sin in itself; but the carnal mind infused into the desire makes it sin and also the fuel of sin. But, unless we greatly mistake the plain sense of St. John's words, he regards it as the perfect operation and last triumph of the Divine love within us that the carnal mind should be abolished. All fear is cast out; but if the mind still retained any the least bias towards evil there would be cause for fear. With his peculiar phraseology St. John could not more plainly teach this doctrine. It is an interesting subject of speculation to ask how he would have expressed himself in this Epistle if he had been moving in St. Paul's vocabulary. He must have spoken of the flesh as mortified and dead, its affections and lusts having passed away before the world that fed them; of the old man as put off, renounced, and abolished; of the law of sin in the members having ceased its operation; and of the carnal mind being rooted out of the nature. Instead of all this he speaks in the beginning of his Epistle of our being cleansed from all sin, in the middle of it of our purifying ourselves even as He is pure, and at the end of a perfect love which negatively casts out fear and positively makes us as He is. The advocates of the doctrine that sin must inhere in our religious constitution so long as we remain on earth may contend against this doctrine, and bring forward many

plausible arguments against it, but they ought not to be amazed that we should hold it with this Epistle in our hands and in our hearts.

After all, there is no more cogent testimony in favour of this deeper and grander view than the whole strain of the Epistle as to the nature of the eternal life already imparted to the Christian in vital union with his Lord. On this subject Rothe strikes a good keynote, though his variations on it are far from satisfactory.

"In order to place it in all the clearer light how the Christian man has in Christ, through the prayer of faith to Him, an actual spring of everlasting life, John adds that, in virtue of this prayer, he not only draws that life for himself, but even communicates it to his sinning brother, who by sinning is wounded in his true life, for his healing: communicates it, that is, by the power of his intercession for him with the Redeemer. Even for the brother he can obtain life from the Saviour. This is the most evident possible argument of the greatness of the power which the prayer of the believing Christian to his Lord possesses. A *commandment* to intercede for the brethren (which, however, is an apostolical precept, 1 Tim. ii. 1—4; Jas. v. 14—20, and elsewhere) it is by no means John's purpose to give. But, assuming the case that a Christian sees his brother Christian (the brother here can only thus be understood) sin, and thus spiritually sicken, he takes it for granted as quite his natural course (to make this prominent he writes, 'his own brother') to repair to Christ in intercession for him. And thereby, he adds, he will give him life; that is, because by his intercession he obtains that the grace which heals his sin is applied to him by the Redeemer. '*He shall give him life:*' to regard God or the Redeemer as the subject here would not only be a syntactical harshness, but would weaken the stringency of the thought in this passage, which simply lies in this, that *the Christian* by means of his prayer to the Redeemer can even give life to others. That John says simply, 'he shall give *life*,' is because the whole context dwells upon the fact that faith in the Redeemer secures life, that is, the true eternal life."

There is nothing more grand and inspiring in all the Bible than the view given by St. John of the transfusion of the eternal life which is in Christ, and was manifested in the flesh, into the nature of the Christian man. He becomes, in St. Paul's words, one spirit with Christ: and that fellowship must have for its issue the expulsion of death and darkness in every form. This is the sublime close of all Scriptural testimonies to Christian experience: justification, adoption, regeneration, sanctification, with their fruits of love and joy and

peace, all rise into and are glorified in the idea of a community of eternal life with Christ. And in the impressive representation which Rothe here worthily descants upon, the same principle of eternal life in Christ gives a new character to sin: not, indeed, an absolutely new character is given to it, but its essential character is in this Epistle more deeply than anywhere else stamped upon it. Sin is death unto death. Of its final issue we shall speak presently; meanwhile, St. John here says by implication that every transgression in the Christian is an invasion of his eternal life: not a suspension of it exactly, nor a suppression of it, but an imperilling of it, and a limitation of its energy. It is very remarkable that St. John does not say, as St. James does at the close of his Epistle, that the sin of the offending brother will be forgiven him, but that "he shall give him life:" shall give to him and as it were restore to him his eternal life. And, finally, what can be more glorious than the Apostle's tribute to the unity between the life of Christ and His living member: he gives by his intercession the life which the Saviour gives by His Spirit.

But what is the "sin unto death"? It is obvious that the Apostle lays much stress on this restriction, as he proceeds to dilate upon it with special reference to intercession. The "sin unto death," whatever it means, is certainly a sin that must issue in one way: there can be no life obtained for that. Our expositor insists that the restriction must not be connected with the "seeing" the brother sin, as if the two kinds of sins were externally distinguishable. "Not unto death" is united with "sin" alone: "if his sinning is not unto death." The condition is not one of the asking, but of the granting the request of life. Certainly there is some truth in this. It cannot be supposed that any mortal upon earth should infallibly mark the presence in any other of the unpardonable sin. But if the expressions are carefully examined, they will be found to indicate something approaching this. The spirit of antichrist has occupied a large place in the Apostle's thought and description: and with reference to that he had said that the believer, having the unction of the Holy One abounding in him, knoweth all things, and can discern the evidence of a total rejection of the incarnate Christ. That this rejection will be final and absolute he cannot know; but he may see that it is at present confirmed, and must feel that for that sin committed by that sinner he cannot pray. The sinner and his sin must be left with God. We feel that the

Apostle would pray for it if he could, and would encourage us to pray for it if he could, but that there is an express interdict on this subject. Whether the sin may be consummated before the end comes, and the last breath of the Spirit's influence withdrawn from the soul before the soul draws its last breath, is left undetermined here, and, as we think, everywhere else in Scripture. But we must give our expositor's note.

"What the sin unto death is must appear to him who is content with John's answer obvious enough. It is that which, as the result of *impœnitentia finalis* (that is, a stiffnecked and consummate impenitence)—but one lasting until the consummation of the kingdom of Christ—has for its results death, that is, the (gradual) annihilation of the individual (Jas. i. 15), called elsewhere the second death; while the sin of him who receives the healing of redemption through grace does not issue in this death, and does not exclude the healed sinner from eternal life. But this sin unto death may appear outwardly in the most manifold forms; yea, in the present life, it is generally speaking never truly consummated. There is nothing so very mysterious in the sin unto death, as exegetes suppose; and so must reject the many definitions of it which have been attempted."

We are quite of the commentator's mind as to the general question here. There is by no means so much difficulty in the matter as St. John leaves it, especially if we connect his words with other express passages of Scripture. The Apostle leaves this awful truth without any further comment of his own. He speaks of it as of one that he must leave to the decision and the judgment of God: he implies that all will perfectly well understand that for it and for its forgiveness there can be no intercessory prayer. Yet with the most exquisite wisdom of charity he abstains from positively interdicting prayer for it, though no less than that can be his meaning. But it is certainly unaccountable that so accurate a critic and so close a thinker as Rothe should allow himself to import into the passage a meaning which is not there, and cannot be forced upon it, namely, that the sin unto death is a sin which has its gradual issue in the final extinction of the being. In general our expositor is very tenacious as to the right of Scripture to explain itself. Nothing is more repugnant to him than the habit of imposing a dogmatic meaning upon isolated passages, especially when that dogmatic meaning is of great importance. Yet here he deliberately sins against his own canon. There is not the shadow of ground for asserting that St. John ever connects

life and death with the notion of mere continuance in being and ceasing to exist. The man either has eternal life or he has not eternal life: in either case he is supposed to exist; and that which has been manifested as eternal life is a possession the absence of which is already death, and not called eternal death only because the charity of the Gospel abstains from the word while there is hope of its reversal. And what shall we say of the argument from the words of St. James? It is precisely of the same character as the forced and reckless exposition of that Apostle's reference to the absence of concupiscence in the regenerate. Here he is made to say that the conceiving lust bringeth forth sin; and that sin, when it has run its course, finishes with extinction. Surely such an interpretation of the word "finished" is contradicted by every instance of its use in the New Testament: it never connotes the end of anything save in the sense of its consummation. Can we suppose the Apostle to have meant that annihilation is the natural result of sin? This is contrary to the entire tenor of Scripture, which makes death the penalty inflicted on sin: not merely as its natural result, but as something superadded. There is no psychology within or without the Scripture which tolerates the notion that anything in sin tends of itself to the dissolution of the substance of the soul. According to Rothe's idea the end of every sinful creature in the universe must be annihilation in virtue of the destructive character of sin itself. But the history of iniquity, as read in the light of the present world, gives no sanction to the thought of any such disintegrating quality of evil. What we know of Satan and his angels tends the other way. And we may be very sure that whatever the penalty of transgression may be, it will be inflicted from without upon a nature fitted, as the Scripture says, for this destruction.

This reminds us of another passage of the volume in which the same doctrine is furtively introduced, with the same unhappy disregard of the inviolability of Scripture. It is introduced in connection with an exposition which we had not marked for comment; but it seems desirable to insert it here. The text is, "He that doeth the will of God abideth for ever;" and the exposition, apart from the closing words of it, is deeply interesting.

"In contrast with that internal vanity of human life which is directed to the world, John makes prominent the blessedness of the life which is directed to God and the performance of His will. The

majority of men think that man can have no greater reality in his aims than when they are pointed to sensible things. Piety is in common estimation pure ideology, at which the sound human understanding must only laugh. John, on the other hand, lays down the only rational idea. If there is to be anything solid in this world there must be a God; all else, taken in itself, is only phenomenon and appearance. And if the life of an individual man is to obtain any reality and solidity, it must hang upon that which is the only pure, Real Being; it must enter into fellowship with Him, and ever more perfectly resign itself to be an instrument of His will. This doing of the will of God is, in a literal sense, the only proper food of the soul of man, through which his sensuous and transitory life is transubstantiated into an eternal one. This we should then particularly lay to heart, when it becomes hard to us to do the will of God. For, the reality of our being is conditioned by this; and the question is of being or not being. . . . . The abiding in eternity is made dependent on the energetic spirit which is devoted in active obedience to the Divine will. John regards the thought of eternal life, of an existence which is imperishable, and uninvaded by any power of time, as one that must impel them to the love of God and a perfect transformation of their course of life. That this great idea has so very little practical influence is one of the most lamentable facts in Christendom. Further, it is to be observed that, according to John, he who doeth not the will of God has no permanent existence in eternity."

But St. John does not say that. If such a thought had been in his mind he would have declared it, as his manner is, unambiguously. All he says is that the phenomenal world, with its vanities feeding the lusts of men, and the lusts themselves as fed by these vanities, is passing away, and will disappear. Substantial life in God, that which alone deserves the name of life, will be the heritage of those who do His will. That those who do not His will shall pass away with the phenomenal world, neither St. John nor any other writer in Scripture asserts. On the contrary, our Lord makes it most emphatic that the souls of all men survive the present state of things; and that He will create new heavens and a new earth, from which sinners shall be excluded: their doom being to be shut out from a new phenomenal universe which shall be both phenomenal and eternal. Hence, and this is the point of our objection to Rothe's view, eternal life and phenomena as such are never in Scripture made antithetical terms. In other words, created nature is not opposed to eternal life; nor eternal life opposed to created nature. That they are regarded as such

is the deep fallacy of all the speculation in this volume. If life in Christ is to be made the exact antithesis of created existence, then it must annihilate, of course, all sinners and all sin with the rest of the creation. But where then would place be found for that part of the saved multitude which is created and material? The issue of this notion is simply Pantheistic. And, if it is to be entertained, the entire Bible must be reconstructed. But to return to our extract. Assuredly, the fearful doctrine of the gradual annihilation of the sinner is not taught by St. John; and it is a most rash misuse of exposition to deduce it from his words. In the present possession of eternal life the Christian is warned against the love of the world, lest he should lose the inestimable blessing he already has. If he, the present possessor of eternal life, performs the will of God, he will abide an eternally living soul in God. If not, he will abide without his eternal life. Such passages as these must be taken to mean what they say, and not forced to yield deductions inconsistent with the rest of Scripture, otherwise great is the havoc that must result. For instance, St. Paul would be made to teach, in Cor. xv., that there is no resurrection of the wicked, in direct contradiction to his own words elsewhere and our Lord's testimony everywhere. St. Peter and some passages of the Apocalypse would be made to teach that the earth would disappear for ever; whereas other Scriptures affirm that the phenomenal world of man will be created anew.

But it is good to turn to a passage which we can entirely approve. It is one that has a peculiar force in these days of Comparative Religion, when the name of Jesus is placed as one among many given under heaven.

"We read here how highly the Apostle rates that which we call Christianity. It is to him the possession of an eternal life given directly by God; and by no means merely a moral illuminism. It is not merely doctrine or hope, not the compendium of new ethical motives and impulses, but a whole and perfect life, a life in itself eternal, which consequently is independent of the condition of our present sensible existence, which is not touched by the decease of our sensuous natural organism. It has its eternal ground in itself, because it is spiritual life. It is eternal life, which we did not beget in ourselves: it is given to us of God. In connection with this, it is absolutely bound up with Jesus the Son of God as its source; with the person of the Redeemer Himself: it is not the result of any particular teaching influence

coming from Him. It can be received and enjoyed by receiving the Lord Himself: Christianity is no other than an actual bond of life between us and Christ; and a Christendom sundered from Him there cannot be. We cannot do Him a worse service than when we bring down His religion from this its high elevation, in order, as we suppose, to accommodate it to the understanding of men; than when we place it in the category of other religions independent of Him. For, in that case, it must submit to the destiny of all *mere* religions; that is, it must decline and disappear after it has done its work, and has guided the consciousness of the generation beyond its own standpoint. To this eternal life of Christianity the Christian must be born again; and this takes place, not through any idealism of the human spirit, but through faith in the historical Individual Christ. Here is the point where high idealism and realism surely meet and are inseparably united.

"It is most certainly true that God has given us eternal life, and that He has given it specifically and exclusively in His Son. We cannot have fellowship with Christ, and not immediately have at the same time life. The Apostles were the first to make this experience: uniting themselves trustfully to Jesus, they experienced at once in their inmost souls a transformation which made their former life appear as death, and their present as actual and imperishable life. This fact is evermore repeating itself in us when we place ourselves in believing contact with Christ; and this itself would constrain us to recognise in Him a living source of eternal life, such as can be in none but God alone. A perfectly absolute objective severance and determination of the conflict between Christianity and the unbelieving world will not take place until the end of human history. By holding fast to Him humanity will actually be born again to everlasting life."

If space allowed, we should have selected a few passages bearing on Christian apologetics, which Rothe handles in a masterly way. One or two extracts we must give, as they meet the difficulties of many around us, but in the form of aphorisms:—"Men easily believe only that which they wish to believe. There is something humbling in this for us. God and Divine things are objects unwished by our hearts; on the other hand, worldly things are desirable: the former repel us, and the latter attract; we have no interest to be assured of God, but find our account in a certain obscurity with regard to Divine things; a God who is only the object of probable conjecture is more desirable than a God who is the object of absolute confidence." "In spite of the clear revelation of the Divine in us, we nevertheless complain of

the want of evidence in God's revelation of Himself. This is unreasonable. God could not evidence Himself more clearly without abolishing our inmost nature. A revelation of the Supreme which would constrain us in a sensible way to acknowledge Him is in itself impossible. We ought not to expect a plainer manifestation of God; but rejoice that we are now so constituted as to be able to believe in a revelation which does not enforce our assent. We shall, indeed, some time have sensible evidence, but then that free faith will be no more possible which becomes the nobility of our human nature. We then only believe when we can no longer withhold faith. John, on the contrary, starts from the presupposition that the testimony of God is greater than any other testimony. In the contest between Divine and human testimony he gives precedence in strength to the former." "It is to be carefully observed that St. John expressly carries up all the testimonies of God to His testimony concerning Christ. He sees in the revelation in Christ the substance of all Divine revelation. If any man would allow validity to the natural and even the earlier historical revelation of God, but not to those given in Jesus the Son of God, he has not yet true faith." "No tranquil observer can deny that the course of human things, under the guidance of God, has brought infinitely near to man the faith in Jesus as the Christ. If the whole history of our race does not issue in this, to bring men to acknowledgment of Christ as its Redeemer, at least all has been ordered as if that were to be the case. If it is not the will of God that we should believe in Jesus, He has led men into a fearful temptation. Striving to keep in view a pure idea of God, we cannot but ascribe to Him nevertheless such a design."

These are but specimens of the high tone assumed by this apologist for Christianity. His notion is that all the facts of our own nature, all the consciousness of history, all the phenomena of the Saviour's life, and all the effects of it in the history of the Church, make it impossible to retain the belief in God, without superadding the belief in Jesus as the Son of God. Every one knows that this Epistle closes with what seems to be a most glorious and absolute tribute to Jesus as the true God and eternal life. Every one knows also that many believing commentators suppose that the "true God and eternal life" refers not to the Son but to the Father. Rothe has most elaborately and most satisfactorily proved that the tribute is expressly offered to the Son. "In His Son

Jesus Christ" gives the nearer definition of one being in the True Being, the concrete form of it: in that we are *in* His Son Jesus Christ, and have fellowship with Him. That by reason of our being in the Son we are actually in Him that is true; the True Being is, of course, only possible so far as the Son is Himself this essentially True Being. Accordingly St. John establishes this most decidedly in the words that follow: "This is the true God and eternal life," words which are substantially the reason assigned for what had just been said. The only natural and obvious reference, the only one that does no violence to the language, of the "This" is not to God, but to the subject immediately preceding "His Son Jesus Christ." This precisely harmonises with the whole context, and the deep thought it unfolds. The subject is everywhere, from verse 11 onwards, that the Redeemer is, and that in Him is, eternal life. This idea is in the highest degree Johannæan. It is the foundation of St. John's religious consciousness that the being of the Redeemer is in the fullest sense Divine; that there is for us no other being of God than that in Him; and, moreover, that His being is the true, imperishable existence, eternal life itself: whence it follows that fellowship with Him is the essential possession of eternal life. Eternal life is, therefore, an appropriate predicate of the Redeemer.

