

From the Library of
Professor William Henry Green
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

BT 10 .C87 v.7

Current discussions in
theology

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY.

— BY —

THE PROFESSORS

— OF —

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

VOLUME VII.

BOSTON AND CHICAGO:

CONGREGATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

1890

COPYRIGHT, 1890,

BY CONGREGATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

PREFACE.

The aim of these DISCUSSIONS is to answer the question, which every earnest student of theology, both theoretical and practical, may well be supposed to ask at the end of each year, viz: What has been done in the different fields of sacred learning during the past twelve months, and what are the latest results of such studies?

In preparing this Report of Progress, critical reference has been made to the most recent literature, as a help, and we trust a stimulus, to others who should prosecute their studies further along the lines indicated, while enough of the results of the latest investigation is given to make the work immediately profitable to the student.

In summing up the labors of theologians and critics, the natural drift of the literature leads the Reviewer, in most departments, to dwell upon works that deviate somewhat from the familiar path, and in such writings to notice principally what seems to be new and claims to be better than what we already know; for any adequate account of generally accepted views, as reproduced in books year by year, is precluded by the limits of the work and by the supposition that they are already familiar to the reader. Such considerations, and not any particular sympathy with theological novelties, explain the complexion of these DISCUSSIONS, which may appear to some as giving undue prominence to radical teachings and criticisms. Such con-

PREFACE.

siderations account, also, for the many references to works of foreign origin, especially German, which appear in these pages. If in some departments Anglo-Saxon writers are in the minority, the reason is that they produce a much smaller number of books, and naturally less that is new, than do foreign authors. A further reason for referring frequently to the results of foreign scholarship was the desire, cherished from the beginning of this work, that it might help many a student or pastor to keep abreast of the theological thought of the age, who could not readily read the languages in which many of the works are written, or who might not be able to procure the books for himself.

We desire to express our grateful appreciation of the co-operation of many publishers, both American and European, who have sent us their works for notice in this Annual Review.

The present volume of CURRENT DISCUSSIONS includes, in general, the literature of 1889, though, in some cases it notices books that appeared towards the close of 1888, and, in a few instances, it extends into 1890.

The hope has been cherished for some time that the scope of this work might be widened, and that such subjects as Comparative Religion, the Relation of Religion and Science, Christian Art, Inter-Denominational History, and Christian Ethics might receive separate and more extended treatment. The realization of this hope depends chiefly upon the favor of the widening circle of students of theological science in America.

THE FACULTY.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Chicago, March 31, 1890.

CONTENTS.

PART FIRST—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

I. OLD TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTORY	4

CHAPTER I.

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION	5-23
<i>The Pentateuch.</i>	5-19
Westphal, on Sources of Pentateuch	5-10
Harper and Green	10-12
Terry, Introduction to the Pentateuch	12
Riehm, Introduction to the Old Testament	13-17
Baudissin, on Old Testament Priests	17-18
Strack, Introduction to the Old Testament.	18-19
<i>Job</i>	20-21
Gilbert, The Poetry of Job	20-21
<i>The Song of Songs</i>	21-22
Griffis, The Lily among Thorns	21-22
<i>Joel</i>	22-23
Kuenen, on Old Testament Canon	22-23

CHAPTER II.

OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS.	24-32
<i>Genesis</i>	24-25
Dods, on Creation	24-25
<i>Samuel</i>	25-26
Blaikie, Commentary on I and II Samuel	25-26
<i>Isaiah</i>	26-27
Smith, Commentary	26-27
<i>Ezekiel and The Minor Prophets</i>	27-28
Orelli, on Joel, Jonah, Zechariah	27-28

<i>Job</i>	28-29
Volck, Commentary on <i>Job</i>	28-29
<i>Ecclesiastes</i> (Volck)	29
<i>Solomon's Song and Lamentations</i>	29-30
Oettli, Commentary	29-30
<i>Chronicles</i> (Oettli)	30-31
<i>Ezra and Nehemiah</i> (Oettli)	31
<i>Ruth</i> (Oettli)	31
<i>Esther</i> (Oettli)	32

CHAPTER III.

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY	33-53
Riehm	37-45
Schultz	45-49
Monographs	49-53
Baethgen, on History of Semites.	49-50
Koenig, History of Israel	50-51
Dalman, on Adonai	52
Zschokke, on Chokma Literature	53

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY—CONTINUED.

II. NEW TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES.

CHAPTER I.

PHILOLOGICAL AND TEXTUAL	57-65
Grimm's Lexicon	57-58
Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek	59-61
Resch, Agrapha of Gospels	61-64
Gregory, Prolegomena to New Testament	65

CHAPTER II.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION	66-100
Zahn, History of New Testament Canon	68-77
Pfleiderer, Urchristentum	77-82
The Gospels (Holtzmann, Handmann)	82-83
The Acts (Wendt)	84-85
The Epistles (Steck, Klöpper, Hesse, Plummer, Farrar, Rendall, Westcott, Weiss)	85-94
The Apocalypse (Spitta)	94-100

CHAPTER III.

NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS	101-119
The Gospels (MacEvilly, Holtzmann, Steinmeyer, Ballantine)	101-107
The Acts (Wendt)	107-108
The Epistles (Dods, Sadler, Riggs, Findlay, Exell, Weiss, Rendall, Westcott, Knoke, Plummer.)	108-117
The Revelation (Graham, Eremita, West)	117-119

CHAPTER IV.

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY.	120-124
Houghton, on John the Baptist	120
Delff, on Jesus the Rabbi	120-121
Valling, Jesus Christ, the Divine Man	122-123
Sommer, The Apostles' Decree	123-124

CHAPTER V.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY	125-131
Bruce, The Kingdom of God	125-127
Everling, Pauline Angelology	129-130
Gunkel, Pauline Doctrine of the Holy Spirit . . .	130-131

PART SECOND—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE OF STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

INTRODUCTION. ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY	135-140
Sell, History of Christianity	135-136
Renan, Origins of Christianity	139-140

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY CHURCH.	141-189
I. <i>Spread of Christianity</i>	141-146
Ramsay, on Christianity in Phrygia.	141-144
Tixeront and Martin, on the Church of Edessa	144-14
La Ville, Jews in the West	145-146
II. <i>Church and World</i>	146-154
Arnold, Persecution by Nero	146-148
Moeller, Heathen Culture and Christianity	148-149
Reville, Religion in Rome under the Severi	149-152
Lanciani, Ancient Rome in Recent Discoveries	152-154
III. <i>History of Doctrine</i>	154-166
Schneider, The Apostolic Century	154-155
Allen, Early Christian Thought	155-157
Purves, Justin Martyr	157-160
Schepss, Priscillianism	161-162
Raich and Grassman, St. Augustine	163-165
Eirainer, Ephrem Syrus	165-166
IV. <i>Organization of the Early Church</i>	166-177
Withrow, Form of the Christian Temple	166-167
Köppel, Coxe, Livius, the Apostles	167-170
Loening, Church Constitution	170-173
Sanday, Gore, Early Episcopacy	173-175
Allies, Schwarzlose, The Papacy	175-177
V. <i>History of Worship</i>	177-180
Usener, Festivals.	177-18
VI. <i>Early Christian Art</i>	180-183
Wilpert, Principles of Early Art	180-181
Schultze, Reply to Wilpert	181-182
Morillot, Use of Bells	182-183
VII. <i>History of Theological Literature</i>	183-189
Zöckler, Handbook of Theological Literature	183-184
Harnack, Wölfflin, Miodonski, <i>De Aleatoribus</i>	184-185

Bert, Homilies of Aphraates	185-186
Harnack, Acts of Martyrs	186-187
McGiffert, Dialogue between a Christian and a Jew	187-188

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES.	190-220
I. <i>History of the Papacy.</i>	190-199
Freeman, Patriarchate of Pippin	190-191
Diehl, Dahmen, Exarchate and Gregory II.	191-192
Friedrich, Seeberg, on Donation of Constantine	192-193
Köhneke, Wibert of Ravenna	194-195
Ehrle, Council of Vienna	196-198
Scheuffgen, Papal Schism	198-199
II. <i>The Eastern Church</i>	199-202
Gelzer, Church of Alexandria	199-202
III. <i>Theological Thought</i>	202-204
Sell, Augustinianism	202-203
Lindsay, Learning in Scotland	203-204
IV. <i>Church Life</i>	204-208
Penitential System	204-205
Strumhöfel, Morals of Clergy	206
Döllinger, The Oriental Question	206-207
Looshorn, Otto of Bamberg	207-208
V. <i>Monasticism</i>	208-212
Heer, Bossert, Irish Missionaries	209-210
L' Huillier, Life of Hugh of Cluny	210-211
Chevallier, Life of Bernard of Clairvaux	211-212
VI. <i>Sects of the Middle Ages</i>	212-219
Döllinger, on Cathari, etc.	212-214
Creighton, Comba, Haupt, The Waldenses	214-218
Fredericq, The Inquisition.	218
Villari, Savonarola	218-219
VII. <i>Mohammedanism and Christianity</i>	219-220
Görres, Haroun al Rashid and Christianity	219-220

CHAPTER III.

THE MODERN CHURCH	221-266
I. <i>The German Reformation</i>	221-223
Schaff, The German Reformation	221
Sell, The Reformation	221-222
Beard, Martin Luther and the Reformation	222-223

II.	<i>The Reformation in England</i>	223-225
	Hutton, Sir Thomas More	223
	Alexander, English Martyrs.	223-224
	Gasquet, Hendricks, Henry VIII and Monasteries	225
III.	<i>Protestant Beneficence</i>	226-227
	Noble, Protestant Charities	226-227
IV.	<i>The Huguenots</i>	227-228
	Courtisegny, Number of Huguenots	228
	French Protestant Schools	228-229
	Perrenaud, French Protestant Growth	229-230
V.	<i>The Christianity of Russia</i>	230-233
VI.	<i>The Roman Catholic Church</i>	233-242
	Wolf, German Protestants	234
	Ward, Counter Reformation	234
	Leinz, Marriage Laws of Trent	234-235
	Lea, Indulgences in Spain	235-236
	Bellesheim (Blair), Catholic Church in Scotland	236-238
	Döllinger and Reusch, Moral Disputes in R. C. Ch.	238-240
	Pfleiderer, Roman Catholic Orders	240-241
	Brecht, Criminals in Catholic Population	241-242
VII.	<i>The Modern German Church</i>	242-254
	Lichtenberger, Modern German Theology	242-244
	Pfleiderer, Graue, Frank, Hermann, Zahn, Theology of Ritschl	244-250
	Delitzsch, Old and New Theology	250-252
	Beyschlag, Kübel, The German Church	252-253
	Lipsius, Liberal Theology	253-254
VIII.	<i>The Churches of Great Britain.</i>	254-256
	Shaw, English Presbyterianism	254-255
	Ward, The Oxford Movement	255
	Sinclair, Theology in Scotland	255-256
IX.	<i>The American Churches</i>	256-266
	Schaff, Religious Freedom in America	256-257
	Fiske, Beginnings of New England	257-258
	Foster, Eschatology of New England Divines	258-260
	Zahn, History of American Ch'cs. in 19th Century	260-263
	Griffin, Allen, Tiffany, Unitarianism.	263-266

PART THIRD—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE OF STUDIES IN NATURAL AND REVEALED THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE OF THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.	
A. PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS.	269-282
1. <i>The Congregationalists</i>	270-276
2. <i>The Presbyterians</i>	276-282
B. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE	282-320
1. <i>Treatises on Theology as a System</i>	282-299
Kedney, Christian Doctrine	283-288
Nitzsch, Evangel. Dogmatik	288-290
Gretillat, Systematic Theology	290-296
Bruce, Kingdom of God	296-299
2. <i>Theological Criticism</i>	299-309
Stählin, on Kant, Lotze and Ritschl	300-304
Dreyer, Undogmat. Christenthum	304-306
Unitarianism, by different authors	306-309
3. <i>Apologetics</i>	309-321
Mead, Supernatural Revelation	309-318
Clark, Witnesses to Christ	318-321
C. ETHICS	321-325
Salter, Ethical Religion	321-325

PART FOURTH—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

I. PRESENT STATE OF STUDIES IN HOMILETICS.

CHAPTER I.

THEORETICAL HOMILETICS—PREACHING.	330-344
Colloquies on Preaching, Twells	330-335
History of Preaching, Ker	336-342
Sermon Stuff, McConnell	342-344

CHAPTER II.

PRACTICAL HOMILETICS—SERMONS.	345-374
Questions of the Ages, Smith	345
On Behalf of Belief, Holland	346-347

The House and its Builders, Cox	348-350
The Pastoral Epistles, Plummer	350-351
The Immanent God and other Sermons, Jackson	352-354
The Law of Liberty and other Discourses, Whiton	354-357
Through Death to Life, Thomas	357-359
The Threshold of Manhood, Dawson	359-360
The Gospel According to St. Paul, Dykes	361-362
Paul's Ideal Church and People, Rowland	362-364
Sermons, Farrar	364-365
Sermons, First Series, Liddon	366
Sermons, Second Series, Liddon	367
Sermons, Magee	367-369
Sermons and Addresses, Manning	369-371
Signs of Promise, Abbott	371-374

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY—CONCLUDED.

II. PRESENT STATE OF STUDIES IN PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

The Call to the Ministry.	377-378
Forming a Minister's Library	378-379
Reforms in Funerals	379-380
A Congregational Ritual	381-382
Religious Teaching in Schools	382-386
Protestantism and Education	386-387
The American Sunday School	388-389
Out-of-town Missions for City Churches	389-390
Social Drawing Rooms	390-392
Women Among the Early Churches	392-395
Deaconesses in America	395-396
Reaching the Masses	396-398
Taxation of Church Property	398-402

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

OLD TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE
OF
OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES,

BY
REV. SAMUEL IVES CURTISS,

PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PREFATORY NOTE.

The discussion of the literature in the Old Testament Department this year is necessarily limited and incomplete. While the writer was engaged in the preparation of his part of contributions to *Current Discussions in Theology* his only daughter was removed by death March 7th. This must be his apology for a briefer and less-satisfactory treatment of the subject than might otherwise have been expected. He hopes that under these circumstances he may receive the indulgence, as well as the sympathy, of those who may examine the following pages.

After the above had been written the sad intelligence was received of the death of Prof. Franz Delitzsch, D. D., of Leipzig. He was born Feb. 23d, 1813, and died March 4th, 1890. Through his departure the department of Old Testament literature loses one of its brightest ornaments, and all who were ever favored with his confidence a faithful friend.

CHAPTER I.

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

THE PENTATEUCH.—The interest of Old Testament scholars still continues to center mainly in the criticism of the Pentateuch. While other parts of the Old Testament are not neglected, this question, of the origin of the Pentateuch, from its complicated character and the effect which it has upon our view of the history of Israel and of Old Testament theology, gives it a prominent place among Old Testament theologians. There is substantial unanimity among all continental critics with regard to the number of documents which make up the Pentateuch. Differences of opinion, however, exist with regard to the different recensions of each document and their relative dependence upon each other, as determined by the time when they originated.

The most important contributions, from a conservative standpoint, have been furnished by some of our American theologians, of whom Professor Green, who might be considered a worthy successor of Hengstenberg, stands in the fore-front.

An interesting work has been produced by Alexandre Westphal, Licentiate of Theology,¹ entitled "*The Sources of*

¹It may not be known to some of our readers that this title, on the continent, partakes somewhat of the nature of a degree, and

the Pentateuch, a critical and historical study."¹ So far as I am aware, only the first volume has appeared, which treats of the literary problem.

His standpoint appears in the preface, where he says: "Science and faith are two sisters, like Martha and Mary. The one receives the Master and provides for His needs; the other adores in silence, and meditates at His feet. Without Martha, Jesus could not have received the hospitality of Mary; without Mary, Martha could not have heard the conversation of the Savior. Doubtless, the good part is for Mary, but if Martha is troubled it is to retain the Heavenly guest.

"When Luther appeared, applying to consciences wearied with the yoke of men the Holy Book which was chained down, he held by the hand the two daughters of revelation, Science and Faith; strong in the independence which accepted the harmony of their two-fold authority, he said: 'The Scripture is only a servant of Christ. As for me, I give myself not to the servant but to the Master, who is also the Master of the Word. He has secured me felicity through His death and His resurrection. Him I possess and Him I guard.'"²

He also quotes Luther with approval as saying: "Even if it should be true that the sacred writers have mingled in the construction of the sacred Word hay and wood with pure gold and precious metal, the foundation does not

that when conferred after a public disputation it confers the right of lecturing in the University where it is given, on the subject of theology.

¹*Les Sources du Pentateuque*, Paris, 1888.

²*Ibid.* p. iv.

remain less immutable, and the fire of criticism consumes its imperfect elements."¹

It will be seen that his standpoint with reference to the criticism of the Pentateuch is entirely free, and he claims for Christian scholars the utmost liberty of investigation as conducive to the best interests of the Church.

The first volume is divided into three parts. The first treats of tradition; the second, of the precursors of criticism; the third, of criticism itself. The latter is divided into four chapters: The Documentary hypothesis; The Fragmentary hypothesis; The Supplementary hypothesis. In the fourth chapter, he returns to the Documentary hypothesis.

In his discussion of the tradition he says, the first five books of the Bible have been placed in the canon of the Old Testament without the name of an author.² These first books recount the birth, the life and death of the legislator of the Hebrews in somewhat the same way that the first books of the new covenant recount the birth, the life and the death of the Savior of mankind.

The parallel which may be drawn is, that as the Gospels are about Christ and report His words, so the Pentateuch is about Moses and gives an account of his words; although the Pentateuch does not claim Moses as its author any more than the Gospels claim Jesus Christ as their author. There is this difference, however, that certain writings in the Pentateuch are clearly assigned to Moses, while none in the New Testament are assigned to Christ.

¹*Ibid.* p. vi.

²*Ibid.* p. 1.

Indeed, the position of Westphal and other Old Testament critics with regard to the traditions embodied in the Pentateuch is similar to that maintained by New Testament scholars with respect to the traditions concerning Christ contained in the four Gospels. They consider that the four documents they claim to find in the Pentateuch are, as has been shown in a previous volume,¹ blended together in much the same way as our Gospels were in the Diatessaron of Tatian.

And there is the same difference of opinion among the critics of the Pentateuch with regard to the age and hence, with regard to the historical value of these different documents which compose the Pentateuch, that there is between New Testament scholars with reference to the historicity of the four Gospels. In certain ways the book of Deuteronomy, in its relation to the documents found in the Pentateuch, may be compared with the book of John, in respect to the differences which it presents when compared with the other three Gospels.

Westphal asserts, in harmony with other Old Testament critics, that the Pentateuch, as has been intimated, nowhere clearly claims Moses as its author. The authorship of Genesis is nowhere assigned to Moses. In the middle books of the Pentateuch it is simply affirmed that Moses wrote certain brief portions. The clearest claim which seems to be made for the Mosaic authorship of any one book is for that of Deuteronomy. But on examination Westphal and others argue that this cannot be applied to the whole book in an absolute sense, but, in any case, only

¹*Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1887, vol. iv, p. 28.

to the legal part of it; and with this modification, that we are not to understand that Moses wrote all of it in its present form.

Westphal alludes to the fact that in Second Kings, xvii, 13, which was written during the time of the Exile,¹ the authorship of the law is not assigned to Moses, but to God's servants, the prophets.² He argues from this, as well as from Zechariah, vii, 12,³ Ezra, ix, 10-12, that the belief in Moses as the author of the Pentateuch did not exist five centuries before Christ. He affirms that the traditional idea of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was not established till a thousand years after the death of Moses.⁴ In the time of Philo, Josephus and Christ, the belief in the Mosaic authorship was so firmly established among the Jews that any one who might dare to question it was in danger of losing eternal blessedness.

¹*Les Sources du Pentateuque*, p. 6.

According to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by the hand of my servants the prophets."

³"Yea they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law and the words which the Lord had sent by his spirit by the hand of the former prophet."

⁴"L'idée traditionnelle de l'origine mosaïque du Pentateuque ne fit donc son apparition que *mille ans*, au bas mot, après la mort de Moïse. Encore est ce d'une manière très vague et bien incertaine, car rien ne nous permet d'identifier avec nos cinq livres le *sépher tōrath Mosheh* de Neh., viii., 1. Tout nous porte à croire, au contraire, que dans cette désignation la partie est prise pour la tout, et que le recueil des *mitsevoth* prescrits par les prophètes, dont Moïse fut le plus grand, reçoit ici le nom de *Sepher Mosheh*, par la même raison que le recueil des *thehillloth*, composés par les chantres religieux d'Israël, dont David fut le plus célèbre, finit par s'appeler *τὰ τῶν Δαΐδ* dans le second livre des Makkabées (ii., 13). Ainsi, peu à peu, toute prescription anonyme devint *loi de Moïse*, de même que tout chant anonyme devint *Psaume de David*."

In his admirable history of Pentateuch criticism, which takes up the main part of the work, while he shows that heretics and even Church Fathers did not always hold consistently to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, none were found among the Jews who dared to question until the time of a certain Isaaq, who seems to be the same as Isaaq ben Suleiman, or Israeli, who is quoted by Ibn Ezra, one of the most acute of the Jewish commentators, who expressed his speculations in regard to the authorship of the Pentateuch in such an obscure way that they were not understood by any except the few who were in intellectual sympathy with him.¹

Westphal brings down his sketch of Pentateuch criticism to the present time. His work is the most systematic, valuable and complete that the writer has yet seen. In the last part of his book he gives a portion of the Pentateuch according to the three different authors.

Pentateuch criticism has for quite a time been domesticated in America, and various articles which have appeared in different Reviews have showed that our American scholars were not wanting in the understanding of these critical questions; or in the ability to handle them.

The ablest and most detailed discussion of this question which has yet found place in our American publications is now going on in *Hebraica*, between Professor Harper, of Yale University, and Professor Green, of Princeton Theological Seminary. Neither of these debaters seems to present anything essentially new; the presentation of each, however, bears sufficient marks of individuality.

¹Cf. the writer's article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oberlin. 1884, p. 6-8.

Professor Harper fully accepts the modern critical analysis of the Pentateuch, although he is far from following in the footsteps of Wellhausen. His treatment of the subject is entirely unrestrained by any theological prepossessions, or the fear of adverse criticism; at the same time his discussion is carried on in a good spirit.

Professor Green, as is well known, is a stout defender of the traditional theory of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; not because it is traditional, but because he believes that this theory can command the most weighty arguments in its favor. At the same time, he confesses that it seems to him that the inferences which are drawn by the critics from the composite character of the Pentateuch are subversive of the doctrine of inspiration as usually held by our theologians. He is, therefore, all the more earnest in seeking to overcome the positions taken by the critics.

While he admits that the analysis of Genesis into the different documents, as indicated by the critics, might be held without disadvantage, since Moses could be regarded as having used different documents in the composition of this book,¹ he stoutly refuses to see the evidences of such documents in the Pentateuch as a whole. He denies that there is any difference in style between the Elohist and

¹Cf. with this view the theory of Astruc, the father of the analysis of the Pentateuch, who says: "Moses had in his hand ancient memoirs containing the history of his ancestors from the creation of the world; in order to lose nothing he separated them into bits, following the facts which are there related: he inserted these bits entire, one after another, and the Book of Genesis was formed through this combination." See the writer's *Sketches of Pentateuch Criticism*, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oberlin, 1884, p. 680.

Yahvist, or that there are any parallel accounts. With great skill he smoothes away the difficulties which criticism has thrown upon the surface of the Pentateuch. It is a question, however, whether the course of the arguments as gathered from various critics who are substantially a unit in regard to their analysis and in regard to the characteristics of these different documents is fully met by this mode of argumentation.¹

There is, undoubtedly, a danger in undermining any views which have been cherished for ages by Christ's disciples. The discussion of what seem to be the foundations of our faith opens the door for unbelievers to raise objections to the genuineness of a Divine revelation. While we might well wish to shield the weak and have the tenderest desire for the welfare of Christ's little ones, it must be remembered that the Master Himself was not greatly

¹Prof. Terry's Introduction to the Pentateuch in the first volume of the *Commentary on the Old Testament*, New York, 1889, pp. 5-48, is a useful statement of the points involved from a conservative standpoint. He says: 1. "Moses may have employed amanuenses to write down his own words, and to arrange, compile, and transcribe various documents according to dictation and desire. It might even be admitted that he himself wrote not a line of the Pentateuch in its present form, and yet the work is as truly and genuinely his as the epistle to the Romans is a genuine work of Paul....."

2. 'It is supposable that the discourses of Moses, as recorded in Deuteronomy, were edited and furnished with their introductory and supplementary narratives by Eleazar and Joshua.

3. 'It is also probable, and in accordance with the ancient tradition, that Eŷra, the ready scribe in the Torah of Moses, which Jehovah, the God of Israel, gave (Exra vii, 6), transcribed the entire Pentateuch and added in the margin or inserted in the work itself most of those words and passages which are generally believed to have been added long after in the age of Moses."

concerned to furnish an unbelieving generation with a sign from Heaven. If a man disbelieves, he disbelieves at his own peril. It is clear that the criticism of the Sacred Scriptures, while it is reverent, should be entirely untrammelled, and it should be held as a fundamental principle, that Christianity has nothing to fear from the honest criticism of any of the books of the Pentateuch, or of the Old Testament.

Some of our theories in regard to the inspiration of the Scriptures may go to the wall, but the grand fact of Christianity, of its founder, Christ, and of the old covenant which led up to Him can never be blotted out. They stand, immovable as the eternal hills.¹ But our theory of the origin of certain books may change or not according to the clearness of the evidence.

The position occupied by Professor Riehm, in his Introduction to the Old Testament,² is one of absolute freedom. He says that when he began his studies the Sacred Scriptures were, in his eyes, written indeed by men, but composed only by the Spirit of God. He did not admit that there were errors or contradictions in the Bible, or that any of its narratives were not strictly historical. He affirms that this position can only be held by theologians who have not thoroughly investigated the Old Testament.

He says, "My standpoint is this: my entire Old Testament theology rests upon a persuasion of the actual existence of a revelation of God in the Old Testament through which there was a preparation made, and a founda-

¹Cf. the writer's article in *Our Day*, Boston, 1889, vol. IV., pp. 184-190.

²*Einführung in das Alte Testament*, Halle, 1889.

tion laid for the revelation of God in the Son and in the Kingdom of Christ. And the longer and more thoroughly I am occupied with the Old Testament, the more firmly is this persuasion established, and the more clearly does this revelation stand forth as a fact before my eyes, in its historical workings and in its high significance. On the contrary, I discriminate, nevertheless, definitely that revelation of God as a historical fact from the Holy Scriptures as its documentary attestation. Further, I am persuaded that the unique religious dignity and authority of the Sacred Scriptures is chiefly established in the relation in which they stand to that revelation, but, that these Scriptures, considered from the standpoint of literary history, although they were composed by men who were filled by the Spirit of God, still arose in an entirely human and historical way."¹

It will be seen from this that Professor Riehm, like Professor Delitzsch, distinguishes between the revelation made by God to His chosen people, and the history or record of that revelation.² In the Old Testament we have, according to these critics, the record of the revelation, together with the history of its reception and effects. It will also be seen that there is an important difference between this theory, which does not exclude a most conscientious and painstaking effort on the part of God's ancient servants faithfully to record the laws, the teachings and the events as they understood them under the guidance of God's Spirit, and the theory which maintains that the Old

¹*Ibid.* p. 2.

²Prof. Delitzsch once gave his views to the writer for publication, but they are not now at hand.

Testament Scriptures are themselves the revelation of God to His people, given with unerring accuracy.

Professor Riehm refers, in the statement of his standpoint, to two articles in the *Studien und Kritiken*; one by himself in regard to the God-man character of the Sacred Scriptures,¹ the other by Professor Rothe in his article on the Sacred Scriptures.²

In this Introduction, which comprises his course of lectures as delivered to the theological students of the University of Halle, he expresses the earnestest desire that he may not shake the faith of any one of them, and that they should not adopt his views because of his authority, but rather examine them at their leisure after they have left the university.

His work is of special value because, that in this intricate subject of Pentateuch criticism, he gives not only results but also processes. He says that his ultimate object is nothing else than to show the foundation for a belief in revelation which can stand before criticism.

In his discussion of the Pentateuch, as has been already intimated, he finds no testimony in Genesis concerning its author. The testimony of the first four books is not that they were written by Moses, but only that small portions were written by him. He finds in such expressions as "And Jehovah spake to Moses," not so much an indication of writing as of the existence of oral tradition. "We are therefore led through the testimony of the first four books to the supposition that Moses wrote only a

¹*Ueber den gottmenschlichen Character der heiligen Schrift*, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Gotha, 1859, pp. 304-320.

²*Ibid.* 1860, *Zur Dogmatik*. Heilige Schrift, pp. 7-108.

little with his own hand, and that he transmitted by far the greater part of the legislation to posterity through oral tradition, partly of the entire people, partly of the priests, and that this oral tradition was first in later times fixed by writing."¹

His summing up in regard to Deuteronomy, which seems to contain a definite statement that Moses wrote the entire book (Deut. xxxi, 9), is as follows: "1. The testimony of Deuteronomy does not relate to the rest of the Pentateuch.² 2. The testimony of Deuteronomy cannot be taken to mean that the entire book was written by Moses. 3. This testimony, which applies to iv, 44-xxviii, 69, does not indicate that it is an authentic copy of the Mosaic law, but refers only to the work of the Deuteronomiker in which he does not attempt to discriminate between the books of Moses and his own writing. 4. The only part unmistakably assigned to Moses is Deuteronomy xxxii."

After thus considering the testimony of the Pentateuch regarding its author, the various theories regarding the origin of the Pentateuch, he discusses the different codes. The oldest of these is the Book of the Covenant, Exodus xx-xxiii, including the Decalogue (Exodus xx, 2-14), which, as he says, is recognized as Mosaic, notwithstanding the criticisms presented by Wellhausen, who assigns it

¹*Einführung in das Alte Testament*, Halle, 1889, p. 104.

²Prof. Delitzsch has shown, through the citation of Jewish writers, *Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, Leipzig, 1869, pp. 220-223, that the law alluded to in Deut. xxxi, 9-11, which is to be read once in seven years, is Deuteronomy, and does not include the rest of the Pentateuch.

to the time of Manasseh. Next in antiquity is "the law of holiness," Leviticus xviii-xxvi. Contrary to those who are adherents of the school of Wellhausen, he maintains that the middle books of the Pentateuch, including Exodus xii, xxv-xxxi, and xxxv-xl, the book of Leviticus, with the exception of "the law of holiness," and most of the legal sections in Numbers i-x, xv-xix, xxv-xxxvi, are older than the book of Deuteronomy; and that they do not in any case belong to the post-exilic period.

Prof. Riehm's Introduction to the Old Testament is still incomplete. Of the parts which have already appeared, 365 pages are devoted to a discussion of the Pentateuch.

In this connection the history of the Old Testament priesthood,¹ by Count Baudissin, may be mentioned as an important contribution to the study of Pentateuch criticism. Indeed, the object of this investigation is evidently with reference to the relative age of the documents in the Pentateuch, according to the analysis of the critics.

The results of Baudissin's investigations lead him to conclusions with reference to the age of these documents very different from those reached by the school of Wellhausen. He maintains, in opposition to those who hold that the middle books of the Pentateuch were written after the exile, that the final editor of the Hexateuch was the Deuteronomist.² He believes that not only JE but also P were in existence before Deuteronomy; but not that JE had been combined with P at that time. He thinks that he sees an acquaintance on the part of D with the Sinaitic law, as found in P.

¹*Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priesterthums.* Leipzig.

²*Ibid.* p. 233.