The last words of the Epistle, which are in a certain sense the last words of revelation, are the exhortation to keep ourselves from idols. The exhortation springs naturally from the thought of verse 20, that the Redeemer is the true God and eternal life. For the idea of the true God immediately suggests that of its opposite, the false gods or idols. Every departure from Christ to any other, be he or it whatever it may, is simply and purely idolatry. And this is the solemn thought that is delivered as a final warning to his readers and to all men for ever. Faith in the Redeemer has been the theme throughout the chapter; and it could have had no more appropriate conclusion than this. Rothe thinks that St. John had a more determinate view of the contrast between the Redeemer as the true God and the idols; inasmuch, that is, as in opposition to the *images* of the false gods, the Redeemer as the true *Image* of the invisible God is the true object of adoration. While the idolatry against which St. John warns is in a wider sense (as in Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 5) to be understood of all that is inconsistent with faith in the Saviour and perilous to that

faith, yet we must not include the thought of the possibility of relapse into the idolatry proper of heathenism; the danger of such apostasy, in the midst of so many domestic and social temptations to it, being imminent in the case of weak Christians in that day. The political persecutions that were coming, and the studied attempts soon made to blend all religions in one absolute gnosis, increased that danger. We may close with our author's noble words:

"In this is contained the sublimest doxology which John could upraise to Christ. Everything falls under the category of idolatry which means apostasy from the Redeemer. Christ is that holy Image, that revelation of God given by God Himself, through the religious acknowledgment and reverence of whom alone true devotion is possible, or any piety that unites us with the true God. That adoration of the Redeemer, therefore, which is often regarded as an invasion of the prerogative of the One God, John exhibits as rather the only cultus which is well pleasing to the Supreme: Jesus Christ alone reveals God truly, and that for all men universally. And this He does notwithstanding His servant-form. He who seeth Him with the Father; he who denies the Father in Him does not know the Father at all. This manifestation in the middle of human history is strictly and properly the polestar, keeping which in view we find all things adjusted in their right place. To fasten the gaze of our inner man always and unvaryingly on Him, and at the same time to receive into ourselves the lineaments of His manifestation more and more purely and distinctly, is the great art on which the wisdom of Christian life rests: it is the source of all that which we call the true simplicity of that life."

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

JANET'S FINAL CAUSES.

Final Causes. By Paul Janet, Member of the Institute, Professor at the Faculté des Lettres of Paris. Translated from the French by William Affleck, B.D. With Preface by Robert Flint, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity, University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1878.

TREATISES on teleology have generally assumed one or the other of two characters. Their authors have either, as in the cases of Paley and Derham, confined themselves chiefly to the elaboration of instances of design; or, as in the cases of Kant and, in a less degree, of Lesage, they have devoted their attention to the criticism of the doctrine. Of these two classes of books there can be little doubt as to the relative value. The former multiplies illustrations and phenomena, the mere multiplication of which beyond a certain point is unnecessary and in very small measure helpful to the conclusion. Whereas the latter determines the limitations of the argument, its intrinsic worth, and its inviolability by opposed hypotheses, and imparts all that confidence which results from the knowledge of precisely how far one's position is invulnerable. M. Janet's treatise belongs to the second of these classes, and is by far the ablest in its sphere. It appeared, in the original French edition, in 1876, and has been greeted by an ever-increasing circle of readers with not undeserved applause. Six months ago the French correspondent of one of the most influential newspapers described its publication as "certainly an event in science." If for "science" be substituted "philosophy"—according to a distinction insisted upon by Bacon, the forgetfulness of which has wrought too much mischief in modern speculation to be observed without protest—that description will be readily accepted by the candid, whether their own views agree or disagree with those of M. Janet.

The general question of finality divides itself into two parts,

of which the object of the first is to show that finality is a law of nature, whilst the second has to determine the first cause of finality. To discuss such problems satisfactorily, several qualifications are necessary. Without an accurate acquaintance with the principles, history, and tendencies alike of mechanical and of biological science, the materialistic position could hardly either be fully understood or hopefully assailed; and without much speculative facility and an intimate knowledge of the course of modern metaphysics, the doctrine of an intelligent First Cause could scarcely be recovered from the hands of those who have denied and tried to destroy it. M. Janet was known from his previous publications to possess all these qualifications, and he has certainly shown himself in the present case to deserve to be esteemed as the worthiest champion of Spiritualism against all its foes, of whatever school. In a preface, written specially for this English edition, he thus describes the difference between his own work and that of his predecessors upon the same side. "At the present day the mere adding of facts to facts no longer suffices to prove the existence of a design in nature. . . . . The real difficulty is in the interpretation of these facts; the question is regarding the principle itself. This principle I have endeavoured to criticise. I have sought its foundations, authority, limits, and signification, by confronting it with the data and the conditions of modern science, as well as with the doctrines of the boldest and most recent metaphysics. If my book has any interest, it is in having set forth the problem in all its complexity, under all its aspects, without dissembling any difficulty, and in presenting all the interpretations. Apart from every conclusion, I think I can present it to philosophers of all schools as a complete treatise on the subject. Considered in this point of view, it will at least have, in default of other merit, that of utility." There can be no doubt as to the utility of the book. No other furnishes such effectual weapons against one of the most dangerous forms of modern unbelief. It is remarkable for its fairness in dealing with objections and difficulties, which are as far as possible stated in the very words of those by whom they have been urged. Whilst it is not an absolutely "complete treatise," the region of morality being left almost untouched, it has the merit of being relatively complete—more comprehensive than any previous work upon the subject, purely philosophical in spirit and in form, and lucid and intelligible as only a Frenchman who was at home in his subject could make it.

There are several notable features in M. Janet's contribution to this question. The majority perhaps of his predecessors treat finality as an *à priori* and necessary principle, on a level in that respect with the more general principle of causality. M. Janet, on the contrary, argues from the fact that there are a great number

of phenomena which do not suggest in any manner the idea of an end, whilst the idea of effect is universal, and maintains that finality is not a first principle, but "a law of nature, obtained by observation and induction." "Just as (he writes) the naturalists admit general laws, which are, as they say, rather *tendencies* than strict laws (for they are always more or less mixed with exceptions)—the law of economy, the law of division of labour, the law of connection, the law of correlation: so there is a law of finality which appears to embrace all the preceding laws, a tendency to finality, a tendency evident in organised beings, and which we suppose by analogy in those that are not." The whole of the first book is devoted to the maintenance and illustration of these points. Starting from the principle "that when a complex combination of heterogeneous phenomena is found to agree with the possibility of a future act, which was not contained beforehand in any of these phenomena in particular, this agreement can be comprehended by the human mind only by a kind of pre-existence, in an ideal form, of the future act itself, which transforms it from a result into an end," he examines the process of analogy by which that principle, known to be true in the case of our own industry, is inferred also of the industry of other men, of the instincts and functions and organic formations of animals, and last of all of the industry of nature generally. Having thus shown that the given phenomena are sufficiently explained by the doctrine of finality, he demonstrates the insufficiency of every other interpretation. The mechanical hypothesis is excluded upon the threefold ground—that it violates all the laws of analogical reasoning by forcing us to call in question even the existence of intelligence in other men; that it violates also all the laws of science, by compelling us to acknowledge an absolute hiatus between the phenomena of nature and the intelligence of man; and that it leads ultimately to a contradiction, because it is arrested at last in the presence of the human intelligence and constrained to recognise finality there. The theory of evolution, as applied to organised forms, is proved, on the one hand, to be not irreconcilable with the doctrine of natural finality, and, on the other, to be inexplicable without it. For that theory "either expresses nothing else than the gradation of organic beings, rising by degrees or intervals to less or more perfect forms,—and in this sense the theory, which is that of Leibnitz and Ch. Bonnet, contains nothing opposed to the doctrine of final causes, but even on the contrary naturally appeals to it: or else the theory of evolution is only the theory of chance under a more learned name,—it expresses the successive gropings attempted by nature, until favourable circumstances brought about such a throw of the dice as is called an organisation made to live; and, thus understood, it falls under the objections which such an hypothesis has at all

times raised." The first book is completed by a chapter which deals with all difficulties, from that of Lucretius and the Epicureans down to the most modern confusion of the final cause with the supernatural by Positivists, and the latest plea of naturalists that some organs are rudimentary and some adaptations apparently hurtful. Obviously the great value of this first part of the treatise consists in the absolute certainty with which step by step the argument advances, the thoroughness with which objections are met and removed, and the ever-increasing firmness and solidity of the foundations upon which the doctrine is made to rest. There is no evasion of difficulty. The inner citadel is surrounded by a wall, so skilfully built that there is left no possibility of breach.

If possible, M. Janet's second book is even more valuable than the first, inasmuch as its object is to maintain the physico-theological proof of the existence of God against the assaults of those who have denounced it. Necessarily the statement of that proof is no sooner completed than Kant's twefold limitation of it comes into view. And here the philosophical subtlety and boldness of M. Janet appear conspicuous. Other masters of eclectic spiritualism, MM. V. Cousin and Emile Saisset, for example, have accepted Kant's criticism, and recurred to other proofs to complete the demonstration beyond the point to which the doctrine of finality confessedly carried it. M. Janet, on the contrary, not only finds a clear *ignoratio elenchi* in the criticism he is engaged in repelling, but also shows that the two sides of that criticism contradict and destroy one another, whilst the gradual decay of Polytheism and Manicheism, in proportion as humanity has become more enlightened, testifies against it. Next the hypotheses of immanent and of unconscious finality in Schelling, Hegel, Fortlage, and the whole school of German Pantheism, are grappled with. And the entire argument is summed up thus: "It is combination—that is to say, the rencounter of a very great number of heterogeneous elements in a single and determinate effect—that is the decisive reason of finality. The agreement and proportion existing between such a rencounter and such an effect would be a mere coincidence (that is, an effect without a cause) if the effect to be reached were not itself the cause of the combination. Mechanism, in explaining the production of each effect by its own cause, does not explain the production of an effect by the rencounter and agreement of causes. It is thus condemned . . . . to explain the universe by the fortuitous, *i.e.*, by chance. Fortunate rencounters, favourable circumstances, unforeseen coincidences, must be multiplied without end, and continually increase in number, as the universe passes from one degree to another, from one order of phenomena to another. Is it sought to explain this faculty of combination which nature

possesses, and which is like that of the industrious animals and the innate art of instinct, by an analogous cause,—*i.e.*, by a sort of instinct,—nature proceeding to its end, like the animal itself, without knowing and without willing it, by an innate tendency? In admitting such an hypothesis, we should do nothing but state the very fact of combination, while assigning it to some unknown cause, called instinct, by analogy, but which would tell nothing more than the fact to be explained, viz., that nature goes towards ends. The only way in which we can conceive an end is to view it as a pre-determined effect. But how can an effect be pre-determined except so far as it is designed beforehand, and pre-conceived in the efficient cause called to produce it? And can this preconception or predestination be for us anything but the idea of the effect? And, in fine, what can an idea be but an intellectual act, present to a mind in consciousness? Take away consciousness from an intellectual act, and what will remain but an empty, dead concept, a potential concept? Take away this concept itself from the efficient cause, and what will remain but an indeterminate tendency, which nothing will lead towards one effect rather than another? Take away even this tendency, and what will remain? Nothing—at least, nothing that can serve to connect the present with the future; nothing that can explain the rencounter of causes with the effect. This rencounter being the problem to be solved, even the hypothesis of tendency establishes a certain intermediary between cause and effect; the hypothesis of the concept adds to it a new intermediary; the conscious concept, such is the third degree, such is the true link of cause and effect. There the range of our vision stops; beyond begins the region of the Unknowable, which the Gnostics admirably called the Abyss and Silence. We too keenly feel the limits of our reason to make our own conceptions the measure of the Absolute Being; but we have too much confidence in His veracity and goodness not to believe that human conceptions have a legitimate and necessary relation to things as they are in themselves. .... Such a hypothesis (the highest that the human mind can form regarding the Supreme Cause of the universe) may well be but an approximation to the truth, and a human representation of the Divine nature; but although inadequate to its object, it does not follow that it is unfaithful to it. It is its projection into a finite consciousness, its translation into the language of men, which is all that philosophy can demand" (pp. 441, 442).

A chapter on the "Supreme End of Nature,"—which M. Janet makes to be, not God Himself, since that would argue some original imperfection in God, nor man, since that would argue that the end was not adequate to the cause, nor *à fortiori* the creatures inferior to man, but morality,—naturally completes the treatise. Several appendices follow, in the first and most im-

portant of which the problem of induction is discussed. The Scotch solution by the doctrine of the stability of the laws of nature is rejected on the ground that that doctrine is itself a consequence of induction, which is regarded as reducible to the two propositions, that "every constant coincidence of phenomena has its reason of being," and that "a given cause (considered in the same point of view and in the same circumstances) always produces the same effect that has once been given."

It remains only to add that Mr. Affleck has accomplished his very difficult task of translation with great success. Except in two respects, an entirely inordinate attachment to the personal use of the verb "behove," and such a confusion of the auxiliaries "would" and "should" as amounts practically to the exclusion of the latter from the language, a purist could find but little fault. In an imperfect world it is perhaps vain to hope for a translation without blemish; and we are grateful to Mr. Affleck for his correct, fluent, easy rendering of a work which in less skilful hands would have suffered much.

Philippi on Romans. Vol. I.

Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By Friedrich Adolph Philippi, Doctor and Ordinary Professor at Rostock. Translated from the Third Improved and Enlarged Edition. By the Rev. J. S. Banks, Manchester. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1878.

This volume of 421 pages extends to the seventeenth verse of the eighth chapter. It is worthy to rank high among the many excellent foreign works, for access to which English readers are indebted to the enterprising ability of the Messrs. Clark. Nor must the scholarly translator go unthanked, who, while faithfully discharging the duties of a Wesleyan minister, finds time thus to enrich our Biblical literature. In an exposition of words and phrases, fulness of knowledge, keenness of perception, and soundness of judgment are more to be desired and expected than elegant flow of diction. Good commentaries are generally abrupt in style, as the most fluent are often the most shallow. It is but just praise to say the work before us belongs to the former class. In his lucid introduction, our author shows that the Roman Church, consisting of Jews and Gentiles, was probably formed by believers soon after returning from the Pentecostal baptism at Jerusalem. The Romish tradition of its founding by St. Peter is properly treated as a "fable," because, *inter alia*, it conflicts with Paul's principle of not building on another man's foundation. This portion of Holy Scripture needed

no lengthy defence of its authenticity or canonicity, which, from the first, have been almost undisputed. Philippi sees good reasons for concluding that, according to the subscription, the epistle was written from Corinth about A.D. 58, or 59, and sent by the hands of Phebe, on her "casual journey" to the imperial city, some while prior to the Apostle's first visit. "The epistle was to be a substitute for Paul's personal preaching in Rome (comp. i. 15). Hence it contains, as no other does, a systematic doctrinal exposition of the specially Pauline gospel. . . . The didactic Roman epistle stands in a similar relation to the polemic Galatian epistle, as the Ephesian to the Colossian epistle." (Intro. p. 10.) An interesting *excursus* of twenty-two pages on the Protevangelium, (Gen. iii. 15) first published in 1855, is interjected at the end of the fourth chapter, proceeding on the maxim of Augustine, "The New Testament is *en*closed in the Old, the Old is *dis*closed in the New."

Our commentator's method is rigidly critical, abounding in Greek and Latin quotations, but seldom done into English. The work is evidently addressed to the learned, though even they would have found it a great convenience had the Greek text been placed at the head of the page, as in most of our English commentaries. Few will be able to read it thoroughly without very frequent reference to the Greek Testament.

The theology is refreshingly evangelical, following the general lines of Augustine and Luther, yet at times differing from both, and always evincing vigour and independence of thought. On the doctrine of sin, vicarious atonement, justification by faith, the relation of justification to sanctification, the proper Divine Sonship of our Lord, and everlasting punishments and rewards, rationalism receives no quarter, and by the maintenance of positive Gospel truth is made to appear alien to Holy Scripture. On some subordinate matters, such as the *spirituality* of the Israelites, whether Jews or Gentiles believing, who stand as the beneficiary heirs of the blessings promised to the seed of Abraham, Philippi's sound interpretation agreeably contrasts with much of the wild talk we hear about superseding this dispensation of the Spirit by a sort of restored Jewish theocracy. The morbid sentimentalism, too, of much modern teaching may find its rebuke in such clear notes as this:—"ὀργὴ θεοῦ (Rom. i. 18). Just as little as ἀγάπη is *manifestation* of love, is ὀργή *manifestation* of wrath, as *metonymia causæ pro effectu* = κόλασις, τιμώρια. Rather does ὀργή denote an inner modification of the divine nature itself, the inwardly energetic antagonism and repellent force of its holiness in relation to human sin, which divine affection, without doubt, finds its expression in the infliction of punishment" (p. 44).

The excellence of the work as a whole, however, must not blind us to questionable positions necessary or incidental to the theo-

logical school to which the writer belongs. To say, for instance, that "the work of atonement and justification conditioned thereby, as the τετέλεσται of the Lord on the cross testifies (John xix. 30), is finished with the death of the Atoner" (p. 204), may mean that justification by virtue of the atonement passed *at that time* upon the *race*, in relation to its guilt incurred by Adam, and not immediately after the perpetration of the sin; but that sense would deprive the pre-ordained atonement of efficacy for pardon in pre-Christian ages (see Rom. v. 18). Or it may mean that the relation of justification to the atonement was fixed at the period of the Lord's death; but that would conflict equally with the truth; seeing the same relation held from the beginning. Or it may mean that all who should be justified subsequently to the death of the Cross, as individual believers, were individually justified at the hour of that death; but that would disagree with the fact that sinners, according to Scripture, are not personally justified until they believe (see *e.g.* Acts xvi. 31; Rom. iii. 30; iv. 24). Neither does τετέλεσται imply any of these meanings.

On the righteousness which came "*upon all men* unto justification of life" (Rom. v. 18), Philippi says, "that by πάντες ἄνθρωποι are only meant all that believe," and thus he ignores the deliverance of the race as such, by the last Adam, from the guilt incurred by the first Adam; a justification, which by no means involves as he seems to think, the final "universal restoration" of all men. This limitation mutilates the apt and striking antithesis between the condemnation of all men through the offence of one, and the justification of all men through the righteousness of one; so leaving the condemnation of all to be balanced by the justification of a part, and that without anything in the passage to require or warrant the limitation. To quote 1 Cor. xv. 22, in support of this one-sided contraction is only to spoil the same antithesis in one more text; for the "all" made alive in Christ are the same "all" as died in Adam.

Philippi rightly says, in reference to "*where*" (Rom. v. 20), "In the same sphere in which sin increased, grace abounded beyond measure"; but wrongly adds, "this sphere is no other than the nation of Israel placed under the law." The scope and connection of the passage seem to require that we understand the sphere to be as wide as human nature.

As little can we agree with our erudite author when he attributes the inward conflict between good and evil set forth in Rom. vii. to the *regenerate* state of the apostle and other believers. No argument is adduced sufficient to overthrow the reference of the conflict to the struggles of an unregenerate soul awakened by the word and spirit of God to a sense of the evil of his sin, as in the penitents David (Ps. li.), the jailer (Acts xvi.), Saul himself (Acts viii.), and many others, whose entrance into the peace of

believing has been preceded by futile and painful endeavours to fulfil the law. The "all manner of concupiscence," the being "dead," "sold under sin," doing what he hated, captivity to the law of sin, the presence, power, and activity of sin, and the extreme wretchedness by which the state is characterised, correspond to the experiences of the penitent sinner better than to those of men enjoying the purity and tranquility of the new birth. Notwithstanding comparison with Gal. v. 17, the passage will not help the Calvinistic view. The text in Galatians points out, in the abstract, the opposition of "the flesh," showing how powerless Christian disciples would be if they became subject to its dominion. But surely, considering what "the works of the flesh" are as mentioned in verses 19-21, we are not to suppose believers are so subject.

Again, after well indicating the distinction between the witness of God's Spirit, and of our own to adoption (Rom. viii. 16), Philippi falls somewhat short of the whole truth when he observes, "But the latter (Spirit of God) witnesses this not by an immediate assurance, but by means of the general word of promise which He applies to the particular individual in whom He dwells" (p. 419). This is to lose sight of the distinction just made; for it resolves the witness of the Spirit into a process of reasoning to a conclusion from the promises as the premisses, or else it identifies it with ascertaining the truth of a fact previously existent; whereas the witness of the Spirit, as distinguished from that of our own spirit, is a direct testimony to the fact of our adoption.

Philippi clings to the imputation of Christ's righteousness to believers; which implies an exchange of places between Christ and them, that is, Christ takes their place in sin, and they His in righteousness. But He nowhere in Scripture finds a basis for the dogma. Indeed, while Adam's sin was imputed to the whole species, and the sin of the species imputed to Christ, and faith is counted for righteousness; neither in the Old Testament or the New is the righteousness of Christ ever imputed to believers. Of this our author appears to be well aware; for on Rom. iv. 6, he says "we must not, with the older exegetes, supply Χριστοῦ, by which course we should get the doctrine of the *justitia Christi imputata* in a directly scriptural expression" (p. 117.) He can reach the doctrine only "by a natural consequence" as he thinks "from the Pauline order of thought." And yet he reiterates it as if it were expressly revealed. On the contrary, we deem it an incongruous addition to the Pauline doctrine. By that righteousness of Christ in which He made atonement we are saved. And at page 279 Philippi says the δικαίωμα of Christ "is the death of Christ upon which the Apostle has hitherto exclusively based our reconciliation and justification." Our justification is

thus *based* upon the righteousness of Christ: the *benefit* of His righteous death is imparted to us: we are saved *for the sake* of Christ, because He became our substitute. But that is very different, from the righteousness of Christ "imparted to us by way of gift" (p. 272), or "imputation of the righteousness of Christ" (p. 281). The more correct expression "justification *depending* on Christ's righteousness" (p. 269) is inconsistent with the words on the same page referring to the same gift as "*consisting* in the imputation of the righteousness of Christ in justification." An admissible sense may be put on the the words, "'faith is reckoned as righteousness,' seeing that this is done by grace for the sake of Christ's righteousness"; but it is simply a *petitio principii* to take this "as equivalent to the proposition: 'Christ's righteousness is reckoned to the believer as righteousness'" (p. 172). To Calvinistic theologians there is a charm in the supposed parallel between the imputation of our sin to Christ, and of His righteousness to us; whereas the true parallel is between the imputation of the first Adam's sin to us, and of our sin to the last Adam. In Rom. v. 15 the gift of God (χαρισμα) needs no imputation of Christ's righteousness for its complement as Philippi imagines; for that is found in the *death* of many "through the offence of one." The notion of complete "exchange of places" tends to obscure the simple but real substitution of Christ for us under the penalty of the broken law.

Taken, however, with a grain of Arminian, or more accurately Pauline, salt, the commentary before us, added to the multitude already in existence, is no superfluity, but a valuable acquisition for which earnest students of the Word will be thankful. We have noticed several typographical errors.

Hagenbach's History of the Reformation, Vol. I.

Hagenbach's History of the Reformation in Germany. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1878.

Among the dishonourable tactics of the Anglican Romanisers, from the rise of their school under the name of Tractarianism to the full-blown Ritualism of the present day, has been the habit of disparaging the Reformation and calumniating its great leaders. Martin Luther, the most central figure, whom millions of intelligent Christians have delighted to honour, has been aspersed vigorously by Dr. Newman, Mr. Ward, and their party, and on other grounds, even Dr. Mill and Sir W. Hamilton some years ago appeared as assailants; but his vindication by such defendants as Ranke and Hare, has left his reputation much less damaged than that of his opponents. On the maxim, as it might seem, that if plenty of mud be thrown some of it will stick, extravagant

impugners of the virulent type of Dr. Littledale and the *Church Times* persist in vilifying the men to whom, as instruments of Divine Providence, Christendom owes an immense debt of gratitude for the Christian light and liberty enjoyed during the last three centuries. True the calumniators would bestow very little attention on those mighty leaders if it were not that by discrediting them, it is hoped to discredit the Reformation itself, and the vital truths of which it was the embodiment. But even if they could succeed in fastening grave charges upon the teachers, it would not necessarily and logically follow that the doctrines taught were false, and that the changes inaugurated were correspondingly evil. That is a test which no system in the world is less able to bear than that of the Romish and Anglican sacerdotalists. While therefore some are striving to obfuscate the public mind respecting the facts of the wonderful upheaving which distinguishes the sixteenth century from all others, it is satisfactory to Christian believers, as it is a gain to the cause of true Christianity, to see another history of the Reformation written in the popular style of the volume before us, so excellently done into English, and marked by the fulness of knowledge, the carefulness of investigation and statement, and the philosophical insight already known to characterise the works of Professor Hagenbach.

The leading spirits of the Reformation, like the early Methodists, had no premeditated plan, and scarcely a preconception of the extent and shape of their movement. Step by step they entered into the openings of Providence, not knowing whither they were to be led. It is the office of the scientific historian of the Reformation to trace as far as possible the manifold influences at work, and the relation of cause and effect in the successive stages of progress, indicating how the whole, though disjointed and perhaps chaotic in the eyes of its immediate subjects, nevertheless possessed, like nature, the beautiful unity which was derived from the supreme design and control of the Divine mind. Accordingly Dr. Hagenbach presents to the reader's view, not a heap of fortuitous events, but an account showing something of a Divine mastery and order in the transactions of the time, impressively illustrative of our Lord's overruling and gracious presence with His militant Church. Under God many forces converged to produce the Reformation. The Gospel flame, which the middle ages never wholly extinguished, was raised from time to time by the noble testimonies of the Wyckliffs and the Husses. The great work was also aided by the "Humanists" in the latter end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, who, notwithstanding their tincture of classical paganism, and their scant subjective acquaintance with evangelical truth and grace, did much to expose the fœtid rottenness of the Romish

fabric. There was the reaction of European public opinion against the absurd dogmas which, with many of the priesthood, were but the husk of an ill-concealed infidelity, as well as against the lax morals and hypocritical hierarchism of the time with its infamous traffic in indulgences. Political complications played their part too, sometimes for, and sometimes against the good work. Probably had there been no jealousies or antipathies between the civil powers the reformers might at some crises have experienced a universal proscription. These and similar causes, but especially the revival of learning and the invention of printing, synchronised in the order of Providence with the qualification and call of Luther, Zwingli, and their fellow-workers for that stupendous struggle and victory which through all time must rank as the greatest religious movement yet experienced in Europe since the first propagation of Christianity.

The interest of this volume, which deals with the Reformation in Germany, and German Switzerland, is largely due to the clear portraitures of the principal characters. The brave Reuchlin whose love of sacred knowledge broke through all restraints of custom and prejudice, the chivalrous knight Ulrich Von Hutten, erroneously supposed to be the author of the *Letters of Obscure Men* which so mercilessly scathed the papists, Erasmus whose advanced scholarship was said to lay the egg which Luther hatched, but whose timidity kept him aloof from the Reformation, the godly educationist Jacob Wimpheling, the fiery fanatical Karlstadt, and the wild prophets of Zwickau, Frederick the Wise. Tetzel and Samson, the pope's dealers in indulgences, the learned and clear-sighted Œcolampadius, who, unlike Erasmus, identified himself thoroughly with the good cause, Francis Von Sickengen whose castle at Ebernburg was a refuge for persecuted reformers, and many other friends and foes, are briefly yet graphically sketched. But of course the prominent figures are Luther and Zwingli with their respective companions Melancthon and Leo Juda. Between Luther and Zwingli there were points of striking similarity and contrast. We have a fine specimen of discrimination in our author's comparison of these two foremost men. "In their personalities they have much in common with each other. Vigour, earnestness, courage, sterling worth and decision of character, sincere and hearty piety, challenge our admiration in both. Both are men of their people, loved and honoured by those who approach them without prejudice, hated by the adversaries of light and by time-servers; in both we discern an equal readiness to lay down property and life for the cause of God, the cause of Jesus Christ, in which they perceive the well-being of humanity to be involved. The necessity for the individual I of the natural man to perish, in order that it may attain to true life as a new man in Christ, may be gathered from Luther's preaching as

well as from Zwingli's; it is proclaimed as by *one* mouth by both these witnesses for the truth. . . . Luther had not *more sensibility* (for understanding and sensibility maintained the most perfect equipoise in Zwingli), but more *imagination*, more *buoyancy* of mind, than the latter. Zwingli, on the other hand, excelled Luther in firmness and security of judgment in individual cases. He was more sober and judicious, and, manifestly, more free from prejudices; and while Luther not seldom bordered on fanaticism, so that there was but a step between his enthusiasm and downright exaggeration, Zwingli always abides within the bounds of moderation. It is, therefore, almost laughable when Luther, in the midst of his fanatical fury of passion, calls honest Zwingli a fanatic,—a man who was so far removed from all fanaticism! It must be that by this name it was intended to designate the idealistic feature of his character (and that, indeed, was obnoxious to the blunt realism of Luther). . . . Both may be regarded as representatives of their respective nations; they issued from the people, and they had perfect command of the language of the people, being never at a loss for the right expression, blunt though that may have been, and bordering on the plebeian. The prevalent quality of the one was a mystical intuition; that of the other strong practical sense. . . . We find in Luther more of the profound investigator, whose attention is directed chiefly to the inner world and its mysteries; in Zwingli, more of the sober thinker, who scans all things with the utmost consideration, and applies all things to practical life and morals in the civil and domestic community. . . . The predominant faculty of Zwingli's mind was reflection; the predominant faculty of Luther's, intuition" (pp. 351-8). It might be due to some of these qualities that Zwingli so far excelled Luther in freeing himself from the mediæval absurdities of the "real presence," though the former, to say the least, seems to have taught less than the truth respecting the covenant character of the Eucharist.

Sir W. Hamilton hinted that the religious and social evils of Germany in this century might have their germs in Luther's teaching. For the most part the charge was refuted by Archdeacon Hare in his *Vindication of Luther*. Still it would be hazardous to affirm that there was no truth at all in the suggestion. On the subject, for example, of inspiration, in which Germany has receded to such lengths during the last fifty years, Luther appears to have tested the inspiration of a sacred book too much by the standard of his own judgment respecting its doctrinal value. Thus tried, few of the sacred books are safe. Following this rule he disliked the Apocalypse, and called the Epistle of James "an epistle of straw" because it seemed to clash with his views on the subject of justification. But, in justice to this great and devout man, Hare points out from the context that

Luther is giving a *comparative* estimate. After mentioning John's Gospel and first Epistle, the Epistles of Paul, especially Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians, and Peter's first Epistle, Luther's remark is, "These are the books which set Christ before you, and teach you everything necessary and salutary for you to know, even though you were never to see any other book or doctrine. Therefore the Epistle of St. James is an epistle of straw by the side of these; for it has no true evangelical character" (*Vindication of Luther*, p. 216). Moreover, in all editions after 1526 he omitted the objectionable phrase; and *Gaussen* (*Canon of the Holy Scriptures*) says he "afterwards retracted that imprudent saying." Nor must it be forgotten that some opinions were held by Luther which were not much shared by the other Coryphei. It is noteworthy that Hagenbach while mentioning this dislike of Luther to the Epistle, makes no reference to these important qualifications. Indeed, we are not thoroughly satisfied with the view of inspiration attributed to Luther by our author with evident approval, when he says,—"Luther held, as the Christian faith has always held, the Bible to be the work of the *Divine Spirit*. But he did not with scrupulous anxiety strive to hold this spirit captive to the letter. And although, in contradistinction to fanatic enthusiasts, he rated the *written* word of God above all else, he also took it for granted that the Spirit of God bloweth where He listeth; and, in conformity to this belief, he regarded the beautiful songs of the Church, which contributed to his edification, as promptings of the Holy Spirit, they having originated in impulses similar to those which gave birth to the pious songs of the Prophets and the Psalmists" (p. 161). From the notion of inspiration here implied it is not a great step to the modern theory which identifies the genius of Shakespeare with the inspiration of Paul. And it need have been no marvel if the peasants led by Münzer and the fanatical prophets of Zwickau, though condemned by Luther, laid claim to inspiration in defence of their extravagant doctrine and practice.

Taken as a whole, however, the volume is a worthy enrichment of Reformation literature, the voluminous dimensions previously attained notwithstanding. A subject which the Protestant Churches can no more allow to die than British patriotism can become oblivious to its national history, is here treated in one of its most important sections, with a masterly hand. The work, so far as out, is learned and reliable without being tedious, compact yet luminous, and intensely interesting, and leaves in the reader's mind a zest, which anticipates with pleasure the appearance of the second volume.

Stoughton's Religion under Queen Anne and the Georges.

Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges, 1702—1800. By John Stoughton, D.D. Two Vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1878.

Studies of the eighteenth century are accumulating upon us. Works like those of Lecky and Leslie Stephen deal chiefly with the social, moral and literary aspects of the period. Dr. Stoughton's field is the religious world. We do not think that the result of these fuller investigations will be greatly to modify the received impressions as to the character of the last century. Our knowledge on the subject is methodised and increased, our ideas are made more definite, but the outline remains the same. The more the history is studied, the more evident it will be that the rise of Methodism had as great an influence in the religious sphere in England, as the French Revolution had in the political across the Channel. It is, in fact, the great outstanding event in the period treated of in these volumes. Mr. Lecky has done full justice to this fact from his standpoint. Dr. Stoughton does the same. He says: "Methodism, in all its branches, is a fact in the history of England, which developes into large and still larger dimensions as time rolls on; this must be felt by every impartial historian, whatever may be his own private opinions." Methodists certainly are not likely to depreciate the greatness of the last century.

Dr. Stoughton's field embraces the whole religious life of England in all its forms and manifestations, not any single section or aspect of it. Laymen, like Johnson, Cowper, John Thornton, Raikes, Howard, Wilberforce, are not overlooked. Every church—Anglican, Independent, Baptist, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Quaker, Moravian, Swedenborgian — together with offshoots such as the Kilhamite movement, receives its due share of attention. The relations of church and dissent, doctrinal controversies, the character of the preaching, worship and literature, the rise of modern missions and religious societies, are brought under review. The volumes throw considerable light on a fact of which not much is generally known—the decline of Presbyterianism in England, or rather its transition into Unitarianism. Let us hope that a like fate does not await the revived Presbyterianism of our own time. The safeguard is that contemporary Presbyterianism is organised into churches, instead of being left to the isolation of independent congregations. It is not very consistent in Unitarian teachers to proclaim their descent from the old Puritans, with whom they have so little in

common. A descent it is. The eighteenth century saw also the extinction of the Nonjurors and the rise of the Evangelical party.

Dr. Stoughton draws his material as well from unpublished as published sources. Scarce manuscripts and tracts in public libraries, local histories, family tradition and reminiscence have supplied many touches. Still these materials would avail little in unskilful hands. We have too many volumes which are the mere dry bones of history, without unity or informing soul. Dr. Stoughton's, of course, are no such hands. He not only paints but frames his pictures, and does one as skilfully as the other. The setting of circumstances and incident is always appropriate and in good taste. The volumes abound in vignettes and English interiors. Their charm consists in the mass of individual portraiture they contain. Many hundreds of writers, preachers, and other are characterised at greater or less length. These portraits impart life and animation to the pages. Familiar names become to us more than names, and many unfamiliar ones receive the honour due but long withheld. These latter will not be the least interesting to readers. We are taken into many corners and byeways and hidden nooks, where good lives were lived, and good work done, away from the dust and tumult of the world's highway. "To what is called the philosophy of history, these volumes make no pretension. . . . To be philosophical is to be polemical, and polemical discussion, properly so called, I have wished to avoid." We have almost too much of the "philosophy of history" in these days. Every little chronicler aspires to the part of Thucydides. It is refreshing to meet with one who is content, like Herodotus, to tell a plain story. Dr. Stoughton is wonderfully impartial, we had almost said neutral. If his pen is steeled with truth, it is also dipped in charity. We doubt whether one of those whom his pages commemorate, orthodox or heterodox, would object to the representations of opinion and character given. Notwithstanding the miscellaneous character of the contents, there is no confusion. The different threads are kept distinct. The volumes are discursive without being rambling.

Dr. Stoughton has elicited some new facts. One of the strong points relied upon by Atterbury in reply to the charge of treason, was that there was no place where conspirators could have met without discovery. He always lived at home, and, when in the Deanery, never stirred out of one room. "It is curious, after the lapse of so many years, that in 1864, a long closet in the Deanery was discovered behind the library fireplace, reached by a rude ladder, and capable of holding eight persons. Here according to a vague tradition before the discovery, secret consultations of the kind alleged might have been held."—Vol I. p. 121, 122.

The last days of Ken, the best of the Nonjurors, were in keeping with his life. "His days at Longleat are amongst the treasured memories of one of England's fairest spots; and his last journeys derive a tender pathos from the singular fact of his carrying his shroud in his portmanteau,—he remarking that it 'might be as soon wanted as any other of his habiliments.' He put it on himself some days before the last; and in holy quietness and peace, his death was as beautiful as his life. Not less beautiful was his burial. He was buried at Frome Selwood 'the nearest parish within his own diocese' to the place where he died, as by his own request 'in the church-yard under the east window of the chancel, just at sun rising, without any manner of pomp or ceremony, besides that of the order for burial in the Liturgy in the Church of England, on the 21st day of March, 1710, anno aetat 73.' Burial at night was the fashion of that age; how much more appropriate was the funeral of this eminent Christian in the early morning!"