He says that the Deuteronomist appears to have belonged to the second half of the Exile. When he speaks of the Deuteronomist he does not mean the original author of Deuteronomy, whom he assigns to an age at latest as early as that of Josiah, but an author writing in the spirit of the one who composed Deuteronomy, and who may perhaps himself, or one who was in closest sympathy with him, have been the author of the historical books of Judges, Samuel and Kings in their modified form.¹

The book is an interesting discussion of the special theme which it treats in regard to the priests, and does not suffer from the criticisms made by a Jewish author who has written upon the same subject.²

The third edition of Strack's Introduction to the Old Testament³, which is a part of Zöckler's Manual of Theological Sciences, was published in 1888. This work, as is well known, is published in the interest of the conservative school of theology. Prof. Strack, however, in his brief discussion of Pentateuch criticism, substantially adopts the views of the modern critical school with reference to the number of the documents which make up the Pentateuch. He says: "In spite of the great popularity which the views of Graf and Wellhausen enjoy at the present time, we are, nevertheless, persuaded that an essential change in the previous treatment of the history of Israel, and especially of the activity of Moses, will not exist permanently."

"On the other hand, one result will certainly remain

¹*Ibid.* p. 235,

²Vogelstein, *Der Kampf zwischen Priestern und Leviten seit den Tagen Ezechiels*, Stettin, 1889.

³*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Noerdlingen, 1888.

fixed—that the Pentateuch was not composed by Moses himself, but was compiled by later editors out of several sources. Against this result no believing Christian has any occasion to contend, or to struggle any more than against any result of true science. It is undeniable, and at present as good as universally recognized, that in the Sacred Scriptures, aside from the Divine factor, human factors have also very essentially been at work. Indeed, the plurality of sources can be turned to the advantage of the credibility of the Pentateuch.”¹

Strack gives an important, although brief summing up, with regard to the number, age and succession of the documents as set forth by the following ten Old Testament scholars: Næleke, Schrader, Dillman, Delitzsch, H. Schultz, Wellhausen, Stade, Graf, Kayser, Reuss.

He says: “Keil, who died on the 5th of May, 1888, was almost the only German Old Testament scholar of any note who still held fast to the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch. If we leave this view aside, since this firm maintenance of it rested less upon his own critical investigations than upon his almost exclusive interest in that which was theological, archaeological and philological, the most important differences (which exist among the critics named) appertain to the Priests’ Code.”²

Inasmuch as Strack admits the right of criticism, it is not surprising that he should concede that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah were written in the time of the Babylonian exile.³

¹*Ibid.* pp. 31-32.

²*Ibid.* p. 29.

³*Ibid.* p. 43.

Job.—Professor Gilbert has produced a valuable contribution to Old Testament Introduction in his treatise on “The Poetry of Job.”¹ It is the result of careful study under favorable circumstances, and represents the consummation of his efforts to secure the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Leipzig. The “translation aims to give the particular rhythmical movement of the original.” The book is divided into two parts, the first of which consists of the translation; the second treats of the interpretation of the poem, including a brief analysis of the book, a discussion of nature in the poem, of the animal kingdom, human life, and the poet’s conception of God.

The following lines give a specimen, not only of the poetical translation, but also of the rendering of one of the most important passages in the book:

“Pity me, pity me, ye my friends!
For the hand of Eloah hath touched me.
O why pursue me like God,
And be not filled with my flesh?
O now that my words were writ down,
O were they inscribed in the book!
With an iron pen and with lead
Forever engraved in the rock!
But I know my Redeemer doth live,
And later shall rise o’er the dust.
Then after my skin, thus beat off,
And free from my flesh I’ll see God;
Whom I for myself shall see,
And my eyes behold, and no stranger.”

So hopeful a beginning in Old Testament work makes

¹*The Poetry of Job*, by George H. Gilbert, Ph. D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, McClurg & Co., 1889.

us regret that the author was not permitted to continue his special studies in this department. We desire, however, to congratulate New Testament scholars on the accession of a man of such scholarly habits and instincts to their ranks.

THE SONG OF SONGS.—Rev. William Elliot Griffis, D. D., of the Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston, has given a noble example of what may be done by a busy pastor in the line of useful scholarship and authorship. His book entitled "*The Lily Among Thorns*," a study of the Biblical drama entitled the "Song of Songs,"¹ is an honor to him as well as to our American clergymen. While the work presents nothing particularly new, to those who are familiar with the criticism of this beautiful love song, it is the most attractive, and perhaps the most complete presentation of modern theories in English dress. He rejects the allegorical interpretation of the poem, and sees in it rather the effort to present a picture of pure love as a lesson to men and women of all times. The work consists of three parts: 1, history and criticism; 2, the text in the Revised Version; 3, studies and comments.

The three main characters, according to the theory presented by Dr. Griffis, are Solomon, the beautiful Shulamite, and her faithful country lover, to whom she remains true amid all the seductions of the court of the most powerful Israelitish king.

It seems to us that the book is far more useful when we lay aside the allegorical interpretation, and adopt that which does not seek to read anything between the lines.

¹Boston, 1890.

The allegorical interpretation has evidently arisen from a desire to find in Scripture, and in this particular Scripture, what it was thought should be its special teaching. It is true that the idea of the relationship between Jehovah and His covenant people as husband and wife, and between Christ and the Church as bridegroom and bride, is often found in the Bible. But we have no authority, except that of Jewish and Christian interpreters, for the allegorical interpretation which makes such a sensualist as Solomon stand for Christ, and the Shulamite represent the Church.

JOEL.—The Introduction to the Old Testament¹ by Professor Kuenen, of which the first volume on the Hexateuch has appeared, has already been noticed in a previous volume. The second volume which treats of the prophetic books of the Old Testament, including the major and minor prophets, has recently been issued. Kuenen's general critical views, which are well known from the English translation of his works, need not detain us. But it is interesting to see that he has entirely changed his theory with reference to the origin of the Book of Joel. As is well known, some of the critics maintain that this is one of the oldest books among the Prophets; others that it is one of the youngest. Professor Kuenen, in the old edition of his Introduction, held that Joel prophesied during the first half of the reign of Joash, between 878 and 858 B. C.

The book contains so much that is favorable to the early origin of the ritual of the middle books of the Pen-

¹*Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan en de Verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds*, Leiden, 1889. The first edition was published in Leiden, 1863.

tateuch, that critics of the modern school are inclined to assign to it a much later date.

Kuenen now holds that Joel was written after, rather than before, the year 400 B. C., for the following reasons : Judah no longer has Israel for a neighbor, but is itself Israel. No king of the royal court is named in the prophecy. The people are ruled by their elders ; next them stand the priests of the Temple at Jerusalem, the only sanctuary which Joel knows. He evidently assigns a high value to the worship in this Temple, especially to the daily sacrifice.¹

There is some danger of the critics reasoning in a circle in reference to the age of this book. If it can be proved that there was no king at the time when it was written, and that all the circumstances conform to the time of the second Temple, then we must admit a post-exilic origin ; but it must be remembered that a large number of scholars firmly hold the older date of the book, although the tendency at the present time is probably indicated in the view quoted from Kuenen.

¹*Ibid.* pp. 341, 354.

CHAPTER II.

OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS.

In our discussion of this subject we shall have reference almost exclusively to the Introduction, in the commentaries mentioned, to the various Old Testament books. An interesting series of commentaries, already known to our American scholars, is in the process of publication, called "*The Expositor's Bible*." The method is not that of treating individual passages, but rather of a free discussion of entire chapters.

While some of the volumes in the series are based upon the results of scientific criticism, others seem to fall below the standard in this respect.

GENESIS.—Professor Dods, in his chapter entitled "The Creation," comprising Genesis I and II, indicates that he is an adherent of a freer method of interpretation than that followed by many. He says we are not to look to the Bible as a source of scientific information. "No one for a moment dreams of referring a serious student of these subjects to the Bible as a source of information. It is not the object of the writers of Scripture to impart physical instruction, or to enlarge the bounds of scientific knowledge. But if any one wishes to know what connection the world has with God, if he seeks to trace back all that now is to the very fountain-head of life, if he desires to dis-

cover some unifying principle, some illuminating purpose in the history of this earth, then we confidently refer him to these and the subsequent chapters of Scripture as his safest and indeed his only guide to the information he seeks.¹

We consider this position taken by Dr. Dods as really a correct one. As we shall indicate elsewhere, we do not think that the Bible was intended to teach science; and we quite agree with Dr. Dods when he says: "All attempts to force its statements into such accord [with science] are futile and mischievous. They are futile, because they do not convince independent inquirers, but only those who are unduly anxious to be convinced, and they are mischievous because they unduly prolong the strife between Scripture and science, putting the question on a false issue."²

Dr. Dods rightly apprehends the design of the writer when he says in connection with Genesis iv, "it is not his purpose to write a history of the world. It is not his purpose to write even a history of mankind. His object is to write a history of redemption."³ He finds that the keynote has been struck in the promise that the seed of the woman should prevail over the seed of the serpent.

In this unbiased way Dr. Dods proceeds throughout the book, which is likely to be useful and helpful to all who wish to make a practical use of Genesis.

SAMUEL.—The commentary on First and Second Samuel by Rev. W. G. Blaikie, of the New College, Edinburgh,

¹*The Book of Genesis*, New York [without date], p. 1.

²*Ibid.* p. 4.

³*Ibid.* p. 28.

is less satisfactory, and does not seem to be especially based on critical study.

This may arise from the fact that Professor Blaikie's department is not that of Old Testament literature and interpretation, but of practical theology.¹ Perhaps there is no book in the Old Testament which furnishes greater room for a careful study of the text than that of Samuel. Besides, those questions which occasion difficulty to Bible students seem to have been entirely passed by, and only a practical discussion of the question has been given.

ISAIAH.—The commentary on Isaiah,² by Rev. G. A. Smith, belongs to the same class of critical exegesis which we have marked in the commentary on Genesis. The treatment of the prophecy is highly creditable to the author and useful to the student. Mr. Smith has taken special pains to discuss the prophecy with reference to its historical setting. The plan that he has adopted for grouping Isaiah's prophecies is as follows: he considers that those which fall within Isaiah's time were determined chiefly by four Assyrian invasions of Palestine: "The first, in 734-732 B. C., by Tiglath-Pileser II, while Ahaz was on the throne; the second by Shalmanassar and Sargon, in 725-720, during which Samaria fell, in 721; the third by Sargon, 712-710; the fourth by Sennacherib, in 701, which last three occurred while Hezekiah was king of Judah."³

He says further, taking all these dates into consideration: "I have placed in Book I all the prophecies of Isaiah

¹See Schaff, *Encyclopedia of Living Divines*, New York, 1887, p. 19.

²*The Book of Isaiah*, New York [without date].

Ibid. p. xi.

from his call in 740 to the death of Ahaz, in 727. . . Book II deals with the prophecies from the accession of Hezekiah in 727 to the death of Sargon in 705. . . Book III is filled with the prophecies from 705 to 702. . . Book IV contains the prophecies which refer to Sennacherib's actual invasion of Judah and siege of Jerusalem in 701."

As a specimen of his method we find that in chapter vii, with all modern critics, he gives up the translation of "*almah*" as virgin, and renders it "*the young woman of marriageable age*," but at the same time he fully accepts the Messianic character of the passage.

EZEKIEL AND THE MINOR PROPHETS.—The commentary by Orelli on these prophets,¹ which is a volume in the series by Strack and Zöckler, is an example of a work which is both practical and critical. The plan of the work is: first, to give a literal translation of the text; second, notes which are grammatical and critical; third, to indicate the contents in a way which will be clear to a layman who is unacquainted with Hebrew. Hence the commentary is useful from a critical and practical standpoint. We cannot delay with his exposition of the prophecy of Ezekiel, but pass on to his discussion of some of the minor prophets.

JOEL.—In contradistinction to many of the modern critics, he considers that the book of Joel was written before the Exile and belongs to one of the oldest prophecies. He places it in the age of King Joash, on literary and historical grounds.

JONAH.—Orelli is among the few German critics who regard the book of Jonah as based upon actual history.

¹*Das Buch Ezechiel und die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, Nördlingen, 1888.

With Keil he seems inclined to believe that the events narrated in it occurred substantially as described, and that they had their justification in the use which was made of them by Christ as typifying his own death and resurrection; although he is not inclined to affirm that if Jesus' resurrection was a bodily fact, the stay of Jonah in the belly of the fish must be a fact of history.

ZECHARIAH.—With reference to Zechariah, he takes a decided position against a unity of authorship. While the first part, chapters i-viii, was written after the Exile, he considers that chapters ix-xi are to be regarded as a prophecy by a younger contemporary of Hosea. Chapters xii-xiv, on the other hand, are from an entirely different age, which he maintains was subsequent to the death of Josiah at Megiddo; hence in the period of Jeremiah.

The series of commentaries, of which the volume just mentioned is one, belongs, as is well known, to the conservative school of theology in Germany.

JOB.—Professors Volck of Dorpat and Oettli of Berne are joint authors of the *Poetical Hagiographa*¹ belonging to the same series as that just noticed. The commentary on Job is by Professor Volck.

He does not hold that the book of Job is actual history, or that the events occurred as narrated there, but that they are presented in a dramatic form. The hero of the book is not an Israelite, but one of those pious servants of the true God who lived outside of Israel. He does not consider it necessary to argue against the early authorship of the

¹*Die Poetischen Hagiographen*, Nördlingen, 1889. †

book, before the time of Moses, for he says that at the present day it does not require any refutation. On the other hand, he does not admit that it was written after the Exile. He thinks that it was probably composed about the year 700 B. C. This seems to him to be supported by the fact that in the time of Hezekiah, 727-698 B. C., the composition of proverbs (xxv, 1) received a new impulse. The discourses of Elihu, which with other critics he maintains were the product of another hand, were composed during the sixth century B. C.

He argues decidedly against the derivation of the doctrine concerning Satan from Parseeism.

ECCLESIASTES.—The commentary on the book of Ecclesiastes is by the same author. He says the supposition that this book originated with Solomon can now be considered as fully disproved; and that the artificial name Koheleth, which is assigned to the son of David and King of Jerusalem, shows that the representation that a son of David is speaking here is to be recognized as a fiction.

From the lexical peculiarities of the book, in which there are many Aramaic elements, he concludes that it was not written until the Persian period, and that the place of its composition was in Jerusalem.

SOLOMON'S SONG AND LAMENTATIONS.—The commentary on Solomon's Song, not to speak of that on Lamentations, is by Oettli, professor of theology at Berne. He takes the ordinary critical view in regard to the dramatic form of the book. Like most modern scholars, he rejects the allegorical interpretation of it. With them, he considers that Shulamith remained true to her shepherd lover in the midst of all the seductions of Solomon's court. He says that the dis-

courses of Shulamith, and of her friend are pure, while those of Solomon and the court ladies are not so in an equal degree. With reference to the view of those who consider Solomon the beloved one he remarks: "No one in the entire Israelitish history is less adapted than Solomon to represent the mystery of wedded love." This is undoubtedly true.

With reference to the time of composition, he maintains that it was written in the first half of the tenth century B. C., in the generation following the time of Solomon, and that the object of the composition is to set forth a pure human love.

CHRONICLES.—Professors Oettli and Meinhold have issued a commentary in the series, on the Historical Hagio-grapha.¹

It is well known that the tendency of scholarship is to throw doubt upon the credibility of the book of Chronicles. It is regarded, at best, as written so strongly with a particular end in view as to cause an actual, if not a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts of history.

While Oettli admits that the author has represented history according to the standpoint of his time, he nevertheless claims that the author of the books of Chronicles has made use of many good sources. Indeed, there is no work in the Old Testament which refers to so many documents as the book of Chronicles. Oettli shows that there is evidence that the chronicler has not drawn merely upon his imagination for those points in which he diverges from the books of Kings and Samuel. He concedes, however, that his writings are inferior as a source of Old Tes-

¹ *Die Geschichtlichen Hagio-graphen*, Nördlingen, 1889.

tament history, to those of the parallel historical books, because the text has been less carefully preserved, and because of the strong subjectivity with which the author treats the history.

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.—The books of Ezra and Nehemiah were reckoned by the Jews as one book, and were known by the name of Ezra. The commentary on these is by Professor Oettli. He considers that they were based on good, historical memorials. He finds in them a history of the post-exilic congregation from the first year of Cyrus (Ezra i, 1), to the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes (Neh. xiii, 6), hence from 536 to 433 B. C., although many important connecting links are omitted. From this period we have the history of the following years: Ezra i-vi, describing the years 536-516; Ezra vii-x, the years 458-457, while the entire intermediate period from 516 to 458 is passed over; Neh. i-vii treats of the years 445 and 444, while the years 457-445 are entirely neglected. Chapters viii-x of Nehemiah fall in the years immediately following until 433.

Following in the footsteps of other critics, he considers it impossible that either Ezra or Nehemiah should be the author of the book called by his name; for in Neh. xii, 10-11 the list of high priests is given from Jeshua to Jaddua; hence the book could not have received its final form until the time of Alexander the Great.

RUTH.—The commentary on Ruth, which is also by the same author, is considered, contrary to many critics, as furnishing true history, and as affording clear evidence of being written while Israel had a grand history behind it as well as a grand future before it. Perhaps in the same age when the books of Samuel were composed.

ESTHER.—The commentary on the book of Esther is also by Oettli. He considers that the object of the book was to give a historical explanation of the traditional festival of Purim. As is well known, the name of God does not once occur in this book. The reason of this may have come from the extreme reverence which in later times led the Jews to avoid the profanation of the divine name, especially perhaps in connection with the joyful celebration of the Purim festival. He argues in favor of the historical character of the book, and considers it necessary to assume this in order to explain the origin of the Purim festival.

CHAPTER III.

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

During the past year, three works have been published covering the entire subject of Old Testament Theology. Two of them were issued after the death of their authors, who were professors in the University of Halle. The third is the fourth edition of Schultz's Old Testament Theology.¹ Together, they form the most important contribution which has been made in any one year to the study of the subject, and are all worthy of translation into English, especially the treatise by Schultz.

As the works of Riehm² and Schlottmann³ were not revised by their authors with reference to publication, they do not possess that finish in detail which might have been expected if their authors had been permitted to carry them through the press.

Professors Riehm and Schlottmann occupied a position which in Germany would be called conservative. This remark is particularly true of the latter, although neither of them would fall into this category from the prevailing standpoint of our American theologians.

¹ *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Göttingen, 1889.

² *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Halle, 1889.

³ *Kompendium der Biblischen Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Leipzig, 1889.

Professor Schultz takes a position nearer that of the school of Wellhausen, though differing from him in essential points. His work is of exceeding importance, because it makes such an application of critical theories as to show that a constructive criticism can rise upon the ruins of that which is commonly regarded as destructive.

No unbiased student can read the work of Schultz without admiring his profound knowledge of the Old Testament, with which he seems to be saturated, and the reverent spirit which pervades the book, and without feeling that whatever criticism may prove we have a settled ground for our belief in the inspired character of the Old Testament Scriptures.

The treatise by Professor Schlottmann, which is called a Compendium of Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments, is especially to be commended for its logical method and clear presentation of the subject.

We shall confine ourselves to that part only which relates to the Old Testament.

After a definition of the idea of Biblical theology in the ordinary acceptance of the term as the scientific representation of Biblical teaching in its historical development,¹ he treats of the origin of Biblical theology, which he dates back about one hundred years, and of which an admirable historical sketch is furnished by Professor Riehm.²

¹ Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1887. Vol. IV, p. 48.

² The first who treated this subject, but from a rationalistic standpoint, was Gabler, 1787. The principles which he laid down were carried out by G. L. Bauer. 1796. A further advance in the discussion of the subject, although of a superficial character, was made by G. P. C. Kaiser, 1813. De Wette marks a still further stage in

In the strict acceptation of the term, however, Biblical theology must be regarded as a product of the scientific system of exegesis developed during the last fifty years.

While Schultz maintains that the Apocryphal writings of the Old Testament can be used only in an explanatory way,¹ Schlottmann considers them an important connecting link between the Old and New Testaments.²

Biblical theology is the completion of the historical and critical study of the trained exegete. Its relation to the scientific treatment of Biblical history is the same as the history of doctrine to that of universal Church history. Schlottmann considers it as the norm and corrective for systematic theology. His division of the subject is as follows: 1. The Primitive Tradition; 2. The Law; 3. Prophecy; 4. The Theocratic Consciousness of the Congregation; 5. Post-canonical Judaism.

His views regarding the primitive tradition are, that the primitive history of mankind (Genesis i-xi) and the patriarchal history (Genesis xii-l) do not rest on a revelation made to Moses, but that they rather contain reminiscences of an original revelation and of the real facts of Divine guidance, not only in the most ancient periods of the human race, but also in the time of the patriarchs. While these reminiscences, from a necessity of the degree of human development in the time when they originated,

this department, 1813. Vatke, 1835, and Bruno Bauer, 1839, prepared works from the standpoint of the Hegelian philosophy. Not to mention several other names, we come to the real founders of Biblical theology, Oehler, Schultz and Ewald.

¹*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Göttingen. 1889, p. 11.

²*Kompendium der Biblischen Theologie*, Leipzig, 1889, p. 2.

have been partially expressed in a poetic symbolism, they are not mere myths, in accordance with the claim of Schultz, as we shall see later on.¹

In like manner the true significance of the patriarchal religion is only recognized when it is understood and represented as a general historical pre-supposition of Mosaism.²

He finds two stages in the primitive Mosaic tradition : 1. the primitive religion ; 2. the patriarchal religion. The history of creation is a primitive tradition of mankind which was preserved in greatest purity by the faithful. The deviations which we find in other national forms of the tradition are due to the disturbing influences of heathenism. We are to discriminate two factors in this tradition : that of the Divine revelation, and that of human meditation on the works of God. Whatever may be true of the account of creation on its natural side, it is not a miraculous anticipation of the results of modern scientific research. Such a theory involves an artificial treatment of the text without any satisfactory results. It belongs rather to the human factor as affected by the time when it was produced. It is not designed to give any laws to science in its special department. It only affords a standard for the way in which, at all times, the human knowledge of the gradual development and of the fixed order in nature is to be harmonized with the Divine factor set forth in the Biblical history of creation.³

¹*Ibid.* p. 6.

²*Ibid.* p. 8.

³*Ibid.* p. 9.

He does not consider the serpent an instrument of evil spirits, as there is not the least allusion to this fact, but rather, the evil spirit himself is symbolically represented through this cunning reptile.¹

In his view of the patriarchal religion, while he admits that the reminiscences of the patriarchal period are partially expressed only in a symbolical and poetical form, the historical characteristics of it are to be recognized, not only internally but also externally.²

The revelations made to the patriarchs are distinguished from those of an earlier period in two particulars: 1, in the announcement of a special people who are to be distinguished from the heathen through a true worship of God, and 2, through a universal salvation which is to be expected in the fulness of time. The first element is especially emphasized by the Elohist, the second by the Jehovist.

The Old Testament theology by Professor Riehm is a much more elaborate work than that by his colleague, Professor Schlottmann. It covers 440 pages, is limited to the Old Testament, and is illustrated by learned notes. His work is a much more valuable contribution to the subject than the posthumous volume of Professor Kayser.³ His treatise is divided into three parts: Mosaism, Prophetism and Judaism. Mosaism includes not only the direct teaching of Moses, but his fundamental thoughts as adapted to the needs of the people in religious and political institutions by the priests, and as developed by them from the

¹*Ibid.* p. 11.

²*Ibid.* p. 13.

³*Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, Vol. iv, pp. 54-59

time of Moses until that of Samuel. Prophetism extends from the time of Samuel until the extinction of prophecy and the restoration of the theocracy through Ezra and Nehemiah. Judaism extends from the time just indicated to the New Testament period, although the latter boundary is rather implied than stated by the author.¹

In the first part of the historical introduction, Riehm considers the difference between the Old Testament religion and the other religions of antiquity, in its conceptions of God, in its ethical character, and in its being the religion of hope.

The Old Testament religion, in its essential differences from all the other religions of antiquity, is neither a product of a universal human capacity for religious ideas, nor a mere product of the natural development of one of the Semitic races possessing an especial gift for monotheism,² as Renan has claimed. Hence, the religion of Israel is, in its origin, a religion of revelation. The other religions are products of the natural development of the religious spirit of mankind.³

He then discusses the characteristics which the Old Testament religion has in common with the other religions of antiquity: 1, as a religion of the people; 2, as connected with a definite holy place, that is with the national sanctuary; 3, in a special priesthood; 4, in popular forms,

¹*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Halle, 1889, p. 11.

²Cf. Renan, *Nouvelles considérations sur le caractère général des peuples Sémitiques, et en particulier sur leur tendance au monothéisme*, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1859. Riehm says his position is historically without foundation.

³*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Halle, 1889, pp. 20-27.

customs and ceremonies. That which the Old Testament religion has in common with the other religions of antiquity was willed by God, was designed for the training of the people, and had its Divine justification in the age of the Old Testament economy.¹

He next surveys the essential connection of the Old Testament with Christianity, as well as the differences between the two. The connection consists in the self-revelation of God in both dispensations, and in the moral and religious knowledge which Christianity everywhere pre-supposes and upon which it is founded. Old Testament piety, in all its essential elements, is the same as that of the New. In the foundation and establishment of the Old Testament Divine State, all the chief elements in the counsel of redemption and in the idea of the Kingdom of God come to a realization; hence, in the entire old covenant the new is typically prefigured, and Christianity in the Old Testament religion. The establishment of a true fellowship with God, and of a perfect Kingdom of God, which is attained in Christianity, is also the end of the Old Testament religion. Christianity is, therefore, the fulfillment of Old Testament promise and hope. The Old Testament law stands in a theological and pedagogical relation to this end, and the entire progress of development of the Old Testament religion in prophetism moves towards its goal as found in Christianity.²

Riehm traces the following differences between the Old Testament religion and Christianity, which all have their common ground in the fact that first through the sending

¹*Ibid.* pp. 27-30.

²*Ibid.* pp. 32-36.

of the Son as the Mediator of revelation and salvation, and through his redemptive work, the complete spiritual and moral fellowship with God, which consists in the indwelling of God in the individual hearts of all, is established, and the Kingdom of God is founded as a Kingdom of Heaven. As an outgrowth of this idea, he discriminates the following elements: That which is essentially new in Christian religious knowledge is the knowledge of the real union of God and man in the person of Jesus Christ for the purpose of carrying out the complete plan of God concerning mankind.

With reference to the life and fellowship with God, Christianity is distinguished from the Old Testament religion in the following particulars: 1, there is a firm foundation in it for a constant and perfect certainty of the forgiveness of sins, which can be secured by all; 2, of a personal fellowship of each individual with God through the constant indwelling of God's Spirit in the heart; 3, in the consciousness that one thus attains as belonging to God, there is the full assurance of being His child. In connection with this, Christianity has no special priesthood who have the calling as mediators of salvation, and no continual atoning sacrifice.

Since through Christ the perfect moral and spiritual fellowship with each individual is established, the Kingdom of God is no more, as in the Old Testament, an external, national, Divine State, but a spiritual kingdom which, as such, is raised above all national peculiarities. Hence, the New Testament universalism first breaks through the national particularism of the Old Testament.

In the Old Testament the religion of the Kingdom o

God appears as belonging to this earth, and to this life. Heaven and earth, the other world and this, come in contact only in the sacred places of God's presence upon earth; otherwise they are completely separated from each other. Only this world is the place of human life, human fellowship and the completion of salvation. Hence, the relation of Old Testament promises and threatenings to the present life, and only scattered presentiments of a future communion with God after death. Christ, on the other hand, as the one who came from Heaven and as again raised to Heaven, founded in connection with complete communion with the eternal God the Kingdom of God, as a Kingdom of Heaven upon the earth; that is, as a kingdom in which this present world and the future world are most intimately connected, and are so related that the development of human life and the relationship of the individual to God attains its decided conclusion and completion in the future life, in the same manner as the development of Christian fellowship. Therefore, the threatenings as well as the promises relate in Christianity to the future life, and hence, the Christian has the clear and certain hope of eternal life, which the believer in the old covenant did not enjoy.¹

In the second part of the historical introduction Riehm treats of the religious peculiarities of the Semites.

The religion of the Semitic race must have been simple and relatively pure, especially without a developed mythology, and without real images; but it possessed sacred stones and trees and teraphim, which served as rep-

¹*Ibid.* pp. 36-42.

representatives of the Deity from whom they sought information. We may form certain conclusions from the common peculiarities of the religions of the Semitic peoples which show that they formed an especially favorable ground for the founding of the Old Testament religion.

The following are the religious peculiarities of the Semitic stock: 1. The uncommon energy with which the religious spirit and bent make themselves felt as ruling the entire current of the people's life, and which easily put all other interests in the background; 2. In connection with this unique character of the religious spirit is the predilection of the Semitic peoples for special deities for their peoples and families. Each tribe had its own peculiar God, as a representative of its nationality in the world of gods, to whom all other gods were easily subordinated. In this expressed predilection for a god of the people lay a connecting link for monotheism; 3. Moreover, out of this religious energy among the Semitic peoples grew an especially strong tendency to know the will and counsel of the Deity, and hence, an unusual development of the lower and higher forms of prophecy. This religious characteristic, therefore, was significant for the founding of a religion through the self-revelation of the living God; 4. A most important characteristic of the Semitic religion is, that the idea of God was not so intimately and immediately connected as in the Indo-Germanic religions with the concrete, sensuous and visible individual essences and elements of nature, but especially with the universal and abstract representations of the great powers and forces which are active in nature. Hence, the names of God are mostly conceptions of attributes which indicate power and lord-

ship. This peculiarity of the religion of the Semites was not a preservative against polytheism, but there always remained a consciousness of the exaltation of Deity above the human world, and of His Almighty power over all created existences: 1. Every representation of the Deity was therefore principally found in the heights of Heaven, especially in the stars; 2. They remained, instead of images, symbols of the Deity for a long time. In the oldest and most simple form of the Semitic religion this consciousness of the exaltation of the Deity above the human world must have become much stronger and purer, thus rendering this domain of religion especially favorable for the development of monotheism.¹

With reference to the religion of the patriarchs, Riehm says that they worshiped a true God. In this respect Abraham differed from the rest of his tribe, who were sunken in idolatry; in case he used the plural form Elohim, he did not understand it in a polytheistic sense.²

So far as the patriarchal consciousness of God is concerned, the first and most prominent elements in their ideal of Him was His omnipotence, as appears from such old Semitic designations as El and perhaps, also, Elohim. El represented God as the strong one, Elohim as the object of fear and adoration. After Abraham had recognized the contrast between his worship of God and that of the polytheistic Canaanites through God's self-revelation, he called Him the Most High, and the Creator of the heavens and earth, and worshiped Him as El Shaddai, that is, as the God who exercises all power over the weak gods of the Canaanites.

¹*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Halle, 1889, pp. 43-46.

²*Ibid.* p. 47.

The patriarchs, according to the ancient tradition, worshiped God under these names, and accordingly, until the time of Moses, El and Shaddai are used as component parts of proper names, but not Yahwe.

In connection with the Almighty Power of God in the patriarchal conception of Him, we have the moral elements. The special relation which the patriarchs had to their tribal God led to a particular feeling of dependence on Him. Hence, the God of the patriarchs entered into a close relationship with His worshipers, and used His Divine power for their good. In connection with this was the consciousness that they were under obligations to do that which was pleasing to Him. The external sign of this obligation was introduced by Abraham as circumcision.

The revelation and presence of God, and hence communion with Him, was joined in the belief of the patriarchs with a definite sacred place, and especially with the land of Canaan. The places which appear in the tradition are especially Shechem, Bethel, Hebron, and Beersheba. But also Mount Sinai, as among many tribes of Arabs, was considered by the Israelites, even in the pre-Mosaic period, as a sacred mountain of God. The worship of the patriarchs was simple, and was exercised in the open air. Old Semitic customs prevailed to this extent that in part great old trees, stones which were raised up and were anointed with oil, served indeed, not as symbols of God himself, but probably as sacred monuments and signs of Divine presence.