As an example of the obscure worthies on whose course Dr. Stoughton succeeds in shedding some light, we may instance Harmer, whose "Observations on Scripture" struck out a new path in Biblical illustration in which many greater men have since followed. For fifty years he pursued his quiet course as Nonconformist minister in the village of Wattisfield, in Sussex. "Within a snug Nonconformist parsonage, not yet pulled down, he collected all the books he could procure bearing on the subject, and wrote to learned friends in every direction, seeking such assistance as they could render. In country lanes, running by pleasant homesteads, one can picture this retired student of the Bible, and of nature as its expository hand-book, taking his daily walk, botanising and musing on Scripture plants, flowers and trees, and trying to find resemblances to them in Suffolk hedgerows and gardens. A few of Mr. Harmer's letters have been published, and they exhibit him as an antiquary, describing coins, and rejoicing in a coronation medal of Charles I., which he had purchased for the sum of one shilling—a fact which may inspire envy in the breasts of modern collectors. His merits as a student do not seem to have been appreciated by his village congregation, nor were his 'Observations' at first duly estimated by some of his friends. 'I thought, sir,' said a lady, 'you would have published a *good* book.'" His flock do not seem to have known that their pastor was an author. For fifty years he addressed a flourishing congregation in a quaint, old-fashioned meeting-house; and fathers, with their sons, daughters, and grandchildren, learned to look up to their learned pastor with respect and love for his personal virtues and the exemplary discharge of his ministrations."

On the other hand, Risdon Darracott, one of Doddridge's

pupils, was an example of a fervent, powerful evangelist. He was settled at Wellington, Somerset, where he repeated Baxter's work at Kidderminster. "He traversed the country round, set up charity schools, promoted the circulation of religious books, and so diffused the power of Christianity, that 'some very profligate and abandoned sinners were deeply struck.'" Sunday ale-houses were empty, Sunday barbers idle, the streets cleared of loiterers. "He died at the age of 42, and his ministry proves, in connection with other instances, that this particular type of ecclesiastical character was not unknown in England during the first half of the eighteenth century."

Samuel Jones, an Oxford man, ejected from a Welsh living, kept an academy at Gloucester. He must have been a great teacher. Bishop Butler, Archbishop Secker, Dr. Samuel Chandler, Jeremiah Jones, author "A New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament," were among the pupils, who studied logic as well as Greek and Latin, Jewish antiquities and Hebrew, the Talmud, Masora and Cabala. "On Wednesdays they read Dionysius's Periegesis with notes mostly geographical; and Isocrates and Terence were conned twice a week. The boys rose at five o'clock every morning and always spoke Latin, except when below stairs amongst the family." Jeremiah Jones was minister at Nailsworth in Gloucestershire, and died in 1724 at the early age of thirty-one. His work is still a standard authority on the subject, and had the honour of being printed at a University press. "The good man sleeps amidst the charming Cotswold scenery, in a burial ground called Forest Green, a cleared space in the heart of ancient woods, where Nonconformists in days of persecution had been wont to meet for divine worship."

Dr. Chandler wrote Greek as readily as English. He was minister of a Presbyterian congregation in the Old Jewry. Conversing once with a bishop on the defects of Dissenters, the latter said, "Why, doctor, do you not leave them?" on which Chandler replied, "My lord, I would, if I could find a worthier body of people."

Old John Hearn, the Oxford antiquary, has the following text on his gravestone: "Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations: ask thy father, and he will shew thee, thy elders, and they will tell thee." George III. told the Countess of Huntingdon of a certain conversation between himself and a church dignitary. The bishop complained of the disturbance which some of Lady Huntingdon's students had made in his diocese. "Make bishops of them, make bishops of them," said the king. "That might be done," replied the bishop, "but, please your majesty, we cannot make a bishop of Lady Huntingdon." "It would be a lucky circumstance if you could," added

the queen, to which the king added, "I wish there was a Lady Huntingdon in every diocese in the kingdom." George the II.'s queen asked the eccentric Mr. Whiston, "What fault do people find with my conduct?" He answered, "The fault they most complain of is your majesty's habit of talking in chapel." She promised amendment, and asked the next fault. "When your majesty has amended this, I'll tell you of the next," was the ingenious reply. The same queen once asked Dr. Pearce, Bishop of Rochester, whether he had read the pamphlets of Dr. Stebbing and Mr. Forster upon the sort of heretics meant by St. Paul in Titus iii. 10, 11. "Yes, madam," replied the doctor, "I have read all the pamphlets written by them on both sides of the question." "Well," said the queen, "which of the two do you think to be in the right?" "I cannot say, madam, which of the two is in the right: but I think that both of them are in the wrong."

The volumes are evidently printed with great care, but every mistake is not excluded. Dr. Priestley's name is sometimes spelt Priestly. On p. 310, Vol. II., Father Berrington of Oscott figures as "Mrs. Berrington." These are printer's errors. Once Dr. Stoughton nods, Vol. I. p. 305, "A Hebrew Bible belonging to Schwartz, with his autograph and the chair in which he was accustomed to sit, are (!) preserved at the office of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel."

Oosterzee's Practical Theology.

Practical Theology; a Manual for Theological Students. By Professor J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D. Translated and adapted to the use of English readers by Maurice J. Evans, B.A., joint translator of Van Oosterzee's "Christian Dogmatics." London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1878.

This is certainly the most complete treatise on practical theology or "the science of labour for the kingdom of God" that we know. It comprises both the scientific treatment of the different branches of ministerial work, and the devotional treatment of ministerial life. The spirit which prevades such a book as Baxter's "Reformed Pastor," is combined with the spirit one has a right to look for in any exposition of the sciences which govern the relationships of a congregation and its leader. Nor, in the abundance of the material thus presented, is there any important omission. Ecclesiastical law is rightly relegated to the domain of historic theology; but due place is given to pastoral government and the maintenance of church discipline in the chapter which deals with Poimenica. Apostolics too receives no special section;

there is very little that may justly be comprehended under that title which will not be found in its proper position amidst the functions of the homilete or of the pastor, or in the appendix which is devoted to activities in behalf of those who stand outside the church. The publishers of "The Theological and Philosophical Library" have hitherto been very happy in their choice of text-books, and need be ashamed of nothing they have presented to their subscribers. This, their seventh volume, is in no respect inferior to any of its predecessors, whilst in a comprehensiveness which is not far short of exhaustiveness it surpasses several. No more thorough handbook on the matters which belong to his office and work is accessible in English to the minister or the theological student.

Of very great importance in all treatises of this kind is the author's standpoint. For so different is the conception of the position and work of the minister of the Gospel in the Roman and the Reformed churches, or in the case of individuals in writers of crypto-Catholic and of distinctly Protestant tendencies, that it would perhaps be impossible so to treat of practical theology as to satisfy equally the demands of either side. If the liturgical element in public worship were emphasised above the homiletical element, the Protestant would naturally object; and no less so the crypto-Catholic, were the liturgical element altogether subordinated to the homiletical. The consequence is that almost all ministerial handbooks may be separated into two classes, the boundary between which is very sharp and defined. No one can doubt upon which side of that boundary Dr. Oosterzee stands. From the year 1840, when he first lifted up his voice against the mytho-poetical hypotheses of the Straussian school, he has maintained his reputation as the ablest evangelical divine, "the Lange," of Holland, if less original and fertile than his German friend, not less genial, and more practical and sober. And there is no forgetfulness of his principles, and no diminishment of his abilities in this, his latest work. He is still, as he describes himself, "positive-Christian and also Evangelical-Protestant," concerned most of all about the honour of Christ, and allowing no other ultimate object of preaching than the edification or conversion of men. Indeed, one pre-eminent excellency of his book consists in that—the steady, persistent, dogged way in which he keeps before the reader the fact, that no ministerial work must aim at anything short of the spiritual good of those in connection with whom it is done. If it be allowable to speak of such a thing as the rectification of a minister's motives, when the two ideas of the ministry and of badness of motive are theoretically incompatible, such rectification would of necessity in some degree follow every thoughtful reading of Dr. Oosterzee's pages.

An introduction, devoted to the definition and to the history of the science of practical theology, is followed by a chapter in which the Divine institution of the Gospel ministry is examined and maintained. The work of a minister is readily classified under two heads, according as it is done with reference to the members of his congregation, or on behalf of the population outside the church. The former again subdivides itself into the duties of a pastor to his congregation in its totality, and his duties to its individual members. Homiletics and Liturgics naturally take their place under the former head, Catechetics and Poimenics under the latter, whilst the whole of a pastor's outside work is considered under either Halieutics, "the theory of the extension of Christianity," or Apologetics. And each section claims for itself three distinct types. It opens with a summary of its main propositions in larger print, followed by an exposition and defence of those principles in smaller print, concluded by a paragraph in still smaller print which refers the reader to further literature upon the subject, and reminds him of certain "points of enquiry" to which he may profitably give his attention. It will thus be seen that Dr. Oosterzee's treatment of his theme is both very full and very judicious and clear. Especially suggestive are the appended points of inquiry, as a single instance, taken haphazard, will show. The section devoted to the consideration of the sermon as an element of public worship closes thus:—"Is the preaching to be addressed to the church-going public, or to the Church of the Lord? To what extent can the congregation itself be said to proclaim the salvation in Christ? How far is the relation between preaching and worship susceptible of modification in the interest of both? Discussion of 1 Cor. iv. 1-5." The reader will not find these matters settled in the text of Dr. Oosterzee's book, though he will sufficient hints of the way in which the author would settle them. Dr. Oosterzee's object seems to have been, not to say all that could be said upon his subject (that would be to multiply his pages *ad infinitum*), but to say as much as would suffice to awaken both the attention and the conscience of every pastor into whose hands his book should come.

Amongst the more novel and salient features of the treatise must be mentioned also the very interesting chapters in each division which relate to the history and to the history of the literature of the various parts of Dr. Oosterzee's theme. Other ministerial handbooks are as a rule sadly deficient here. For it is neither caprice nor display which, in the introduction to any scientific investigation, brings its history under review. Not only is the genesis and development and present condition of the science thereby more satisfactorily explained than it can otherwise be, but also abundant safeguards are provided against error and

equally abundant hints for the further prosecution of the study. No homilete will henceforth be able to plead the lack of a text-book as an excuse for the fact that the history of the art of preaching is to him almost a *terra incognita*. In the hundred pages which Dr. Oosterzee gives to supplying that lack, not all indeed is done that needs to be done, but much is well done that has rarely if ever been attempted before. Nor is the quality of our author's contribution to this subject, or of Mr. Evans adaptation (whichever it may be—one principal blemish in the book is the impossibility of distinguishing with certainty the hand of the adapter from that of the author) by any means equal. Germany and Holland, and in a less degree Sweden and France, receive abundant attention from a mind obviously alive both to the faults and to the excellencies of the art of preaching, as it has been practised there. On the other hand the history of the English pulpit is very meagre, and not without some strange blunders, excusable if they are the author's, but which the adaptor should scarcely have allowed to pass without comment or qualification. And whilst thus Dr. Oosterzee deals amply with the theoretical branch of his subject, he omits to notice very few even of its most minute practical details. A minister, troubled by the failure of his week-night services and prayer-meetings, or hesitating as to the best method of retaining the children of his congregation and leading them to personal consecration, will find all such matters discussed, and will rarely fail to profit from our author's counsels. Best of all, the tone of the book is never doubtful. There is no section given up to the consideration of "unction," but at the same time there is no section in which unction is not considered. The homilete is never allowed to forget that his sermons will of necessity fail unless they give forth the clear and powerful echo of the testimony of salvation, and aim directly at the spiritual upbuilding of his congregation. The pastor must be faithful to God and to himself, is the central proposition of the theory of poimenica. The supreme rule of liturgics is, "no day without special secret prayer, without definite reading and reflection on Holy Scripture, without an inner laving in the refreshing and invigorating well-springs of a higher life." It is the same from beginning to end of these six hundred pages. Dr. Oosterzee has surpassed all his predecessors in that particular, that personal religion with him is not one, or the most desirable qualification, but the indispensable condition and *sine qua non* of ministerial life. The ultimate aim of all practical theology is the fulfilment of the prayer in John xvii. 21. Practical theology is the science of the labour of those only who are *ministri a Deo facti in Ecclesiâ constituti*.

Forbes's Predestination and Freewill.

Predestination and Freewill, and the Westminster Confession of Faith. By John Forbes, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Some years ago, Dr. Forbes, a minister of the Scotch Established Church, and now Professor of Oriental Languages at the University of Aberdeen, published a Commentary on Romans, containing, among many other good things, a very able dissertation on Predestination and Freewill. This dissertation, revised and enlarged, he has now republished in a separate volume. His professed object is to "relieve the tender consciences of those who fear that, by giving their signature to the *Westminster Confession*, they commit themselves to the obnoxious doctrines charged against Calvinism," by showing that the Confession does not "render it impossible to hold, what Scripture so plainly teaches, the boundless and impartial love, to every one of His creatures without reserve, of the great Father of all, 'who will have all men to be saved,' and is 'not willing that any should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance,' and that it does not limit salvation to a few arbitrarily elected and predestined by Him."

To speak generally, Dr. Forbes seems to us to be successful in his attempt to prove that the Westminster Confession does not absolutely exclude these great truths. He shows that it does not teach, as he admits that Calvin and Edwards taught, that the difference between the lost and saved originates entirely in God, and not at all in them. To the objection, "that the defence now offered of the Westminster Confession is not in accordance with the historical interpretation of that document, as determined both by the well-known sentiments of its authors, and by the general current of opinion ever since," he cleverly replies, that "no public and authoritative document is to be interpreted as enjoining anything further than what it distinctly states;" and that "the very forbearance to give distinct expression to these sentiments, shows that the authors of the Confession did not deem it expedient to enforce them" (p. 51). We are thankful to find, by the more careful study of the Westminster Confession, to which Dr. Forbes's book prompted us, that this venerable standard of the Presbyterian Churches is much less removed from the truth as we hold it than we formerly thought. And, for the pleasure of this discovery, we thank Dr. Forbes.

At the same time we must say that there are one or two stray expressions which Dr. Forbes does not explain satisfactorily, and that both he and the Confession differ from us in holding the unconditional perseverance of believers. This difference does not surprise us. For the doctrine in question, although it is, as we

think, plainly contradicted in Scripture, is not contradicted by our inner moral consciousness, and is therefore not likely to arouse the scruples which prompted Dr. Forbes to write.

So far, then, the book is successful. But it is also successful in a point much more important than this. It is one of the ablest refutations we have seen of the doctrine of Irresistible Grace, and of the concurrent doctrine of a Limited Atonement. In reference to Predestination and Election, Dr. Forbes's position is precisely our own. He says, "It is an alarming truth, the force of which we ought to be most cautious in weakening, that by the very nature of our constitution as freewill beings, God has given us the awful power to resist, if obstinately so inclined, the utmost striving of His Spirit with our spirit, and bring upon ourselves that state of spiritual insensibility and hardness which is called in Scripture 'the sin against the Holy Ghost,' 'which cannot be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.'" "With every one God's Spirit is striving, from the first moment of moral consciousness, to recover him, or more correctly, to *induce him to give his consent* to his recovery from that state of corruption in which all are involved. This is what Christ has procured for every individual of Adam's race by His great work of redemption." But Dr. Forbes has done more than refute error. He has bravely attempted a task which nearly all the refutations of Calvinism evade, viz., to expound the great truths which the New Testament teaching about Predestination and Election was designed to set forth. This task he has attempted; and, in our view, with complete success. "Predestination assumes its true place as a blessed truth, assuring the believer that all his sin, and weakness, and dangers, have been fully anticipated and provided for, and every step in his onward progress pre-arranged and ensured, so that no unforeseen obstacle or enemy can arise, to make him come short of his eternal reward. What more delightful or consolatory truth could be imagined than that which creates the assurance that, amidst the seemingly fortuitous medley of good and evil which besets our path here below, all things are under the perfect regulation and control of a Heavenly Father, and that not the slightest occurrence can take place, even through the wayward wills of the wicked, that has not been foreseen and had its place adjusted beforehand, in the perfect plan of Him who overrules all things to work out His own great and glorious purposes, for the highest possible good of all!"

The work before us contains also a most able discussion and refutation of the practical fatalism taught in Edwards's famous treatise on the Will, and now revived in another form by Mill and Bain. This revival, outside the Church, of errors formerly taught within it, and the use of them as instruments of attack against Christianity, give to the matter of predestination a new

and great importance. Indeed, the old battle must be fought again, not now with men who proclaim Irresistible Grace, but with the worshippers of a blind, impersonal, irresistible Force. It is therefore all-important to show that "Necessity" has no support in Scripture. And, as affording splendid proof of this, we warmly commend to all thoughtful Christians Dr. Forbes's able dissertation on Predestination and Freewill. He who wishes for great intellectual gain at a small cost, cannot do better than buy this book, which costs only half-a-crown, and study it from beginning to end.

One remarkable omission we must note. Dr. Forbes seems to be utterly unconscious of the fact that, against the errors he so conclusively refutes, Arminius and the Remonstrants protested nearly three centuries ago. Indeed, it seems to us, that to every word about Predestination in the five Remonstrant Articles Dr. Forbes would joyfully subscribe. Nor does he betray any consciousness whatever that this protest has been kept up in this country and America by the unvarying testimony of the Methodist churches. He speaks twice of "Arminian and Pelagian error," but he does not refer to a single passage in proof that Arminius, and the Methodists, who are his modern representatives, teach the doctrines Dr. Forbes so ably refutes. Perhaps, however, the omission is intentional and wise. The book would probably have been less acceptable to Presbyterians, if it had come as an avowed defence of the teaching of Arminius. Dr. Forbes is ready to acknowledge "the error into which Calvin fell, of attributing reprobation solely and simply to the will of God." And, if he will erase the word "Arminian" we will join him in accepting heartily "the cardinal doctrine of Calvin's system, which he has so conclusively established in opposition to all [Arminian and] Pelagian error, that the salvation of the redeemed originates wholly with God, and is all, from first to last, solely the work of God's free sovereign will and grace, in their election, calling, conversion, renewal, and final sanctification, 'without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto'" (p. 53). And we are ready to admit that Arminians generally have omitted from their teaching an important side of Scripture truth. They have done so because it has been grossly caricatured by others, and because the pressure of evangelical work has left them no leisure to unravel its intricacies.

VAUGHAN'S SERMONS BEFORE THE UNIVERSITIES.

My Son, Give Me Thine Heart. **Sermons preached before the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 1876—8. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Master of the Temple, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. London: Macmillan and Co. 1878.**

THESE sermons must not be judged by the ordinary sermon standard; they were delivered in the University pulpits of Oxford and Cambridge by a "select preacher." This circumstance should be remembered in estimating their appropriateness and worth. The practice of appointing eminent ministers of the Established Church to preach occasionally at the national seats of learning is of more than local interest. No doubt the religious thought of the more serious young men of our country, who belong to the highest social grade, is in some degree influenced by "University Sermons." It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that those who contribute so much to the religious instruction of candidates for the highest positions in Church and State should be well qualified for their responsible task. There are few preachers so entitled to confidence, or who would be so readily trusted by men of every shade of opinion for this special work, as the Master of the Temple. Dr. Vaughan belongs to no party; he is an eminent Biblical scholar; he has a high reputation for personal excellence and for orthodoxy; his cast of mind is far too practical to allow him to indulge in speculations "which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith." Moreover, he has had large experience in dealing with young men; he understands their dangers, he sympathises with their aspirations; he is eminently judicious and genial, and is therefore a safe and popular counsellor. Indeed, we know of no man who comes nearer to our beau ideal of what a university preacher should be. Let us see how far his work is worthy of our conception of himself. The volume before us contains eight sermons, very varied as to subjects and as to mode of treatment, but all bearing the impress of the gifted author's individuality. Those who think dogmatic theology essential to every sermon will not be satisfied with these; but the preacher would probably have defeated his purpose if he had tried to please such critics. However we may regret it, theological preaching is not popular in many congregations. Even those composed of young men of culture are no exception. Something that bears directly upon the improvement of personal character, or that relates to daily conduct, is usually more welcome.

In these sermons there is very much to arrest the attention of

educated young men; they are essentially modern; there is nothing mechanical about their construction, nor is there anything commonplace either in the matter or in the language. There is abundant evidence of ripe scholarship, but no parade of learning; there is just enough careful criticism to delight the soul of an enthusiastic student of the Greek Testament. Originality and freshness appear on every page. The language is chaste and happily chosen; throughout, there is a singular combination of strength and beauty.

The preacher's aim is evidently to influence the practice rather than the opinions of his audience. "Burning questions" are not touched. He neither attacks heresies nor launches new theories. The common failings of young men are indicated with delicacy and tenderness, and yet with rigorous fidelity. Indolence, self-indulgence, scepticism, conceit, are keenly rebuked, and the opposite virtues presented in an attractive light. The book abounds with discriminating analyses of character, and is pervaded with lofty moral tone and intense religious earnestness.

Our author is for the most part topical rather than textual. Hence he comes before us more as an essayist than an exegete. This is to be regretted, considering his fame as an expositor of Scripture. There are two examples of allegorising, which sometimes tempts preachers to take unwarrantable liberties with the text, and which, in the hands of incompetent men, is often far-fetched and fanciful. These evils, however, are avoided in this case, and this method of treatment is managed with admirable skill and excellent effect. "The sympathy of God a necessity of man," is the title of one sermon of this class which fairly illustrates many of the best qualities in the volume. The text is taken from the narrative of Christ stilling the tempest, and consists of the pathetic appeal, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" A brief quotation will show how the preacher applies this passage. "Miracle and parable are but differences of name in many places of the Gospels, and it is so here. That crossing, that storm, that sleep, that awakening, all were typical; real as facts, significant as emblems. They have all been acted again and again in human lives, in spiritual histories. Redemption itself is just that—a world's misery, a world's sense of neglect, a Divine sleep, a Divine awakening—'the times of that ignorance God winked at:' at last He interposed for deliverance, rebuked the wind and the sea, and would have all men everywhere to be saved."

The first sermon is in some respects the most striking. The title is, "Scorn, a breach of the sixth commandment," and the text, "Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." A few words will indicate the scope of this powerful discourse. "Not to destroy but to fulfil, was the office of Christ

towards the law and the prophets. Not to demolish, but to fill; not to take down the fabric of the old, but to bring into it the presence which shall occupy each chamber with a life at once Divine and most human—this is the legislation of Jesus Christ, and the text is one of its most beautiful and characteristic examples. He comes to rescue this commandment, the sixth of the decalogue, from the literalism of the Scribe, from the fantasticality of the Pharisee, and to lift it into the spirituality—the thoroughness, that is, and the practicalness—of the new, the Gospel life." The preacher goes on to show how the feeling which prompts one to say to his brother, "Thou fool!" has in it the germ which, when fully developed, becomes murder. He sets forth most forcibly the tendency of scorn to crush and kill every noble sentiment, to destroy every intellectual and spiritual aspiration.

The last sermon in the series, on "The Proper Attitude for Religious Inquiry," is most timely, and strongly tempts quotation and comment.

Dr. Vaughan has certainly helped to sustain the high reputation of the English pulpit. While such sermons are heard by the most distinguished congregations of the land, there is no danger that preaching will ever cease to be a great spiritual power in our midst.

We are sorry to add one word of adverse criticism, but fidelity requires it. The first thing we have to find fault with is the least important, and that is the title of the book. We are at a loss to know on what principle it has been chosen. Any other would have been just as appropriate as the one selected. We expected to find one sermon or more from the text, "My son, give me thine heart," but there is nothing akin to it in the volume, and we should have preferred the omission of that passage from the title.

In one respect these sermons, admirable as they are, are seriously defective. We shall perhaps be considered narrow and old-fashioned when we complain that the way of salvation is nowhere clearly set forth. It is true that it is seldom found in published "University Sermons," but that only makes the matter worse. God's way of saving men, stated as Dr. Vaughan must surely be able to state it, might have led many a thoughtless undergraduate to reflection and immediate religious decision. That there should be no answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" in a series of sermons preached to a congregation of persons of every variety of character, is deeply to be regretted. We have referred to this point for the sake of expressing our sorrow that the clergy of the Established Church, generally, should assume that all their hearers are already converted. No doubt it is the theory of the Church that all baptised persons

are of necessity something more than nominal Christians, and in our judgment that is one of the most vital defects of the Church as by law established.

We are compelled to refer to another matter scarcely less important. We never suspected the Master of the Temple, of sacerdotal proclivities, and therefore were not prepared for anything savouring of sympathy with the doctrine of priestly absolution. Here, however, is a passage which looks uncommonly like it: "If you are in trouble and cannot find comfort; if you have postponed or intermitted communion because of some weight lying upon your life; or if in the approach of death you feel something burdening your soul, and are afraid lest you should be about to stand before God with a lie in your right hand; then ask the human help of one whose office it is to guide, whose experience it is to sympathise; open your grief to him, receive his counsel; and then, if you feel that it would be comforting to have the promise brought home, to have the 'ye' of the universal turned for once into the 'thou' of the particular, ask him to stand over you and speak to you personally the reassuring word, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee." There is no Scripture authority for putting words into the lips of any man which it is the prerogative of the Holy Ghost alone to pronounce, and we deeply regret that Dr. Vaughan has lent the sanction of his deservedly high reputation to the support of a most pretentious and perilous dogma. In these days, not a word should be said to strengthen the position of the Anti-Protestant party in the Church of England.

An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century.

An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century; Proposal for Catholic Communion. By a Minister of the Church of England. New Edition, with Introduction, Notes and Appendices. Edited by H. N. Oxenham, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1879.

The motive of the last-century essay, here republished, is very simple. The anonymous author undertakes to show that there is nothing in the doctrines, practices, and history of the Papal Church which ought to prevent reunion between it and the Anglican Church. When we say that in the course of two hundred pages the whole ground of controversy is gone over, it will be at once apparent that the treatment is of the most general, not to say cursory, character. Many of the brief chapters, indeed, are composed of mere assertions, without attempt at proof. The different charges against the Roman Church are brought up, and to each one the answer is returned—Not guilty, or not proven. All is made to turn on the distinction between matters of faith and

opinion, what must and what merely may be believed. The method of reconciliation is one with which by this time we have grown pretty familiar, namely, to take the minimum on one side and the maximum on the other, and to show that there is but a step between the two. The result is decidedly unsatisfactory, because the two parties thus approximated are in no sense representative. A minimum Catholic would be a very poor one. In fact, his views would be far less extreme than those implied in the maximum on the other side. These laboured attempts to show how little may be meant by the doctrines of one system or another seem to us mere baits. We know well enough that there is a great deal more behind. That Mr. Oxenham should republish this essay is not surprising. Its whole drift is to justify the Church to which he belongs. Laying aside the essay, we may notice one or two points in the editor's introduction in which is given an account of the various efforts after reunion from the Stuart days to the establishment of the A.P.U.C. in 1857.

The only kind of union which Mr. Oxenham recognises is a corporate one. He has no idea of a union of charity and mutual recognition. The latter we believe may exist without the former, and certainly must precede it. We are far from saying that all existing divisions are wise or necessary. On the contrary, we have no doubt that many of them might cease with advantage. But, after we have got rid of superfluous divisions, there might still be outward separation along with the recognition of common truth and faith and goodness. In point of fact, we believe there is more of such recognition already than is often suspected. Does any one doubt that all churches bearing the Christian name hold the cardinal verities of the faith, that all such churches have been and are enriched by saintly lives, that they are all channels of Divine blessing? In study and devotion do we not take all that is good, wherever we find it? We would suggest to the editor that nothing tends more to hinder the growth of such inner spiritual unity than such language as occurs here and there in the present introduction. He says of the theology of the Cranmer school that it was "as little respectable as their lives." "The Elizabethan bishops, as a rule, and with some notable exceptions, were only less disreputable in their conduct, and not one whit more respectable theologians than their predecessors under Edward." He writes of "Foxe's exploded mendacities." Such strong language reminds us of Dr. Newman's saying about the olive-branch and catapult. Mr. Oxenham's introduction is meant to be the first, but it looks very much like the second. And this from a liberal moderate Catholic, who reprobates the violence of Jesuits and Ultramontanes! "If they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

Perhaps it may sound strange to our editor, but to us it seems

that the great obstacle to unity is his own church. But for its abuses in faith and practice there had been no Reformation or "schism of the sixteenth century," just as if the English Church had been all that it should have been in the last century there had been no Methodism. At the present moment there is no Church so distinctively controversial and proselytising as the Roman Catholic Church. To what are all its efforts directed but to the gaining of adherents from other communions? It is strangely inconsistent, therefore, for the editor to remind us so often that our differences from each other are trifles in comparison with our differences from Atheism and Materialism. Surely this cannot be the view of the authorities of the writer's own church.

Again, how can corporate reunion be brought about save by mutual concession and compromise? But is it not precisely this that the Papacy utterly repudiates? Has it any other word than "submission"?

In seeking for evidences of the decline and disintegration of Protestantism, Mr. Oxenham is satisfied with very little, and exaggerates most trifling circumstances. He says: "Protestantism, as a dogmatic and religious system, has had its day; three centuries have sufficed to elicit and exhaust its inherent capabilities in that line; it has been weighed in the balance of history and found wanting." That may be a superficial outsider's view. It cannot be the view of one who knows Protestantism from within—its learning, its institutions, its powerful hold on the intellect and heart of millions. What is the sort of evidence on which so sweeping a judgment is based? Such facts as the existence of indifference and scepticism in Germany, and the lapse of English Presbyterian congregations into Unitarianism. The attendants on public worship in Berlin is said to be about 30,000. The author of *German Home Life* states that men never think of attending church. This is precisely what we are constantly hearing and reading of Roman Catholic cities on the Continent. If German rationalism is the inevitable sequence of Protestantism, what of the infidelity of France and Italy? Who taught Voltaire and Comte and Renan and St. Beuve? The editor brings forward as a witness a youth, with whom he conversed some twenty years ago, whose competence may be gauged by the fact that he held belief in God to be a note of the High Church. After quoting some statistics from *Whitaker's Almanack* respecting the divisions of Methodism, he alleges as a further evidence of decline that "several Wesleyan ministers have sought ordination from the present Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Wordsworth." One is irresistibly led to attach just as much significance to the other proofs adduced as to this. Mr. Oxenham exaggerates the importance of mere incidents, and treats exceptional phenomena as typical. Thus,

Irvingism, an abnormal excrescence, becomes to him a "striking testimony" to the necessity of unity.

One portion of the republished essay puts the editor in a dilemma. The first subject dealt with by the anonymous writer, as the one "which abounds with the greatest difficulties," is the infallible power of the Pope. The question is settled as it was always settled up to the eve of the Vatican Council, by denying that the dogma is an article of the faith. The judgment of twelve Catholic Universities and fifty-seven theologians of different countries in Europe is quoted in proof of this conclusion. The point is a perplexing one for the editor. All that he can do is "to offer a few suggestions in arrest of any premature and peremptory judgment." The first suggestion is that "the facts mentioned by our author, and others like them, remain equally facts, which cannot lose their significance whatever may have occurred since." Quite so; the reply that the dogma in question is merely a private opinion held good for former days, but it holds good no longer. This argument for reunion no longer exists. And who knows that the same change may not come over all the other questions which are explained away in similar terms? "In the next place the Vatican Council is not dissolved, but suspended, and must some day reassemble; and until it is over, no one has a right to say what shape its decrees will ultimately assume as a whole." We suppose the meaning to be that the definition solemnly decreed and promulgated may be modified or reversed. We doubt whether any man living believes such a thing to be probable or possible. "And meanwhile the particular definition to which exception is so framed that it has already received many and most divergent interpretations from divines of unimpeached orthodoxy, without any sign of a disposition on the part of authority to arbitrate between them." It is the first time we ever found ambiguity claimed as a merit in the definition of a Papal Council. We thought that formal definitions were intended to remove ambiguity, which was left to be the special mark of Protestantism and private judgment. We doubt whether Cardinal Manning would endorse the explanation, or rather the special pleading. The "Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century" has utterly broken down on an essential point. The edge is taken off its reply. And who knows that the replies on all the other questions will not be upset by other decisions of the Vatican Council, for it "is not dissolved, but suspended, and must some day reassemble; and until it is over no one has a right to say what shape its decrees will ultimately assume as a whole"?

Curtiss's Levitical Priests.

The Levitical Priests. A Contribution to the Criticism of the Pentateuch. By S. J. Curtiss, Ph.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

The author of the present volume sets himself to refute one of the many theories started by the ingenuity of German rationalism for the purpose of discrediting the genuineness and authority of the Pentateuch. The particular theory examined may be briefly stated thus: "Deuteronomy supposes all the tribe of Levi to be alike eligible to the priesthood, while Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers restrict the priestly office to the sons of Aaron. The former represents the more ancient, original condition,—the latter is an innovation and did not emerge till after the return from exile, Ezra being most probably the author. Ezekiel is the connecting link between the two periods." This is the theory to which Dr. Curtiss devotes a searching investigation.

The first argument for the priority of Denteronomy is drawn from certain passages in the book itself. The passages are only three in number (x. 9, xviii. 1—8, xxxii. 8—11), are couched in general terms, and are susceptible of an explanation just as much in harmony with the old belief as with the new hypothesis. The latter in fact is an inference from a particular construction put upon the words. The different terms and ideas are minutely examined by the author, and shown by no means to bear out the theory built upon them. The following are the results of the author's arguments on this point. "(1.) These references are so incomplete as to demand the existence of as full a code as is contained in the middle books of the Pentateuch. (2.) There is no radical contradiction between the brief notices of the Levitical priests and the more complete regulations concerning them in the preceding books. (3.) Apparent contradictions are due to the oratorical, prophetic, and popular character of Deuteronomy as distinguished from the more minute and strictly legal statements of the middle books of the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy is emphatically the people's book; Exodus—Numbers, the code of the priests. The popular form in Deuteronomy is later than the technically so-called priestly legislation, and naturally follows it."

Not only has Ezekiel been interposed between Deuteronomy and the priestly legislation, but he has been supposed by some to be the author of Lev. xvii.—xxvi. The reason assigned for this opinion is nothing more than the fact of priestly terms occurring in his writings. But this may just as well be explained by the other fact that Ezekiel was a priest and of course would be familiar with the legislation relating to the office. Jeremiah uses similar expressions. "It is often the case that a writer is in-

sensibly moulded by some author, so that, without intending it, he borrows the style, and even the modes of expression of his favourite author." "Fancy some German or Dutch professor trying to prove that Kuenen wrote Professor Smith's article on the Bible in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, because of an unconscious similarity in some of Professor Smith's thoughts and expressions to those of Professor Kuenen in his work on the *Religion of Israel*, and you have an example of the length to which such criticisms can go."

The rationalist critics accept the historical character of the books of Samuel and Kings, because those books seem to make for their theory, while, for the opposite reason, they describe the Chronicles as fictitious and interpolated. The former books are supposed to be against the genuineness of the priestly legislation, because they say very little on the subject. But this at best is an argument from silence, and therefore inconclusive. For the comparatively rare references to the subject, as our author shows, it is a sufficient reason that the matter did not fall in with the purpose of the writer. The critics "demand of a narrative which was never intended to trace the sacerdotal fortunes, and which merely mentions them incidentally where they are essential, the same explicitness as in the priestly portions of the Pentateuch." In point of fact, references do occur, but these are set aside as interpolations, for no other reason than that they do not accord with an arbitrary theory. Of one such reference Colenso says: "It has manifestly been inserted by some priestly writer who could not endure that the people should 'ask counsel of Jehovah' except through the intervention of a 'priest the son of Aaron.'" The attacks on the credibility of the Chronicles are well met.

It has been alleged that the teaching of the prophets is opposed to that of the law and anterior to it. By a detailed examination of the prophetic writings from Joel to Malachi, Dr. Curtiss shows that all that the prophets condemn is the perversion and abuse of sacrifice and ritual, and pertinently observes that prophecy supposes the law to be already in existence. "Their denunciations of idolatry after the exile would have been as ill-timed as the appearance of abolitionists in America after the extinction of slavery." It is to this disappearance of idolatry, not to the rise of sacerdotalism, that the cessation of the spirit of prophecy was due.

The argument for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and against Ezra being the author is ably summarised. In truth, all the presumption and evidence tell for the former position. It is a singular critical perversity which seeks to transform a mere reformer or restorer into an author or founder. We have no doubt that if Ezra had been the legislator and Moses the reformer,

the love of contradiction which forms the very soul of rationalism, would have maintained the present orthodox position.

From a Quiet Place.

From a Quiet Place; some Discourses. By the Author of "The Recreations of a Country Parson." London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

Twenty-three sermons in A. K. H. B.'s peculiar style—a style in which he stands alone in the present generation. Readers of current literature are familiar with the light, graceful essays in the monthlies about everything in general and nothing in particular, which yet are so pleasant to read. The hand would be recognised without the four initials. We are reminded of nothing so much as of the essayists of the Addison school, from which the author of the present volume might be a survival. In this very positive, matter-of-fact generation a writer of this class is far from unwelcome. It is useless to desire more solidity and strength. We might as well expect the lily to supply the perfume of the rose. We can only take a writer of such marked characteristics as he is, and be thankful for what he gives us.