In Egypt, the patriarchal religion was partially corrupted through the worship of the old Semitic symbol of a

steer, and was partially supplanted by that of other gods.¹

Riehm speaks of Moses as called by God and appointed through great miracles as the leader of the people. All his laws and ordinances are given as the mediator of revelation in the name and by the command of Jehovah.²

Schultz differs essentially from the preceding authors in his treatment of Old Testament theology.³ Instead of dividing his subject under the three heads of Mosaism, Prophetism, Judaism, as is done by Riehm, he considers, first: The historical development of religion and morals among the Israelites, until the foundation of the Hasmonæan state; and then, The religious views of Israel as the result of the religious history of the people.

In an introduction extending over seventy-seven pages, he discusses the idea and method of Biblical theology, literary forms in the writings of the Old Testament, the religion of the Old Testament in connection with the history of religions, the relation between the Old and New Testament, the periods and sources of the Old Testament religion, closing with a survey of the literature of Old Testament theology.

Perhaps the most important and interesting part of this introductory matter for English readers is the view which he presents in regard to "sage" and myth (*Sage und Mythos.*) He maintains that the history of Israel begins like all other histories with "sage,"⁴ and the religious

¹*Ibid.* pp. 47-52.

²*Ibid.* p. 56.

³*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Göttingen, 1889.

⁴The writer retains this term because it is really untranslatable.

views of the people are represented, in their earliest stage, by myths. He claims that both "sage" and myth are best adapted as the media of Divine revelation. The "sage" is best adapted, because it introduces us at once to the popular heart, and gives us a representation of the inmost life of the people unconditioned by the stern necessities of a historical account. He defines "sage" as the spontaneous effort of the people to embody their historical characters, before the literary period has commenced, by means of a free use of tradition. In this effort there is no consciousness of an attempt to give a false representation of the early annals of the people; but certain persons who present the life of the people in an ideal way, are set forth as their ancestors. In such "sagen" there is perfect freedom from the conditions of time and space, of heaven and earth. In this way he accounts for the great age of the antediluvians, and of many things which in the early accounts seem to be contradictory, or are accounted as miraculous. The myth, in contradistinction to the "sage," is the direct medium of religious truth; that is, the truth is presented in a symbolical, or allegorical way. "As history is developed from 'sage,' doctrine is developed from myth."¹

In illustration of the proposition that "sage" is better adapted than history as the medium of the Holy Ghost, Schultz says, that in Jacob-Israel the Israelite is more fully portrayed than in any form which we find in the books of Kings or Chronicles. He considers Abraham, whom he regards as one of these characters which have arisen from

¹*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Göttingen, 1889, pp. 16-22.

Old Testament "sage," as more instructive, for the Old Testament revelation, than all the kings from Saul to Zedekiah.

He says the narrative of creation, the primitive state, and the fall are myths; that is, they are designed as the media of religious instruction.

The following is his view of the Old Testament: "Genesis is the book of sacred 'sage' introduced by myths. Its first three chapters contain myths of revelation of the most important kind; the following eight, mythical elements which are cast more in the form of 'sage.' From Abraham to Moses we have pure, popular 'sage,' commingled with many mythical elements which have become almost imperceptible. From Moses to David we have history, still mixed with very many *sagenhaft* elements, which have also, in part, been blended with mythical elements which cannot be distinguished as such. From the time of David forward, we have history with no more *sagenhaft* elements than are found everywhere in ancient historical writing."

Such views are more commonly held by German evangelical Old Testament theologians than is usually supposed. Riehm evidently recognizes such elements in the Old Testament, although he nowhere enters into a detailed discussion of the subject; and, from certain remarks which the elder Delitzsch dropped to the writer, it was evident that he had a place in his view of the Old Testament, at least to a limited extent, for mythical elements. But Schultz is the only man of evangelical spirit who has discussed the presence of mythical elements with reference to their bearing upon the question of inspiration and Divine revela-

tion. Whatever criticism may be made upon this theory it must be conceded that he has thought the matter through, and has conducted the investigation in a sympathetic and reverent spirit. There is no room in this theory for the gross assumption of deliberate fiction, fraud, or fabrication. He simply claims that God has made use of human instruments in making His revelation, without suspending the laws of the human mind, or transporting writers into a state of Divine perfection in the preparation of history. The ultimate end of God in this revelation was not science, or history, but the redemption of mankind. In carrying out this end, He has not given perfect science or perfect history, but the revelation has been made in the best manner attainable, through the people to whom it was given, and with a complete adaptation to the end in view. The chief thing, then, is the redemption and the life which it involves; everything else is subsidiary. While there are, doubtless, difficulties connected with this view, it possesses these advantages:

1. Criticism of the Scriptures can be conducted with as little fear as that of any other book, because criticism can never touch the purpose for which they were given;
2. There can be an entirely unbiased exegesis, conducted on purely grammatical and historical principles, the question ever being, not what we would like to have a passage mean, but what it does mean;
3. There can be no gulf between science and religion. Let science make her investigations perfectly untrammelled by theological necessities, without desiring to prove a given thesis; and let the scientist keep his hands off from the Scriptures, and confess that he knows nothing about theology;
4. The fact of a revelation will be

kept distinct from the literary problems which confront us in the Old Testament; 5. Such theories as those maintained by Schultz in regard to the literary elements in the Old Testaments will be rejected or modified, not because they shock us or seem unworthy of a Divine revelation, but because they are demonstrated as untrue. There certainly should be a position found where, after criticism has done its worst, we can say with all confidence of the Scriptures: "They are the Word of God."

MONOGRAPHS.—There are two schools which hold diametrically opposite views with reference to the origin and history of the Old Testament religion. As has already been remarked, Renan maintains that we find monotheism among Hebrews, because the Semitic people had a genius for monotheism. On the other hand, Kuenen and others teach that monotheism was the last stage in a historical development beginning with fetichism, polytheism, and passing on up through monolotry into monotheism. He holds that the latter was the product of the prophetic teaching of the eighth century B. C. Baethgen, in his contributions to the religious history of the Semites,¹ seeks to show that both these views are untenable. His book consists of two parts. In the first he treats of the world of gods of the heathen Semites; and in the second, of Israel's relation to polytheism. Under the first division, he shows conclusively that not one of the Semitic peoples was monotheistic in its early form of religion, and that therefore, the position assumed by Renan is groundless.

Koenig, in his Contributions to a positive building up

¹ *Beiträge zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin, 1888.

of the religious history of Israel,¹ argues against the existence of monotheism among other peoples who are of non-Semitic origin. He says that Max Mueller, in his lectures on the origin and growth of religion, has expressed the opinion that the Indian religion as we find it in various strata of the Vedas, had advanced to henotheism, in which one god stood out so strongly in the entire pantheon before the spiritual eye of the poet, as to have concealed the other gods; and further, that this religion had advanced to monotheism, since in the songs of the Vedas, the idea of one God as the creator and ruler of the universe found expression. Koenig does not find this position established. He sees no evidence in the Indian religion of a personal God, but merely of an abstraction in a pantheistic system, which does not exclude other gods.

The view is also held that among the Indo-Germanic peoples we find evidences of monotheism; and also among the Hamites, as represented in the land of the pyramids. He alludes to the fact that Amenhotep IV., the tenth ruler of the eighteenth dynasty, declared that there was one only god, namely, Aten, the sun disk. But Koenig maintains that we have here no genuine monotheism, but only materialism, which was really the deification of the sun. It must be remembered, too, that this form of worship passed away with the death of Amenhotep. Koenig concludes, as the result of his investigation, that there was no monotheism outside of the Old Testament. In the second part of his work, Baethgen seeks to show that monotheism among the Israelites is not an outgrowth of polytheism. Among the

¹*Beiträge zum positiven Aufbau der Religionsgeschichte Israels.*
Leipzig, 1889.

arguments adduced by those who maintain this position, controverted by Baethgen, are, that we have the following evidences of polytheism as the original religion of ancient Israel: 1. In the use of the name *Elohim* as a designation for God. Baudissin maintains that this word can scarcely be otherwise understood than as going back to a polytheistic origin, but Baethgen shows that it is employed for Dagon and other individual deities, and insists that the form is to be explained on the same principle as other plurals in Hebrew. He also discusses the use of *Baal* in the formation of proper names. It has been argued by Kuenen and others that, as Gideon is called *Jerubbal*, and Saul had a son *Eshbaal*, and Jonathan a son *Meryibbaal*, and David a son by the name *Beeljada*, that this is evidence that at this time the Israelites worshiped the god *Baal*. Baethgen, however, argues that the term *Baal* in these names was equivalent to *El*, and was not used with reference to a Canaanitish god. In support of this position, he quotes the name *Baalja*, which he says cannot signify anything else than *Jehovah is Lord*. In the time of the Prophet Hosea, the Israelites called *Jehovah Baali*, "My Lord." While Koenig admits that as the name *Baal* was associated in the minds of later writers with the heathen god, and therefore names compounded with it were transformed by using another component part in place of *Baal*, he argues that the original reference could not be to the god *Baal*. He alludes to the fact that, perhaps with one possible exception, there are no other names of Semitic gods which are used as component parts of Israelitish names. But among the Phœnicians, we find the names of many gods so employed.

He also shows that there is little substantial evidence for the position held by some critics, that in the names of the antediluvians and the early patriarchs we have the names of heathen deities.

He reaches the following result in his discussion: that monotheism was not developed from polytheism by the prophets, but that it was maintained by the patriarchs and by Moses in the early history of the people; and that where we find polytheism, it is along side of monotheism, according to the representation which we find in the Old Testament.

Dalman has issued an interesting discussion of the Divine name Adonai,¹ in which he treats of the following subjects: 1. Baal, Adon, Adonai; 2. Adonai, and Adoni; 3. The suffix of Adonai; 4. Survey of the use of Adonai; 5. The fact of the introduction of Adonai for Yahwe; 6. Jewish testimonies concerning the use of the name of God; 7. History and significance of the transition from Yahwe to Adonai; 8. The name of the Lord and of Christ, and an appendix on the Massora to Adonai.

He reaches the interesting result that since the beginning of the third century before Christ, the name Adonai has taken the place of Jehovah; while this was partially the result of an almost superstitious anxiety, it was of great importance as preparing the way for Christ. The name Jehovah was a proper name with special reference to the God of Israel. But the name Adonai was a general name, and adapted to be the designation of Him who was revealed as the Lord of all the earth.

¹*Studien zur Biblischen Theologie. Der Gottesname Adonai und seine Geschichte*, Berlin, 1889.

Zschokke, a Roman Catholic professor at the University of Vienna, has written a work on the theology of the Old Testament Chokma literature,¹ including extensive references to Apocryphal books. While the work may be considered of interest, it is not conducted on scientific principles, and, therefore, need not further detain us.

¹*Der dogmatische-ethische Lehrgehalt der alttestamentlichen Weisheitsbüchern*, Wien, 1889.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

NEW TESTAMENT.

PRESENT STATE
OF
NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES.

BY
REV. GEORGE H. GILBERT,

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CHAPTER I.

PHILOLOGICAL AND TEXTUAL.

The new edition of Grimm's New Testament Lexicon¹ registers some advance upon the second. As might be expected, it gives the readings of Westcott and Hort, not always, however, their use of the smooth and rough breathing. The definitions of some words are amended, of others they are supplemented. One New Testament word, formerly overlooked, is treated in the new edition. The Lexicon is not appreciably enlarged. The additions, even the most important of them, are brief. A new proof-text is given to show that ἀνωθεν had the meaning of "denovo, iterum." In defining ἀπόστολος reference is made to the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (xi, 3-6), from which we learn that the name "Apostle" was given to the itinerant heralds of the Gospel in the second century. Under βασιλεία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν it is observed, in parenthesis, that, according to Tischendorf, this expression is found in John i, 5, which seems to be a mistaken reference. In speaking of the new name of James and John, the conjecture of Kautzsch is given, who thinks that it signifies "sons of ebullition" (filios exandescentiæ). Under ἐξπαύς, in-

¹*Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti.* Editio tertia emendata et aucta. Lipsiæ, In libraria Arnoldiana, MDCCCLXXXVIII.

stead of finding the Hebrew of Christ's time spoken of as Chaldee or Syro-Chaldee, we find the correct designation, "Western Aramaic." Another interpretation of ἐπιπόσιος is introduced into the Lexicon, namely that of Warth and Lockle, who, in view of passages in Plato and Aristotle, understand the expression in the Lord's Prayer to mean 'food necessary in order to pass comfortably the dawning day.' Grimm rejects this on internal grounds. The remarks on θαδδαϊος are modified. He is not affirmed to be the same as Jude, but this is regarded as most probable. The old statement that he was a brother of James the Less is dropped. Under Τίτος a note is added against those who make this a surname of Silas or Silvanus. The word ὠσαυτί is no longer derived from the Hebrew words meaning, 'Save, I pray;' but rather from the form which signifies, 'Save us.' A considerable number of these new references are to be found in Prof. Thayer's Lexicon. This American edition of Grimm, with its numerous and valuable notes and references, and with its superior typographical equipment, surpasses even the latest edition of the author's Latin work.

To the grammatical literature of Hellenistic Greek no work of great importance has been added during the past year. The posthumous volume of W. H. Simcox,¹ while presenting nothing new, either in the mode of treatment or in the results, has the practical merit of furnishing the matter of the large works in a brief form. Its treatment of tenses is incomplete, as it omits the peculiarities of the second form of Conditional Sentences. It falls into a

¹*The Language of the New Testament.* Thomas Whittaker, New York, 1889.

common error in laying great emphasis upon the ungrammatical features of the language of the Apocalypse. The peculiarities of grammar in this book seem to have been, for a long time, unduly magnified, while that which is normal has been neglected.

It is said, in another quarter,¹ that there is no adequate grammar of Hellenistic Greek, no good lexicon, and no philological commentary. This, in view of the labors of such scholars as Winer and Buttmann, Cremer and Grimm, Robinson and Thayer, Ellicott and Lightfoot, not to mention others, seems to be a sweeping statement. The best may not yet have been produced, doubtless it has not been; yet it can scarcely be denied that good work has been done in all these departments. The author of "*Essays in Biblical Greek*," in making the foregoing statement, is urging the importance of critical study of the Septuagint for the interpretation of the New Testament. It is the lack of such study that renders the existing lexicons, grammars and commentaries on the New Testament so defective from a philological point of view. The author shows that a critical study of the Septuagint would furnish a needed check on the common tendency of scholars to draw too subtle distinctions between synonyms. It would do this chiefly in virtue of the fact that it is a Greek translation of a Hebrew book which we have. Its value as a Greek book is great, but far greater its value as a Greek translation of an extant Hebrew work. By its glosses on the original, its change of the Hebrew metaphors, and the various renderings it gives of the same Hebrew word, it

¹*Essays in Biblical Greek*, by Edwin Hatch, M.A., D.D. Henry Froude, London, 1889.

furnishes valuable data for the determination of the meaning that attached to New Testament words in the second century before Christ. Its value is heightened by comparison with Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the Fifth and Sixth translators. Two canons for the use of the Septuagint are proposed: (1) A word which is used uniformly, or with few and intelligible exceptions, as the translation of the same Hebrew word, must be held to have in Biblical Greek the same meaning as that Hebrew word. (2) Words which are used interchangeably as translations of the same Hebrew word, or group of cognate words, must be held to have in Biblical Greek an allied or virtually identical meaning. In the application of these principles to the study of particular New Testament words, the author arrives at some interesting conclusions. Following the uniform use of the Septuagint in all the canonical books he gives to *ἀρετή* the sense of "glory" or "praise," never allowing its classical meaning of "virtue," unless perhaps in II Peter i, 5, whose translation he does not discuss. Surely the Septuagint meaning, as given above, is inapplicable here. It is held that *σαταναῖος* is never, as a proper name, used in its etymological sense, a slanderer, but always as the equivalent of the Hebrew Satan, an enemy. From their use in the Septuagint it is inferred that *παράλογος* and *παρομύια* were convertible terms, or at least that they were so closely allied that one could be substituted for the other; and that they both referred (a) to common sayings or proverbs, and (b) to sayings which had a meaning below the surface, and which required explanation. Hence it will be seen that the author does not seek to find a comparison in every parable and detail of a parable. A parable, he

holds, is simply a story with a hidden meaning. Interesting for the study of three passages in Matthew (vi, 19, vii, 11, xx, 15) is the meaning of *παραπόζ* which the author finds in Sirach, viz. niggardly or grudging. In the third Essay some psychological terms are discussed, as they are used in the Septuagint and Philo. The results of the discussion are unfavorable to the fine drawn discrimination between *καρδία*, *πνεῦμα* and *ἐπιθυμία*. They are capable of being interchanged as translations of the same Hebrew words. They cannot be limited to special groups of mental phenomena, with the exceptions that (a) *καρδία* is most commonly used of will and intention; and (b) *ἐπιθυμία* of appetite and desire. Study of Philo's use of these terms leads the author to conclude that it is futile to endeavor to interpret Paul's psychology by that of Alexandria.

Of special interest is the Essay on Origen's Revision of the Septuagint text of Job. The author holds it probable, from a study of the Greek text, that the book of Job originally existed in a shorter form than at present; and that in the interval between the time of the original translation and that of Theodotion large additions were made to the text by a poet whose imaginative power was at least not inferior to that of the original writer. This statement is suggestive as compared with what has been said, especially by some German writers, of the evident inferiority of the Elihu section.

Another line of work that is important in its bearing upon the text of the New Testament is the study of the Agrapha.¹ The Agrapha are defined to be those words

¹*Agrapha, aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente in möglichster Vollständigkeit zusammengestellt und quellenkritisch untersucht*, von P. prim. Alfred Reisch, Leipzig, 1889.

of the Lord and related sayings, preserved in the early Christian literature, which are contained neither in the Canonical Gospels nor in the known Apocryphal Gospels. The criteria for testing the genuineness of the Agrapha are: (1) the trustworthiness of the authors citing the words; (2) the concurrence of several authors in the citation; (3) the stability of the citation in the same author; (4) absence of any "tendency" in regard to the content; (5) definiteness of the formula of citation; (6) linguistic character, particularly, relationship with the synoptic Gospels, presence of Hebraisms, and variant readings that presuppose a Hebrew original; and (7) the content in three particulars—relation to the canonical words of the Lord, agreement with the New Testament doctrines, the possibility of a satisfactory exegesis and a significant thought-content. Applying these tests, the author finds 63 Agrapha, in 290 citations by 85 writers (or writings), besides a number which are discussed in appendices. A critical study of the patristic citations from the Gospels leads to the conclusion that those prior to Clement of Alexandria and Irenæus reveal a text which is essentially different from the Canonical. Few of these early citations can be definitely ascribed to either of the Synoptists. There are many variants not found in any one of them. The author's theory is that these citations were made from a pre-Canonical form of the Gospel, namely from the Hebrew writing which served as the chief source for all of the Canonical Gospels. He accepts the results of Holtzmann and Weiss, that Mark's Gospel was the earliest, that there was a Hebrew writing which contained chiefly the sayings of Jesus, and that our Matthew and Luke were derived mainly

from these two sources. This pre-Canonical Hebrew writing was that so frequently mentioned in the early Church as the Gospel of Matthew. The author thinks this was in Biblical Hebrew, not in Aramaic.

In the exegetical treatment of the Agrapha, the principal means for determining the sense are the consideration of Old Testament parallels, echoes in the Canonical Gospels, parallels in the doctrinal books of the New Testament and in the patristic literature, the context in which the respective Agrapha stand, patristic epexegetis and comparison with the apocryphal literature. The argument for genuineness based upon the parallelism between an Agraphon and the Scriptures seems sometimes to be unduly pressed. For instance, the saying, "He who is near me is near the fire, and he who is far from me is far from the Kingdom," is thought to be confirmed as genuine by Luke xii-49, "I came to cast fire upon the earth;" Luke iii-16, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire;" Mark ix-49, "For every one shall be salted with fire;" Mark xii-34, "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God." But excepting the last quotation the parallelism consists simply in the common use of the word fire. This, however, is less significant than the difference of meaning attached to the word. Christ nowhere likens himself to fire; and the use of the word in quite a different sense establishes nothing. Take another Agraphon, "Blessed is he through whom the good cometh." This is thought to be surprisingly confirmed by Rom. iii-8, "Let us do evil that good may come." One saying not found in any other catalogue of the Agrapha is this: "Cleave unto the saints, for those who cleave unto them shall be sancti-

fied." This is regarded as unquestionably genuine, chiefly in view of a certain similarity between it and the thought of I Cor. vii, 14 and Rev. xxii, 11. These passages, however, seem to bear only a remote resemblance to the Agraphon in question. Many of the sixty-three Agrapha might be more easily accounted for, it would seem, as unimportant variations of canonical sayings than as original. Such are for instance, the following: "If ye did not keep the little, who will give you the great?" "He who giveth is blest above him who receiveth."

Among the most important of these traditional sayings, both as to the thought and the external evidence, are these: "Sufficient unto the laborer is his good," the correlate of Luke x, 7; "Become approved money changers;" "Jesus, seeing a man at work on the Sabbath day, said to him, If thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou, but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed and a transgressor of the law;" and, "The Lord, having been asked by one when His Kingdom should come, said, when the two shall be one, and that without as that within, and the male with the female, neither male nor female." One important feature of the work of Resch is the full text of the Agrapha, including at least the formula of citation, and sometimes something more of the context. All the patristic passages are cited in which a particular Agraphon is found. In this respect, as well as in many others, the volume of Resch is the most complete that exists, and is of permanent value.

The second volume of *Word Studies*¹ treats the writ-

¹*Word Studies in the New Testament*, by Marvin R. Vincent, D. D. Vol. ii. The Writings of John. Scribner, New York, 1889.

ings of John. The general features of this unique work were mentioned in vol. v of *Current Discussions*.

The literature of New Testament textual criticism has been enriched by the publication of the second volume of the *Prolegomena*¹ to Tischendorf's Greek testament. This opens with a supplement to the first volume, viz. a list of twenty-one uncial fragments, three of which were discovered by the author, Dr. C. R. Gregory. This is followed by a description based upon wide and careful personal observation, of twenty-three hundred and fifty-two Minuscules (Scrivener's Introduction notices only thirteen hundred) and twelve hundred and one Lectionaries. The book embodies the labor of nearly a decade. In its description of MSS. it is a model of exactness and completeness. In the authority which comes from personal examination of MSS. it surpasses all former works.

¹*Prolegomena* scripsit Casparus Renatus Gregory additis cuius Ezrae Abbot. Pars Altera. Lipsiae. T. C. Hinrich. 1890.

CHAPTER II.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

No original contributions have been made during the past year in the English language, so far as we know, to the department of New Testament Introduction. A brief summation of the results of criticism in this branch of Biblical investigation is given in the "Theological Educator."¹ Yet this work is not wholly objective; the author's own views are frequently given, incidentally, or in direct, though brief, statement. It is to be regretted that the author so often passes a point without expressing his own opinion. For instance, he expresses no decided opinion as to the author of the Apocalypse, or the date of its composition. Some of the views advanced as the author's own are noticeable:

For instance he says (p. 2) that the Gospel was designated according to the special messenger or mode of its delivery, and thus we find Paul speaking of "my Gospel" (Rom. ii 16). Again, that our Gospel (Matthew) is not a translation but an original may be accepted as one of the ascertained conclusions of criticism. Compare with this statement the language of Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Canons*, Seite 896. In speaking of the early

An Introduction to the New Testament. By Marcus Dods, D. D. Whittaker, New York, 1888.

Roman Church, the author takes the ground that the account given in the Acts (xxviii 17) of Paul's reception by the Jews in Rome is such as to make it difficult to suppose that there existed before his arrival any large number of Christians in that city, or any organized Church. Now Paul's reception by the Jews is indeed evidence that the Jewish population of Rome had not been deeply affected by the Gospel; but it can scarcely be regarded as evidence that there were not many Christians and an organized Church among the Gentiles of the capital. Indeed, the Epistle itself implies that the Church at Rome was a strong and aggressive spiritual community (Rom. i 8). Paul's praise of the condition of the Roman Christians involves a good degree of prosperity, and prosperity in Paul's thought would surely involve growth of the church in numbers and in graces (ii 8, xv 14).

The more recent view regarding the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians is modified as follows (p. 123). Paul writes a letter which will equally benefit Ephesians, Laodiceans and Colossians, and bids Tychicus carry it to the three churches, while he instructs the Colossians to receive it from Laodicea. But where is the evidence that the Epistle was designed for these three churches in particular? And what grounds make it probable that it was intended for Ephesus at all? In some respects the statements in this work seem inadequate. For instance, in speaking of the external evidence for the Johannean authorship of the Fourth Gospel, no reference is made to Papias, Ignatius, Barnabas, Clement and Hermas. Again, in speaking of the Apocalypse, the author does not allude to the explicit and credible evidences of the early Church bearing on the

date of composition; and while he gives a half-page to Harnack's feeble arguments against the Johannean authorship of the Apocalypse, he refers in a single brief general sentence to the well-nigh decisive testimony of the early Church. This is not the right proportion of things. It is in the interest of science to treat all evidence both pro and con in a manner befitting its inherent importance.

The literature of the New Testament Canon has been enriched during the past year by the monumental work of Zahn.¹ This writer begins his investigations with a study of the New Testament at the close of the second century. Harnack² admits that this time is not badly chosen. The investigation can profitably proceed backward and forward from this point. But Harnack would prefer the date 230 or 240 as a starting point, if he wished to begin investigations at the time when the New Testament Canon was complete. Zahn does not treat separately of the attitude of different churches toward the New Testament, with the single exception of the Syrian churches, but subjects all to a common treatment. His critic urges that in this way the characteristic element in the attitude of the different churches is erased and the significance of the opposition of individual churches, as that at Alexandria, is disturbed. The charge of obscurity and self-contradictoriness is made upon the author's statement of his aim. The second part of this is made without good ground. Zahn distinguishes

¹*Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Canons*, Erster Band: Das Neue Testament vor Origenes. Erste Hälfte, Erlangen, 1888; Zweite Hälfte, Erlangen und Leipzig, 1889.

²*Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200*. Theodor Zahn's Geschichte &c., erster Band, erste Hälfte, geprüft: Freiburg, 1889.

between the history of dogma and the history of Church life. He admits that the attribute of holiness, of Divine authority, is inseparably connected with the conception of the Bible; and holds that one can speak with full historic right of a New Testament only there where that attribute is applied to the writings of the New Testament. He holds that where we find the conceptions of holiness, supernatural Divine origin and dignity, applied to writings of the Apostolic age, we have a sure proof that a New Testament existed which was more or less equally esteemed with the Old Testament. But at the same time he holds that it would be a sad mistake to confound the history of these attributes with the history of the thing whose attributes they are. The thing in question, a collection of writings which we call the New Testament, writings scattered in all parts of the Church; an actual discrimination of these from other writings, and a mighty influence of the same upon the Church life—this must be older than the fixed coinage of the honorary titles and dogmatic conceptions which were first derived from these facts. He does not propose to write a history of these dogmatic conceptions, but rather of the development which they pre-suppose. In the Introduction of his work Zahn presents an argument to prove that the Montanists, while recognizing an Old Testament and a New Testament, produced a third, a “newest” Testament, which was higher in authority than either of the others. It is said that after the death of Maximilla (179 A. D.), who had declared that another prophetess would not arise, it was felt to be high time that the oracles, which had apparently been begun in the lifetime of the prophets, should be put in writing. Various collections

arose. An Asiatic pastor of unknown name cites such a collection in the year 192 or 193, which a certain Asterius Urbanus had caused to be made. Now, according to this pastor, the Montanists referred to what the Spirit said in Asterius Urbanus just as Christians spoke of what the Lord said in the Gospel according to Matthew. Since this is the only evidence advanced for a Montanist Testament at this time there seems some ground for Harnack's statement that Zahn has been able to create a "newest" Testament out of nothing, and out of nothing to call forth witnesses for the existence of the New Testament.

Zahn thinks that the Montanist movement intensified in the Church the consciousness that the revelation made by Christ and His disciples was closed, and that the documents of the revelation possessed a peculiar dignity. Harnack's position is that the Montanist movement *produced* this consciousness, instead of intensifying a consciousness that already existed.

According to Zahn, the New Testament was equally esteemed with the Old throughout the entire Catholic Church about the year 200. This truth is so generally admitted that he does not seek to prove it, but rather to illustrate the mode of thinking of that time by a study of the names applied to the Bible and its principal parts. Of this study Harnack affirms (p. 34) that it suppresses some material and mistakes other. He denies, for instance, that the words *γραφή*, *γραφαί* were, in 180 A. D., so firmly attached to the New Testament as to the Old, and affirms that in Alexandria at least the words were used of writings outside of the Bible. A certain weakness in regard to the fundamental position seems to be shown now and then.

For instance, the author affirms, on the one hand, that the writings attributed to the Apostles and their contemporaries were regarded throughout the entire Catholic Church as a corpus of holy writings. The entire New Testament literature appears as a defined holy territory whose limits could not be enlarged without sin (pp. 111–113). On the other hand, it is said to be plain that the content of the New Testament was different in different churches (p. 114). The collection of New Testament writings had by no means the completeness of limitation that pertained to the Old Testament collection. The New Testament of that time was not a definitely limited whole with immovable boundaries. Zahn's investigation of the four-fold Gospel, as it stood at the close of the second century, leads him to a full endorsement of Irenæus, who said of the four Gospels that they were the pillars which from immemorial times had borne the roof of the Catholic Church. They were unique in the churches of Irenæus' homeland as well as in those over which he presided. So also were they in Rome, Carthage, Alexandria, and Antioch. Harnack admits that this position is in the main right. He himself holds that the collection of four Gospels was firmly settled by the year 200; but he would modify the rhetorical language of Irenæus more than Zahn does. The position of the four Gospels was firmer in Carthage and Lyon, says Harnack, than in Alexandria. In the latter place the Gospel of the Egyptians had but just been removed from Church use in the year 200. It is also held that the formula in use in the Western Church, "the Lord says in the Gospel," points to an authority above the Gospels, i. e., the word of Christ. This word of Christ was chiefly, though not solely, to be

found in the four Gospels. But this view of Harnack is open to objection.

The view of Zahn regarding the fifth book of our New Testament is that no one questioned its firm position in the Canon, and that no one exaggerated its content in a noticeable manner. Harnack modifies this statement by showing that the Acts were not considered, in Egypt, as the sole source of the Apostolic history, though they were so regarded in the West; and that the content of the book was sometimes exaggerated. Clement of Alexandria used the Johannean Acts of Leucius and the tradition of Matthew by the side of the Acts of the Apostles, and also the Preaching of Peter. As to the statement that the content was not considerably exaggerated, Harnack refers to the language of the Muratorian Canon, which describes the book as "*acta omnium apostolorum*," and to the singular language of Irenæus.