The present volume is fully equal to A. K. H. B.'s average in style and thought. We note the same fondness for treating uncommon aspects of common topics. This is indicated in such titles as, "The Love of Money the Root of all Good," "The Privilege of Repentance," "Our Worst Enemies," a sermon to volunteers from the text, "A Man's Foes shall be they of his own Household." There are also thoroughly characteristic and excellent essays on topics like "Getting On," the lesson of which is the rather cynical one that however you try to get on, the result is in the hands of chance or Providence, "The best Friend, "The Natural Tendency to Congenial Society," "Thankfulness and Hope." We confess that the best discourses to us are those which answer most nearly to the idea of a sermon, such as those on Christmas-day, "The Peace of God," "With Him all Things," "Natural Indications of God's Hatred of Sin," "The Desire of all Nations." The first sermon, "The Reckoning," Eccles. xi. 9, is quite characteristic. The idea running through it is that every success, every station in life, has its drawbacks. He instances in graphic touches the domestic life with its cares and trials, the single life with its loneliness and want of sympathy. "Take this line in life or that: choose this profession or that: live in town or country: live in this land or that, in this place or that: choose society or solitude, this kind of society or that: work like a slave at college, or idle your time away: choose this religious communion or that other; you will find that many troubles will come of

your choice; and if you be hasty, and forget that there are reasons for and reasons against every choice that man can make, you will probably repent your choice. There are few thoughtful men in this world, I believe, who have reached middle age or are going down the hill, who have not their moments of bitter repentance for having made nearly every material choice in life they ever have made; and of firm persuasion that in some other walk of life,—amid other scenes, and other surroundings, and other people —they would have been rightly placed, and far happier, and more useful. In some cases it may in truth be so. But in far more it is a vain imagination. Another choice would have eventuated in its own troubles. It is the condition of our unsatisfying being here. There is but one place where all will be right with us, and that is far away. Let not words be multiplied: the outcome and upshot of the whole is clear. There is but one choice we can make, and be sure we shall never repent. It is the choice of Christ, the choice of life and good in Him. The day may come when you will look back with shame upon many a resolution which seemed wise when you made it; but you may enter into judgment with this, and it will stand the test. There is but the one rest for the soul: Christ. There is but the one satisfying portion of the soul: Christ. There is but the one home of the soul: Christ. Make that choice: and, as for every other choice you make, you will have to enter into judgment for it. But this will abide the trial of that great day.

The one jarring note in the sermons, as in most of A. K. H. B.'s writings, is the constant girding at Presbyterian ways and customs. He reminds us at p. 22, "that there is nothing so ridiculous as a Scotchman "lifting up a testimony," and yet he himself is constantly "lifting up a testimony" against the customs of his friends and neighbours. We suppose that residence among the bleak "severities of Presbytery" has been the drawback in his own lot. But wisdom would surely have suggested the lesson of accommodation to circumstances, not to say that charity requires appreciation of the virtues as well as condemnation of the faults of one's neighbours. We note at least half a dozen such testimonies in the present volume. The reason why they seem unjust to us is that they are accompanied by no reference to the reasons from which the incriminated practices arose, or to the undoubted excellencies of Presbyterianism as a whole.

Brooke's Fight of Faith.

The Fight of Faith. Sermons Preached on Various Occasions. By the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, M.A. Second Edition. One Volume. H. S. King and Co. 1877.

This volume is a striking instance of the strength and weakness

of that section of the Church of England to which its distinguished author belongs. For gentle and tender sympathy with man and all that is human; for fearless exposure of the meanness and folly of society; and for sternly faithful preaching of righteousness, these sermons are abundantly worthy the reputation of the biographer of F. W. Robertson. But in their characteristic departures from that line of teaching which under St. Paul, Luther, Wesley, and others has been most powerful in swaying men and turning them to God, the sermons err, in our judgment, both by what they teach, and by what they fail to teach.

This volume has grave deficiencies, and to our thinking fundamental errors. We complain of the use, in a loose and misleading manner, of terms to which a rich and definite spiritual meaning is attached; as, for instance, in the fine sermon on National Worldliness, where Mr. Brooke speaks of love of country and devotion to a lofty national ideal as "spiritual worship." In this case we object both to the adjective and the substantive, especially to the latter. Again, on p. 185 we are told that to believe that God in His calm, unreproachful, sovereign love is determined to make us His own "is salvation." Antinomians of all ages have believed that, but they certainly had not "salvation" while living in sin. Universalism and its kindred and necessary dogma of Fatalism are implicitly or explicitly taught in many places, *e.g.*, p. 78: "It is in vain that we try to escape from God. No one can escape. There shall not be one soul of man that ever lived left at last wandering on the mountains . . . all will be folded in the fields of heaven." So again, p. 91, "If we wander away from Him He must seek us, and we must be found of Him. The *must* consists in this—that if we were lost, a part of Infinite Being would be missing for ever, which is an absurdity." And these statements are the more to be regretted as they occur in the midst of much that is true and very necessary to be said about our proper individuality and personal relation to God. There is apparent too in this volume what appears to us to be a radical misconception of the person of Christ, and of the nature of sin; as, for instance, "It was as one of us that Christ said, 'I and my Father are one,'" p. 293. If this were true there is not a saying relating to the true and proper divinity of Christ which could not be uttered of every Christian. If so, we are all Divine as He was, or He is all human as we are. So on page 69, from lax and defective views of sin we drift into a sort of sentimental self-pity. Sin is a sad accident, and instead of suffering for it we should be treated pitifully and very indulgently. "Lord of love, let me sleep a little . . . and then when I awake punish me and give me trials as much as Thou wilt. But first be kind to me, for I have been lost in a far country, and the way to find Thee has been long." If that be the prodigal we suppose he took his own

journey into that "far country." Certainly the Bible says so in the parable, and in many other ways as well.

Very briefly we have referred to the characteristic errors of the teaching of this volume—errors too which belong to the whole of the Broad School to which their author belongs. We hasten to say how rich the sermons are in a zealous preaching of the law of morality, which those who hold a more evangelical theology would do well to copy. There is abundant evidence too of a wider sympathy than the pulpit is wont to show with the everyday life of those who listen to its ministrations. The plea for love of country in the sermon on National Worldliness is a noble one, part of a noble sermon.

The volume is rich too in a fine vindication of God's possession of all that is in Beauty and Truth and Art. Nature is made or shown to be His interpreter of our spiritual nature in so many of its moods, and in its dim foreshadowings of truths which lie all around and within us.

The style is that of sober, earnest thought, fitly embodied in clear pure English; there are few figures and no rhetoric, but every now and again the author rises into a chaste eloquence. We know of nothing more beautiful in their way than the sermons on Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter, especially those on the first and last.

In leaving this volume were we asked what is the great lack of these sermons, we should say motive power. Healthy moral teaching there is, true indignation at meanness and vice; much to make us ashamed, but little to lift us up. There is seemingly a persistent effort to exclude the *burden* of sin, and the *burden* of the Cross. Greek beauty with Christian morality is apparently Mr. Brooke's ideal. He cannot make his fellow sinful man realise it, we venture to say, without the sublime motive which fills the soul as it rises from the cross of a crucified Saviour, saying, "He loved me and gave *Himself* for me."

Rigg's Churchmanship of John Wesley.

The Churchmanship of John Wesley, and the Relations of Wesleyan Methodism to the Church of England. By James H. Rigg, D.D. London: Wesleyan Conference Office.

The respected President of the Conference has rendered good service by this timely and able essay. Nothing is more common with Anglican disputants than to plead the High-Church opinions of Wesley, and charge Wesleyans with unfaithfulness to his teachings in this respect. A complete answer, which can only be gathered from a review of Wesley's whole life and writings, is

not always at hand. Such an answer is supplied in the present treatise. Dr. Rigg shows clearly how much, or how little, there is in the allegation. Wesley's ecclesiastical views followed, and were largely determined by, his personal religious faith. The year of his conversion, 1738, forms a sharp dividing line between the two positions held by Wesley in both relations. Just as before that period, instead of accepting the righteousness of faith, he sought to establish a righteousness of his own, so also he held high views as to priestly powers and sacramental efficacy. When he abandoned the one set of views, he abandoned the other. With what fairness can Wesley's opinions in the former period be taken as typical of the man? He was then groping his way to settled conclusions. By his own testimony he was an unconverted man. He passed through a variety of phases, ritualistic, ascetic, and mystic. Nothing, as it seems to us, can be more disingenuous than to transfer views which belong to this immature state, views which Wesley subsequently renounced, and with which his whole subsequent career was inconsistent—to the second period, and represent them as Wesley's final opinions. Our answer is short. "The Wesley of the period before 1738 is not our founder. With him we have nothing in common; to him we owe no allegiance." Nay, we do not differ more widely from him than Wesley differed from himself. The action of modern Wesleyans is not more diametrically opposed to the views of Wesley in his first stage than was Wesley's whole career in the second and greater stage, when he became the founder of Methodism. Nothing is more certain than that, if Wesley had remained at the first standpoint, he could not have become the originator of the Wesleyan system. Even in the earlier period he was by no means the pronounced High-Churchman that would satisfy modern Anglicanism. As Dr. Rigg shows, he was much more mystic than ritualistic, and mysticism and ritualism are mutually exclusive. In Georgia he refused the Lord's Supper to a Moravian pastor, because the latter had not been canonically baptised. He says of this act afterwards, "Can any one carry High-Church zeal higher than this? And how well have I since been beaten with mine own staff!" Dr. Rigg says:—"He did not even in Oxford believe in any such doctrine as that of the supernatural bodily presence of the Lord Jesus in the consecrated elements, as now taught by advanced High-Churchmen."

As to the second period, which really represents the Wesley of history and of Methodism, dispute is out of the question. Dr. Rigg accumulates the evidence of word and act in proof "that he very soon and once for all discarded the 'fable,' as he called it, of 'apostolical succession,' and that he presently gave up all that is now understood to belong to the system, whether theological or ecclesiastical, of High Church Anglo-Catholicism." It is also

clearly shown how Wesleyanism is the logical and necessary outcome of Wesley's own teaching and acts, and High-Churchmen ought not to object to a process of development. It would have been strange if Wesley had not leaned strongly to the church of his baptism and ordination. But by what right can those who have no such personal grounds of obedience and attachment be held bound to follow him in these purely personal inclinations?

We have little hope that Dr. Rigg's essay will prevent a repetition of the charges alluded to. The argument is too handy to be easily relinquished. But at least those who use it will be left without any excuse of ignorance. Only a few months ago we read a letter in a newspaper, in which a clergyman charged the Wesleyan authorities with mutilating Wesley's works. Dr. Rigg notices this old charge in a note on p. 120, characterising it as "altogether untrue." Those who accuse Wesleyan Methodists of unfaithfulness to Wesley's teaching might just as well accuse the early Christians of unfaithfulness to the teaching of Paul the Pharisee before the Damascus journey, or modern Roman Catholics of unfaithfulness to the teaching of Newman the Anglican before the year 1845.

Unsworth's Aggressive Christianity, &c.

The Aggressive Character of Christianity. By the Rev. W. Unsworth. London: Wesleyan Conference Office.

The Evangelistic Baptism Indispensable to the Church for the Conversion of the World. By the Rev. James Gall. London: Gall and Inglis.

These two works are similar in subject, one dealing with general truths, the other with a particular application of the truths. Mr. Unsworth first of all illustrates the universal design of Christianity in contrast with previous dispensations, then discusses the opposition to be expected from various sources, states the grounds of his faith in the ultimate triumph of the Gospel, enumerates the qualifications requisite in church-workers, details the various means to be employed, exposes the sin of indifference in vigorous terms, and describes the reward of faithful service, both in the present and future. From this it will be seen that the plan of the book is very comprehensive. The subject is undoubtedly important, the different heads are well worked out, both language and thought are alike clear and vigorous. Mr. Unsworth has something to say and knows how to say it. If anything, some of the statements are almost too bold and unqualified. "Cain deliberately and intelligently rejected the

atonement of Christ, while Abel received it with strong and sincere faith." What more could be said of any one in Christian days? We hope it is not correct that immoral periodicals "are doing more to corrupt the morals of the rising generation than all other institutions are doing to save and bless the youth of our country." Among other means of religious aggression Mr. Unsworth earnestly recommends advertising, which he considers would be a most effectual way of letting our light shine,—a very original application of a familiar text. The whole work is very practical and earnest, and cannot fail to do good.

Mr. Gall advocates a definite scheme of religious aggression. It is that of congregational missions, the congregation to bear the expense of building and plant, the workers to be all voluntary, and the methods to include education and every means of social reform. Mr. Gall objects on principle to paid evangelistic labour. He would restrict paid labour to the regular pastorate. We think that the same reason by which he justifies it in this latter case, its necessity for efficiency, would very often apply with equal force to the former. With a great deal that Mr. Gall says about the need of personal service, and the employment of the whole Church in evangelistic labour we cordially agree. But we regret that in the service of a pet theory he should undertake a crusade against all existing organisations. He maintains on the ground of Scripture teaching and precedent that all evangelistic effort is meant to be carried on by gratuitous agency alone, and that all existing home and foreign missions are working on a false basis. The title of the book is somewhat awkward, but by "evangelistic baptism" is meant a baptism by the Holy Spirit for evangelistic work. This, the author holds, was the distinctive blessing of Pentecost. We have no space for criticism. We are with the author in the constructive portion of his book, against him in the rest. He argues elaborately that Scripture nowhere requires "systematic liberality" from Christians. He claims, not a tenth, but *all* a Christian's possessions for God's service. But if it is impossible to obtain even a tenth from Christians generally, what hope is there that the larger demand will be successful? We doubt also whether on account of the great amount of ignorance and sin existing, it is right to speak of present modes of church-work as having failed. Probably similar results would have followed upon any system. There is a curious sentence on p. 95, "Paul, being a Roman, could of course speak Latin." The conclusion does not follow from the premiss. Many pure Greeks and others were Roman citizens.

Hodgson's Memoir of Rev. F. Hodgson, B.D.

Memoir of the Rev. Francis Hodgson, B.D., Scholar, Poet, and Divine. By his Son, the Rev. James T. Hodgson, M.A. Two Vols. Macmillan. 1878.

This is an interesting and valuable biography in a double sense. It will be valued for its presentation of a singularly attractive life, and it will be a book of reference for the side lights it throws upon the character and history of some who were the friends of Provost Hodgson, and whose lives and works form a permanent part of English literature.

There should be a correspondence between the style of a biography and its subject. The tone, so to speak, must neither be very much higher nor very much lower than the life it describes, else it ceases to be a biography, and becomes a treatise or a homily. That correspondence is found in the volumes before us. Kindly, modest, the work of a Christian and a gentleman, the book is a fitting memorial of one who did his duty with unassuming dignity and quiet zeal. Those who go to the Memoir, as to the lives of Macleod, or Kingsley, or Guthrie, will be disappointed; it is the record of a quiet man quietly told, and therefore not without its charm.

Francis Hodgson, its subject, was Assistant Master at Eton, Fellow of King's College, Rector of Bakewell, Archdeacon of Derby, and Provost of Eton; the acquaintance of Tom Moore, and of most of the leading literary men of his time; and an intimate friend of Lord Byron's. He was a scholar without pedantry, a keen critic without a trace of bitterness, and a reformer of abuses, at once sagacious, resolute, and temperate. This Memoir of his life will be eagerly read, as another and much-needed contribution to the history of Byron, a contribution, too, from one singularly fitted to make it. From the time of Hodgson's residence at Cambridge, as Fellow and Tutor of King's in 1808, until the death of Byron in 1824, the friendship between them was intimate and constant. Much information is given in letters respecting the character and tastes of Byron; information which, on the whole, despite the kindly charity of our biographer, does not heighten one's conception of the wayward egotistic poet, who fills so large a place in the history of genius. The summing up of the causes which led to the separation of Lord Byron and his wife (vol. ii., p. 57—64), strikes us as eminently just and discriminating. And as for the reference to the poet's life, we can all adopt the words in vol. ii., p. 155; "The lovely woods and waters which surround this picturesque and beautiful abbey (Newstead) seem to blend their voices in pathetic harmony, and to breathe a peaceful requiem which fancy wafts onward to the

church where, in quiet and obscurity, lie the mortal remains of him whose youth and beauty, and genius and goodness, whose crimes, and follies, and misfortunes, alike await the final judgment of that Omnipotent Creator whose essential attribute is love."

No small part of the value attaching to these volumes will accrue from the information afforded concerning the piety, the goodness, and the sweetness of Byron's sister, Mrs. Leigh. This, too, is a contribution greatly needed.

It is curious and amusing to observe in these volumes the manner in which gentlemen in the beginning of the present century were wont to communicate their thoughts in verse; Francis Hodgson was no mean adept at this, but his son, the biographer, seems to lament that this is not now the practice. We question whether the decadence of that species of our national poetry is worth lamenting over, if our fathers were like the gentleman mentioned in the second volume, p. 181, who made "women" rhyme to "chimney," and when this was objected to, exclaimed, with a poet's ardour, "What do you say to 'nimbly'?"

We commend these informing and most interesting volumes to our readers.

Stanford's Symbols of Christ.

Symbols of Christ. By Charles Stanford, D.D. Author of "The Plant of Grace," "Central Truths," etc. A New Edition. London: The Religious Tract Society.

A REPRINT of a well-known and deservedly favourite book. Poetry, genius, spiritual strength and sweetness are all found in its pages. The twelve discourses are surprisingly even. There is nothing to skip, nothing that would not bear quotation. The author's own quotations are most apt and choice; he has evidently drunk deeply from the Puritan writers, but, while borrowing their solid, marrowy thoughts, he clothes these thoughts in a style as rich and fascinating as natural taste and diligent culture can produce. Among the causes which make evangelical doctrine distasteful to the educated classes, John Foster enumerates the illiterate way in which it is sometimes set forth. Not, we add, that mental feebleness is never to be found in other quarters. The present volume, like many others, proves that gifts and culture are perfectly compatible with evangelical faith. The subjects are—"The Royal Priest of Salem," "Shiloh," "The Angel in the Burning Bush," "Captain of the Lord's Host," "The Shepherd of Souls," "The Teacher of the Weary," "The Refiner watching the Crucible," "The Healer," "The Master of Life," "The Wings of the Shekinah," "The Advocate in the Court of Mercy," "The Awakener." It is evident from the titles how the

Lord Jesus Christ is the Alpha and Omega of the book, as He is of the author's faith. Less for the style than the sentiment we quote the following: "The centre of union is not a crotchet, but Christ. Not to the chair of Saint Peter, not to the banner of an establishment, not to the shibboleth of a sect, but 'to Him shall the gathering of the people be.' By bringing us nearer to Himself He seeks to bring us nearer to each other. Near the father, the child is near the other children who are gathered round the father's knee; and if I am near Christ, I am near to any other man who is near Christ. The same hope fires us, the same life circulates in us both, and if you touch Him you touch me. There may be endless diversities of thought, profession, and observance prevailing amongst those who from all nations are gathering round Christ. Let them prevail. What is circumstantial will not disturb what is essential. In grace, as in nature, what is various may be harmonious, what is manifold may be one; many branches, one tree; many stones, one temple; many gems, one crown; many tribes, one commonwealth. The great principle of union is union with Christ; the great secret of mutual nearness is nearness to the Fountain of our common life. When we gather to Him we gather to each other. He is gathering the people to Himself that, by a process most simple, natural, and necessary in its working, He may bring the scattered members of His family together, and hush its distractions into rest."