That the Apocalypse had an established place in the Canon at the close of the second century is conceded by Harnack, but he disagrees with Zahn regarding the Epistles of John. The latter holds that all three were in the New Testament of the entire Church, while the former denies that the third Epistle stood in any collection known to us. Touching the opposition to the writings of John, Zahn and Harnack are decidedly at variance with each other. According to Zahn, the chief motive of the Alogi in opposing the writings attributed to John was hostility to Montanism, while Harnack holds that it was their hostility to Gnosticism. Zahn minimizes the value of the testimony of Epiphanius, while Harnack makes this testimony his starting-point. Consequently Zahn regards the name Alogi as an inappro-

priate invention of Epiphanius, while Harnack maintains that it points to their fundamental character. His strongest historical support for this is the fact that the Alogi attributed the Fourth Gospel to Cerinthus, who was a Gnostic. As these writers differ widely in the criticism of the Alogi, so also in the inferences which they draw concerning the Canon of that time. Zahn says that the Alogi bear witness that the Johannean writings were in the New Testament, in that they declared these writings unworthy of the Church. They did not deny the historical right of these books to a place in the New Testament, but they objected on the ground of internal evidence. Harnack, on the other hand, affirms that when the Alogi appeared (date uncertain), there was not a fixed Christology in the Asiatic Church, nor a complete New Testament. There was opposition to the Gospel of John on the ground that it aided Gnosticism, and also did not accord with the old Gospels. Hence there was no sure tradition which ascribed these writings to the Apostle John. But at this point he does not seem to break the argument of Zahn. It needs no proof that the Alogi had not a complete New Testament, and that they did not accept the tradition which ascribed the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse to John. But this does not prove that the Church of Asia Minor may not, in its dominant elements, have accepted the Gospel and Apocalypse. The views of the Alogi, whom Hippolytus counts as heretics, views which soon disappeared entirely, are not to be attributed to the Asiatic Church in general. Concerning the Epistles of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, Zahn concludes, first, that the recognition of Paul as *the* Apostle throughout the Catholic

Church must have been a result of the use of his Epistles in the Church. But this statement does not seem to contain the whole truth. The fact that Paul was the founder of most of the great churches, or, if not founder, the most important agent in founding, may quite as well be assumed to have given rise to the peculiar dignity of apostleship which attached to him, as the fact that his epistles were read in churches. Second, a collection of thirteen Pauline Epistles was everywhere in use in the Church. No distinction was made between the letters to churches and the Pastoral Epistles. In reply to this, Harnack calls attention to the fact that Hieronymus, Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia had to defend the canonicity of Philemon, and Theodore that of the Pastoral Epistles as well; and also to the fact that the Muratorian Canon refers to the private letters of Paul as though they had been sanctified in Christian use. This suggests that they had not always enjoyed the same consideration as the other Epistles. Two other conclusions are, that there were some in the Church who accepted the Epistles to the Laodiceans and that to the Alexandrians, and that the belief in the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews was not exactly co-extensive with the belief that it was canonic.

With regard to II Peter and James, Zahn holds that they were in the Canon at the close of the second century, Harnack that they appear first from the time of Origen. The author objects vigorously and with good ground to the view that the Canon was a conscious product of the latter part of the second century. He also shows the insufficiency of the theory that the writings of our New Testament were gathered together simply on the basis that

they were believed to be of Apostolic origin. From 200 A. D. the author moves backward, and in the second book of his elaborate work he investigates the condition of the New Testament at the middle of the second century, chiefly as it is suggested in the writings of Justin Martyr, Marcion, and the schools of Valentine and Basilides. He holds that we find essentially the same mass of apostolic writings in Church use and authoritative position at the middle of the second century, which, at the close of that century, began to be called the New Testament. The Church had at that time a Gospel which was composed of our four Gospels and included no other writing. It had also a collection of Pauline Epistles, which embraced the Pastoral Letters. The Acts of Luke were not less at home in the churches. The Apocalypse of John was regarded as a document of divine revelation and a work of the Apostle John. Of the other writings which, between 170-220 A. D. were recognized as holy, partly everywhere and partly in some churches, the scanty sources of the middle of the century give little information. That is to say, the author finds evidence that the Catholic Church, at the middle of the second century, used as authoritative nineteen of the twenty-seven books which constitute our present New Testament. There is no evidence that the so-called Catholic Epistles and the Hebrews were so regarded. Eighteen of these nineteen writings constituted two collections, in the time of Marcion, one of the four Gospels, and the other of thirteen Pauline Epistles. The year 120 A. D. is given as the approximate date before which these collections were made. In studying the origin of these collections, it is argued that the Apostles could not have had the

great authority which they did have, say in the year 100 A. D., had there not been writings in which the congregations believed that they heard the voice of the Apostles. Here and there the Apostolic authority may have been due in part to the testimony of a pupil of the Apostles, as in the case of Papias, but this sort of influence must have been relatively small. The conclusion that there was in the time of Clement and Ignatius a collection of thirteen Pauline Epistles, is reached in the following way:• In Clement, Polycarp and Ignatius we find references, direct or indirect, to Romans, I Corinthians, Philippians, I and II Thessalonians, Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles. No competent person, it is argued, will doubt that a collection which contained the most questionable portions of that group of writings that Marcion found extant, and even those that Marcion rejected, was co-terminous with that which Marcion found extant, and which the Church in later times preserved. That is, the collection contained thirteen letters.

As to the time in which the collection arose, the author thinks of the year 80 or 85 A. D. For it was before 96 A. D., the date of Clement's letter to the Corinthians, and after the composition of the Acts. Had the collection existed when Luke composed the Acts, he would have used its rich material. It is thought probable that this collection was made in Corinth. It could not have originated in Ephesus or Asia Minor in general, because of its erroneous assumption that the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians was actually sent to the church at Ephesus. It is natural to suppose that it was made in Corinth in view of the fact that the Epistle to the Corinthians stood at its

head, and in view of the central position of the Corinthian Church. It is thought that the principle according to which the collection was made, was the edification of the churches. For the formation of the Gospel collection the author lays emphasis on the absence of competing documents, and on the influence of John. In regard to books which did not belong to either of these collections, special attention is given to show that the Apocalypse was received in the Asiatic churches in the time of Papias, Polycarp and other pupils of John, as a work by the author of the fourth Gospel.

At the other pole from Zahn, stands Pfleiderer.¹ His voluminous work on Primitive Christianity, its Writings and Teachings, while, according to the author, it differs from Baur in maintaining that the opposition between Gentile and Jewish Christianity was not the active principle in the development of the post-apostolic literature, is constructed on the principles of criticism used by Baur, and leads to results concerning the origin of the New Testament literature akin to those of the founder of the Tübingen school. The fundamental position of the author is that the Gentile Christian Church was planted, through the preaching of Paul, in a soil which the pre-Christian Hellenism had long since prepared for it. Hence the two factors out of whose union the peculiarity of Gentile Christianity from its beginning is naturally explained, are this Hellenism and the preaching of Paul. Paul's theology had two roots, a Jewish-Pharisaic and a Hellenic.

In the post-apostolic period, the Hellenic side was de-

¹*Das Urchristenthum, seine Schriften und Lehren*. Berlin, 1887.

Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. vi, 1889, p. 154.

veloped to the repression of the Jewish. As characterizing the methods of the author, a part of his Introduction will be most instructive, in which he treats of the resurrection. Out of the hints of the oldest Gospel (it is assumed that Mark's is the oldest and the foundation of all the other Canonical Gospels, not excepting John) we gain as probable two results: (1) that the disciples lost their faith when Jesus was put to death, and fled to Galilee, their home; (2) that they, Peter first of all, saw in Galilee Him whom they had believed dead, and in consequence of this vision they had gathered the scattered band. If the representation of Luke, according to which the disciples remained together and saw Jesus in Jerusalem on the evening of the resurrection-day, is historically correct, then it is incomprehensible how the oldest Gospel should speak in the express words of Jesus about a scattering of the disciples, and about seeing them first in Galilee. The representation of Luke, the author holds, is due to the feeling of later times, that the Apostles, the heroes of the faith, could not have been so weak as reported, and moreover, men felt the need of confirming the reality of the resurrection of Jesus, of which they were convinced, by striking signs done at the place of His death and burial. The appearance of Christ to the women, narrated by Matthew, is only a repetition of the vision of angels according to Mark. That is, the story of Christ's appearance at the grave is but a developed form of the legend, which, in its earlier stadium, knew only of a future appearance in Galilee.

The entire group of narratives concerning the appearances in Jerusalem, are without historical foundation. The facts that account for the faith of the disciples in the res-

urrection are to be sought in Galilee. If Jesus was seen by His disciples only in Galilee, far from the place where His body was interred, then it cannot be that the same body which was buried near Jerusalem was seen alive in Galilee. In other words, there is no question of a vision of a corporally risen one. What, then, was seen? Paul gives us a hint. He puts the appearances to the other believers in the same class as that to him. His was spiritual, therefore theirs was also. The stories in the Gospel are to be explained as the product of a coarse tendency of legend, of apologetic reflection and allegoric fiction. In accounting for the vision which the disciples had in Galilee, it is needful to bear in mind that the belief in resurrection from the dead was common. In the case of the disciples it is not difficult to understand how the common belief should have been for once actualized. The disciples were surprised by the catastrophe of Christ's death, and for the time they were without self possession. They fled to Galilee. But there, in the places where a little while since they had walked with Jesus, and received the deepest impressions from Him, they soon recovered themselves. They felt how barren their life must be, if it was really over with the cause of Jesus, who had sacrificed himself so joyously and confidently. They recalled now the words which Jesus had spoken to them before going to Jerusalem, of the necessity of suffering and the certainty of victory. Could these promises be an empty delusion? But how could they be true if the Messiah remained in death? Must He, however, remain in death? Would not the frequently confirmed truth hold in His case, that God rescues His own? • When the courage of the disciples began to revive through

such recollections, when their hearts burned in the conflict between doubt and hope, when longing love sank itself in the picture of its Lord, as He had opened the Scriptures unto them; then were all the conditions satisfied under which a visionary experience like Paul's becomes wholly explicable. Peter was the first to have the vision, for which his peculiar temperament predisposed him.

Some of the more important results of the author's studies in reference to the different books of the New Testament may be briefly indicated. The genuine Pauline Epistles are six,—Galatians, I Thessalonians, I and II Corinthians, Romans and Philippians. II Thessalonians, in view of its repetition from the first letter and its eschatology, must be regarded as the work of an imitator. It is possible that a genuine letter of Paul formed the basis of our Epistle to the Colossians, which however, belongs to the post-apostolic age. The Epistle to the Ephesians was written by a Paulinist of the second century, somewhat later than the Hebrews. The Pastoral Epistles, which served the purpose of developing Episcopacy, presuppose the Gnosticism of the middle of the second century. Even the Epistle to Philemon is not allowed a place among the genuine Pauline Epistles. Of the ungenuine Pauline Epistles those to the Colossians and Ephesians are monuments of Christian Hellenism, while the Pastoral Epistles are a product of the antignostic Catholicism of about the same period. The Apocalypse was not the work of the Apostle John, but of several persons, its last redaction having taken place in the second century. The bulk of the book is a Jewish Apocalypse.

The second Gospel is regarded as essentially the same

as the original. The favorite hypothesis of an "Ur-Marcus" is rejected in view of the unity of the Gospel as we have it. The Book of Acts is thought to have been written in the second decade of the second century, and not by an immediate disciple of Paul. Luke may have been the author of the "We"-passages, and this circumstance may account for the fact that the Church tradition ascribes the entire work to Luke. The Gospel according to Matthew, is thought to be based chiefly upon Mark, secondarily on Luke. It is not Jewish-Christian nor Pauline, but represents the general consciousness of the Catholic Church in the second century. It is said to show dependence upon the first chapter of the Apocalypse, and since the Apocalypse is assigned to the reign of Hadrian, Matthew cannot be earlier. The author puts it in the fourth decade of the second century. In regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is held to be beyond question that it depends largely upon Philo. Its allegorizing treatment of the Old Testament; its view of Christ as the great and sinless High-priest, who is at once the agent in the creation of the world, and the sustainer of the universe; its conception of ritual sacrifices as means of the remembrance of sins, not of their forgiveness; its error regarding the daily sacrifice of the High-priest; its quotation according to Philo (xiii, 5); its conception of Abraham's faith as shown in his journeying to a strange land; and its view of this world as the sensuous copy of a higher original world of ideas—these features all point to a dependence upon Philo. I Peter, John, the Epistles of John, Jude and James originated near the middle of the second century; and II Peter, the latest of the New Testament writings, is assigned to the latter part of the second century.

In essential agreement with Pfleiderer's view of the Synoptic Gospels is that of Holtzmann.¹ He speaks of the Marcus-hypothesis as a well-established scientific result. The earliest continuous narrative of the evangelical history was that of Mark. Prior to that was the loosely constructed and fragmentary document, the *λόγια* of Papias, which was a collection of the Lord's sayings. The Gospels according to Matthew and Luke, were based upon the primitive documents. The Synoptic Gospels were all composed subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. As to the historical character of the Synoptic Gospels, the author does not regard it more highly than do the other advocates of the Tübingen views. He thinks they give a recognizable picture of Jesus of Nazareth, yet it is by no means purely historical. Sometimes a religious motive, sometimes a dogmatic motive, and sometimes even an æsthetic motive, helped to determine the content and form of the narrative. The facts of Christ's life are ideally treated, and hence we have in the Synoptists the oldest Christian dogmatics as well as the oldest historical tradition.

The very ancient writing known among the Fathers as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, will doubtless give rise to new speculations until perhaps some discovery of old MSS. throws clearer light upon it. That it was an important Gospel narrative appears from the writings of the early Church. Significant traces of it or allusions to it are found in the writings of the second, third and fourth centuries. But by whom it was used, how it was regarded

¹*Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament.* Erster Band.

with reference to canonicity, what its character was, what its relation to the *λόγια* of Papias and to our canonic Matthew, are questions difficult to be answered. Careful study has recently been given to the entire subject,¹ some of the results of which are interesting. The Gospel according to the Hebrews is distinguished from the *evangelium secundum XII apostolos*. The former was the Gospel of the Nazarites and common Ebionites, the latter that of the Gnostic Ebionites. The Gospel according to the Hebrews was all the New Testament possessed by the Jewish-Christian sect who used it. It was not canonic, as was the Old Testament. There was no occasion for regarding it as canonic. It did not contain a new doctrine, but only a historic confirmation of what the Old Testament had taught concerning the Messiah. The Old Testament was the sufficient norm. The designation "Gospel according to the Hebrews" is regarded as coined by the Greek Fathers. The document was in Aramaic, the language used by the Nazarites, and it is thought improbable that they should have designated themselves as "Hebrews."

The Hebrew Gospel is not regarded as the direct foundation of the canonic Matthew, but as a possible source, one among others, for both Matthew and Luke. This Gospel according to the Hebrews is thought to have given rise to the tradition of a Hebrew Matthew. It is held to be decidedly problematical whether such a writing ever existed.

The editor of the last edition of Meyer's Commentary on the Acts departs widely from the original author in

¹*Das Hebräer-Evangelium*. Von Rudolf Handmann, Leipzig, 1888.

some matters of Introduction. While Meyer regards the "We-passages" as the product of the author of the whole book, indicating how far he was an eye-witness of the events contained in the Acts, his latest editor holds that the author of our Canonical Acts is unknown.¹ It was not Luke, for he was the author of the "We-passages;" and had he been the author both of these passages and of the rest of the book, he would not have left such abrupt changes in the person of the narrator; namely, changes from the third person to the first. If he had wished to indicate his personal relation to the Apostle, we should expect him to have mentioned his first significant meeting with Paul and the circumstances which led him to become his companion. Further, Wendt holds with Weizsaecker that the "We-passages" are a part of a larger writing used by the author of the Acts as a source. This is thought to be supported by two circumstances: First, we find in connection with the "We-passages" certain narratives which manifestly contain untrustworthy elements. So, for instance, the wholly intelligible story of the imprisonment and liberation of Paul and Silas in Philippi (xvi: 19f.) in connection with the entirely incomprehensible episode regarding the miraculous nightly events in the prison (verses 25-34). Second, we find also in immediate connection with a "We-passage" (xxvi, 12-18) an account of Paul's conversion, whose characteristic deviation from the two former reports can be explained only in this way, that the author of the Acts followed here a fixed written

¹*Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte.* Siebente Auflage. Bearbeitet von Dr. Hans Hinrich Wendt, Göttingen. 1888.

document, which in his two earlier accounts he took as his essential basis, but which in those cases he altered according to a different tradition. The third report is the original one, as appears from the fact that it is in accord with Paul's most firm consciousness that he was called of the Lord to be an Apostle. Since Wendt holds that one mind produced the Acts and the third Gospel (p. 1), and that Luke did not produce the Acts, he appears to reject Luke's authorship of the third Gospel. As to the date of the composition of the Acts, while Meyer fixes upon the year 80 A. D. as approximate, Wendt would leave the entire last quarter of the century open.

It is nearly a century since Edward Evanson published a book in which he asserted that the entire New Testament originated in the post-apostolic age. His book has long been forgotten. The most radical of the negative critics have accepted the four chief Pauline Epistles as genuine. The evidence in their favor has been admitted on all hands to be overwhelming. This, however, can no longer be said without qualification. We have an elaborate monograph¹ which puts the four great Pauline Epistles in the period from 120 to 140 A. D., and which relegates the entire New Testament literature to the second century. The author differs from many of the negative critics in some points. For instance, he does not consider his views at all dangerous to Christianity and the Church, and he advances them with a degree of modesty that is seldom found in works of this sort. The reason for seeking a period for the compo-

¹*Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht, nebst Kritischen Bemerkungen zu den paulinischen Hauptbriefen*, Von Rudolf Steck. Berlin, 1888.

sition of the four major Epistles different from the one generally accepted is, that, according to the present view of composition the exegesis of these Epistles is involved in insoluble difficulties. Such are a lack of agreement concerning the locality and nationality of the Galatians (p. 26), baptism for the dead (p. 266), the doctrine of marriage contained in I Cor. vii (p. 268), the Christ-party in Corinth, and a number of similar points. These difficulties are accounted for, it is held, if these writings originated in the Pauline school of the second century. Regarding the Epistle to the Galatians, which is the special object of investigation, it is held that it is dependent upon the Romans (p. 74f). In the latter Epistle we have the original system of doctrine, an organic whole; while in Galatians the same thoughts and words are often brought together, but in an outward manner. It is a structure for which the hewn stones are taken from another building, and are arranged on a different plan. It belongs to this plan, that the Law is less highly esteemed in Galatians than in Romans. It is represented as given by angels. This derogatory treatment of the law is a step toward the position of Marcion. Again, the conception of Judaism found in the Galatians is said to be different from that of Romans. For in the former writing, Judaism and heathenism are represented as standing on the same plane (Gal. iv, 10-11), while in the latter the prerogatives of the Jews are mentioned (Rom. ix, 1-5). Again, Paul's reference to his conversion in the Epistle to the Galatians is thought to be suspicious (pp. 81-84), and the accounts of Paul's visit to Jerusalem and the story of the conflict with Peter in Antioch are regarded as artificial history. It is also urged

against the genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians that Paul's claim to apostolic authority is too strongly emphasized to comport with the modesty which a real author usually shows.

In the same line is the criticism on Gal. i, 6. Comparison shows that Romans and Corinthians (i. 8: I. C. i, 4) have the word *εὐχαριστῶ* at the beginning of the letter, after the address, while Galatians has *θωπιάζω*. Of course, says the author, the word *εὐχαριστῶ* was shut out by the nature of the case. The Apostle could not thank God for the faith of churches which he was obliged so severely to blame. Anything but an expression of wonder would have been out of place. But is it probable, he continues, that the Apostle chose this form *θωπιάζω*, if this letter was the first he ever wrote? Does not this word in place of the well-known *εὐχαριστῶ* make the impression that the letter was composed by some one who knew the Pauline form, and kept it here, but quite appropriately instead of the laudatory initial word, placed the word of blame?

This reasoning is scarcely strong enough to support a hypothesis of any value. The author concludes that the Epistle to the Galatians must be regarded as a literary product of the Pauline school. It was intended to give the strongest expression to the opposition between the liberal Gentile Christianity and the aggressive Jewish Christianity. With the full force of a superior mind he scourged the tendencies of his time, which would make Christianity Jewish again. It was composed after 120 A. D. An objection to this view is anticipated by the author, and is dealt with, viz., the objection that it affirms the impossible. Such a fresh, living letter, it is said, bears too plainly the

impress of the Pauline spirit to allow the supposition that a mere imitator could have composed it. It is a unit, and by no means makes the impression of a patchwork out of other letters. The author replies that it is not necessary to see in the later writer a simple imitator. He may have been a Paulinist of independent, decided, spiritual individuality, who understood how to weave together the watchwords of the Paulinism of the older letters in a new, ingenious way. The author recurs to this point again, as though not satisfied with his own argument. He says (p. 352) of the four major Epistles, it will be objected that they manifestly belong to the creative beginning of Christianity, and the circle of the Apostles. They contain the most forcible and original religious thought found in the New Testament. But it does not follow, he says, that because these letters are incomparable they must therefore have been composed by Apostles. What proof have we that the Apostles were such original thinkers? Are writers like the author of the Epistle to the Romans impossible in the second century? The case of the fourth Gospel should restrain us from answering in the negative. The critical school agree that this Gospel belongs to the second century. If there was a mind in that period which could produce the fourth Gospel, there might also have been one which could produce the Epistle to the Romans.

Having put these Epistles in the period between 120 and 140 A. D., the author feels it to be necessary to show that there is no reference to them in any writing prior to this time. This is done by the hypothesis that Clement wrote forty years later than is generally supposed, and by

denying many of the traces of the Epistles that are commonly believed to exist.

Of importance for the defense of the genuineness of II Thessalonians is the fact, brought out and emphasized recently¹ that the Macedonian churches, unlike the others which Paul established, were founded and developed under the stress of persecution. This fact explains the presence in these churches of a peculiarly intense longing for the Parousia. The second Epistle, it is said, shows us the same congregation as the first, but the eschatological tendency in it is strengthened by an outbreak of persecution. The peculiar doctrine of the second chapter is explicable with the aid of Daniel's prophecies and the historical appearance of Caligula. That which restraineth is the Roman law, the restrainer is Claudius. The Thessalonian Apocalypse differs too widely from that of John to belong to the same period.

The question of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles is still earnestly discussed. The position of Hesse² is that all the letters contain genuine Pauline elements. Second Timothy is even thought to be based upon two veritable letters of Paul, one a letter of encouragement to Timothy, the other a letter summoning the same disciple to Rome. Our Pastoral Epistles arose in the first half of the second century. Their aim was to check growing heresies, and to regulate the offices of the Church. Since they were thought to be in the spirit of Paul, they were ascribed to him. His own words were modified and enlarged to meet present

¹*Der Zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher erläutert und kritisch untersucht.* Von Albert Klöpfer, Königsberg, 1889.

²*Die Entstehung der neutestamentlichen Hirtenbriefe.* Halle, 1889.

needs. The author holds that the Epistles themselves suggest and confirm the hypothesis of a release and a second imprisonment. The heretics had in view in the Pastoral Epistles are thought to be the Valentinians and Marcionites. The endless genealogies and denial of the resurrection are said to point to the Valentinians, while the forbidding to marry and antinomianism point to Marcion. Hence the Epistles in their present form are assigned to the middle of the second century. It is held by another writer¹ that two results of the controversy regarding the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles may be accepted as practically settled, viz., (1) that it is impossible to accept two, or one, or any portion of one, of these Epistles, and reject the rest; and (2) that they stand or fall with the hypothesis of the second imprisonment. The first of these statements must be modified, since some of the ablest recent writers accept portions of the Pastoral Epistles as genuine, while they reject them as a whole. The strong argument for their genuineness, which is found in the last named author, is legitimately drawn from the contents of the letters.

The same diversity of views regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews is found in the writings of the past year. On the one hand² Apollos is held to be the only known person who fills all the conditions regarding the author; on the other,³ it is shown quite conclusively that the authorship of

¹*The Pastoral Epistles.* By Rev. Alfred Plummer, D. D., New York, Armstrong & Son, 1889.

²*The Epistle to the Hebrews, with Notes and Introduction.* By F. W. Farrar, D. D. Cambridge, 1888.

³*The Epistle to the Hebrews.* By Frederic Rendall, A. M. London, 1888.

Apollos is out of the question. The former of these writers thinks that the Epistle was probably directed to believers either in Alexandria or Ephesus; the latter argues forcibly that it was sent to some church in Syria. As to the author, Mr. Rendall says that the silence of primitive tradition is inconsistent with the idea that the name of Apollos was ever associated with the Epistle. He thinks the author was plainly a Hellenistic Jew, who had received a Greek education as well as training in the Old Testament. He sometimes borrows the language of Philo, but is not in harmony with Philo's spirit.

Against the view that Paul wrote the Epistle, the author presents with especial emphasis the argument, that the theology of the Epistle is of the Petrine stamp rather than of the Pauline. The conception of the Mosaic Law which is found in Hebrews differs widely from that of Paul. The Apostle to the Gentiles regarded the Law as an incidental and temporary addition, something almost of the nature of an interruption of God's original covenant. In the Hebrews the Old and New Dispensations form an unbroken continuity. The Jewish and Christian Church are spoken of as one and the same household of God. The Gospel is presented not as antagonistic to the Law, but as the natural climax of the Mosaic revelation. The conception of faith and righteousness in the Epistle to the Hebrews tallies with that which is contained in James. The Epistle to the Hebrews objects to the retention of the Levitical system by the Israelites themselves; but Paul did not advocate this liberty for the Jews, though he did for the Gentiles. Mr. Rendall places the composition of the Epistle in the time of the last conflict between the Jews and Rome,

and more particularly in the very year of the downfall of Jerusalem. This rests entirely upon internal evidence. The attitude of the author of the Epistle toward the Mosaic worship and sacrifices is accounted for by the course of political events. The refusal of the Jewish Christians to join in the revolt against Rome—a refusal which they were obliged to make in loyalty to the precepts of Christ—brought necessarily their abandonment of the national ritual. The Epistle justifies this abandonment by showing the superiority of the Christian revelation to that of the Old Testament.

Westcott¹ arrives at conclusions which differ from both those of Farrar and Rendall. He decides that the readers of the Epistle were the Hebrew Christians of Jerusalem or of the immediate neighborhood. This is an inference from the relation in which the readers manifestly stood to the Levitical ritual. He does not regard this conclusion as beyond doubt. He puts the composition of the Epistle about the year 67 A. D. As to the author of the Epistle Westcott's conclusion is similar to that of Rendall. He says that it cannot be the work of St. Paul, and still less the work of Clement. It may have been written by St. Luke. It may have been written by Barnabas, if the "Epistle of Barnabas" is apocryphal. The scanty evidence which is accessible to us supports no more definite judgment.

The view that James wrote before Paul, and hence that his Epistle is the oldest portion of our New Testament, is represented again in the latest edition of Mey-

¹See title under Exegesis.

er's Commentary on that book.¹ The composition is put in the decade between 40 and 50 A. D. James, the brother of the Lord, is held to have been the author, and Jewish Christians of the Diaspora, probably in Southern Syria, are regarded as the readers.

Weiss, in his edition of the Meyer-Huther Commentary on the Epistles of John,² holds with his predecessor that the Apostle John was the author of the Epistles; that the first Epistle is indeed a letter, and not a homiletical essay; and that the false teachers who are warned against, are Corinthians. It is said that John had Pauline Christians in view who, in the consciousness of a righteousness bestowed by grace, forgot that the aim of Christ is to produce in us the practice of righteousness. The Epistle is by no means a polemic against Paul, but against a wrong practical conclusion drawn from a misunderstood Paulinism.

No problem in New Testament Introduction is receiving so much attention at present as that of the origin of the Apocalypse. A considerable number of works have appeared in quick succession, which agree in holding that the Apocalypse is the product of several authors, living in different times, and being adherents of different religions. Among these are the writings of Völter, Vischer-Harnack, Sabatier, Schœn, Pfeiderer, Weizsæcker and Spitta. Opposed to this hypothesis, and called out by these attacks upon the unity of the Apocalypse, are numerous articles

¹*Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief des Jacobus.* Fünfte Auflage. Neu bearbeitet von Dr. Willibald Beyschlag. Göttingen 1888.

²*Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über die Briefe des Apostels Johannes.* Fünfte Auflage. Neu bearbeitet von Dr. B. Weiss. Göttingen, 1888.

which have appeared in the German and English languages.

The work of Spitta,¹ the latest of the opponents of the traditional view, is an elaborate and learned presentation of a hypothesis differing in many points from the views of other writers who reject the unity of the Apocalypse. His hypothesis, in its leading features, may be stated as follows:

The Canonical Apocalypse is the work of four authors. The oldest portion (J²) was composed about 63 B. C. The next oldest (J¹) arose under Caligula about the year 40 or 41 A. D. The third document (U) was composed in 60 A. D. These three were made one, and were increased by a good many additions, by a writer (R) who lived under Domitian or Trajan. The oldest document is contained in the following passages of the Apocalypse: Chap. x, 1b-2a, 8-11; xi, 1-13; xiv, 14—xv, 4; xv, 6—xvi, 21; xvii, 1—xix, 8; xxi, 9—xxii, 3a, 15. The Caligula Apocalypse is found in these passages: Chap. vii, 1-8; viii, 2-5; viii, 6—ix, 21; x, 1a, 2b-7; xi, 15; xii-xiv, 13; xvi, 13-16, 17b-20; xix, 11-21; xx, 1-xxi, 8. The third document consisted of these passages: Chap. i, 4-6, 9-19; ii-v; vi, viii, 1; vii, 9-17; xix, 9b, 10a; xxii, 8-21. To the final redactor belong about 126 additions, varying in length from a single word to several verses. The redactor made relatively more changes in the second Jewish Apocalypse than in either of the other documents. The first Jewish Apocalypse, composed at the time of the downfall of the Hasmonean dynasty, when Jerusalem was finally given over to heathen

¹*Die Offenbarung des Johannes untersucht*. Halle, 1889.

rule by Pompey, is characterized by the same political sobriety and religious confidence which are found in the Psalms of Solomon. Its conception of the Messiah is midway between the collective idea of Daniel and the personal conception of Enoch. In its picture of the future the Messiah has no place. Its attitude toward the Temple is not that of extreme loyalty. It looks forward to a time when there shall be no temple. Its characteristic symbol of the Roman power is a luxurious world-city. Although it approaches nearer to Christianity than the second Jewish Apocalypse, still its type of Judaism is not liberal. Jerusalem is the center of the nation; outside of it is the place of dogs.

The second Jewish Apocalypse is intensely Jewish and fanatical. Israel alone stands in the book of life; Israel alone is rescued in the great catastrophe of the end; all the heathen perish. The earthly Jerusalem is the scene of the Millennial Kingdom. According to the Apocalypse, the Messiah is born in heaven, where Satan tries in vain to destroy him. Satan cast down to the earth gives all his power to the representative of the Roman Empire, viz., Caligula. This emperor is supported in his blasphemous opposition by Simon Magus. All people except Israel are seduced to worship Caligula, and are gathered together at Megiddo to destroy the faithful. At this crisis the Messiah rides forth from heaven, and without Israel's help destroys the foe. Satan is bound, and Caligula is cast into the lake of fire. Then begins the Millennium. These events, predicted by the Jewish seer, did not come to pass. Caligula died before the anticipated battle of Megiddo and the coming of the Messiah.

In the meantime the followers of Jesus among the Jews were increasing. They, of course, affirmed that the Gentiles should partake of the redemption of Christ. This position, since the Jews were growing more and more hostile toward the Gentiles, made the Jews persecutors of the Christians. In this state of things the third document (U) originated. In this the Messiah stands in the foreground as prophet, sacrificial lamb and king. His redeemed are not of Israel merely, but out of all peoples and tongues. The antithesis in U is between Christians and Jews.

The historical situation is totally changed when at last our Apocalypse is composed. The Christians are persecuted, but not by Jews. These are scarcely mentioned. Their city lies in ruins. The foe of the Christian is the Roman power.

What the second Jewish document said of Caligula, the redactor refers to Nero. The beast coming out of the sea is, according to J¹, interpreted of Nero's return from Hades. Nero, together with ten foreign kings, will burn Rome, as he had already attempted to do in his life. Then he himself will be overcome by Jesus, and the millennial reign will begin.

The author of the third, i. e. the Christian, Apocalypse, is thought to have been John Mark. No name is suggested for the final redactor. It is held as certain that he wrote under the sixth emperor, who was either Domitian or Trajan. He was strongly influenced by the Johannean writings. Regarding the testimony of the early Church very little is said, and that testimony, strangely enough, is made to support the above hypothesis. The testimony of Irenæus, it is said, is not to be ignored. It is to be taken

for what it claims to be—the views of those who had known John. If John lived in Asia Minor after the death of Paul, and died at the beginning of the second century, it is easily intelligible how a great Apocalypse, which appeared about that time in Asia Minor, and which became known under the name of John, should have been immediately attributed to the Apostle John. Such an error becomes nearly unavoidable, if we accept that the Apocalypse did not become public until the death of John. Further, the redactor, who stood under Johannean influence, surely believed that in his publication he was acting in the spirit of John, and therefore had a good right to let the public believe that his Apocalypse was really a work of the Apostle John.

Such briefly, is the theory. The grounds which are thought to justify this analysis of the Apocalypse can not be given in full, nor would we leave them wholly unnoticed. The weight of the argument can be fairly estimated by studying the author's treatment of two or three chapters. He begins with the unproved assumption that the impression made by the Apocalypse is not one of unity but the reverse. He admits a superficial unity, but thinks this is to be accounted for as the work of the redactor. The question seems not to have been asked, whether it is more probable that a uniform style in a literary document argues unity of authorship or that such a style was mechanically produced out of several different styles by the hand of a redactor. We follow the author's line of argument for a little in detail. Verses 1-3 of the first chapter are held to be an addition of the redactor because they represent the revelation as made by an angel, while from

verse 9 forward to chapter xvii, nothing is said of mediation by angels. In verse 9 Jesus speaks directly with John. Here an apparent difference in the method of communication with John is at once assumed as real. Because the entire revelation is said to be mediated by an angel it is inferred that John, even in an ecstatic state, cannot be represented as seeing and hearing any other than this same angel. Further evidence that verses 1-3 are a later addition is found in verse 2, which shows a misunderstanding of i. 9. This passage was understood to mean that John went to Patmos in order to receive the word of God and the testimony of Jesus, and this false interpretation of a passage in the earlier document led the editor to trace the Apocalypse, as he does, through the angel and Jesus, up to God. Here it is assumed that the clauses "word of God" and "testimony of Jesus" have a radically different meaning in verse 2 from that which they have in verse 9. Further, it is assumed that in i. 9 and later these expressions refer simply to the word of Scripture and to the testimony which Jesus bore in His earthly life. Again, because the verb in verse 2—ἐπαρτήθησαν—has no object expressed, while in verse 4 the seven churches are specified, it is inferred that the redactor regarded the Apocalypse as addressed, not to seven churches, but to the Church universal. Now it might perhaps be said that a redactor with this idea of the Apocalypse could have expressed himself in this way; but the expression does not help to prove the existence of such a redactor. The variation in language is altogether natural. Verses 7 and 8 are assigned to the redactor. First, they are felt to disturb the connection. The Introduction is at an end in

verse 6, and we expect at once the beginning of the content of the letter. This method of reasoning is common throughout the book. The feeling or taste of the critic is put forward as an adequate ground for the most varied changes in the text. Verse 8, beginning with the words "I am the Alpha and the Omega," is assumed to refer to Jesus, and then it is argued that it cannot be by the author of i, 46, in which passage the attributes of Christ are characteristically different from those of God. Again, these verses cannot be by the author of i, 4-6, 9—iii, 22, because while these sections refer to Christ only in His present relation to His Church, verses 7-8 refer to His coming as judge. The answer to this is obvious.

The last verse of the first chapter is assigned to the editor for the following reasons: (1) The verse is suspicious because it is anacoluthically connected with the foregoing; (2) It anticipates part of the content of the seven letters; (3) It gives a false interpretation of symbols, and therefore cannot belong to the author of chapters i-iii. It is wrong to suppose that the candlesticks stand for the seven churches and the stars for the angels of the churches. For, in the first place, i, 9-17 contains only general designations of Christ's heavenly power and glory, and therefore it would be inconsistent to make two of the features of that vision specific. Here it is assumed that the symbols of i, 9-17 are general. The second reason for regarding verse 20 as a false interpretation of symbols is that these churches were for the most part not fitted to serve as an adornment of the heavenly Christ. It is not needful to pause to reply to this objection.

Chapters ii-iii, while belonging in the main to the

original Christian Apocalypse from the year 60 A. D., are no longer in their primitive form. The words, seven times repeated, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches," cannot be an utterance either of Christ or John. This point is dispatched with a simple assertion. Another trace of the redactor is in the words, "What the Spirit saith to the *churches*." Each letter, it is said, is to a single church, and hence the word "churches" is an addition. Here the critic assumes, what is indeed excluded by i, 4, that each letter was designed to be sent separately to a particular church. The promise associated in each letter with the words just mentioned is also regarded as an addition of the editor, because, first, it is suspicious that all the churches alike should receive a promise; second, these promises are introduced abruptly; and finally, there is no connection between the content of the promise and the characteristic of Christ which stands at the beginning of the letter, and no connection between it and the content of the letter itself.

This is the style of argument by which this new hypothesis is supported. The course of the book has been followed in these examples. They have not been chosen at random, or with partiality. And the argument of the entire book is neither stronger nor weaker than that of these first chapters. It may be said, before passing on, that this hypothesis of Spitta seems to us to ignore the deeper spiritual unity of the Apocalypse, to ignore its poetical character, to ignore the testimony of the early Church, and to create vastly more and greater difficulties than those which it seeks to remove.

CHAPTER III.

NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS.

The work in this department during the past year has not been of so great importance as that on the subject of New Testament Introduction. There has been no dearth of works, but less of original investigation than we sometimes have.

It is peculiarly interesting to compare the writings of a Roman Catholic Archbishop¹ and a German Rationalist². One represents exegesis under the ban of dogmatism, the other, exegesis which acknowledges allegiance to science only. One is thoroughly mediæval in method and results, the other as thoroughly modern. The confessed motive of the Archbishop in publishing is the atheistic and materialistic character of the age on which we have fallen: the other author's motive is the wide-spread need, in Germany, of a scientific exposition of the New Testament, which is adapted to theological students, clergymen and intelligent laymen. The attitudes of these writers toward the sacred text is most widely different from each other. For one, the letter of the Gospel is without flaw, a divinely

¹*An Exposition of the Gospel of St. John.* By His Grace. The most Rev. Dr. MacEvilly, Archbishop of Tuam. Dublin, 1889.

²*Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament.* Erster Band, erste bis dritte Abtheilung. Die Synoptiker. Von H. Holtzmann, Freiburg, 1889.

perfect document; for the other, it is a human story, remarkable it is true, but specifically human, and by no means free from incorrect statements and other consequences of human frailty and imperfection. For one the Gospel is fully historical; for the other, it is largely idealized, and contains around its historical nucleus, a mass of devout meditation, interpretation and legend. It follows that the Romanist has little liberty for criticising the meaning of the text, while the Rationalist has no restraint.

As might be expected, the conclusions of these writers are most dissimilar. The Romanist's comments on passages like John i. 48, ii. 25 are to the effect that Jesus constantly possesses the attributes of omniscience, omnipotence and omnipresence. Jesus, in virtue of His Divine immensity, was present under the fig-tree with Nathanael. It is said to be plain from ii, 25 that Jesus knew, as God, the secrets of man's heart, the future as well as the present. In the resurrection of Lazarus, Jesus did all by His own sole command and authority. He invoked no other power to assist Him. Not only during His public ministry was Jesus consciously possessed of Divine power and wisdom, but there is nothing to prevent us from thinking that He might have privately manifested His Divine power to His friends in His home in Nazareth.

On the other hand, the German writer sees in Jesus a man born of Joseph and Mary, who from the hour of His baptism regarded Himself as the prophesied Messiah, a man of great power both moral and spiritual, a man of true and deep religious insight, a reformer of such personal power that He was able to work wonders in the psychological sphere. That is, according to the German writer,

Jesus was a man; according to the Romanist, He was a God.

In one notable point, these writers of the extreme right and extreme left agree, viz., in holding that the Gospel teaches the primacy of Peter. The Romanist holds that this doctrine is fully and emphatically set forth in John xxi, 15-17. In reward for Peter's triple confession, Jesus gives him charge of His entire flock. His commission to feed and rule the flock involves supreme authority over all members of the Church. Peter's commission involves universal legislative, judicial and executive authority to rule, govern and uphold the universal Church, including pastors and people. Here it is assumed that whatever authority was given to Peter, was given also to the successors of Peter. The agreement between the Romanist and the Rationalist is as follows: Holtzmann holds that Matt. xvi, 13-23 contains a solemn proclamation of the primacy of Peter, but he regards this passage as purely fictitious, written at a late day to justify an existing fact in the Church. He declares that this primacy of Peter is in direct contradiction to Matt. xvi, 23, where Jesus calls Peter by the name Satan; is inconsistent with the teaching of Jesus regarding greatness in His kingdom (Mk. ix, 35); with Paul's views of the Apostolate, and with his actual relation to Peter.

As illustrative of the Archbishop's exegetical method his treatment of the passages relating to Mary the mother of Jesus may be noticed. He says of John ii 4: "Woman, what have I to do with thee! mine hour is not yet come," that these words have taxed the learning and ingenuity of the ablest commentators ancient and modern. One may

be pardoned for thinking that it taxed the ingenuity of the Archbishop himself to deduce from the simple statement of the text the following teaching. He says the most probable meaning of the entire verse is thus given: "My Lady, the miracle regarding which thou givest me a suggestive hint, is a work which cannot emanate from my human nature, received from thee, which alone therefore is common to you and to me. It is a work peculiar to my divine nature. There is some difficulty in the way, arising from the decree of my Father's providence, as to the time, for my public manifestation to the world is not yet come. But thy powerful intercession cannot be frustrated; thou askest it, let it therefore be done." The author adds: "What more calculated to inspire all her children with the greatest confidence in the wonderful intercessory power of the Blessed Virgin?"

From the words of Mary in verse 5 it is inferred as certain that she knew all about the coming miracle. She knew that her Divine Son would perform the miracle in compliance with her request.

Perhaps the most remarkable bit of exegesis is that of John xix, 26-27. On the words, "Woman, behold thy son," we read: "From the lofty summit of His cross Jesus contemplates the sorrows of this dolorous Queen of Martyrs, and in the person of St. John, who, then, according to the teaching of several holy fathers, represented the human race, or, at least, the sincere followers of our Divine Lord, He gave us over to her, as her children. Are we not, then, the children whom Mary brought forth in sorrow at the foot of the cross, the children recommended to her by her dying first-born? If she was spared the ma-

ernal throes in Bethlehem, was it not that she might experience them with ten-fold intensity, in giving us, the children of sin, birth amid the glooms of Calvary! Then turning to us in the person of St. John, he exclaims, "Behold thy Mother!" Woe to us if we ever fail to reverence with special honor, or love with the most intense filial affection of devoted children, or cherish with unbounded confidence the mother bequeathed to us, as the last pledge of His love, by her Divine vine Son, our dying Saviour. . . . If in our conviction regarding the powerful advocacy of the Blessed Virgin we are deceived, then all we can say is, that the saints of heaven and the faithful on earth, have gone astray for eighteen hundred years. Happy we, if we err along with them."

Comparable with this exegesis as regards only the remarkable character of the results attained, is Holtzmann's treatment of the passages concerning the resurrection. He regards Matt. xxviii, 16-20 as the oldest of the extant reports of the resurrection. He holds that after the disciples fled (Matt. xxvi, 56), they went to Galilee, and there where all the memories of the living Christ were in full strength, and where the Jerusalem picture of his death could work on them only from afar, Christianity was born a second time. The only point, it is said, in which the Synoptists agree perfectly is that the grave was found empty. No one knows what became of the buried Jesus. The accounts of the appearances of the risen One are too full of contradictions to be regarded as historical. According to Luke (xxiv, 13, 34) Jesus appears to the disciples on the day of the resurrection in Jerusalem; according to

Matthew and Mark, He directs that they should go to Galilee, where further revelations should be made. The appearances in Jerusalem are so related that they exclude the Galilean, and the Galilean appearances so that they exclude those in Jerusalem. According to the Gospel of Luke, the last appearance of Jesus seems to be on the day of the resurrection; yet the same writer in Acts i, 3 puts it forty days later. The Gospel of Mark breaks off at xvi, 8, manifestly because it does not count the resurrection as belonging in a strict sense to the history of Jesus. According to Mark xvi, 8, the women do not deliver the angel's message to the disciples; according to Luke xxiv, 9, they do. And who are the women who found the grave empty? Mark says, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Salome; Matthew speaks only of the two Marys; Luke says there were three and Joanna. Two angels are seen according to Luke; one according to Matthew and Mark.

Further, there is no agreement touching the nature of the risen one. Now He is represented as corporeal. He can be touched, and can eat. Again, He appears as a supernatural being. He comes and goes suddenly. He is taken for a ghost. Holtzmann's conclusion is that the whole account of the resurrection is unhistorical; Jesus did not rise; and Christianity was born the second time of a fond memory.

The eleventh chapter of the Gospel according to John, upon whose story of the raising of Lazarus Strauss made his bitterest attack, has been treated exhaustively from a conservative point of view.¹

¹*Die Geschichte der Auferweckung des Lazarus.* Von F. L. Steinmeyer, Berlin, 1888.

The argument against the genuineness of the narrative on the ground that the event is not referred to in Matthew, is met, not by saying that his field was Galilee rather than Judea, but by the fact of different aims on the part of the evangelists. Matthew's aim was to show that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jewish people, but for the accomplishment of this aim the event in Bethany was not appropriate material. It was just this event that led to the culmination of Jewish hate against Jesus. As such it was received by John. In accounting for Christ's sorrow on the receipt of the news of Lazarus' death, the author advances the view that Jesus saw in the Bethany family a type of the Christian Church. This was the reason why He was so deeply touched by the tidings that the circle had been broken.

The distinction between *ἐλθὼν* and *ἀγαπᾶν*, long and generally advocated on the ground of classic usage, is abandoned. The better evidence of New Testament usage is appealed to, and the conclusion is that the words are not discriminated. This conclusion is reached by an American writer also,¹ after an exhaustive study of the LXX and of the New Testament.

The conservative criticism of Meyer is pretty seriously transformed by some of his editors. Particularly is this the case with his work on the Acts. His editor (see title of work under Introduction) has generally altered the historical and theological passages. In his view, later and unhistorical tradition has left traces in the Acts. For instance, the statement that the multitude perfectly understood the Apostolic preaching on Pentecost is legendary.

¹Prof. Wm. G. Ballantine, D. D., in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1889.

The speaking with tongues in Jerusalem was what we find later in Corinth. As to the interpretation of Acts xxvi, 26, the author goes back to Chrysostom's explanation. It means this: "With a little, i. e., a little more, thou makest me a Christian." Agrippa makes a half-way confession of Christ, not ironical but serious.

Another illustration is furnished of the universality and depth of the spirit of Paul, of the firm grasp which he had upon the great principles of Christianity, and of the need which the world still has of his solution of some of its difficult problems. Following the philological commentaries of the past two or three years on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, there comes a popular volume⁶, but such a one as grows out of scientific study. It is a forcible discussion of the leading features of the Epistle, and consequently it is a discussion of questions which are largely vital in our own times. The writer comes near to those who regard Paul as the second founder of the Christian religion. It is to this man, he says, that we owe our Christianity. It was he who disengaged from the dying body of Judaism the new-born religion, and held it aloft in the eye of the world as the true heir to universal empire. It was he who applied to the whole range of human life and duty the inexhaustible ethical force which lay in Christ, and thus lifted at one effort the heathen world to a new level of morality.

Critical works which are produced for the holders of a particular dogma are not likely to possess much critical value. It is well-known how the criticism of the Roman

⁶*The First Epistle to the Corinthians.* By Marcus Dods, D. D. New York, Armstrong & Son, 1889.

Catholic Church is controlled by the Decrees of Trent. A recognized exponent of the Church of England, highly endorsed by the organs of that body, admits frankly in a volume on Corinthians¹ that he writes exegesis for members of the Church of England. This is to renounce in advance the privilege of scientific investigation. Given the doctrines of the Established Church, and one can foretell the scientific results to which the exegesis will attain. To illustrate this from the work in question. On chapter iv, 1, in I. Cor., where Paul speaks of himself as a minister and steward, we are told that ministers are priests more truly than Aaron. . . . that they dispense the mystery of the Incarnation. . . . and that they stand between Christ and His people.

So important to Church action is the actual presence of a bishop, that the spirit of Paul is said to have been miraculously present with the church in Corinth when that body took measures against the fornicator. It is expressly affirmed that the presence of his spirit was not by an act of sympathy with what they were doing, but by a supernatural act. The excommunication and absolution of the fornicator are both acts of the Apostle alone. Another illustration of the same sort is found in the author's treatment of the Lord's Supper. The words, "This is my body," cannot be understood figuratively, because there is no similar figure in Scripture. In the matter of the Holy Sacrament the Lord directs our attention to the lower part of His nature—His body and blood—rather than to Himself. In all other figures—"I am the

¹*The First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, with notes critical and practical. By. Rev. M. F. Sadler. London, 1889.

Door, I am the good Shepherd," etc.—the Lord directs attention to His spiritual nature. But here, in the institution of the Supper, He directs our thought to His lower and passive nature, as that through which we are to receive the benefits of His redemption. The remembrance is made before God and God alone. It is also called a Church remembrance.

A singular view of the Greek word *μυστήριον* is adopted in connection with the author's view of the Supper. It does not denote a truth once hidden, but now made known and comprehensible. It signifies rather something that is unsearchable, and ten-fold more mysterious by reason of the light thrown upon it. The author admits the doctrine of probation after death. The man delivered over to Satan (I Cor. v, 5) was to be cut off by death, but this death would not be followed by eternal death; for the punishment of temporal death would be remedial, and either bring about a repentance, though a very late one, or else his temporal death would be taken in mitigation of his punishment in the unseen world. This passage is held to be parallel to Matt. xii, 32, which distinctly implies, so the author says, that sins may be forgiven in the future world.

A novel view of the "spiritual rock" (I Cor. x 4) is set forth in a little volume on *Difficult Passages of the New Testament*.⁷ It was not really the rock itself which followed the Israelites, but the stream from the rock, and this followed them because they descended from Horeb. The water came down the same ravine with them.

⁷*Notes on Difficult Passages of the New Testament.* By Elias Riggs, D. D., LL.D. Cong. Pub. Society, Chicago, 1889.

Small addition has been made to the critical study of the Epistle to the Galatians. An excellent popular volume has appeared,¹ treating the thought of the writing in some of its more salient features. A second volume² on this Epistle is an ingenious mosaic of quotations.

Some acute suggestions are made as to the rendering of certain clauses in the Epistle.³ In i, 14, instead of "Jews' religion," "Jewish partizanship" is suggested. The difficult sentence in ii, 2 is rendered as follows: "I laid before them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those who were thinking that possibly I was running, or had run, in vain." This gives ἀποκρυπτῶς its natural meaning. Weiss⁴ transforms Huther's commentary on the Epistles of John, extensively changing both form and substance. His aim is to combine the glossatorial and reproductive methods. The positive explanation of the text is placed in the foreground, and its justification is given in continuous analysis of words and connections which is interwoven with the interpretation. Subordinate place is given to the discussion of others' views. The grammatical and lexical references are few in comparison with those of Meyer. There is a decided gain in clearness of statement. The change of explanation is often striking. For instance, Huther's comment on 1 John, i. 5,

¹*The Epistle to the Galatians.* By Professor G. G. Findlay. London, 1888.

²*The Epistle to the Galatians.* Biblical Illustrator. By Rev. Joseph S. Exell. London, Nisbet & Co., 1889.

³Cf. *the Expositor*, for July, 1889.

⁴*Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Briefe des Apostels Johannes.* Fünfte Auflage neubearbeitet. Göttingen, 1888.

“God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all,” is to the effect that the word ‘darkness’ is a symbol of sin; while Weiss regards it as signifying the unknown. Again, the “manifestation” of chapter ii, 28, is regarded by Huther as the manifestation of God. The verb here employed does not denote the becoming visible of the invisible, but the becoming known of the unknown.

Of the same character as his work on the Epistles of John is the work of Weiss on the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹ Lunemann’s work is revised in a thorough manner. There are new views on every page. It is impossible to discover how much of the original is left except by comparing the new work with it, line for line. The volume by Rendall, already referred to under Introduction, is more suggestive than the German commentary. They differ widely on some important points. For instance, the view of Weiss on chapter ii, 10, is that the sufferings through which Jesus passed on earth afforded Him opportunity to become perfect, *i. e.*, to maintain His moral perfection in the extremest trial. Rendall, looking at the uniform usage of the LXX., and also at the Epistle to the Hebrews, takes the verb *τελειόω* in the sense of “consecrate.” His idea of the passage is, that the sufferings and death through which Jesus passed in His incarnation, are regarded as a consecration to His heavenly priesthood.

The view of Weiss, and apparently of the Revisers, that iv, 13 contains a figure borrowed from the language of sacrifice, is rejected by Rendall, who sees in it rather a figure from the wrestling-school. The word in question,

¹*Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über den Hebräerbrief.* Göttingen, 1888.

τῆς ραχὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ στήθους denoted primarily one who was mastered by the grip of his antagonist on the back of his neck. Philo used it to describe one who was over-mastered by distress, or tyrannized over by lust. Mr. Rendall's translation of chapter vi, 6, gives a new meaning to that important passage. It is impossible *to keep renewing* again unto repentance those who have been enlightened once for all, etc." The impossible here asserted consists not in a single repentance, but in the indefinite renewal of the first vivid life of the Spirit in the case of Christians who are meanwhile continually crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh. The passage thus understood, is in harmony with the previous context, which maintains the need of progressive teaching as the child grows into a man in Christ, and protests against the constant reiteration of truths which have lost their freshness. It is in harmony also with the subsequent context, which condemns spiritual barrenness under the figure of sterile soil, which, season after season, in spite of fertilizing rain and human tillage, produces only thorns and thistles. The most important work on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and perhaps the most important commentary of the past year, is that by Westcott.¹ It combines German attention to detail, and comprehensive understanding of the scope of the Epistle. It is elaborate and learned; conservative in tone, free from polemical matter, and fair.

The author's views on matters of introduction have been referred to in another connection. Mention may be made here of some especially interesting and difficult passages. The 'taking hold of a seed of Abraham' is understood as a

¹*The Epistle to the Hebrews: the Greek Text with Notes and Essays.* London, 1889.

taking hold to help (ii, 16). Christ did not take hold of angels, to help them, but took hold of men. And indeed, He took hold of a seed of Abraham, that is a true seed, those who are children of faith. But this conception that Christ took hold only of those who should believe, does not seem to be the necessary teaching of the verse.

The difficult word (*παρρηλίσεν*) in chap. iv, 13, is understood in the sense of 'revealed,' but the author does not say from what image he thinks this meaning derived. He does not accept the reference to the 'wrestler.'

The words 'without sin,' chap. iv, 15, are held to describe a limitation of Christ's temptation, not, as in our version, the issue of His temptation. Accordingly, the thought is, Christ met all the temptations which we meet, except those which spring out of our sin. This greatly limits the range of His temptations.

The 'heavenly things' of ix, 23, which it was necessary to cleanse with something better than the Levitical sacrifices, are things which embody the conditions of man's future life, things which answer to the sanctuary with all its furniture. Various conceptions of the Epistle are treated in separate essays, which to the number of more than forty, are scattered through the volume. These constitute an important feature of the work. Two works¹ on the Pastoral Epistles illustrate the independent and the dogmatic styles of exegesis.

Some points are of especial interest. The difficult passage in 1 Tim. ii, 12-15 is ingeniously explained by Knoke. The word *αὐτοεπίτιμον* is said to mean an egotistic

¹ Knoke. See title under Introduction. *The Pastoral Epistles*. By Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1889.

and reckless withdrawment of the woman from the man. It does not refer to her having dominion over him. There could have been no need of such an injunction in one of Paul's churches. Further, this view of the word is inconsistent with the latter part of verse 15. But the idea of withdrawment from the husband may have been a question of the day. That chastity which was required by the Christian faith might seem to be best secured by sexual abstinence. With some it was a question whether the married state did not render the attainment of salvation impossible. Paul had to meet just these ideas in his letter to the Corinthians, and similar views had probably been expressed in Ephesus. Adopting this meaning of *ἀποστρέψαι*, the sense of verse 15 becomes plain. Woman shall be saved. Her salvation is not imperilled by her married state, as some suppose. She shall be saved, if, with child-bearing, she continues in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety.

This point is made against the ordinary understanding of Paul's requirement, that a bishop should be the husband of one wife. Paul, in verse 9, requires that a widow, in order to be enrolled as a church-widow, must have been the wife of one man. In verse 14, he advises the younger widows to marry. If now the clause in question, "wife of one man," meant that she could be but once married, Paul by his advice to young widows would be cutting off the possibility of their ever being helped by the Church, should they a second time lose their husbands. This is said to be improbable. Reference to polygamy is thought to be entirely out of the question. Hence the injunction is referred to chastity. Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. VI, p. 126.

The difficulty of the passage, Titus ii, 13, is avoided by a new rendering. According to Knoke, Christ is not the great God, but the glory of the great God. It is the epiphany of this which is anticipated.

The two authors differ widely touching the "laver of regeneration" (Titus iii, 5). The English writer declares that, according to Paul, regeneration takes place by means of the baptismal washing. This is said to be the natural and almost necessary meaning of the Greek construction (*δου* with the genitive). The German writer, on the other hand, finds no reference to the baptism of individual Christians. The expression "laver of regeneration" is taken figuratively, and its meaning is said to be determined by that of the following clause, "the renewing of the Holy Spirit." This refers to an event which took place in connection with the appearance of the goodness of God, *i. e.*, to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. This is called a renewing in view of the sporadic and partial outpourings of the Spirit upon the prophets. The laver of regeneration denotes essentially the same thing. The language is based upon the promise to the prophets that when the new covenant should be made with Israel, they should receive new hearts. This promise was fulfilled at Pentecost.

The right of praying for the departed is argued by the English writer on the ground of II Tim. i, 15-18. The balance of probability is said to be decidedly in favor of the view that Onesiphorus was already dead when Paul wrote these words. For the house of Onesiphorus is spoken of in connection with the present, while Onesiphorus himself is connected with the past. Then, Paul sends greeting to the house of Onesiphorus, not to Onesiphorus himself.

And finally the form of Paul's prayer points to the death of Onesiphorus as already accomplished.

The exegesis of the Apocalypse can scarcely be said to have been furthered by works of the past year. The Bishop of Liverpool, in the preface to a popular commentary by Mr. Graham,¹ says that the Apocalypse is a book of hieroglyphics, that we have at present no key to their meaning, and must be content with modest conjectures. And yet, strangely enough, this commentary on a book for whose interpretation we have no key, this commentary which consists of modest conjectures, is said to have food for all classes of Christians, and to be adapted to do good to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Some people will differ from the Lord Bishop in regard to the spiritual value of guess-work in Bible interpretation.

The author seems to have no definite theory of interpretation, and to lack that sobriety of scholarship which is most emphatically required in the interpretation of the Apocalypse. For instance, the seven churches are thought to correspond to seven periods of history, which cover the past eighteen centuries. Only the author finds it necessary to skip the Reformation period, perhaps the most important of all since the Apostolic. This fanciful scheme of dividing history makes it necessary to call the modern period the Laodicean. The Church of this century is neither dead nor alive. Such a conclusion bears hard upon the theory.

Again, the rider on the white horse, chapter vi, is said to be the Antichrist, because he seems to conquer by irre-

¹A *Popular Commentary on the Book of the Revelation*. London, 1889.

sistible fascination. The author thinks it is due to the god of this world that the Apocalypse is an enigma to so many Christians. Some people, however, may still be inclined to think the result is due to bad commentaries rather than to Satan.

The work of Eremita¹ combines different principles of exegesis. Sometimes the text is interpreted symbolically, sometimes realistically. For instance, the first beast symbolizes earthly power in general; the second beast, false teaching in general; but the thousand years are taken literally, and the cubic form of the city, the New Jerusalem, is also understood realistically.

The American contingent² to the interpretation of the Apocalypse has less claim to be considered scientific. Nothing is clearer, according to the author, than that the thousand years of John are found in the Old Testament prophets. The truth is said to blaze everywhere in the Old Testament and the New, that the second coming of Christ precedes the Millennium. The author has made it so plain that the seventieth week of Daniel is contemporary with the times of the Apocalypse iv-xix, that, as he affirms, compound myopic hypertropic stigmatism could hardly fail to see it. The New Jerusalem is a literal material city, in which God will manifest Himself forever. This very earth, made new, shall be for all the creation of God a center where the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be, and wherein the Church with Christ shall reign forever, dis-

¹*Erklärung von der Offenbarung Johannes.* Cap. x-xxii. Gütersloh, 1888.

²*The Thousand Years in both Testaments.* By Rev. Nathanael West, D. D. Chicago, 1889.

pensing therefrom the economy of all the worlds. During the thousand years there will be a seven-fold increase of light, solar and lunar; there will be a yearly concourse of people from all nations to Jerusalem to worship; and the risen saints will have **m**aterial bodies adapted to spiritual uses, and free from certain physical functions.

CHAPTER IV.

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY.

There has been comparatively little discussion along the lines covered by this rubric. The Life and Work of John the Baptist¹ have been treated in a popular and not wholly satisfactory manner. The author draws pretty strongly upon his imagination. For instance, he says that in the social life of Hebron the parents of John the Baptist held a leading position. Their home was visited by the learned and refined, who held them, and consequently their son, in the highest respect, and who insensibly exerted over the lad a most favorable educating influence. And so throughout the book, that which is purely hypothetical is stated as though it were a well authenticated historical fact. The author states that John's conception of the coming Messianic Kingdom was quite different from that of his countrymen, that his was spiritual while theirs was material. This view, however, is not substantiated by the evidence adduced.

The History of the Rabbi Jesus of Nazareth² brings a strange mixture of metaphysics and exegesis. The out-

¹*John the Baptist, His Life and Work.* By Ross C. Houghton. New York, 1889.

²*Die Geschichte des Rabbi Jesu von Nazareth.* Von H. C. Hugo Delff. Leipzig, 1889.

line of Jesus' career is as follows: He was born in Nazareth of Joseph and Mary. He was over forty years old when He began His ministry. At first He attached Himself to John the Baptist, and taught according to the customary form of the Haggada. Gradually He began to go His own ways, and claimed a peculiar authority, higher than John's. At first He met the opposition of the Pharisees in a friendly spirit, but when this failed to be effectual, He lost patience, and used hard and bitter words. He attacked the Pharisaic party by openly transgressing the Sabbath law. The author thinks that Lazarus was not absolutely dead but in a cataleptic condition. In general the works of Jesus do not concern us. The narrative concerning them may be mythical, but that does not affect our confidence in Him. It is even a matter of indifference to us whether the resurrection of Jesus is a fact or a dream or a simple rumor. For we are sufficiently cultured to be able to hold, as possible, an existence in spirit or as spirit, and a continued influence of such spiritual existence upon us. It is to be remembered that it has always belonged to the fate of the hero that he should rise from the dead and be glorified. As to the story of Christ's resurrection, each one is to believe as much of it as his genius permits him.

Regarding contemporary writers on the life of Christ, the author's opinion is not very favorable. Weiss is a scholastic of the seventeenth century in the dress of the nineteenth. Beyschlag is too theological to be historical. Hausrath, Keim, Holtzmann and Pfleiderer, as they reject the Fourth Gospel, reach only artificial and untenable results.

In splendid contrast with this work of Delff, stands the story of Christ as told by an English writer.¹ The author does not present new views on the great facts of the Life of Jesus, or new solutions of difficulties that meet the student of the Gospels; but, having largely appropriated the best results of modern scholarship, and confessing the faith of the early Church, he writes a biography of Jesus which is remarkable both for its concentration and its poetical power. The special aim is to contribute to the moral and spiritual history of Christ, and this in some especial relation to missionary work and the contact of Christianity with non-Christian religions. There is sometimes a positiveness of statement that is scarcely warranted by the facts. For instance, the journey of the Magi is said to have taken altogether about two years, and the birth of Christ is said to have occurred in December, 5 B. C. Again, it is stated as beyond question that Judas alone of the twelve Apostles was of Judean origin, and that all the others were Galileans. Christ's transfiguration surely took place upon one of the elevations of the snowy height of Hermon; and at His ascension He was escorted by a guard of angels. Though aiming to contribute to the spiritual history of Jesus, the conception is sometimes questionably realistic. For instance, in speaking of the Temptation, the author says that an external coming of Satan alone satisfies the conditions of the narrative. The history must be accepted as authentic or relegated to the region of myth. But here he *assumes* that the narra-

¹*Jesus Christ the Divine Man. His Life and Times.* By T. F. Wallis, M. A. New York. Randolph & Co., 1889.

tive is a history of objective events. This is the very point at issue.