Cox's Expositor's Note-Book.

An Expositor's Note-Book; or, Brief Essays on Obscure or Misread Scriptures. By Samuel Cox. Fifth Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1879.

We only need to endorse the approval expressed by the public of this useful book. The supplementary title accurately describes its character. Mr. Cox takes for the most part difficult or misunderstood passages, and does his best to bring out their true meaning and lessons. Even where his interpretation fails to satisfy, it removes some of the darkness and supplies hints and material for the right interpretation. His spirit is somewhat iconoclastic. He seems sometimes to take pleasure in exposing a misinterpretation which has taken hold of the popular fancy, as in the case of Joseph's coat, which was not a coat "of many colours," but a long coat or tunic reaching to the wrists and ankles. This was a sign of nobility, while the short coat betokened plebeian position and work. The "coat of many colours" came from Luther's version, which so greatly influenced the Authorised Version. Many of the essays show considerable ingenuity and supply the results of much curious

reading. One temptation Mr. Cox always avoids. We mean the temptation to read modern ideas and habits into ancient history. We have all heard or read of illustrations of Old Testament characters, which the most elementary feelings of reverence might well have forbidden. But even apart from this consideration, such representations are untrue to fact. To make patriarchs and prophets speak like modern Christians is to ignore all that is distinctive in their character and to misunderstand their mission and work. Mr. Cox is never in danger on this score.

Barclay's Sermons.

Sermons by Robert Barclay, Author of "The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth." With a Brief Memoir. Edited by his Widow. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

All who have read that interesting work, *The Inner Life*, &c., will be glad to know something of the author who revealed to them a new world. Before the publication of the work the history and inner life of the Friends were as much an unknown country to outsiders as Africa was to the rest of the world before the discoveries of Livingstone. Mr. Barclay's researches flooded the scene with light. It was evident from the work that the sympathies of the writer extended far beyond the denomination to which he belonged by name and hereditary tradition, and these memorials confirm the impression. We do not know, but we should suppose that it would have been hard to detect the Friend in Mr. Barclay. The Memoir, written we presume by his widow, is far more distinctively Quaker than anything in Mr. Barclay's personality. We confess it somewhat jars on our unaccustomed ears to find in a memoir the subject spoken of as "R. B." or "Robert Barclay." Mr. Barclay was evidently a loveable character, distinguished by all that is best in the Quaker spirit without any of its narrowness or littleness. His letters written luring foreign travel are brimful of geniality. He died at the early age of forty-three, killed apparently by overwork. Had he lived, he might have succeeded in carrying into effect some of the measures which he so earnestly advocated as essential to the prosperity of his communion. His sermons are the earnest, practical addresses which we might expect from an educated Christian man in daily contact with the duties and temptations of business life.

Cook's Light and Life.

Light and Life. By the Rev. George Cook, D.D. Borgue: William Blackwood and Sons.

In object and matter this volume is unexceptionable. The author

contends against that view of a religious life which makes it consist simply in exterior acts and professions, and looks upon salvation as something to be received hereafter. On the contrary, he insists that salvation is an inward and present experience; he also connects all spiritual life with Christ, its source. We wish we could say as much that is good of the style of the sermons; but we could not truthfully describe it as clear, terse, or forcible. The sentences are burdened by limiting, qualifying clauses to such an extent that it is often difficult to trace the course of thought. For instance: "Let us, then, as a salutary exercise, endeavour to make some farther application of the above illustrated, and surely reasonable, because alone possible, guiding principle of a true discipleship to the Lord Jesus." We should find it hard to construe the following: "These remarkable words suggest a matter, than which there is hardly, if anything, more worthy of notice in the record," &c. It may be etymologically correct, but it is not usual, to speak of persons as "obvious" to contempt and ridicule. The author says that he can advance no claim either to originality or popularity. Certainly the matter, though good, is not original, and the style cannot be called popular.

Ponton's Freedom of the Truth.

The Freedom of the Truth. By Mungo Ponton, F.R.S.E. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Thirteen brief chapters on such related topics as the Spirit and Means of Religious and Philosophical Inquiry, Modes of Inquiry, and Reasoning, well thought out and carefully expressed. The author advocates at once a rational science and rational faith, and believes that it is only an irrational science and irrational faith that are in direct contradiction. We can sincerely commend both the positions laid down and the arguments by which they are defended. "Evolution is sometimes spoken of as if it were 'a true cause'—the prime origin of all organic phenomena; whereas, taken in its legitimate sense, evolution is simply a mode of procedure, and involves the idea of some agent pursuing that mode. The truth is, the human mind cannot rid itself of the idea of an agent as the primary cause of all phenomena, though sometimes it has recourse to the personification of nature to supply the void."

II. MISCELLANEOUS.

Some Recent Books of Verse.

Legends of the Morrow. By Thomas Gordon Hake, Author of "Parables and Tales," "New Symbols," &c. London: Chatto and Windus. 1879.

Songs of a Wayfarer. By F. Wyville Home. London: Pickering and Co. 1878.

A Book of Miscellaneous Lyrics. By Joseph Skipsey, Author of "Annie Lee," "Two Hazel Eyes," "Meg Goldlocks," "My Merry Bird," "The Fairies' Adieu," and other Ditties. Bedlington: Printed for the Author by George Richardson. 1878.

The Victories of Love. By Coventry Patmore. Fourth Edition. London: George Bell and Sons. 1878.

The Unknown Eros. By Coventry Patmore. I.—XLVI. London: George Bell and Sons. 1878.

Dr. Hake's *Legends of the Morrow* is certainly one of the most remarkable volumes of poetry published of late. It is genuine poetry and of no ordinary kind; full of thought and fine feeling, ranging somewhere midway between the fields which Blake and Wordsworth worked in, and yet being distinctly individual. It is a finer book than could have been securely anticipated from the promise of *Madeline with other Poems and Parables*, which Dr. Hake published in 1871; because, noteworthy as that volume was, those who were most interested in it discerned a laxity of method and want of finish which it was not reasonable to expect to be remedied entirely, seeing that Dr. Hake had published a volume of *Poetic Lucubrations* as long ago as 1828, and might well be supposed to have reached an age at which men seldom work at the perfecting of style. Nevertheless, the volume of *Parables and Tales*, issued in 1872, with illustrations by Mr. Arthur Hughes, and the volume entitled *New Symbols*, published in 1876, successively gave evidence that Dr. Hake as a poet had learned from the unwearying medical profession a good lesson of craftsmanship, and had kept a watchful eye on the minutiæ of execution. The result of this watchfulness and anxiety to perfect his work in detail was visible in the enhanced clearness of his expression and in increased metrical and verbal finish, as well as in a more sparing

use of the quaint and homely imagery which, in the truly admirable poem "Old Souls to Mend," was almost alarming in its attractiveness—alarming, that is to say, lest the poet should presume upon his success and carry the quaint and homely element too far. He has not done so. There is scarcely a trace of quaintness in *Legends of the Morrow*; and the style is unexceptionably finished.

The subject matter of the book is pre-eminently serious, as in all Dr. Hake's recent books; and the treatment is pre-eminently artistic,—artistic in the best sense, for the style is not overwrought, and does not show, till compared with that of the previous books, what labour has been given to it. It is not in any sense a dramatic line of art,—not even narrative in any strict sense; but a number of spiritual situations are made the basis of that mode of work which may best be called the contemplative. "The Palmist," "The Soul-Painter," and "The Lost Future" are the three most important poems in the book; and these are wrought out with so much care in the order of parts and such complete reticence of detail that neither extract nor description can give the least idea of their scope and bodily form. "The Lost Future," as a poem depicting the ruin of a life through one act done in the face of conscience and religion, is in its kind a masterpiece; and there is nothing in the language with which it can be usefully compared. A fourth considerable poem is called "New Souls," and deals hardly by modern sceptical ideas of man's spiritual destiny, connecting itself by subject, title, and treatment with "Old Souls to Mend." A comparatively short poem entitled "The Inscrutable" depicts in a wonderful manner a power which some psychologists hold the human spirit capable of exercising—the power of influencing another will in sleep. A lover, whose lady is held apart from him by her father, dreams of telling her to stab her father and put his hand around the hilt of the weapon to simulate suicide: she does it in her sleep; and as the youth wakes aghast at the horror of the dream, she comes to him wailing that she has dreamt this also, and that her father lies dead with his fingers round his sword's hilt. This poem is too long to extract, too closely-knit to break; and we must be content to quote entire, as an example of Dr. Hake's mode of work and thought, a small piece entitled

FLOWERS ON THE BANK.

I.

"Flowers on the bank, we pass and call them gay;
The primroses throw pictures to the mind,
The buttercups lag dazzlingly behind.
And daisy-friends we spy, but do not say
A word of joy; thoughts of them follow not,
And soon are they forgot.

II.

"What care we for wild flowers except their name?
Bright maidens at the sight in rapture start,
Which, as our smiles say, comes not from the heart.
Flowers dance not, sing not, all their ways are tame;
They love not, neither love in us inspire;
Nor blush when we admire.

III.

"Yet stay, the fingers of that panting child
Have culled for us the choice ones—many a gem—
Have set their lovely colours stem to stem.
In her fond hands they are not tame or wild,
Nestled in fringy fern so changed appears
The little gift she bears!

IV.

"She gives herself, and she can dance and sing
And she can love inspire and blush at praise,
The flowers are part of her, have caught her ways.
She gives herself who gives so sweet a thing,
And she is gone, with other thoughts than ours
Gathering fresh love and flowers."

We may perhaps flatter the taste of posterity too far; but we should have little hesitation in predicting that this poem will find its way into many an anthology of the future.

Songs of a Wayfarer is the first book of a young man, Mr. F. Wyville Home, for whom, while we are in the mood of prediction, we should be inclined to foretell a notable future. There is great delicacy of feeling and a most ardent love of poetry evident throughout the volume; and if Mr. Home's years have not brought him the rich freight of thought and knowledge of the human spirit that Dr. Hake's have, that is not the fault of his will or of his talents. It is probable that contact with the world, and, if he has the good fortune to find it, contact with undefiled nature will bring him mental experiences worth imparting: if so, he will unquestionably know how to impart them, and will not be able to resist the impulse to do so. Meantime this book of *Songs of a Wayfarer* should be welcomed for what it contains as well as what it promises. Too much, perhaps, of over-acute love-poetry, with its unreasonable longings and despondencies; but this is almost certainly incidental to a first book, and is not likely to be repeated in a second. Also the versified story from Boccaccio, "Salvestra and Girolamo," which is really well managed, and written in a graceful stanza, may be regarded as a kind of 'prentice work; but if Mr. Home means to persist in versifying Decameronian tales, it might be well to choose those that have more of novelty for English verse-readers than that of "Salvestra and Girolamo," which has been rendered more than once in English verse, and notably in an anonymous book called *Stories from*

Boccaccio. We may presume that our readers know the story, which is a very touching one, and may quote without context the dedicatory stanza at the close:

> Mortals, this is a song in land of Death;
> For who among you steppeth forth and saith
> A gracious word for Life, that all their days
> Held pitilessly heart from heart these twain?
> Will ye not rather lift your voice to praise
> The abettor Death, who helped them past their pain,
> Saying, "Whom Love hath joined, let Life not sever,"
> And bound them each the other's, and for ever?

This does not quite represent the self-imposed difficulty of metrical execution; for the stanza, throughout the poem, opens and closes with a couplet wherein the rhyme is disyllabic, the central quatrain being composed with single rhymes. The effect of this arrangement is very agreeable; but, in our tongue, not easy to sustain in a serious or pathetic poem. Difficulties of craftsmanship, however, do not stagger Mr. Horne; and the most salient quality of the whole book is that the work is conscientiously done. One reads it through without finding any evidence of haste or disinclination to do the best for the verse that the artist can; and when the volume is closed the cause of regret that strikes most forcibly is the little that one carries away of thought or new experience. The following sonnet is a fair sample of the more thoughtful and less impulsive side of the book:

VASTNESS.

> The terror and the enchantment of the sea
> Allure me and affray me where I stand;
> The Sea, whose fierce white arms enclasp the land,
> Whose foam-flakes fly like white birds wide and free;
> Whose anger shakes the sheer cliff under me,
> Whose laughter wreaths the dimples in the sand,
> Who guards the tender shells within her hand,
> Who shatters the leviathan ships that flee.
> I come back when from out the East is crept
> Starred night; and strive in spirit to conceive
> While o'er my head the greater planets roll,
> The power that moves those myriad worlds, each swept,
> Maybe, by vaster seas than Earth can have;
> There is not room within mine awe-struck soul.

It is easy to see that this has been very carefully worked out, however real the feeling at its root; and the almost unnatural self-retention of the last line suggests that something much more ardent in expression has been sacrificed in the chiselling process. Whether this be so or not, it is certain that from some cause the sonnet fails to be as impressive as it should; and this is not unfrequently the case in poems of Mr. Horne's that are excellent up to a certain point. The mood is almost always poetic, the method of work always honest; but, whether from immaturity

of imagination, or from want of knowledge of life, the texture is too often thin.

The transition from Mr. Home to Mr. Joseph Skipsey is very abrupt—a transition from extreme culture to rough-and-ready old-fashioned verse-making by a self-educated pitman. We use the term old-fashioned in no unpleasant sense, but as indicating that the tricks and embellishments incident to the ultra-executive school of modern verse are not a part of Mr. Skipsey's poetic creed. This vigorous singer indeed owes but little of the effect produced upon his readers to the executive side of poetic art. He is a strong-hearted and, one would say, strong-headed man, whose education has been wrung from the hard hand of circumstance, under most unfavourable conditions;—indeed, he says in his preface that he is wholly self-taught, having entered the coal-pit "to help to earn his bread while yet a mere child, and when the sum total of his learning consisted in his ability to read his A B C, or, at most, his A B, ab, card." That his gift of song is innate, and not the result of education, we should judge not only from the statement that he began to make verses "while he was yet a child, behind his trap-door," a door connected with the ventilation of the mine, but also from the superiority of his verse to his prose. His thoughts, which are often very fine, seem to flow naturally in measures sometimes very primitive, never very exacting, but generally well-handled from the metrical point of view; and while the sentences are often by no means syntactical, a thing not easily tolerable in prose, they are seldom unrhythmical; so that, looking at the circumstances, one feels but little disposed to exact the uttermost requirement of syntax or any other part of grammar. Sometimes, however, a fine thought or image seems to be marred by want of clear utterance. The two following stanzas, for example, though in a certain sense admirably graphic, lose some of their force by a seeming inability to grasp the fine image of the groping giant in its entirety:

> "Alas! the woe the high of heart,
> Seem pre-ordained to undergo;
> While proud ambition hides the smart,
> And smiles delude the world below.
>
> "The anguish, like a Samson blind,
> Gropes on in darkness, till at length
> It grasps the pillars of the mind,
> And dies a victim to its strength."

The fault here is that the death of anguish involves the ruin of the mind in such a way that it is inappropriate to call anguish a victim. It is not perfectly clear whether the poet means to depict mind triumphant over anguish, or mind and anguish dying together, in strict accordance with the historic basis of the figure. If the latter, the expression is better than the thought; if the

former, the thought is better than the expression. All the best poems in the volume are those which deal with the larger aspects of the inner life of man. Some of the homely youth and maiden love-poems, such as "Rosa Rea" and "The Seaton Terrace Lass," are capital in their kind, spontaneous, virile, and yet not even bordering on the coarse; but the best work usually accompanies the best thoughts in the higher class of poems, such as "Man—What is he?" "The Seer," "The Mystic Lyre," "Arachne," and others of like scope. In the following stanzas, descriptive of some of the "Seer's" characteristics, Mr. Skipsey appears in his highest and best mood:

"Unlike the crowd who never dare look inward,
Lest they a hideous spectre there should meet;
Would point to secret longings prompting sinward,
He looks within and finds a solace sweet.

"There in a conscience pure he sees a charmer,
A harper from whose harp such tones are hurl'd;
They act as mighty spells, as tested armour,
To shield him from the malice of the world.

"'Go on brave heart,' he hears an anthem chanted,
The distant echoes of that harp's weird tones;
"Go on—to thee a richer dower is granted,
Than that which gilds a hundred monarchs' thrones.

"'Thou mayst be thrust aside and scorned and taunted,
As being a lunatic, a knave, or fool;
Thou hast within thy inner being planted
A power that yet shall put the world to school.

"'Thou mayst be destined here to tribulation;
Thy every pang shall prove a key by which
Thou shalt unlock some safe of the Creation,
And with its precious stores thy mind enrich.

Illumined by that sun for ever burning,
Deep in the centre of the inner spheres;
Thou shalt be gifted with the gift of learning,
What lieth hidden from thy mortal peers.

"'In every planet in the midnight heaven,—
In every hue doth in the rainbow blend;
Shalt thou perceive a lore and meaning, given
To very few on earth to comprehend.

"'The very flower upon the meadow blowing,—
The very weed down trampled on the road;
Shall be to thee a priceless casquet, glowing
With glories hinting of the light of God.'"

This is better sustained than is usual in the poems of this volume; and more even in tone and worth than other stanzas of the same poem. Thus, after the close of the "inner voice" portion, we have two stanzas in conclusion, of which, in point of execution, one is as poor as the other is fine; and there is a corresponding disparity in the value of the sentiment which the two stanzas express:

"And this enableth the true seer ever
To triumph tho' he falleth, and to pray
That theirs like his may be a potion, never,
Who plot and plan to take his life away.

"Ah! to the last his words and deeds are sweeter
Than is the lark's song in the cloud above;
And rare the bard could find befitting metre,
To hymn the love we owe this child of Love!"—(P. 9.)

Mr. Skipsey's volume is one which ought to find many readers, and it is so far removed from the superficial that any friend which it once makes it will surely keep.