The author accepts Edersheim's view of the transportation of Jesus from the wilderness to Jerusalem. "As the Spirit of God had driven Jesus into the wilderness, the spirit of the devil now carried Him into Jerusalem." This seems to be a grotesque idea, worthy of the apocryphal gospels.

An important question concerning Jesus' family relations is disposed of summarily in a sentence regarding the miracle at Nain. The author says, "The only Son of His Mother feels for the mother of an only son." But it is something of an assumption that Jesus was the only Son of His Mother.

In speaking of the apostolic decree a recent writer¹ thinks that the journey of Acts xi, 3; xii, 25, which is omitted by Paul in Galatians, must either be supposed to have dropped out of Paul's memory, which is not probable, or that the author of Acts has introduced here a journey which belongs to a later day. It is held to be unhistorical to represent Paul as participating in the formulation and promulgation of the decree. That decree enjoins a partial subjection to the law on the part of Gentile Christians, a thing wholly opposed to Paul's conception of Christianity. He agreed in a measure with the requirements of the decree. For instance, he objected, in certain cases, to the eating of meat offered to idols, but he did this on entirely different grounds from those recognized in the decrees of the Council. The Acts throughout, it is said, represent

¹*Das Aposteldekret.* Von Joh. Georg Sommer. Königsberg, 1889.

Paul as a faithful keeper of the Law, and betray no trace of his true relation to it. This indicates that the author was a Jewish Christian, friendly to Paul but unconsciously presenting him in a false light. The apostolic decrees are thought of as having been occasioned by Paul's report upon the state of things in Antioch, and as having been ascribed in part to him, in order to give them the greater force.

CHAPTER V.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

The chief, if not sole problem, of New Testament theology is, according to a recent writer¹, to ascertain what answer the New Testament gives to the question, What is the *summum bonum*? It is the study of the leading types of doctrine concerning the things freely given to us of God in Jesus Christ. The author admits that this may not be exhaustive, but thinks it has the merit of definiteness and interest. Such a method as that of Weiss he characterizes as vague. His own work is not, strictly speaking, a treatise on New Testament theology, but on certain features of the same, which the author regards as fundamental. He finds four types of doctrine in the New Testament, described by the titles: The Kingdom of God, The Righteousness of God, Free Access to God, Eternal Life. The volume in hand is concerned with the first of these types. But yet it does not give us the entire New Testament teaching on this topic; it is confined to the Synoptists. Now, while it is true that this conception is more prominent in the first three Gospels than elsewhere in the New Testament, it may be a question whether it is in the inter-

¹*The Kingdom of God; or Christ's Teaching according to the Synoptical Gospels* By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D. Scribner, New York, 1889.

est of truth to consider the conception only as we meet it in the Synoptical Gospels.

The present volume on the Kingdom of God cannot be charged with any neglect of the negative critics. It will rather be said that it gives them too much consideration. The author differs from Weiss regarding Christ's conception of the Kingdom of God. He thinks that Christ idealized the Old Testament conception. He emphasizes what he considers new in Christ's views. According to Weiss, Christ was more conservative and more in line with the Old Testament. Prof. Bruce thinks that Christ's conception was new as regards grace, universality and spirituality. Some, however, would say that in these particulars Christ taught nothing new, but only emphasized Old Testament thoughts.

The author holds that Jesus regarded Himself habitually and from the first as Messiah, but also that His Messianic consciousness underwent gradual development, advancing from twilight to perfect day. This advance was promoted by the Baptism, the Temptation, the Miracles, the Transfiguration, and Christ's fellowship with God. He thinks the form of the Messianic consciousness was determined by Christ's spiritual nature. He gathered up out of the Old Testament, as by elective affinity, those elements which were congenial to Him. He chose the conception of a gentle, missionary, suffering Messiah. The author finds the source of Messianic consciousness not so much in Christ's holiness as in His love for men. He thinks it was a matter of faith with Jesus.

Especially valuable is the discussion of the Parousia and the Judgment. The author holds that Christ looked

forward to a Christian era. He did not expect the end in a short time, as some have held. In some of His parables He represents the Kingdom as subject to laws of growth. Again he speaks of the delay of the Parousia, and exhorts to watchfulness. Those passages which suggest a Gentile day of grace also imply a lengthened Christian Era.

The author adopts Holtzmann's classification of the passages referring to Christ's coming again, according to which three comings are spoken of, viz., a dynamical coming, which is in the heart of the believer; a historical coming, such as in the destruction of Jerusalem; and the apocalyptic coming at the end of the age.

The judgment of the heathen will be purely ethical. It will not be according to their treatment of Christ, but according to their treatment of the poor and suffering, the brethren of Christ. "All who live in the spirit of love the Son of Man recognizes as Christians unawares, and therefore as heirs of the Kingdom. All who live a loveless life of selfishness He relegates to the congenial society of the devil and his angels.

While recognizing that there was, among the believers in Israel, a living fellowship with God in prayer, it is held¹ that this fellowship differed in not a few important particulars from that of the New Testament believer. The Old Testament suppliant has a lively appreciation of the fact that God's bearing toward him is fatherly, but yet he does not conceive of God as a father. This is manifested in various ways. The Old Testament believer shows a frequent desire to legitimate himself before God, and does

¹*Das Gebet im Alten Testament im Lichte des Neuen betrachtet* Von Lic. Theol. Königsberg, 1889.

this in long introductions to his prayers. Even when there is confidence in the grace of God, the suppliant cries unto the Lord that he would hear him. In the New Testament, the believer knows at the outset that God will hear him. He does not think it is necessary to beseech God to open His ear to him. Again, the Old Testament believer prays earnestly for the granting of a particular request—prays as though his prayer would be in vain were this not granted. The New Testament believer, on the other hand, recognizes that the Father has many ways to help. Hence there is here more of quiet resignation.

The personal communion of the believer with God, according to the Old Testament, is a conception dominated by the grace of God, while in the New Testament it is controlled by the conception of His love. The thought of being loved by the Father has the emphasis that the Old Testament gives to God's grace toward the sinner. The Lord's Prayer contains no petitions that are foreign to the Old Testament, and yet it is all new because of the new conception of Him to whom it is offered. And this it is that explains all the difference between the Old Testament spirit of prayer and that of the New. The relation of a servant to his master has given place to that of a child to its father.

In a book already mentioned (Rendall on the Hebrews) Paul's attitude toward the Law is characterized as over against the attitude of the other Apostles. Paul regarded the Law as an incidental and temporary addition, almost of the nature of an interruption of God's original covenant. This attitude was the inevitable outcome of his education. He regarded it with the purely legal spirit of the Pharisees.

The attitude of James was quite different from this. For him the Gospel was not a message of deliverance from the condemnation of the Law, but a fresh means of grace for a more perfect obedience to its commands. When James spoke of righteousness, he did not mean, like Paul, the original acceptance before God which makes the starting-point of Christian life, but rather the inward peace of conscience which is the fruit of holy living. With him faith consists not so much in the abandonment of all self-confidence, that we may throw ourselves on the merit of a crucified Saviour, as in the sustaining principle of a life given to God. The author of the Hebrews was a man of the same type as James. For him the Gospel was the natural climax of the Mosaic Law, and the key to its comprehension. The Law was an earlier Gospel, which failed only for lack of faith.

The angelology and demonology of Paul has for the first time received independent treatment.¹ This is a chapter of Paul's theology which has been neglected. The author agrees with Ritschl that Paul did not regard all angels as either positively good or positively bad. He believes that there were both these classes, but also a class which stood in a relative antithesis to God. The angels as such are capable of going astray (I Cor. x, ii), and capable also of receiving a reconciliation through Christ (Eph. i, 10). Paul's angelic world is a world thoroughly disorganized and full of dark forms. It is not a sphere of pure poetry, where winged forms of light lead a blessed existence. It is a world of definitely marked classes. There

¹*Die Paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie.* Von Otto Everling, Göttingen. 1883.

are orders of the good, thrones and dominions being the highest, and likewise orders of the bad, with Satan at their head. Satan's influence upon men is regarded as physical rather than ethical (I Cor. v, 5; II Cor. xii, 7; I Cor. xi, 3; Rom. xvi, 20). Satan and his hosts are thought of as dwelling in the air between the earth and heaven. The dwelling place of good angels is yet higher. The practical religious value of Paul's teaching concerning angels and demons is not discussed. The author's view, however, seems to be that the conceptions of Paul have become obsolete.

We have an interesting discussion of the activity of the Holy Spirit according to the popular conception of the apostolic age and according to the teaching of Paul.¹ In the popular conception, the Spirit is not thought of as the author of all Christian activities; and further, some activities not moral or religious are ascribed to the Spirit. The common religious functions of the simple Christian were not regarded as gifts of the Spirit; indeed, it is held that not all gifts of the Spirit had direct influence upon the Christian life. Cf. Acts. x, 19; xvi, 6.

The symptom of the Spirit's activity is the presence of something mysterious and powerful. The confirmation of the Spirit's presence is according to the law of cause and effect, not the law of means and end.

When wisdom is derived from the Spirit, it is of a special irresistible kind. Faith that is traced to the Spirit is of a special character. The Old Testament conception

¹*Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach den populären Anschauungen der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostel Paulus.* Von Hermann Gunkel, Göttingen, 1888.

of the Spirit's activity was wider than that of the New Testament. There everything mysterious and powerful in Israel was attributed to the Spirit; here everything mysterious and powerful in the Christian Church.

Both in the popular conception and in the teaching of Paul, the Spirit was thought of as material. The laying on of hands, breathing upon disciples, events of Pentecost, and other indications support this view.

Paul is pneumatic. His standard for judging the gifts of the Spirit is higher than that of the Corinthian Church. He esteems the Spirit's gifts according as they tend to the edification of the Church, not as they excite amazement. Paul's conception of the activity of the Spirit was broader and deeper than that of his time. People in general held the extraordinary to be pneumatic, Paul, the ordinary. With him the Christian life itself was pneumatic. The root of this teaching lay in Paul's own experience.

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE
OF
STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.
BY
REV. HUGH M. SCOTT,
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

INTRODUCTION.

ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.

It is interesting to notice in recent secular literature the growing conviction expressed that the heart of human history, as that of the individual man, must be regarded from the religious point of view. The Neapolitan philosopher Chiapelli, in turning thinking Italians towards the golden mean between Papal superstition and blank atheism says,¹ "the great epochs in the history of the world are marked, not by the overturning of empires or the migration of nations, such things belong to the external history; but the real history, the inner history of man is the history of religion." That is just the thought with which the Church historian naturally begins his work. A recent writer² sets out by saying that the history of Christianity is the inner history of the world, for it is moral ideas which govern the inner development of the human race, and Christianity has multiplied these moral ideas, transformed them, and brought them into new connections by a new religion. The gospel gave to mankind the ideas of a new religion, whose center is Jesus, the representative of God; his sole mission is to preach the gospel; his aim is to

¹*Le Idee Millenarie dei Christiani.* Naples, 1888. A Lecture.

²Sell, *Aus der Geschichte des Christenthums.* Six Lectures. Darmstadt, 1888. Suggestive.

gather a people of God about the throne of the Divine King. But are not these fundamental ideas of Christianity contained in New Testament writings, and has not the Higher Criticism made their statements very doubtful? Sell replies, By no means. These foundation truths of Christianity, he says, are beyond the doubts of criticism, for they are rooted in New Testament writings, which all admit to be primitive records, such as the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, and the four great Epistles of Paul. Hence, he continues, "the fundamental contradiction between the earlier and later traditions of the Christian Church, which negative criticism maintains, does not exist."¹ To grasp the underlying thoughts of early Christian life, we must have a Christian experience of the Gospel which formed the heart of that Apostolic Church. Those early brotherhoods with their officers, and sacraments, and associations were very similar to many Jewish and heathen societies; what made them different from all others was the conviction that they possessed a real, new, living revelation of God, that they stood upon the ground of an old history of redemption, and that they alone had a mission for all men. With such convictions they opposed the religion of Rome, a deification of this world and its relations, a belief in the divinity of the world as it is; they preached "faith in an ever existing God, who rules over a world that is passing away." The new Evangel proclaimed "real entrance into an everlasting empire of liberty, equality and fraternity." Hence, as Paul points out in an article on Harnack's *History of*

¹Cf. also the interesting work of C. E. Johansson; German by J. Claussen, *Die heilige Schrift u. die negative Kritik*. Leipzig, Dörffling & Franke. 1889.

Doctrine,¹ original Christianity was life rather than doctrine. It rested for the most part upon the impression of the person of Christ gained by Christians from the Old Testament and in view of Jesus as the Messiah there foretold. Besides this Old Testament element in the formation of early Christianity, there came an element from Hellenism, which soon thrust aside most of St. Paul's teachings, except the thought of the universality of the Gospel. But Baur, we are told, was not right in calling Paul's own theology Hellenistic; Harnack holds that here we have always the teaching of a converted Pharisee. Harnack agrees with Baur that Paulinism is not sufficient to explain the post-Pauline development of the Church; another element must be brought in for that purpose. Baur found this in national Jewish Christianity, which, in conflict with St. Paul's Hellenism, gave rise to early Catholic theology. Harnack rejects this, as we know;² but Paul (*l. c.*) thinks the studies of Lipsius on the Apocryphal Acts show that the influence of Jewish Christianity upon early Catholicism must be recognized, especially after A. D. 150, when it became denationalized, lost Jewish narrowness, and received speculative coloring from both East and West. Paul accepts here Harnack's statement, that the bridge from Judaism to Heathenism for the early Church was this Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, scattered through the Pagan world as a mediator between the Old Testament and Gentile thought, and gives it wider application. He thinks it is a special merit of Harnack to have pointed out that the influence of Hellenism in the Church grew just in pro-

¹Cf. *Jahrbh. f. Protest. Theologie*, April, 1889.

²Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. V. 1888, p. 153.

portion to the decline of the original, predominant, enthusiastic, charismatic element in early Christianity. In this chilling atmosphere of Graeco-Roman thought, during the second century, the forming Church became crystallized. The simple congregational brotherhood became an ecclesiastical system. The prophetic ministry, exercised by any believer who felt called, became confined to certain clergy. The free, extempore prayers ran towards liturgical forms. The brief baptismal confession hardened into a creed. Fraternal addresses turned into theological discourses; and the Church became a School. It is a merit of Harnack to have made prominent this process of petrification by which the primitive charismatic Congregational Church was turned into the theological hierarchial Church of post-Apostolic times. But it is a weakness in his treatment of the origin of Christianity, that for him the presence of the miraculous in any early writing makes its historicity very doubtful. "Every single miracle is for the historian completely a matter of doubt, and a summation of what is doubtful can never lead historically to certainty." Belief in the miracles, he adds, is a matter of moral-religious impression, which may lead a man to feel that Jesus Christ possessed supernatural powers; but such belief belongs to the department of religious faith, not to that of historic research. Paul agrees with all this, and quotes approvingly the words, "A stronger religious faith in the predominance and control of the Good in the world can be supposed, which does not need to infer the supernatural character of Christ from miracles," and then adds himself, "It would certainly be a strange thing if a view of the world, which rests on historic knowledge, should necessarily have 'irreligiosity' as a con-

sequence, or that piety could be present only where there was historic ignorance." The weak point in all this argumentation is the assumption that no amount of evidence can prove a miracle and make it a vital part and factor in sacred history. Schleiermacher held that we cannot escape from two miracles, the creation of the world and the person of Christ. The historic Christ was a miraculous Christ, and this miraculous Christ, his death and resurrection, form the foundation of the history of the Church; hence to rule the supernatural out of the origin of Christianity leaves it "the baseless fabric of a vision," and gives us a Church History whose beginning is inexplicable. How ridiculous and psychologically absurd a "history of the Origins of Christianity" appears, leaving out the miraculous, can be seen in the brilliant work of Renan.¹ He says that the ecstatic love of Mary Magdalene produced the vision of the risen Christ, and "the image created by her delicate sensibility hovers over the world still." "Next to Jesus, it is Mary, who has done the most for the establishment of Christianity." Jesus is still dead; it was all a fancy of the frenzied heart of Mary! The miracle of Pentecost was simply the result of a meeting like that of the "Quakers, Jumpers, Shakers, Irvingites," but on this day a violent thunder storm and lightning completed the miracle. Paul had a fit on the way to Damascus, and remorse for what he was about to do against the Christians, with an accompanying thunderstorm, blinded him and made him have

¹Book II, The Apostles; Book III, St. Paul; B. IV, The Antichrist; B. V, The Gospels; Book VI, The Chr. Church; Book VII, Marcus Aurelius, English Translation. London. Mathieson & Co. 1888-89 2sh. 6d. each.

the vision of Jesus! "The Christ who personally revealed himself to him is his own ghost; he listens to himself, thinking that he hears Jesus." Renan thinks Paul did not hesitate to declare he had knowledge of Christ by personal revelation, when he really got his information from those who were personal followers of Jesus. To such positions is the historian driven in ignoring all that is supernatural in the origin of Christianity. Christianity arose from dreams and visions and pious frauds! When Renan, however, comes to deal with the human side of Church history he is most instructive and brilliant; and no advanced student of the "Origins of Christianity" should fail to read his stimulating pages.

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

One of the most obscure sections of early Church history is that which deals with the conversion of Asia Minor, hence the information that Ramsay has gathered from "Early Christian monuments in Phrygia"¹ is most welcome. We learn from his study of inscriptions that the people of Phrygia, the home of Montanism and similar movements, were only learning to speak Greek under the Roman Empire. That language was coming into use here, in country places, between A. D. 100 and 200, and did not prevail in the remoter regions of Phrygia till A. D. 200-300. It seems as if it was the Christian religion that spread the use of Greek. The Bible being in that language was one reason for this. About A. D. 200, the rural population was almost wholly uneducated, knowing only the Phrygian language and unaffected by Graeco-Roman culture, which had entered the cities. Christianity spread first in these cities, and reached the country places, during the third century. It at once produced a desire for education. The people must learn Greek to read the Bible or to become really cultured. Thus with the gospel a spirit of progress appeared, which gradually extirpated the native dialects, and started

¹*The Expositor*. Oct. and Dec., 1888; Feb., April and May, 1889.

a tendency just the opposite of that in the West, where the Scriptures were translated into Latin and Gothic. Two groups of inscriptions are found, pointing to two sources of Christian activity in Phrygia, one in the North-West, the other in the South. In the first region, many Christian inscriptions are found in the country and very few in cities; the reason, Ramsay thinks, is the presence of Roman officials in the towns and the worship of the Emperors there, both of which were not in rural places. Besides this, the heathen neighbors were stronger and more dangerous in the cities of Northwestern Phrygia, while the Christians were relatively stronger in the country places of this region. The inscriptions of Central and South Phrygia, however, show just the opposite condition; here the Christians are numerous in the cities and few in the country. We find leading citizens and senators in the church, hence it is inferred that Christianity was the leading religion in several cities here like Eumeneia. In South Phrygia alone is there a probability that the story of Eusebius, that a whole Phrygian town was Christian in the days of Diocletian, could be approximately true. A number of these inscriptions, of the early part of the third century, spell the name Christian *chreistian*, as if the name and the new religion were not yet quite consolidated here. Two inscriptions have the spelling "Chrestians to a Chrestian," which is interesting in view of the well known statement of Suetonius, that Claudius banished the Jews from Rome for rebellion at the instigation of "Chrestus." Doubtless Christ is meant in all these cases, but the Greek word Chrestos, meaning "good," would occur much more readily to educated Greeks and Romans than the almost unknown word "Christos."

This spelling "is therefore a pre-Constantine error." The Christians used the usual tomb-stones as prepared for sale by the heathen stone-cutters, to avoid observation, filling in the inscription to suit themselves. The threat, found often on pagan tombs, the Christians also used, with somewhat different reference. "Thou shalt not wrong God," that is, by violating this tomb. One Christian inscription, of Hierapolis, is dated as early as A. D. 200, its slight and peculiar deviation from pagan epitaphs showing the great caution used by Christians. Ramsay continues, "In general one is struck with the fact that wherever there is a touch of natural feeling, of real life, of kindly sentiment, the epitaph is almost always Christian." The character of the Christianity in north Phrygia was different from that of the south. Bithynia, north of Phrygia, was full of Christians early in the second century, and the gospel would naturally pass thence into north Phrygia. And this was what did happen. An old tradition says Paul and Silas planted Christianity in Bithynia on their way to Troas. The gospel came into south Phrygia from the valley in which lie the towns of Laodicea, Colossae and Hierapolis, that is from the Pauline churches. These two currents of Christian activity, the one from the north, having its source among the rural population, and that from the south, springing from those dwelling in cities, seem to have met in the middle of the second century, and gave rise to some of the strange movements that were peculiar to this part of the Church. Montanus was from the northern churches; hence, Ramsay thinks, "the beginning of the Montanist controversy corresponds to the time when the Christianizing influence spreading from the Northwest met that which

was penetrating from the Southwest;" the one was primitive and Montanistic, the other was more influenced by current thought and Catholic.¹ The orthodox country churches of Phrygia held to early Millenarian views, kept themselves apart from the world, expected the destruction of the Roman Empire, and by strict discipline sought to hasten the coming of the Lord; but the city churches came in contact with Roman and Greek society, saw that the Church was to make its home on earth for a long time, and had to accept the prospect of converting the Roman Empire with all its culture to Christianity. This Puritanic movement of the country churches, when it spread through the Empire as Montanism, was crushed by the strong city churches led by their bishops. But the ascetic ideal here emphasized could not be buried; it reappeared in the Catholic Church as Monasticism, and the double standard of Christian life, monastic and secular, that has wrought such evil in the Catholic Church through the ages, may be regarded as an outgrowth of the early conflict between the city and country churches of Phrygia, of which we now hear for the first time.

Next to Antioch, early tradition speaks of Edessa as a great Christian center in Asia Minor. Tixeront, however, follows Lipsius and others in holding that the gospel did not reach Edessa before A. D. 170, when the first missionaries had a Syriac translation of the Gospels ready to put into the hands of their converts.² Martin combats this

¹Cf. also Ramsay's Article *Antiquities of South Phrygia and Border Lands*, in *The American Journal of Archeology*, 1887-88.

²*Les Origines de l'Église d'Édesse*. Paris. 1888.

view,¹ and maintains that Christianity did not spread simply naturally, as every other belief; he argues that it was planted in Syria by Apostolic men, in the first century. Paul's missionary activity in the West was not exceptional; the other apostles were equally active in the East and in more barbarous lands. At Pentecost there were converts from the Parthians, Medes, Elamites and Mesopotamians; hence he infers the gospel must have gone thither very early, and was doubtless followed very soon by Apostolic missionaries. Edessa was the "daughter of the Parthians." It was on the caravan route from Antioch and must have early heard of Christianity. Hence, Martin says, it is highly probable that organized churches appeared here in the first century according to the "ancient, unanimous, universal and constant" tradition. The fact that the church of Edessa has always claimed Thomas as its founder, though it has also always known that he was later the Apostle of India and died there, and the further fact that his body was brought to Edessa A. D. 232, as founder of the church, when the city was largely Christian, point towards the early preaching of the gospel here and Thomas as one of the missionaries.

From Antioch through Edessa Christianity spread into Mesopotamia and Assyria, passing along the route of Jewish emigration to the conquest of the East. A recent French writer finds the Jews taking the same place of forerunners of Christ in the West also.² The Roman Em-

¹*Les Origines de l'Église d'Édesse et des Églises Syriennes.* Paris. 1889.

²Cirot de la Ville, *L'Empire Romain et le Christianisme dans les Gaules.* Poitiers: Oudin. 1888. Uncritical.

pire unwittingly helped the spread of the gospel in Gaul by the dispersion of the Jews, as well as by the building of roads and the movement of the legions. He traces the presence of Jews in Germany, Spain and France before the time of Christ. They traveled as favorite secret agents of the Roman government, as collectors of revenue, as merchants, selling their wares. Together with Greeks and Syrians, the Jews went through Gaul, but, unlike all others, the Jews labored zealously to make proselytes to the worship of Jehovah. They had synagogues in different parts of Gaul, which doubtless, as in the East, opened up the way for the reception of Jesus as the Messiah.

II. CHURCH AND WORLD.

The sharpest point of contact between Church and World in the first century was the persecution under Nero. Since the time of Gibbon, not a few critics have regarded this tragedy as the result of mere Jewish hatred, and in support of such a position have taken the statements of Tacitus either as spurious or as interpolated. But Arnold shows all this to be groundless and reaches the following conclusions:¹

1. The sources in Tacitus (xv, 44) are genuine.
2. The Christians were punished because of the circumstances in which Nero was placed, and not because of their religion.
3. The religious confession did not even offer a pretext to Nero, but he used the unpopularity of Christians, which

¹*Die Neronische Christenverfolgung.* Leipzig. F. Richter. 1888. M. 4.

arose because of the charges against them of immorality and lack of patriotism. These accusations were partly of Jewish origin. 4. Not Jews, but Christian heretics seem to have informed the Roman police in this persecution. Arnold seems to give little proof of this statement. 5. The number of Christian martyrs appears to be rhetorically exaggerated by Tacitus; but though the number was not great this persecution was never forgotten, first because it was connected with the burning of Rome, further because it was extraordinary and took Neronian forms, and finally because now for the first time the Roman authorities proceeded against Christians. All this was remembered by both Christian and heathen in the light of later persecutions. 6. The persecuted Christians had no connection with the Jewish population; they were, in A. D. 64, chiefly Greeks and Hellenists, and clearly distinct in their modes of life from the Jews. 7. The persecution did not extend beyond Rome itself, as Nero's purpose did not require further persecution. 8. For these reasons this persecution did not make the impression of "an epoch-making event" in Christian circles. 9. The Christian tradition of this persecution was perverted, since about A. D. 150, through apologetic motives, to make the good Emperors friendly and the bad Emperors hostile to sound doctrine; hence, Nero came to be regarded as an enemy on principle of revealed truth, and all sense of the historic situation was lost. 10. The Apocalypse did not arise through the Neronian persecution. There is no connection between the sufferings there described and the expectation of Nero's return: least of all is such expectation to be traced to a Christian source, but rather to a heathen origin, from which

it passed to the Jewish Sibylline books, thence into Christian heretical writings, and finally into Church circles.

The importance of a knowledge of heathen thought and culture for a true estimate of early Christianity is recognized much more now than was the case even a few years ago. Instead of a scrappy description of the Roman Empire when Christ appeared, followed by some remarks on Greek thought in treating Gnosticism, progressive Church historians see the necessity of tracing the parallel movements of classic civilizations as part of the real current of the Church's visible life. Moeller, following this course, has two chapters on "Heathen Religiosity and Culture in their relation to Christianity," first in the time when the early Catholic Church was consolidating (to A. D. 150), and then in the period between its consolidation and Constantine.¹ Inge² shows how religion in Rome, losing its patriotic element under the Empire, lived on through the first century as superstition, till an inevitable reaction arose "in favor of positive and emotional religion" Eastern mystic cults led in this reaction, taking root first among the lower classes, then extending to the rich and powerful. The superstition of the masses and the Agnosticism of the few were now attracted towards monotheism, whether Jewish or Christian. In matters of punishing criminals, treatment of slaves, care of the poor, there appears also a growing humanitarianism, as if anticipating the coming of the gospel.

¹*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte.* I Bd. Die alte Kirche. Freiburg i. B., 1889.

²*Society in Rome under the Caesars.* New York: C. Scribner's Sons. 1888. \$1.25.

But especially does Reville, who devotes a whole book to the subject, set forth the active and vital relations between revived Paganism and growing Christianity, in the third century.¹ He points out how Stoicism died with Marcus Aurelius and heathen thought went through a great change; it became syncretistic; it became transformed; and such transformation must be understood before we can explain the recognition of Christianity by Constantine. He finds a peculiar time of transition in the first half of the third century, in which the syncretism took in Graeco-Roman and Oriental elements, the last and most important of these being Mithras worship.

The most prominent mark of Roman society in this period was its cosmopolitanism; in it all nations were blended, but the social system had not now sufficient vitality to assimilate these elements, and was flooded by them. Hence the policy of the government was force and the strong hand of Septimius Severus ruled. And yet this was the golden age of Roman jurisprudence. In this half century great doctors of the law, such as Paul, Papinian and Ulpian, took the place of senators and transformed Roman laws into a code for all men. Roman traditions were now weak and the central power was strong; hence Caracalla could declare all free men in the Empire Roman citizens, and laws be made for such wide relations. Rome and the world were now regarded as the same; so human and natural rights, not traditional usages, were made the basis of legislation. The liberties of slaves, freedmen and

¹*Die Religion zu Rom unter den Severern.* German from the French. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1888. M. 6. Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. IV, 1887, p. 127

clubs of all sorts were greatly extended. In this period, too, religious questions held the uppermost place in men's thoughts. The self-satisfied skepticism of the last days of the Republic was gone; so was the cautious skepticism which had lingered in polite society till the middle of the second century. "The superficial Voltairism of Lucian had vanished," and "from Cicero to Marcus Aurelius Roman society had advanced from unbelief to faith." In the third century, all men were believers in religion. Roman society had everywhere lost its taste for what had previously satisfied it, and sought a new source of peace, in the gods. All forms of idolatry had again become current in the Empire and influenced one another; hence a general feeling spread that there was essential unity in God and in religion, which found expression through different deities and cults. Such religious syncretism is the naturally produced religion of such a cosmopolitan society as occupied the Empire in the third century, a society without interest in patriotism or politics, ruled by a despot, without literary inspiration, without fixed philosophic ideas, yet educated, over-refined, and longing for an ideal higher than that which had been given by tradition.

In this syncretism, as already observed, the most important factor was the Mithras worship, which was introduced last. The East sent three great religions into Roman society, Judaism, Christianity and the service of Mithras; so Reville classes them. In the first half of the third century, Judaism was widest spread; Christianity was making rapid progress; but both of these, being irreconcilably hostile to heathenism, kept out of the current of syncretism, which swallowed up all others. The worship of Mi-

thras, however, though superior to other oriental religions, as Judaism and Christianity were, blended with heathenism, and so took a commanding position in this pagan syncretism. In the time of Aurelian and Diocletian, this Phrygian Mithras became the God of the Empire. His worship spread, in the third century, as fast as did Christianity, and for a moment it seemed as if Mithras would conquer Christ. Renan says, "If Christianity had been checked in its growth by any deadly disease the world would have belonged to Mithras." In this revival of pagan faith the attractions of bloody worship, the offerings of bulls, held a very prominent place. Hitherto this attraction has been ascribed to the Mithras service, but Lebeque maintains that these "taurobols" were made to Cybele, and it was this deity, not Mithras, that led the Pagan Renaissance.¹ Cybele worship, not Mithras worship, was the great rival, he thinks, of growing Christianity, for this cult taught a lively pantheism, while that of Mithras tended towards a spiritualism, which did not rouse popular enthusiasm. Returning to Reville, we learn that in this syncretism heathenism reached a height before unattained. A longing now appeared for moral improvement, for perfection, a movement as never before towards the union of religion and morals in mutual support. With such views, and seeing the departure of national lines in the Empire, earnest men gathered into societies. "There was no Church as yet, but there were churches," and in all such heathen clubs syncretistic tolerance prevailed, socially, intellectually, religiously. Everywhere, too, as we have seen, moral

¹Cf. *Révue Historique*, July, Aug. 1888.

and religious questions were in the fore-ground. The great evil of this syncretism was its lack of "simplicity, naturalness, I might almost say, youth." It was mystical, fanciful, and could not deal practically with human life. Hence all its efforts directly aided Christianity in the end, for it could found no permanent religion itself. Upon this syncretistic basis Reville finds three great attempts made at religious reformation: first the Neo-Pythagorean, at the court of Septimius Severus, led by the empress, Julia Domna and her philosophic friend, Philostratus; next the Oriental Reformation, in which Heliogabalus set up Baal as the supreme god of Rome; then the Eclectic Reformation, the worship of Holy Men, under Alexander Severus. The outcome of this whole syncretistic movement Reville finds to be a Sun-Monotheism, the worship of the sun as the one supreme object of life and light. Heathenism had become transformed; the very idea of religion had changed. It was now presented as an ideal of the heroic, the pure, involving a regeneration, redemption by a new heart, beginning on earth but continuing in immortality, demanding a universal brotherhood of all classes of men, and preaching growth unto perfection and living communion with the gods. This syncretism could not save heathenism, but it formed a middle step, through which the Empire passed under Christianity.