Our not very difficult prognostication* that the fastidious poet of domestic love intended to restore to separate existence the last two books of *The Angel in the House* is fulfilled in the publication of a third volume of the uniform edition of his poems. This, the fourth edition of *The Victories of Love* includes in one volume what were originally two, *Faithful for Ever*, issued in 1860, and *The Victories of Love*, issued in 1863. There is in this single volume, as in the former two, nothing external to connect the beautiful series of letters in octosyllabic couplets with *The Angel in the House;* although, among the many changes of structure and detail, there is nothing to dissociate the letters from the differently planned and executed *Betrothal* and *Espousals*, now arrogating to themselves the title of *The Angel in the House*. The most decided improvement in general plan to be found in the new edition of the *Victories* is the transfer of the Wedding Sermon to the end of the book, where it comes much more appropriately than in its original station between the final flippancy of Lady Clitheroe and the concluding letter of Felix Vaughan to Honoria. To this change is annexed a minor one; a beautiful passage which used to stand near the close of one of Mrs. Graham's letters to Frederick, now ends the Wedding Sermon and the whole book. Letter XI. of the first book of the *Victories* (formerly *Faithful for Ever*) now wants the closing lines:

"Your love was wild, but none the less
Praise be to love, whose wild excess
Reveals the honour and the height
Of life, and the supreme delight
In store for all but him who lies
Content in mediocrities!
Many men cannot love; more yet
Cannot love such as they can get.
To wed with one less loved may be
Part of Divine expediency."

Of these the most important now stand slightly modified in the sermon-close, thus:

* *London Quarterly Review*, October, 1876, p. 222.

"Then was that nought,
That trance of joy beyond all thought,
The vision, in one, of womanhood!
Nay, for all women holding good,
Should marriage such a prologue want,
'Twere sordid and most ignorant
Profanity; but having this
'Tis honour now, and future bliss;
For where is he that, knowing the height
And depth of ascertain'd delight,
Inhumanly henceforward lies
Content with mediocrities!"—(P. 256.)

The sermon formerly ended at the word *bliss*. There are many minor changes; but it seems to argue a strange defect of ear in a poet so exquisitely sensitive as Mr. Patmore, that in all the fortunes of this book it has not had the good hap to get certain lax and evil rhymes done away with: *self* seems still to be the only rhyme Mr. Patmore condescends to find for *gulf;* and *done* is still considered a good enough rhyme for *Vaughan*. It is also a matter to wonder at that Mr. Patmore should not have cared to take the opportunity of removing so clear a case of borrowed thought as the couplet—

"The daisies coming out at dawn,
In constellations on the lawn!"—(P. 117)

which reproduces an often-quoted passage from Shelley,—

"Daisies, those pearled Arcturi of the earth,
The constellated flower that never sets;"

a passage, too, on each line of which there is a charming sonnet in Wade's *Mundi et Cordis Carmina*.

When we reviewed the first edition of *The Unknown Eros*, &c., the collection was confined to thirty-one odes, and two poems afterwards transferred to another volume. Mr. Patmore has since issued a second edition consisting of forty-six odes, sixteen of which do not appear in the first edition, for the original thirty-first ode disappears, and the new matter of this volume begins with Ode XXXI., page 127. Why these sixteen odes were not issued as a second volume, it is hard to see: Mr. Patmore's admirers could then have added them to their collection without being obliged to have two copies of Odes I. to XXX.; but worse, than this, there is an edition of *The Unknown Eros* just issued consisting of fifty-two odes; and those who want to add the six to their collection cannot do so without securing Mr. Patmore's poetical works in four volumes; for the third edition of *The Unknown Eros* is Vol IV. of these works, and is not sold separately from the other three. Of the sixteen odes forming the new portion of the volume now before us, we may say that they add considerably to the beauty and variety of the book. There are three in the form of dialogues, "Eros and Psyche," "De Natura

Deorum," and "Psyche's Discontent," which are peculiarly subtle and delicate. Ode XXXVI., "Winter," reminds us, in regard to crispness of execution, of a small poem similarly named which first appeared in *The Germ;* but the present poem is far more thoughtful. Of the pallor on winter's face the poet says:

> "It is not death, but plenitude of peace;
> And the dim cloud that does the world enfold
> Hath less the characters of dark and cold
> Than warmth and light asleep;
> And correspondent breathing seems to keep
> With the infant harvest, breathing soft below
> Its eider coverlet of snow.
> Nor is in field or garden anything
> But, duly look'd into, contains serene
> The substance of things hoped for, in the Spring,
> And evidence of Summer not yet seen."

We cannot find among these new odes any one possessing the universal power of appeal evinced in the exquisite No. XI., "The Toys," wherein the subject is wholly within the comprehension even of uncultured readers; but for the more cultured class, those that we have particularised will be a prize. They exercise, it is true, the thinking powers, to some extent; but thoughtful verse should, in the nature of things, do this; and Mr. Patmore does not number among his eccentricities that of wilful obscurity.

Macpherson's Memoirs of Mrs. Jameson.

Memoirs of the Life of Anna Jameson. Author of "Sacred and Legendary Art," &c. By her Niece, Geraldine Macpherson. London: Longmans. 1878.

Most of us have read that chapter of Miss Martineau's *Autobiography* in which she speaks, not genially, of the various men and women of note who had been her contemporaries. It is a curious chapter in many ways. It reminds one most, perhaps, of the kind of conversation that passes so freely in some literary circles—how A. has irretrievably damaged himself by a certain article, and B. can talk of nothing but his own works, and C. was so deficient in tact as to be seen chatting with a celebrated critic the day after his poem appeared, and D., E., and F. have each their smallnesses and peculiarities;—and that it should remind one of conversation of this kind is not perhaps flattering to a chapter in a grave work written for the enlightenment of posterity. However that may be, among the many passages in the chapter that have an unkindly and inharmonious ring, and carry no conviction whatever, is the following, which we quote because, as Mrs. Macpherson tells us, it indirectly suggested this book:

"The circumstances of women render the vanity of literary women well-nigh unavoidable, when the literary pursuit and pro-

duction are of a light kind: and the mischief (serious enough) may end with the deterioration of the individual. Lady Morgan, and Lady Davy, and Mrs. Jameson may make women blush, and men smile and be insolent; and their gross and palpable vanities may help to lower the position and discredit the pursuits of other women, while starving out their natural powers," etc.*

It is not, perhaps, to be wondered at that words like these should have rankled in the heart of one who had stood to Mrs. Jameson almost in the relation of a daughter. Mrs. Macpherson states, "with frankness," that one of the "strongest motives for her work" is to show, by a simple record of her aunt's life, that the impression conveyed by Miss Martineau is not only "unjust," but "uncharacteristic." We may add that in such passages, and notably in that which relates to Lord Macaulay, Miss Martineau, sitting in judgment, seems to us to condemn herself rather than the prisoners at her bar. Be that as it may, it is not a little surprising that these *Memoirs of Mrs. Jameson*, due, in so great a degree, to a feeling of natural indignation, should be written in such perfect taste and temper. Mrs. Macpherson is now dead. Her story, as told by Mrs. Oliphant in a "postscript" to the "preface," is one of great pathos and beauty—the story, not happily a singular one, of brave womanly self-devotedness, of a life that passes "not unmarked of God." And as death robs praise of all suspicion of fulsomeness, though, alas, in a degree also of its pleasure, we may say quite freely that this book is evidently the production of a cultivated English gentlewoman, who uses her pen ably, and with perfect rectitude of judgment and feeling. An English lady—there can be no higher praise. And now let us turn to Mrs. Jameson's life.

Anna Brownell Murphy was born in Dublin in 1794. Her father, a miniature painter of some note, left Ireland when she was about four years old, and thenceforth pursued his art in various parts of England. The child was clever, imaginative, self-reliant. There is a pretty story told of a wild plan of escape in which she acted as ringleader. We quote it, notwithstanding its length:

"With the parents often out of reach, and the sway of their representative not much beloved by her little subjects, accidents of a thrilling character were apt to happen. Here is one which remains dimly—in its confusion of baby excitement, discomfiture,

* It is amusing to contrast Mrs. Jameson's report of Miss Martineau—written, however, it must be premised, in a private letter, and not at all for publication. "Harriet looking fat and portly, and handsomer than I ever saw her—less plain, perhaps, were the more proper word. But she looks so full of radiant self-complacency that I gazed with admiring astonishment. Gifted, dauntless woman, who has doubt about nothing, and, as people say, belief in nothing; but that I don't *believe*. Her translation of Comte's philosophy is to appear to-morrow."

daring, and distress—in the mind of the last survivor (a sister). By age alike and by nature, Anna was the leader of the little troop of girls, and evidently exercised her power with the charming absoluteness of unquestioned and beneficent despotism. . . . The little girls were left alone for two or three days under the charge of the people of the house in which they lived. These temporary guardians interfered to prevent some delightful composition of mud-pies on which the younger children had set their hearts, and the wail that followed the prohibition came to the ears of the elder sister,—a visionary princess of less than nine summers—who, fired by the wrongs of the babies, and probably urged on by some private injuries of her own, and a longing for the softer sway of their mother, whom all their lives the sisters idolised, immediately conceived a plan of escape. To Anna, as to most other imaginative children, life was *tout simple;* she had not a moment's hesitation in proposing the easy plan that would set all right. It was clear the tyranny of a landlady was not to be endured. With what flutterings of heart must the bold project have been listened to! But what Anna said was sacred to the little sisters, and not to be contested. She unfolded her plan after binding them all to secrecy, and the four little conspirators drew close together in breathless awe and excitement. This plan—what could be more natural and easy?—was, that they should all start instantly that very evening, to join their father and mother in Scotland. It would be the easiest thing in the world, if once they could get away safely. They must be sure and eat all the bread and butter they possibly could at tea, and stow away in the front and pockets of their frocks whatever amount of slices could be secretly abstracted from the plates; then, each provided with a tiny bundle containing a change for Sunday (it chanced to be Saturday, and the clean things had just come from the wash and were not yet put away; and it did not occur, even to the head conspirator, that the change might be made with less inconvenience before they went), they would start on their journey. . . . All went as smoothly as possible, no suspicions were roused, and the little girls stole softly from the house, the nine year old leader, with her heavier burden, encouraging the others till their faltering footsteps broke into a run, and they hurried, one after another, down the village street. But the unusual appearance of the party soon attracted attention, and first one, and then another, 'wondered' to see 'the little Murphys running off by themselves.' Some gossip more energetic than the rest took it upon herself to give the alarm; and, greatly to Anna's chagrin and disappointment, they were pursued and captured before meeting with a single adventure, save that one of the little bundles fell into a ditch, and, when fished out again by herculean efforts, one of Camilla's little red shoes proved, alas, to have been lost for ever."

We shall not linger over the life of this adventurous maiden, or follow its forward course very closely. Let the following brief sketch suffice. Her father's art seems never to have achieved great pecuniary success. At an early age she fell in love with Mr. Jameson, whom she afterwards married. But the course of love did not at first run smooth,—nor afterwards, alas—and she went abroad, through France and Italy, as a governess. It was while on this tour that she wrote, entirely for her own private amusement, the notes and memoranda that were afterwards published, as her first book—the *Diary of an Ennuyée*. In 1825 she married. The marriage was not happy, and, perhaps fortunately, childless. On either side there was no wrong—no hindrance to concord, beyond that which is perhaps the most irremediable—absolute incompatibility of taste and temper. Into the relative rights and wrongs of such a case it is almost always idle to enter. Nor shall we attempt it; merely remarking—and tho remark is general rather than particular—that in the history of matrimonial disputes, the literary husband or wife has usually a rather unfair advantage. In 1829, Mr. Jameson obtained an appointment as puisne judge in Dominica, whither his wife did not accompany him; and then a legal appointment in Canada. Here she joined him for some months in 1836. But, except during this period and the short interval of his previous sojourn in England between the two appointments, her life was practically that of a literary spinster, or widow, with its own pursuits, interests, pleasures, and friendships. She travelled much in Germany and Italy, wrote many books—of which the *Sacred and Legendary Art*, *Legends of the Madonna*, and *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, are the chiefest and best—devoted much time and thought—being an example herein to the newer dilettante school of æsthetic writers—to social questions—was the mainstay and chief support of her father, mother, and sisters—and finally died, full of honour, in March, 1860. There is a fine sculptured head of her, by Gibson, who was her friend, at the South Kensington Museum. The face is massive and powerful. Of her friendships there is one respecting which it may not be amiss to say a word. She was most intimately, devotedly attached for many years to Lady Byron, and the light thrown by their relations on the character of the latter is full of interest. Here, as wherever else one catches a glimpse of her, Lady Byron shows herself a woman of strong, implacable,* unyielding will, of strong if narrow understanding, of abundant charities and imperfect sympathy, of a conscience whose rectitude was untempered by humour or the faculty of entering into the position of others—a woman, in short, whose very qualities

* When asked, after their first interview, what was the chief impression her new acquaintance had made upon her, Mrs. Jameson replied at once, "implacability."

rendered her unfit to be the wife of Lord Byron. The love that for years had bound her to Mrs. Jameson—a love, the shattering of which was as a death-blow to the latter—broke, because Mrs. Jameson had been guilty of some want of confidence, real or imaginary, respecting some circumstance affecting a member of Lady Byron's family.

There would be an interesting chapter to write on Mrs. Jameson's position in the history of English art criticism. We shall not attempt it now. She belongs to the school of critics, for whom any work of art is a poetical theme, a motive of inspiration. We quote the following, not so much for the purpose of illustrating this, as of showing how entirely gratuitous is the assumption that Blake was unknown and unappreciated till within the last few years:

"The most original, and in truth the only new and original version of the Scripture idea of angels which I have met with is that of William Blake, a poet painter, somewhat mad—as we are told, if, indeed, his madness were not rather the telescope of truth—a sort of poetical clairvoyance bringing the unearthly nearer to him than to others. His adoring angels float rather than fly, and with their half-liquid draperies seem to dissolve into light and love; and his rejoicing angels—behold them—sending up their voices with the morning stars that, singing in their glory, move."

Life and Letters of Sydney Dobell.

The Life and Letters of Sydney Dobell. Edited by E. J. With Steel Portrait and Photographic Illustrations. In Two Volumes. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1878.

Sydney Dobell will probably in the future divide with Mr. P. J. Bailey the credit of standing at the head of that group of poetic writers known as the Spasmodic School; and although Dobell, like the rest of the world of contemporary poets, has produced no poem so full of fine thoughts and the elements of poetry as *Festus*, his works show a greater variety, and his career, prematurely terminated, a greater vigour and earnestness than those of Mr. Bailey so far, and than those of any other poet of the group nicknamed spasmodic. We know nothing of the life of Mr. Bailey as yet; for he still lives and periodically remodels *Festus*,—nothing of the life of Stanyan Bigg; and the life of Alexander Smith is by no means striking. Dobell's life, on the other hand, is full of interest even apart from his being the excellent poet he was. Never was man more completely in earnest in everything he did; and but seldom is it shown to us of a poet that he is more thoroughly imbued with the love of righteousness than Sydney Dobell was, from his boyhood upwards.

The book now before us is the third substantial memorial of him that has issued from the press since his much deplored death in 1874; and it is the memorial which tells us most about the man. As a poet he is of course best appreciated through the collected edition of his poetical works edited by Professor Nichol; as a politician and man of letters, we may judge him through the complementary volume of *Thoughts on Art, Philosophy, and Religion*, superintended by the same hand; and now the interesting memoir affixed to the *Poetical Works* is rather supplemented than superseded by the two goodly volumes of *Life and Letters* edited by "E. J.," who, however, states in a prefatory note that "the initials on the title-page are those of the writer of the narrative portion of the book, by whom, also, the letters, &c., have been collected and arranged; but the work has, to a great extent, been 'edited' by more competent hands." Whether this work also owes its finishing touches to Professor Nichol, we are not in a position to say; but it seems more than likely. The labour has been well performed; and though the bulk and extent of the volumes will but too probably prevent their wholesome influence from spreading as far as could be wished, they will be dear not only to the increasing class who love to make a special study of the mind poetic in all its phases, but also to the larger class of readers whose interest lies in biographical art whether the subject be a poet or not.

The trite saying, that this is a world of compensations, though by no means a safe generality, applies with some truth to the case of Dobell. It can hardly be regarded as compensating *him* for his sufferings and premature death that such ample materials for a biography have survived, and such loving and productive labour has been brought to bear thereon, so promptly as to have got before the world, within four years of his death, the five volumes containing his poetical works, posthumous essays and fragments, life and letters. And yet those who love his poetry and cherish his memory may see in his early death a diminution of the chances which these records and the persons best qualified to deal with them had of dropping out of the way. But no one can read this most interesting life without feeling that the world sustained a great loss in the cancelling of those twenty years which might have been expected to be added to the fifty which Sydney Dobell passed on earth. Laymen of the fervently religious habit of thought which characterises Sydney Dobell are not common in the present age; and when to that habit of thought is added such a keen intellect as he possessed, and such fine poetic powers, the world's loss in him is not easy to measure. We seem to discern in this very fervency, and in the preternatural energy of mind disclosed in the early part of his life, the primary cause of his ealy death. His wiser father records in his

journal misgivings on the subject of the passion contracted for Miss Fordham, who became Sydney's wife when he was but twenty years old; and when we note that at this very time (*æt.* 17) he was somewhat arduously occupied in his father's business, and was following his education with vigour and assiduity, we may well believe that a man's passion of desperate earnestness, complicated by painful convictions of the erroneousness of the religious views of the beloved one, would go far to undermine the boy's constitution and produce those years of failing health and that deplorable curtailment of a noble and productive life.

As a chapter in the literary history of the nineteenth century this *Life of Sydney Dobell* has a strong and varied interest. His correspondents were many and distinguished; and, notwithstanding the rigour with which, in his early days, he acted upon a tenet of the small sect to which he belonged, that it was wrong to associate with those of a different way of thinking, his views widened as he gained experience, and he formed literary friendships with men and women of varied views and attainments. The record of these correspondences and friendships becomes peculiarly interesting in the second volume; and it is regretworthy that, so far as utility to the future historian is concerned, this record is impaired by the omission of names which one can hardly see good reasons for omitting. Indeed, in one case, the omission is not effectual,—the case of a "young poet" with whom Dobell came in contact, whose name, scrupulously kept out of the text, is easily discovered through a poem with which it is connected. This "young poet" was Mr. Arthur O'Shaughnessy, by whom the poem in question is acknowledged.

There is one point that calls for special commendation,—the liberality of rejection which has been brought to bear upon the materials. These seem to have been so extensive that, beyond a doubt, much of intrinsic interest has been rejected; but with a residuum so sufficient both in varied quality and in quantity as the two volumes before us contain, it is impossible to do otherwise than commend the editorial judgment which has been content to leave in slumber not only large masses of letters and journals, but also a vast amount of juvenile poetic work, including much that might of itself be worthy of preservation.

PRINTED BY BEVERIDGE AND CO., FULLWOOD'S RENTS, HOLBORN.