Recent excavations in Rome show how bitter was the final struggle between Paganism and the new religion, in the fourth century.¹ The most absurd superstitions

¹Cf. Lanciani. *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1888. \$6.00. Popular and interesting.

were revived, especially those "which bore a certain analogy with the ceremonies of the Christian worship," in order to oppose Christianity. We hear of heathen leaders, as senators, who were initiated into Eastern Mysteries to fight the Eastern Christianity. They met for secret conference in the shrine of Cybele on the Vatican hill, and in the grotto of Mithras in the Campus Martius. It is humiliating to hear these men call themselves "fathers of Mysteries," "sacred crow of the invincible Mithrae," "great shepherd of Bacchus." They echo Christian thoughts, in calling their gods "keepers of the soul and the mind," in describing their baptism in blood as being "born again forever," and in all rejoicing in the baptism in the blood of a bull or a goat, which some renewed after twenty years. Two senators presided in a Mithras lodge, between A. D. 357 and 377 and administered right and left the six degrees of the crow, the griffin, the lion, the Persian, the Heliodromos, and the Father.

What changes Christianity brought into Rome for its good appear even in sanitary matters. Lanciani found one spot where 24,000 bodies had been cast into an open ditch and left to fester in the sun. Corpses of the poor, slaves, &c., were thrown into such places with common garbage. The sick were also neglected. "The hospital, even in its most rudimentary shape, was not known in Rome much before the third century of the Christian era," Medicine was little understood; the gods were the physicians; "charity was a virtue altogether unknown in ancient times;" and wars, slavery and gladiatorial shows made the most tender Roman hearts insensible to human sufferings. Such impartial descriptions of the life of the ancient

heathen world should ever be kept in mind when listening to other accounts, which, in the name of liberal Christianity, speak of the Church in her progress assimilating from Jewish and Gentile sources whatever was good and true in any religion.¹ What good or true doctrine or usage has Christianity learned from other religions, that was not already taught in its own Scriptures?

III. HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

The history of the Church is the story of a Divine Kingdom on earth, and the hand of God must be traced behind the movements of men in its course. This fact is too often overlooked. Schneider² says that modern authors "like Harnack, Stade, Bleek and Wellhausen," write as if they presupposed "not the Christianity, but a Christianity." They tell how the Scriptures must have arisen "if I—Stade, Wellhausen—had composed them; how the Church of God, Christianity, must have begun, if I—Harnack—had been its founder." Each describes the Divine, or wishes to do so, not as it appeared historically, but as the respective author presents it to himself. The principle for the right handling of Christian truths and history is wanting. Mere reason cannot deal with sin and its passions, in historic treatment, he holds, any more than it can deal with them in the single human heart; for the

¹Cf. Stone. *Readings in Church History*. Philadelphia. Porter & Coates. 1889. \$1.50. A popular, uncritical work.

²*Das Apostolische Jahrhundert als Grundlage der Dogmengeschichte*. Regensburg. C. J. Manz. 1889. A Roman Catholic work, based on the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, which the author holds to be genuine.

struggle here is not to be regarded as upon a merely natural ground. Every historian writes the history which grows in himself as he studies; but Christian history has spiritual elements, which do not grow up in the mere reason of man, and cannot be reproduced by such reason, however well informed. Life in God alone qualifies for such work. The supernatural, as foundation, the divinity of Christ, and the essential character of the Scriptures, as accepted realities, are necessary to any true work on Christian history. This Catholic writer lays great stress upon the position that all the doctrines of the Church have been developed only in so far as we set forth more clearly what Christ and the Apostles fully taught once for all. Dogmas may be multiplied, but there is no increase in Revelation or Theology. "The cause for the development in dogmas is ever the weakness of the human mind." Most conservative scholars will agree with the main positions of Schneider, for if the legitimate development of doctrine take in elements from outside the Bible, they must come from Church tradition, the voices of nature, conclusions of reason, or the Christian consciousness, all of which have borne testimony to very conflicting views.

Allen, a Unitarian, expresses similar thoughts about the study of early Christian thought.¹ We must not look at early opinions scientifically alone, he says; that is dangerous. Above all we should regard them religiously, sympathetically, for "even the polemic temper is not so far away from those as the non-religious or agnostic." He finds the limits of ancient theology in the middle of the first century when Paul "set about the task of interpreting the

¹*The Unitarian Review*, 1889.

Messianic office of Jesus, and a little past the middle of the fifth when Pope Leo laid the foundations of the ecclesiastical structure that was to be." In this period Allen sees first two groups of thinkers, the Sabellian, in the third, and the Arian, in the fourth century, prominent, the first to deal with the nature and office of Christ, that are likely to have any definite meaning to modern ears. The two centuries before Sabellius he finds cut across by the attempt of Justin to give perhaps the first formal statement of the Logos doctrine as a cardinal point of the Christian theology. The Messianic hope died out when the Jews were crushed under Bar Cochba, A. D. 135, and Christianity now took its second great step forward to become a new and independent force in the world of thought. "The doctrine of the Logos came in . . . to fill the void left by the perishing of the Messianic hope." Paul's doctrine of the Spirit was the first step; Justin's doctrine of the Word was the second. Here, Allen thinks, is the germ of the theology of the next three centuries. The early Church believed in the divine life in Jesus, just as we feel we are sharers of such a life, and "call that prompting voice the Word of God." The question then was, how to state theologically this religious faith. Allen thinks that the "vividly imaginative" theology of those days turned this inner Word into a person, gave it objective existence, and made it incarnate in Jesus as the Son of God. He finds the germ of the Christian trinity in the words of Athanagoras, "The Mind and Reason of the Father is the Son of God." This Reason personified gave Christ. The next easy step was to think this Divine Logos took the place of the human soul in Jesus and made him Son of God. Such a

conception, it is added, is impossible to us, but to the early Christians it was easy and natural. Their Realism made all things possible. The movement of thought through the third, fourth and fifth centuries was from mysticism of the eternal Logos to rationalism of the more human Christ, till at Chalcedon a point of rest was found, by authority, that held good. Allen admits that the outcome of the long struggle was the great thought "God with Man," which has led Christianity victoriously until this day. To get time for the manufacture of the Logos as a divine attribute into a Son of God subjective, then objective, then incarnate in Jesus, then a Divine Deliverer, Allen puts the origin of the Fourth Gospel about the middle of the second century.

Purves takes more conservative ground on these questions.¹ He finds the literary fact that the New Testament appears here as the work of masters, and the post-apostolic literature as that of learners, to be a refutation of those theories of the origin of Christianity and the New Testament "which would extend the period of its formation over at least the first fifty years of the second century." He holds, further, that the Logos doctrine of Justin could not have produced the Fourth Gospel, because the circle of thought in which Justin moved was full of Alexandrian philosophy, of which the Gospel of John contains no element.

Purves follows the school of Ritschl in opposing the

¹Cf. *The Influence of Paganism on Post-Apostolic Christianity*, in *The Presbyterian Review*, Oct. 1888; also *The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity*. New York, Randolph & Co., 1889. \$1.75.

Tübingen theory of the rise of the early Church; but wisely modifies the view of Harnack, that this Church took both form and substance in part from Greek thought, by holding that such philosophic tendencies "produced division in the Church, but caused that portion which clung to the apostolic teaching to realize more perfectly the unity and significance of the faith," though even here the gospel was often perverted. He finds Justin's defense representing "Christianity as the complete manifestation of Reason, accredited as such by the fulfilment of prophecies"; a new way of defending Christianity, for it is boldly claimed by "an orthodox Christian writer that his doctrine was the superior on their own ground of those of the Academy and the Porch." And yet this plea, we are told, was one-sided, for Christianity is more than philosophy: it is an association of religious societies, belonging to a kingdom of Heaven. With all Justin's philosophy, however, Purves holds "it possible to collect from him other phrases and ideas which imply the evangelical view of the way of salvation"; though he also admits that his "whole idea of the way of salvation was strongly affected by what we may fairly term his rationalistic tendency." It is well urged that besides the philosophical element in Justin's theology there was a genuinely Christian element, the belief of the Church handed down from a previous age. His very effort to explain Christian doctrine philosophically testifies to the previous existence of the non-philosophical beliefs of which he gives us a sight as the original faith of the Church. And this pure transmitted doctrine he claims to teach, in opposition to heresy and error.

This primitive belief of the Church, separated from the

superimposed philosophy in Justin's theology, Purves finds to have faith in a divine-human Christ as its central article. He testifies to the Church's belief in Christ's divinity; his own explanation of it is another thing. "The belief occasioned the philosophical efforts to explain the mystery; philosophy did not create the belief." The Church believed then also in the Trinity, though Justin's "own thought tended strongly away from the doctrine of the Trinity." We can trace also beneath his philosophical statements the Church faith in "a redemption wrought out by the Son of God through His incarnation, death and resurrection." Finally, he "testifies to the faith of the post-apostolic churches concerning the spiritual privileges and future prospects of the Christian." Hence Purves justly rejects the Baur theory, that post-apostolic Christianity arose from some kind of fusion of previously hostile Pauline and Jewish Christian parties; he rejects also the extreme position of Harnack, saying, "Neither was it caused, so far as its essential character was concerned, by the union of Pauline or apostolic teaching with Hellenic culture," for the Hellenic elements that came in found a Christianity already established. "On the contrary, the Christianity of Justin presupposed, both positively and negatively, just that foundation which is described in the New Testament." In the very fall of post-apostolic doctrine below the completeness of apostolic teaching can be seen rather a fresh testimony to the supernatural construction of the latter. How could the later age create and project into the apostolic age ideas, and even records, which show a completeness of thought which the later age itself did not possess? All admit that the clear-cut Pauline doctrine of

justification would never have been formulated by the Church of the second century, which very imperfectly apprehended it.

We think that Purves is right in following the school of Ritschl as far as he does, though we are inclined to admit a greater influence to the Greek element in Justin's theology than he does.¹ The scattered statements of Justin, looking towards the evangelical plan of salvation, may reflect rather a general vagueness of view in the Church of that period, for, as English Protestants have long held, post-apostolic degeneracy seems very early to have thrust aside the Pauline teachings by a gospel of moralism. We may even go a step further and doubt if Paul's teachings were clearly grasped at first by any of the Gentile churches.

On the other hand, we cannot say that all the difference between the simple faith of the churches and the theological creeds of Justin and his successors came from philosophy, or that all that came from Greek theology was necessarily false. Certainly, there is a Biblical doctrine of the Logos ; there is a Scriptural Christology ; there is a Scriptural teaching of the Trinity ; there are doctrines of our faith which bear a definition coined by philosophy, but the substance of which comes from Revelation, and is far beyond the wisdom of the schools of Greece. This tendency to put theology out of our belief by ascribing it to philosophy, has been especially traced in the Alexandrian teachings, in which a place has been found for every vagary. Origen, as is known, carried his theory of free-

¹Cf. my article, *Some Notes on Syncretism in the Christian Theology of the Second and Third Centuries*, in *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, Vol. I. New York, Putnam's Sons, 1889.

will so far as to hold, not only that the lost in a future state might exercise it and turn to God, but that the redeemed in Heaven might choose evil and fall. It has been held also that his teacher Clement believed in the possibility of repentance and salvation after death; but Love denies this,¹ and holds that Clement was not a Universalist. He taught that punishment might be remedial in its tendency, but not necessarily in its effects. He admitted a purgatory for Jews and Gentiles dying before Christ came, in which they would hear the gospel; but of probation after death for others he knows nothing. The current errors about Clement's teachings, he says, come from Redepinning, who has been blindly followed by others.

Schepss shows also that the Priscillians were less heretical than has been hitherto taught.² From the writings of Priscillian, recently discovered,³ we see that he did not favor Gnostic, Monarchian, Montanist or Manichæan errors; neither did he follow the Novatians in repeating baptism. He held that Jesus Christ was "God, the Son of God, crucified for us." He says, "Anathema be to him who denies that our Lord God was fastened by a nail and drank the vinegar." He calls the Manichæans idolators, fit only for the sword and hell fire. The charges of Manichæism were made against him by heretical interpolators of the Bible. His enemies were those who "under the name of zeal pursued domestic enmities." He says, in his

¹*Clement of Alexandria not an After-Death Probationist or Universalist*, in *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. Oct. 1888.

²*Priscilliani quæ supersunt &c.*, in *Corpus Scriptorum Eccles. Latinorum*. Vol. XVIII. Leipzig, Freitag, 1889.

³*Cf. Current Discussions*. Vol. V, 1888, p. 158.

Book to Bishop Damasus, that at a synod held in Saragossa none of his followers were convicted of any false teaching. He admits that some of them had separated from the Church and communicated by themselves, but it was because of unworthy clergy in the Church, and not through love of division or following the Manichæans in setting up pseudo-bishops. The stories, too, that the Priscillians had a Fifth Gospel and used apocryphal Scriptures he denounces as false. In his essay on *Faith and the Apocrypha*, however, he holds that the apostles read books not in our Canon. He refers to Jude's quotation from the Book of Enoch, and Tobit's reference to Noah and others as prophets, also to Luke's speaking of Abel as a prophet, to prove that there were prophecies not in our Bible. He says that only ignorant zeal can deny this. Paul also told the church in Colossae to read the Epistle to the Laodiceans, which is not in the Canon; why may we not use such writings, he urges, if they have been remembered or preserved in any other way? Schepss thinks this new source proves that Priscillian, the first Christian put to death for heresy by Christians [A. D. 385], deviated in no respect from orthodox teachings; he died rather a martyr to free thought and a pure Church. Haupt takes the same view. Bnt Moeller (l. c. p. 465) and Loofs¹ hold that Priscillian's strong ascetic tendency, his conventicle movement, separating from the Church as worldly, was strongly influenced by dualistic Gnostic speculations, his Christology was Apollinarian, while his ethics and exposition of the Bible point also towards Gnostic theories.

¹*Theologische Literaturzeitung*. 1890, N. 1.

Everywhere in this early theology we come upon places of contact between Christianity and philosophy; it is not often that anything here reminds us of the supposed conflict between the Bible and modern science. Recent studies, however, of Augustine's doctrine of creation show that the Book of Genesis had to answer at the bar of reason before the Frank had crossed the Rhine or the Saxon set foot in Britain.¹ The scientific views that Augustine met in pagan Rome were not very unlike modern theories. They taught that matter and force were the source of all things. Through these, original material chaos developed into suns and systems and harmony of life. This science went so far as to teach a world builder, but the idea of a world creator was not thought of. Here Augustine found the Bible teaching a most scientific advance. Matter was a product of Almighty power; the forces in it were implanted by God; and through his constant co-operation these forces continue to act. He held firmly that God wrought in the formation of the world gradually, and by means of the laws implanted in matter. He finds the origin of species in certain seminal laws, which the Creator put in the elements of the world. These "original germs," or "laws of seeds," produced seeds, which now reproduce their kind. To him our terms, like *Bildungstrieb* or *nisus formativus*, would not have sounded at all strange. He does not shrink from regarding the creation of man as taking place according to these same laws; "before all visible seeds there were those primal causes" at work. Adam's body gradually developed. The soul was the animating principle in

¹Cf. Raich. *St. Augustinus u. d. Mosaische Schöpfungsbericht*, in *Frankfurter Zeitgemässe Broschüren*. Bd. X. H. 5. 1889.

the formative potency which framed the body. The soul built the bodily home in which it rules as queen; and it did so in virtue of a natural impulse created in it. The account of creation in Genesis he regards as a dramatic picture of divine, creative activity, presented in six acts; the days mean great periods, or different phases of the one work. Such an account of creation may be news to some modern critics, who rarely notice that for fifteen hundred years the greatest Father of the Church has been on record against all narrow views of science and religion. Men of the "Dark Ages," too, like Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, praise these views. Augustine agrees with modern teleological evolutionists, such as Wigand; for both teach the constancy of species, both hold that the organic world is the result of development of rudimentary conditions; they differ, however, in Wigand thinking that all developed from one original cell, while Augustine received an original cell for each species.

Where the great Father's doctrine of creation differed from that of Darwin has been shown in a study by Grassmann.¹ Augustine allowed individual things a real existence, while Darwin was an extreme Nominalist, and held that one species could pass into another. The theologian thought that all first organizations arose through the begetting of God, who worked through the forces that he had implanted in earth and water; the scientist considered it "nonsense to think at present on the origin of life." The one taught that the souls of animals and men are distinct, the human soul being the form of the body, but further an

¹*Die Schöpfungslehre des heil. Augustinus u. Darwins. Prize Essay. Regensburg, März. 1889.*

active being, which can act independently of every organ: the other held that all souls of animals and men differ only in degree, not in kind. Augustine regarded Nature as penetrated and ruled by the thought of God; Darwin's view of Nature was mechanical, and explained all by matter and force; "a foreign intelligence" controlling Nature cannot be accepted.

What Augustine was, especially as an opponent of heresy, in the Latin Church, that was Ephraim, his early contemporary, in the Syrian Church.¹ He finds the work of theology to be the exploration of what God has revealed in the Bible. Speculation on what is not revealed he considers a device of Satan to destroy faith. He regards man as the bond of created things, uniting in his body and soul the world of matter and spirit. The soul, he says, has three great attributes, rationality, immortality, and invisibility. The privilege of the likeness of God in man he finds in (1) freedom of will joined to dominion over created things, (2) in capability to accept all the gifts of God, and (3) in the activity of the human spirit, which can bring all within the realm of its thoughts. God forbade Adam to eat from the tree of knowledge, in order to show him that God is creator and Lord, to show man the distinction between good and evil as resting in the divine will, and by obedience to lead Adam from the outward to the heavenly Paradise. Ephraim thinks if our first parents had at once repented they would have avoided much evil. The number of children born would have been much less, for none would have died; the pains of child-birth

¹See Eirainer, *Der heilige Ephraim der Syrer*. Kempten: Kösel. 1889.

would have been absent; and chastisement of the young would have been unnecessary. Like some brethren now, the Syrian Father argued that the end of the world must be near, because of the lack of love on earth and the general misery. He thought the Last Judgment would be held on the spot where Christ was crucified.¹

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

Whether any form of church polity is a thing of divine revelation is still an open question, with the drift among historic students apparently increasing against the theory of divine right. Withrow still holds² to the organization of the Church as from God, at least so far as concerns the local congregation. Beyond this the divine order extends only indirectly. "Association, whether of churches or rulers, is a Scriptural principle. The association of elders in the government of a local church, that is, the congregational presbytery, is a divine institution; the association of the rulers of different congregations for managing matters in common, that is, the district presbytery, is simply a matter of agreement and consent, but is the outcome of a principle that has received divine sanction again and again." What is divinely established is the congrega-

¹Harnack's *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*, viii, pp. 183, Freiburg i. B., Mohr. M. 4. 1888, is a brilliant outline of the theology of the Greek Church and very suggestive, especially to teachers. A valuable outline, covering the whole history, is Loofs, *Leitfaden f. seine Vorlesungen über Dogmengeschichte*. Halle: Niemeyer. 1889. pp. 302.

Farrer's *Lives of the Fathers*, Edinburgh, 1889, an attractive work, unduly praises the Greek Fathers and unduly criticizes the Latin.

²*The Form of the Christian Temple*. New York, Scribner & Welford, 1889.

tional presbytery, with its elders, pastors and teachers. It will thus be seen that this Presbyterian divine teaches Congregationalism *de jure divino*, and Presbyterianism as a valid inference therefrom.

The most prominent men in the Apostolic Church were, of course, the apostles, and with them questions of organization in the first Church usually begin. Köppel finds¹ that Paul calls himself an apostle on his second missionary journey, hence the name did not arise first in the literary part of his career. He uses the term as a general title, well known since the Apostolic Council, and also before that time Paul was recognized as an apostle by the eleven, as original, deriving his authority from Christ, not from the other apostles. He was so recognized at the Council in Jerusalem. His apostolate rested upon his call by Christ, and upon his special endowment as missionary to the Gentiles. His acquaintance with the Twelve was for him a secondary matter. What made every apostle was the call of these men, assured of salvation in Christ, to found churches of Christ. Paul's apostleship was not attacked in Corinth or Galatia because of any outward mark of it lacking or present; the nature of this office rested, according to the view in apostolic days, not in outer signs, but in the power of God, shown in miracles, wrought in strong faith and love, in the founding of Christian Brotherhood. An apostle meant every preacher of the gospel, so far as his activity was devoted essentially to the founding or first building up of churches in an independent manner. Jewish and Gentile Christians so regarded apostles. Seufert's idea of a gradual limiting of

¹*Studien und Kritiken.* H. 2. 1889.

the number to twelve by Judaizing Christians, to exclude Paul, is rejected. Yet Paul (I Cor. xv, 1-11) admits a certain precedence of the Twelve, a circle of workers who labored with Jesus. But this circle was not enlarged or completed by his activity. After those eye witnesses had been chosen to preach the gospel, and for that purpose the circle of the apostles of the circumcision enlarged, there was added to this group another group of apostles to the Gentiles. Apostleship is a calling; it belonged to the Twelve, and to be one of the Twelve was a peculiar honor: but at first the name apostle was a wide designation, which gradually became more precise, and was limited to the calling of the missionary only. In Pauline churches, Paul's apostleship came to be regarded as the typical one; in other churches, the idea became more general, and was not closely limited to the Twelve. The Petrine circles also regarded the apostolate as resting upon personal, spiritual gifts, and not upon official character; though the needs of the churches led to a recognition of the higher authority of a group of men under the apostles, and other prominent leaders, which grew into a necessary and sound limitation of the number. In Jewish regions, this narrowing of the number would very likely lead to the limitation to the Twelve, as suggested in the Apocalypse, in respect of the continuity of a prophetic picture. Köppel also finds that the Gospels do not limit the disciples of Christ to the Twelve, though they have a place of honor; the Twelve were the inner circle of the disciples. It was a dogmatizing tendency which later limited all honor to the Twelve. This tendency appears even in the Gospels of Matthew and John. This position of Köppel

seems, in the light of the *Didache*, very probable. But so much the less probable seems the claim of Apostolic Succession still made in the name of history for the traditional Episcopate. In support of this claim Bishop Coxe finds¹ that Barnabas and Paul form "an enlargement of the Apostolic College." Then came the "apostles [or angels] of the Churches," men like Titus and Timothy, who began the Apostolic Episcopate, which had the ordinary, not the extraordinary gifts of the Twelve. That is the view of Canon Liddon,² whom Coxe follows in making the first bishops an outgrowth of such men incorporated into the Apostolate.

This explanation does not tell us what became of the bishops already in existence in the days of the apostles, while it assumes that the office of Timothy and Titus was permanent and had full apostolic power. Then, what of the identity of primitive presbyters and bishops, which Reimensyder has just proved again³ from the *Didache*? We may be told by Livius⁴ that Peter the apostle was bishop of Rome, and that for twenty-five years; but a reviewer well replies⁵ that until A. D. 350 "no extant writer speaks of the duration of St. Peter's Roman Episcopate." Further, Peter is hardly ever, in the first three centuries, called "bishop" of any See, Antioch or Rome. The statements

¹*The History and Teaching of the Early Church, as a basis for the Re-union of Christendom.* Five lectures by different writers. Young & Co., New York, 1889.

²Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. IV. 1887. p. 142.

³*The Lutheran Quarterly*, Jan. 1889.

⁴*St Peter, Bishop of Rome.* London, Burns & Oates. 1889.

⁵*The English Historical Review.* Oct. 1889.

about Rome make Peter and Paul common founders of the church there. It was not till the See of Rome became "the chair of Peter" instead of the "foundation of Peter and Paul", that the idea of an episcopate of St. Peter became possible. The "primitive evidence with singular unanimity withholds from St. Peter both the title of bishop and a place in the Episcopal catalogue." Apostles and bishops had different duties; and an apostle with his field limited to one city would cease to be such. So the traditional bishop is not a diminutive apostle, neither can he be traced to Timothy, while to identify him with the bishop of the New Testament is dangerous, for most scholars agree that this bishop was a presbyter. Where, then, did this monarchical bishop come from? We are familiar with the view of Hatch¹, that this official was borrowed from the religious clubs of the heathen. But Loening says² that no proof has been brought for this view, or for the general theory that the constitution of the early Church was framed in imitation of the forms of pagan societies. He thinks that not only in Palestine, but even in the Gentile churches of the last quarter of the first century, an elected committee of elders existed. This "name and establishment of elders were taken from the constitution of the Jewish congregations," and formed a transition stage in the growth towards the monarchical episcopate, though its influence was not entirely lost. The later bishop arose as follows: The first bishopric, as

¹Cf. *Current Discussions*, Vol. I, 1883, p. 98; Vol. IV, 1887, p. 143; Vol. V, 1888, p. 165.

²*Die Gemeinderfassung des Urchristenthums*. Halle, Niemeyer, 1888.

Hegesippus tells us, arose in Palestine, in connection with the position that James held in Jerusalem and his relation to the Lord. It took here the monarchical form without any reference to the church constitutions of either Jews or Greeks, synagogues or pagan clubs. The bishop, he says, was not an outgrowth of the moderator of the committee of elders, or of the Roman system of Mysteries—for the bishop arose in the East—or of Greek cults or municipalities; the bishop arose in imitation of a man like Simeon, who followed James in Jerusalem, and because of the need of greater unity in the congregation than the congregational presbytery could effect, to guard against the conventicle system and other disturbing elements: but the idea of being Christ's representative, after the model of Simeon, was the starting point for the monarchical episcopate. In this direction Ignatius is the typical follower of Simeon. In the conflict with Gnostic errors, the idea of imparting a *χρίσμα*, the Holy Spirit, by the laying on of hands, must receive a very different efficiency from that given it in Judaism. There was joined to it now the thought that bishops were successors of the Apostles in their office, in order to confirm the monarchical position of the bishops. So, in the second century, the new order of bishops, presbyters and deacons appeared. Another new thing also now appeared, the idea of clergy and laity as distinct classes. At first, as Loening urges, there was no clerical class, as such, in the Roman world; no pastors, no moral guides, no authoritative teachers of sound doctrine. Gradually, the clergy became a distinct class, regarded as successors of the Apostles, preservers of sound doctrine, and, since the end of the second century, viewed as were the priests of the Old Testament among the Jews.

Harnack defends his view of the separate origin of presbyters and bishops, and their later union, against Loening.¹ He thinks still that "the bishops formed at first a committee, which had charge of the worship of the congregation, and in connection with that managed also the money matters of the church." Hence the presbyters, in the first century, were not office bearers, and did not coincide with this committee of bishops. These early elders were men of experience, honored for their long service, and not officials. These elders, however, soon formed a committee of their own, a committee chosen from the formless group of "old men," in larger congregations, which was not the same as that of the bishops and deacons. He defends well the position that Apostles, Prophets and Teachers had the highest place of honor, from which they advised the churches authoritatively in matters of morals, doctrines, and methods. As men called of God, they could direct all forms of Church activity. He says that only by grasping the significance of the original, spiritual-despotic element in the early Church, the charismatic preachers of the Word of God, can we understand how a despotic power could develop in these early churches, which were free, democratic societies. At first there appeared in the churches [1] prophets and teachers, [2] "old men" or patrons, to whom "honor" was due, then [3] elected officers of administration; that, he thinks, must be the starting point in the study of early church constitutions. From this point of view it can be seen that the monarchical bishop was just "the cumulation of the dignities of the president of the committee of elders, and of the

¹*Theologische Literaturzeitung*. 1889. No. 17.

teacher upon the head of the highest officer of worship; and his position was further made secure by the theory of his being successor of the apostles."¹ Harnack admits, however, that his theory cannot stand if the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles are writings of the first century, and warns against the use of these as such.

Sanday thinks² that we must still hold our judgment in suspense respecting the growth of church organizations before A. D. 150; but for the period between that date and the Council of Nicaea, we are nearer reaching a satisfactory conclusion. He opposes a writer in *The Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1888, and agrees rather with Hatch, in holding (1) that there were in this second period two or more bishops of one See; (2) that the earliest Episcopacy was Congregational; (3) that the earliest churches were independent communities; and (4) that the rudiments of national churches did not appear before the fourth century. These are most encouraging results to be reached by two scholarly historians of the Episcopal Church, and show the impartial spirit that is fostered by modern historic methods. Ramsay argues in the same direction from a study of early Phrygian inscriptions (*l. c.*). He thinks that the Phrygian Christians were organized somewhat like the "funeral clubs" of the heathen. This province was under the rule of the Senate, not the Emperor, and hence had more municipal liberty than any imperial province. Trade guilds, united in the worship of a god, existed here;

¹Cf. also Gore, *Ministry of the Christian Church*. London, 1889., who thinks the traveling apostle or prophet "localized" in the Congregational Presbytery, became the bishop.

²*The Expositor*, Nov. 1888.

so there is no reason why Christian societies might not be tolerated. A bequest of property by a Christian, A. D. 253, gives it to the "Society of the First Gate People," on condition that they keep roses upon the grave of the donor's wife. This society must have been legal to accept such a commission; it was doubtless Christian, and very likely in the form of a Burial Club, to which the care of the tomb was legally entrusted. Still earlier, another man left property to the "Council of Presidence of the Purple-Dippers," which Ramsay thinks, was the governing body of the Christian congregation. "Council of Presidence" is unique, meaning probably the Presidents, as Eusebius speaks of the bishop as President of the church. In that case we have here the council of presbyters, which co-operated with the bishop, called by Ignatius the "council of the the bishop." Hierapolis, where this inscription was found, was a great place for dyers, and a heathen society of "the Corporation of Dyers" is known to have been here. But the Christian society was known as the "Purple Dippers," or, as the word can be rendered, the Purple-Dipped, likely intentionally ambiguous, meaning perhaps those dipped in blood. Ramsay finds the title of bishop but once in the inscriptions, and then in the fourth century. Presbyters occur often, for "the evidence points clearly to the conclusion, that the term presbyter was much more commonly used in Phrygia than bishop, to denote the head of the church in each district." The names were frequently equivalent, he adds, in early times, and the title bishop was not in ordinary use in the early Phrygian church. "The leader and equal of the Apostles exercised his supreme and implicitly accepted authority under the humble

title of presbyter." He was one among a number personally prominent, not officially designated. There is no evidence, he continues, that Montanus was ever called bishop. It is now generally considered that he represented the old school of Phrygian Christianity, as opposed to the hierarchical Church, which was making Christianity a power in the world. But the bishops arose and crushed the Phrygian church methods; Montanism was suppressed; and after A. D. 160, church organization took shape according to the civil organization, every city having its own bishop, every metropolis having its own archbishop. But the thought of the Phrygian Christians remained primitive, and we long hear of Phrygian "heresies."

The first church Synods met, under the lead of bishops, to stop the outburst and protest of free, charismatic, Congregational Puritanism, as seen in Montanism. The government of the Church became Episcopal; the next step was towards the supremacy of great bishops, culminating in the Papacy. A recent Roman Catholic writer¹ finds very wonderful currents bearing the boat of St. Peter to Rome. He "treats of the Papacy deprived of all temporal support from the fall of the Western Empire, taking up the secular capital into a new spiritual Rome, and creating a Christendom out of the northern tribes, who had subverted the Roman Empire." This creation of the German races from Pagans and Arians into a body of states whose center of union and belief was the See of Peter, Allies considers a wonder of history, like that which we see in the rise of the

¹Allies, *The Formation of Christendom*. Vol VI. The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations. From St. Leo I to St. Gregory I. New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1888.

Papacy itself. He sees in the confirmation of the decrees of the Fourth General Council by Leo I, just at a time when Attila had been turned from Rome and Genseric was preparing to sack the city, "a special intention of Divine Providence," whereby the two Roman Emperors, just when the Western Emperor was about to fall, and the whole Episcopate in solemn form should attest the Roman bishop's universal pastorship. A great period, he says, was ending, that of the Græco-Roman civilization, from which after three centuries of persecution, the Church had obtained recognition; and a great period was beginning, when the Wandering of the Nations had prepared for the Church another task. The majestic figure of Leo expressed the completion of the first task; the solemn figure of Gregory I showed the Papacy thoroughly prepared to undertake the second. With him "began the Church's Rome."

As Rome fell more and more under the power of the Papacy, material affairs and matters of civil and financial nature took a larger place in the thoughts and energies of the Church. The ways and means for the material support of the Papacy form a most interesting subject of inquiry, recently discussed by Schwarzlose.¹ The Roman Church was supported from its patrimonial possessions, which grew rapidly from the end of the fourth century, especially because of three influences, the conversion to Christianity of the leading families of Rome, the great elevation of papal power under Leo the Great, and especially through the military and political want which burst over Italy after the fall of the Western Empire. After this the

¹ *Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte.* Bd. XI. H. I 1889.

Roman See possessed large estates in all parts of Italy, in Gaul, Africa, and in far-off Asia, all of which were cultivated in a masterly manner. This property, in its political relations, was subject to the laws of the Empire, and the Pope laid no claim to sovereign rule. The income from the patrimonia was in money and in natural products, which the tenants paid twice a year. The actual amount received cannot be learned, but it must have been large. It supported a vast system. Incidentally we hear that 3,000 nuns were provided for in Rome when Gregory I was Pope, and that they received for bedding alone \$3,265, with an additional annual amount of \$17,900. Vast sums were spent upon the poor. In one time of want in Rome Gregory I spent \$18,375 for food. The mission of Augustine to England was paid for out of these funds. Pelagius II, the predecessor of Gregory I, paid \$652,500 to invaders. These illustrations all show how far the successor of Peter was from saying "Silver and gold have I none," when he turned from the sinking Eastern Empire towards the German races, to whom he was to send the gospel and over whom he was to rule as Cæsar in the place of Cæsar.

V. HISTORY OF WORSHIP.

The most important work of the past year, touching on worship, treats of the Christmas Festival and the services connected with it. We know that until the beginning of the fourth century the Church did not celebrate either Epiphany or Christmas as festivals; but about that time both of these appeared, the one on the sixth of January, the other on the twenty-fifth of December. The ques-

tion is, however, just when and how these festivals arose; and this question Usener sets himself to answer¹ in an elaborate work. He leaves no stone unturned, and as to the time and place of the origin of these sacred seasons his explanation is thorough and conclusive. Christmas, celebrated on Dec. 25, appeared first in Rome, where we find Bishop Liberius, in 353, keeping Christmas on Jan. 6, but the next year, 354, holding the Festival on Dec. 25. So that point is settled exactly. From Rome this usage spread to the East, in the reign of Theodosius the Great, a Western Emperor, who then extended his sway over both East and West. The December Christmas was first celebrated in Constantinople, A. D. 379. Through Constantinople this Festival entered the East. In 380 it was known in Antioch, though not celebrated by the church till 388. It was observed in Cappadocia by 382, and in the beginning of the fifth century it occurs in the province of Diospontus. Until A. D. 400, both the birth and the baptism of Jesus were celebrated in Egypt on the sixth of January; but under Cyrill the December Christmas was observed. In Palestine, the Epiphany-Christmas was kept until about 451, when, Usener thinks, Bishop Juvenal, returning from the Council of Chalcedon, where he had been created Patriarch, introduced the new usage as a return for the favor of the Council. The Armenian Church never accepted the Western Christmas.

With the rise of the Christmas celebration came also the growth of reverence for the Virgin. The

¹ *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, I. Theil. Das Weihnachtsfest. Bonn. 1889. M. 9. See Harnack's review, in *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1889, No. 8.

same Liberius who introduced the Christmas festival, 354, into Rome, founded the great Mary Basilica, *S. Maria Maggiore*, and led the Church into Virgin worship. Of this church Usener says, "It was built to prepare a worthy place for the new Festival. The manger of the gospel, which first on this spot performed a churchly service, became the cradle of all the poetry with which faith, art and legend have illumined the Holy Night." In this connection he shows how the growing ritual, encouraged especially by Liberius, was fashioned after heathen ritual, and took its place in the hearts of the people. Thus the *litania minor*, used before the Ascension, took the place of the ancient *ambarualia*, in which offerings were brought to the Dea Dia, Ceres, for the fertility of the fields; and the *litania major* took the place of the *robigo*, a festival to keep the fields from mildew. He shows further that Candlemas, on Feb. 2, took the place of the heathen *amburbale*, in which the Roman Church introduced the procession with lighted torches instead of the ancient *amburbium*, a festival for the purification of the city, as the *ambarualia* was for that of the country. This Christian version of the heathen procession was made long before anybody thought of celebrating the purification of the Mother of Christ, and the Presentation in the Temple as a Church Festival. Older than Christmas, in both East and West, was Epiphany. In the time of Arnobius and the Donatist schism, this festival is not found in the West; but was introduced shortly after the Council of Nicaea. It seems to have come into Egypt as early as A. D. 300, and probably spread thence by means of the Nicene Council. "It is certain," Harnack says, "that the Church until at

least A. D. 250 nowhere knew this Festival." In the time of Clement of Alexandria, the Gnostics celebrated Epiphany in honor of the baptism of Jesus; but after it was introduced into the orthodox Church it was held in memory of both his birth and baptism. How this was brought about is still wrapped in obscurity.

VI. EARLY CHRISTIAN ART.

The controversy between Protestant and Roman Catholic Archaeologists, in respect of the true theory of interpreting ancient monuments, is still active. Wilpert, a Catholic scholar, charges¹ Schultze, Hasenclever and Achelis with incapacity, prejudice and dishonorable use of material. These Protestant students of art hold that the early Christians at first simply continued to use and develop pagan art ideas and models, as ornament and without any particular thought connected with them, until later a time of reflection came in the Church and the heathen pictures assumed a conscious Christian character. The Catholic divines deny this, and hold that from the beginning Christian art was consciously moulded by the thought of the Church, that that thought was Roman Catholic, that such Roman Catholic thought is painted in the pictures and carved in the monuments of the catacombs, and hence the way to explain this early art is by a symbolical application of the Decrees of the Council of Trent. Wilpert says "the earliest Christian inscriptions had certain marks which distinguished them from the Pagan." He adds that the word slave was not

¹*Prinzipienfragen der christlichen Archäologie.* St. Louis, Mo., Herder, 1889. \$1.50.

used in Christian epitaphs. But Schultze replies¹ that this is incorrect; and the statement of Wilpert that the Christians put *alumnus* in place of *slave* he says will be news to the scientific world. In the 237 inscriptions of the catacomb of St. Priscilla, the Catholic finds "nothing that reminds of idolatry and heathenism." The Protestant, however, refers to the 13,000 Christian inscriptions in Rome, and says the larger field proves the opposite. This special pleading of Catholics in the name of archaeology Schultze calls part of the Jesuit policy, "the organizing hand" that now controls the Romish Church. From a comparison of recent works by men of that communion, he shows that early Christian art is now made to teach the Primacy of Peter, the Roman Church the sole repository of salvation, the Virgin the Queen of Heaven and the great intercessor, the worship of saints and reverence of relics and pictures, also the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass. Thus the whole theology of Rome is read into the catacombs; and every Catholic student is expected to read a system of Romish theology, ethics and worship out of these same monuments.

Further excavations, made during the past year, in the catacombs of St. Priscilla,² have discovered a chapel, near which was uncovered the "*cubiculum clarum*" of Marcellinus, bishop of Rome, who died in the persecution under Diocletian. In the same place was found an inscription bearing the names Acilio Glabrioni Filio, Manius Acilius Verus, &c., pointing to the resting place of Christians of the noble family of the Acilii; for, besides Flavius Clemens

¹*Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1889. No. 30; and *Die Altchrist. Bildwerke u. die hist. Forschung*. Leipzig. 1889. 40pp.

²Cf. *Römische Quartalschrift*. 1889. Hh. 2 and 3.

and his wife Flavia Domitilla, Dio Cassius tells us that Glabrio, who was consul with Trajan, was put to death on the same charges as Flavius, under Domitian; hence this light from the catacombs seems to confirm the view that Glabrio was one of the noble martyrs under Domitian. We learn, further, from these excavations that not a few of the sculptures in the catacombs were colored to make them look more life-like. This custom was in harmony with Pagan art, which usually colored sculpture. A statue of St. Peter has the tunic green, the pallium red, the beard and hair brown. Three groups of colored sculptures are distinguished: first, where three colors are generally used, gold, brown and purple or green, put on chiefly in lines or bands to help express the work of the chisel; next, those completely painted, from the color of the clothes to the shading on lips and cheeks, eyes and hair; lastly, where the marble was treated pictorially, chiefly by gilding. Coloring was the rule in early Christian sculpture; perhaps there was no exception.

Another point of contact between ancient art and Christianity recently discussed is the use of bells. Schiller and Poe have shown in song how life in Christian lands now circles about the ringing of bells. The work before us¹ takes up the history of bells among the ancient nations and points out how much it has been enriched since the triumph of Christianity. Bells were used in pagan life "to call the meetings, to baths, to marches, to the circus," and passed over naturally to summon Christian worshipers to their place of meeting. Hence we cannot learn what pope or

¹Morillot. *Étude sur l'emploi des clochettes chez les anciens et depuis le triomphe du Christianisme.* Dijon. Damongeot. 1888.

bishop first used them. The writers of the fourth and fifth century mention the use of bells as a most natural occurrence. In Italy and Egypt, bells appear in Christian use very early; in Gaul, where the trumpet was employed to call assemblies, that instrument was used until the sixth or seventh century by Christians; while, in the East, bells were not so introduced till the ninth century, when a Doge of Venice sent the first bells to Constantinople. They were not known in Jerusalem till it was taken by Godfrey at the head of the first crusade, 1099. Before that time, boards were struck to summon the congregation. Monasteries did not at first use bells. Pachomius called his monks together with a trumpet. Jerome says the hermits in Bethlehem were summoned by the word Alleluia; but from the sixth century on, bells were used in monasteries also pretty generally.

VII. HISTORY OF THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Zöckler has just published¹ a brief and serviceable History of Theological Science, with special reference to Patristics. He classifies this study between the History of Worship and the History of Christian Archaeology, and includes in it the circumstances amid which authors wrote, the intellectual tendencies of the times, and the literary products of theologians of the Church, the men who strove to give a scientific exposition of the Christian religion. This early Christian literature at first addressed believers, and

¹*Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften. Supplement Volume. A History of Theol. Literature.* Nördlingen. Beck, 1889. pp. 195. Valuable.

hence the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the Homilists; it next addressed the heathen world, hence the appearance of apologetic works. An interesting example of the first class, an anonymous Treatise on Gambling, has been discussed in a most interesting way by Harnack.¹ He thinks this work, long bearing the name of Cyprian, was written by Victor I. of Rome, and is consequently the oldest writing of a Roman bishop that we have, the first Latin Christian document from the Roman Church. In any case, it is the oldest Latin sermon that we possess; and it shows the earliest use of Matt. xvi, 18f., in Rome, though the consciousness of episcopal primacy is rather that of high moral responsibility for the flock entrusted to the bishop, than of lordly rule. Wölfflin disputes this position of Harnack² and puts the treatise later than Cyprian, making it dependent upon him. He thinks it was written by some African bishop, after A. D. 250. Miodonski thinks³ the mention of Christians having "pieces of land and villas," and the gambling for large sums point to Rome as the place of writing. Perhaps Bishop Melehiades (310), by birth an African, was its author. The study of this little treatise shows not a few nominal Christians in the third, perhaps in the second century, who could not resist the fascination of the gambling room. Think of a Christian bishop saying to his flock, thus early, "it even happens that those players celebrate their orgies by night behind closed doors in

¹*Der Pseudo-Cyprianische Tractat De Aleatoribus &c.* Leipzig. Hinrichs. 1888.

²*Archiv f. lateinische Lexicographie.* Bd. V., p. 487. f.

³*Anonymus adversus Aleatores;* with German translation and notes. Leipzig. Deichert, M. 2. A handy book for the student.

the company of vile women!" We learn incidentally that every gambler before playing must sacrifice to Palamedes, the inventor of gaming.

The oldest homilies, after those of Origen, which we possess, are from the Persian Aphraates, who wrote A. D. 337-345. Wright published the Syriac text, in 1869; now we receive a full German translation.¹ This work sheds not a little light upon the Syrian Church at a critical period, just as it was passing over to become the imperial Church. The appeal was being made to all classes, to leaven culture with Christianity, and oppose the wide-spread corruption of the Empire. We see church life here as it went on far from the theological controversies that vexed the Church elsewhere, but also as it was approaching that of the Western Church. We observe in the church of East Syria and Persia growing sympathy with the Christians in the Roman Empire, which had now become Christian. We hear of persecution of these Persian Christians because their government regarded such sympathy as treason. We see Easter and other seasons observed here in a way condemned by Church Councils in the West. On the other hand, the Peshito text appears assimilated to that of the Greek Bible; the Catholic Scriptures are substituted for those of the East Syrian Church, that is, the Four Gospels put in the place of Tatian's Diatessaron and the Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse added to their New Testament Canon: also, the exposition of the Scriptures avoids the allegorical excesses of the Western Church. Such men as Aphraates, trained in connection with the Jewish colleges in Eastern

¹Bert, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Edited by Gebhardt & Harnack. Bd. III, 1888.

Syria, started a school of thought, opposed to the allegorical learning of Origen and his followers, which found a continuation in the school of Antioch.

A further contribution to the early literature of the Church are the Acts of three martyrs, published by Harnack.¹ It is a work of the time of Marcus Aurelius, and reflects the Christian thought of those days. It quotes Luke xiv, 15, thus: "Blessed is he that shall set a dinner," etc., reading ἀριστον not ἄρτον, as most critics prefer. Its only formula of quotation is "according to the divine remembrance of the Lord"; and this, Harnack says, "corresponds *exactly* to the degree of the New Testament Canon, as it was taking shape about A. D. 165." It describes Agathonike becoming a martyr because Karpus at the stake saw a vision and died in great joy; she "standing by and seeing the glory of the Lord, which Karpus said he had seen, and knowing the call to be from Heaven, straightway cried out 'This dinner hast thou prepared for me, I must share the eating of this glorious dinner.'" We have here the most vivid picture yet given in early literature of the joys of Heaven as a Feast, and pointing, with the voluntary death of the woman, to the influences at work in Asia Minor to produce Montanism. In fact, these Acts say that Papyrus was from Thyatira, a city in which, in the time of Marcus Aurelius, Montanism wholly prevailed. He says of himself, "I speak the truth; in every province and city there are my children in God," pointing, very likely, to his work as a travelling Evangelist, or Prophet. Although he belonged to Thyatira, his work was

¹*Texte u. Untersuchungen.* Bd. III, 4.

at large. Such men remind us of the apostolic men mentioned in the *Didache*.

The other class of early Christian literature, the Apologetic, had two kinds of critics in view, the Pagan and the Jewish. We have from Justin, the Father of Apologetics, his writing addressed to Antoninus Pius, and his Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew. These works had many successors, of which especially those intended for Jews have received little attention; hence the monograph of McGiffert, publishing for the first time one of the treatises addressed to Hebrews, is of interest.¹ The work here given is not very important. It was written about A. D. 700, probably in Egypt. The Jew asks why Christians pray to pictures. The Christian says they pray to Christ beyond the pictures. The Jew calls it blasphemy to say God has a Son. In reply the Christian quotes the Old Testament, especially Ps. ii, 7, to show that Christ is Divine. He then argues further from the spread of Christianity, as compared with Judaism, to show that God must be in it. He finally answers the objection that Jesus Christ was not foretold by the prophets. He says if the prophets had said openly that Christ would abolish the Jewish ritual, they would have been stoned, and their books burned. He asks in reply why, if Jesus were a false Messiah, the prophets uttered no word of prediction of such a terrible thing in Israel.

Beyond such writings as those of Apostolic Fathers and Apologists, the early Church must soon produce still a third class of works, polemic treatises against Christian teachers of false doctrine. Irenaeus and Tertullian

¹*Dialogue between a Christian and a Jew.* Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. The Christian Literature Co. New York, 1889.

entered the lists against Gnostics and Monarchians, and the bitter battle of the theologians began. Among other writers of this sort Eusebius refers to Caius, a Roman scholar of the early part of the third century, as author of a Dialogue against Proclus, a Montanist of Rome. That is about all we know of Caius. But recently Gwynn has found in a Syrian manuscript in London opinions of Caius quoted, and answered at length by Hippolytus, his Roman contemporary¹. These are called *Capita Hippolyti adversus Caium*. We learn of them through the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*,² in which Harnack adds the following information about Caius. He wrote the work cited by Eusebius, against Proclus, in which he rejected the Apocalypse of John, because he could not harmonize its eschatological prophecies with the Scriptures and Paul. From the words of Caius, "as it is written" and "Paul says", Harnack infers, rather precariously, that in the time of Caius "Paul and the Scriptures were still sharply distinguished in the Roman Church." Caius agreed with the Alogi in rejecting the Apocalypse, but accepted the Gospel of John. We learn also from this new source that we are not to interpret Eusebius iii, 28, 2 as saying that Caius ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus. Hippolytus really wrote against Caius, and answered also all the errors of the Alogi. These fragments of Hippolytus so agree with what Epiphanius says of the Alogi (c. 31) that it is very likely he used for his attack the material of Hippolytus. That was not an uncommon thing amongst these early writers. They not only at times published their own

¹*Hippolytus and his "Heads against Caius."* Dublin, 1888. 21 pp.

² 1888, No. 26.

thoughts under some honored name, but they published other men's thoughts and information without acknowledgement, under their own name.

It was only an extension of this principle to take Jewish or heathen writings, and by giving them a Christian coloring make them part and parcel of the Church's possession. We know what a mass of heathen tradition in this way crept into the monasteries and received the stamp of Christian currency. A recent study of Amelineau¹ shows that monkish stories, told now in Egypt, were told in that land in the fourth century; nay, he goes further and makes it probable that they are the working over of heathen romances of three thousand years ago. These stories of the ancient Egyptians were read by Coptic monks, as the *Romance of Satni*, found in the tomb of a Christian monk, clearly shows.

¹*Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte Chrétienne aux IVe et Ve Siècles.* Paris. Leroux. 1888. Fr. 48.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

I. HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.

Gregory the Great has been called the last of the Fathers and the first of the Popes, for with him [d. 604] the bishop of Rome was led to turn from the Emperor towards some Western ruler, and seek an independent position between conflicting civil lords. The thoughts of papal supremacy, which occurred to Gregory, came forth in Papal action in the next century, when confusion and war led Pope Stephen III. to offer Pippin of France the title of Patrician of the Romans. Freeman says¹ "there is no time in the history of the world of which it is harder to grasp the true understanding than the history of Italy in the eighth century." The reason is largely because we have been taught to regard the end of the Western Empire as fixed A. D. 476; whereas the undivided Roman Empire, he holds, continued from 476 to 800 A. D. He sums up, what will "sound in many ears as an impossible paradox," thus: "When Pope Stephen the Third bestowed the title of Patrician of the Romans on Pippin king of the Franks, he did it by authority of the reigning Emperor, Constantine Kopronymos, and in the character of his ambassador." It is also true that

¹*The Patriciate of Pippin*, in *The English Hist. Review*, Oct. 1889.

Stephen had no idea that Pippin would act as an imperial officer. The Pope deceived the Emperor. The Imperial policy was obviously to keep the shadow of authority, and appoint Pippin Patrician, rather than lose all control in the West. The Empire had long followed such methods. Besides, Pippin was friendly to the Emperor, while Aistulf, the Lombard ruler, was hostile. Diehl urges¹ that in the time of the Exarchate (575-751), the Emperor had more power in Italy than has been usually represented in Rome. He also points out that the bishop of Rome not only increased his power as the Empire weakened, but hastened its decay by his increasing power.

What the influences were that carried the Papacy more and more towards the Germanic Princes can be well traced in a recent study of Gregory II.² He was educated in a school in the palace of Pope Sergius [d. 701]. As a young sub-deacon he was given charge of the papal library. He went [710] with Pope Constantine to visit the Emperor in Nicaea. In 715, he became pope, the first Italian pope, after seven foreign pontiffs, since Benedict II. His first work, as pope, was to begin to restore the walls of Rome, as a defence against the Lombards. He also set himself to repair churches and cloisters. The famous monastery of Monte Casino, the home of Benedict, had been 110 years in ruins. In 716, Gregory received Theodo II, Duke of Bavaria, the first Bavarian ruler to make a pilgrimage to Rome. We see also Corbinian, the anchorite bishop of Freisingen, in Bavaria, visit him twice. He made Boniface,

¹ *Études sur l'administration byzantine dans l'Exarchat de Ravenne*. Thorin: Paris. 1889.

² Dahmen: *Das Pontifikat Gregors II.* Düsseldorf. 1888.

the apostle of Germany, "bishop for his work of Romanizing Germany." The pope was still but one great bishop among others; but he was reaching out towards supreme sway. We hear of the bishops of Aquileia and Grado being then called Patriarchs, one under the Lombards, the other under the Empire. But we hear also of the English king, Ina, abdicating and coming 726 to Rome as a pilgrim. Here he started a school and home for English students and pilgrims. Gregory saw the fierce Iconoclastic Controversy rage in the East, which weakened the Imperial power, and gave the Papacy new claims to monarchical rights. Religious uniformity was the policy of the Emperor Leo; hence he ordered Jews, Montanists and worshippers of images, all to observe the prescribed worship. The Jews pretended to obey. The Montanists, on the day set for their baptism, burnt themselves and their churches together. The edict against pictures in Italian churches led Gregory to oppose Leo and preach Revolution in the West. But Dahmen holds the charges of disloyalty, stopping Italian tribute due the Emperor, separating the West from the Empire, and excommunicating Leo for his edict are groundless. Whether intentional, however, or not, the bishops of Rome must follow the current of events, which was bearing then towards closer relations with the chief monarch in the West. A generation after Gregory II, the spurious *Donatio Constantini* arose, claiming that Constantine actually left the West and made Constantinople his capital, that the pope might be free to do as he pleased in Rome. This forgery has been put by most historians in Rome, as birth-place, and the years 752-774 as time of

origin; now Friedrich¹ finds this Donation used in a letter of Hadrian I, of A. D. 785, to the Emperor Constantine. He distinguishes two parts in the gift, an older, written about 653, and giving the pope the Lateran palace and the city of Rome, and a later, written shortly before 754, by Paul I, as deacon, giving him the whole West. Some critics of Friedrich's book doubt if two parts can be distinguished in the *Donatio*.² But all agree that here a position is claimed for the pope, in the West, like that occupied by the Emperor in the East. Christ is the "heavenly Emperor" and the bishop of Rome is his representative. Constantine offers him a golden crown like his own, but the Pope declines it for his tonsured head; he accepts, however, the imperial pallium, "*ad imitationem imperii nostri*."

In any case, we stand here in a time of transition for the bishop of Rome. It is very significant that Hadrian I, connected with whose letters Friedrich finds the gift of Constantine, dated his letters from A. D. 781 on, not after the years of the reign of the Greek Emperor, but after the years of his own pontificate.

It is also very instructive to learn that Leo III changed this style when Charlemagne became Emperor of the West, A. D. 800, and dated decrees after the reign of Charles. The Papacy climbed to power on the framework of the German Empire. Hence the key to the life of the great Pope Sylvester II, once Gerbert, has been found in his unshaken fidelity to the Emperor Otto.³ It was a beautiful

¹*Die Constantinische Schenkung*. Nördlingen: Beck. 1889. M. 5.

²Cf. Seeberg. *Theol. Literaturblatt*. 1890. Nos. 3, 4, 5.

³Cf. *Lettres de Gerbert*, by Havet, in *Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire*. Paris. 1889.

dream of Otto, that he and Sylvester should rule the Empire from Rome, the one as temporal, the other as spiritual head. But the question soon arose as to who should define the limits of authority, and, in case of conflict, who should yield. A classical illustration of such conflict is the famous case of Henry IV and Gregory VII. A recent treatise¹ brings into prominence the activity of the rival Imperial Pope, Clement III, as leader of a party, long before he became Pope. As Wibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, and for a time made Chancellor of Italy by the Empress Agnes, he put himself at the head of the Lombard bishops in opposition to the reform measures of Gregory. When Henry submitted to the Pope at Canossa, Wibert and the Lombards made the Emperor break his disgraceful promise. They agreed with the Council of Worms, which declared Gregory deposed. Gregory's Council then declared them excommunicated for conspiracy. Wibert and his men then put Gregory under the ban. So the struggle went on till Wibert was chosen rival Pope, in 1080, as Clement III. In spite of Gregory, he held his place as Archbishop of Ravenna, and when Henry besieged Rome, 1082, Clement was with the army, entering the city as Imperial Pope, 1084. He fought with Victor III for possession of Rome. Then, with Urban II, the Papacy exchanged the policy of force, advocated by Gregory VII, for a milder method, in which "everything proceeded in the name of Christ and association with Christ and the cross."² Under this policy the first Crusade started, which threw Clement into the shade. He shared

¹ Köhncke, *Wibert von Ravenna*. Leipzig. 1888.

² Moffat, *Papers of Amer. Soc. of Church Hist.* Vol. I, 1889.

the hardships of Henry in north Italy, for in 1093 Urban entered Rome. In 1097, Henry could return to Germany, and Clement go back to Ravenna. Two years later, he could enter Rome, and hold part of it against Urban. He died, 1100, and wonders were wrought at his tomb, till 1106, when Paschal II put an end to the miracles in favor of an Anti-Pope by casting his body into the Tiber. This whole struggle between rival Popes is a conflict between the traditional Papal methods, which bound the Bishop of Rome to the Emperor, and the ideas of the Gregorian party, that sought to free the Papacy from Imperial control. The reform Popes must break away from national entanglements in their efforts for religious improvement. The Exile of the Papacy in France wrought so great evil just because it brought the Pope into the power of a single king. A recent study¹ shows that at first Clement VI, who was born in an English Province in France, sided with the king of England against the king of France. He entered Bordeaux escorted by troops in the pay of England. He received as presents from the king of England twenty tuns of wine, twenty oxen, twenty hogs, a cross of gold and other things. The English governor protected him on his way to Lyons, where he was to be crowned. After he transferred the Papal seat to Avignon (1309) he came under the power of the king of France, to please whom he destroyed the Order of Templars.² Other grave questions, concerning the Holy Land and Church Reform, also demanded solution, so Clement called, in 1311, a General Council in

¹ Cf. *Révue Historique*, May-June, 1889. pp. 48f.

² See Prutz, *Entwicklung u. Untergang des Tempelherrenordens* Berlin. 1888.

Vienna. Only fragments of the Acts of this Council are known, hence the discovery by Ehrle of 53 pages more of its Records is very welcome.¹ The Bishops were arranged, we learn, according to nations,—French, Spanish, British, German, Danish, Italian. The Irish and Scotch were classed together. The prelates proposed to take up, first, matters of complaint, and, then, matters of morals. Matters of complaint meant especially wrongs suffered from temporal lords. These were heard at length. The Scotch bishops complained that on every pretext their property was given to royal favorites. The Irish said that “before the invasion of the English, their Church recognized no superior in temporal things, but exercised both spiritual and temporal jurisdiction.” The English king promised to respect the rights of the Irish Church but “gradually he usurped places, things, rights and jurisdiction.” All church authorities were compelled to account to civil judges. The clergy were so maltreated that many fled to deserts and caves for safety.

The English complained that the Church must hand over clerical criminals to the civil court. If the jury found them guilty they were put to death, unless the bishops demanded them, in which case the State seized the goods of those condemned. If the criminal escaped with church punishment, the king exacted a fine of £100.

Especially in France, do we see the State resisting the growing power of the Church, in behalf of law and order. Under Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, this conflict reached a crisis, and the Church summed up

¹ *Archiv f. Lit. u. Kirchengeschichte d. Mittelalters*. Bd. IV. H. 4 1888.

its complaints against the State. We have that summary in the fragment of the Acts of the Council given by Ehrle. The Church bases its claim here on various legal rights, to which it expressly appeals. On this ground it opposed the State; but the struggle was not very severe, for just then the king of France was centralizing the royal power, and had to meet much civil opposition also. The Church, with its estates, appeared in many ways like one of the duchies of France resisting the autocracy of the monarch. How far the Papal Court had become as those of kings and dukes appears from the Will of Clement and the litigation about it under John XXII.¹ The fortune of Clement had disappeared, and John called upon the late Pope's nephew to come and explain. It was found that Clement left 814,000 gold guldens, of which 300,000 were for a crusade, 314,000 were to be given to Clement's servants and relatives, the remaining 200,000 were for the poor, churches, and monasteries for the good of the Pope's soul. In 1313, 320,000 guldens had been loaned the kings of France and England; the 160,000 loaned Philip the Fair were never paid back. Clement died in 1314, and his nephew spent 50,000 guldens building a sarcophagus for him. This new information but confirms the charge of nepotism brought against Clement. This money which he gave to his relatives was church funds. He left for his successor only 70,000 guldens, about \$140,000, or less than one tenth of what was in the treasury. But in this, Ehrle says, Clement acted just as all rulers did in those days. It cost the Papal Court about \$200,000 a year to live; but the

¹Cf. Ehrle, *l. c.* Bd. V., H. I., 1889.

Pope's income was fully double that amount. Hence he left a fortune of over \$2,000,000. In this connection, Ehrle¹ says that the usual statement, that John XXII left an estate of \$50,000,000, is absurd. Account books of the Papacy show that he could not have had more than Clement III.

The sojourn of the Popes in France wrought great demoralization; and it was hoped that the return to Rome would be marked by improvement: but the return to Rome was followed by the Papal Schism, which shook all moral foundations, for the unity of the Church, upon which all faith rested, was built upon the Papacy, and now rival Popes rent the Church assunder.² Out of this war of Pontiffs came disease and death for every lovely and virtuous thing in Christendom. From MS. sources we hear in deeper refrain than before the lamentations over the corruption in the distracted Church. Respect for Popes and cardinals sadly waned at the sight of evils unchecked. One writer says, "Cardinals are not to be regarded as bishops, priests and others, for in the Bible there is no mention of cardinals. They have only by accident the right to elect a Pope, a right which can be transferred to Emperors and bishops." He is "the true Pope, who most feels the misery of the Church; that is the test." Henry of Langenstein, here quoted, holds that the Church Universal has the right to choose the Pope. It may entrust

¹*Ib.* Bd. V., H. 4, 1889.

²Cf. Scheuffgen, *Beiträge zu der Geschichte des grossen Schismas*. Freiburg i. B. Herder 1889. M. 2.

See, in general, the valuable compilation of Mas Latrie, *Trésor de Chronologie, d'Histoire et de Géographie, pour l'étude et l'emploi des Documents du Moyen Age*. Folio. Paris, 1889.

this right in ordinary cases to cardinals; but now a crisis had come, "the bishop does not live in his diocese, he and his priests are in the theatre, the clergy are peddlers and merchants, the prelates believe in Pagan superstition, consult fortune-tellers, and observe the stars, the priests do not attend mass on Sundays, nor fast, none of the clergy study the Bible, they lead immoral lives and visit taverns"; hence now a time had come, he urges, when a General Council should elect the Pope. Conrad of Gelnhausen (1380) also pleads for a Council, saying if the early Popes had been as proud as those of the Schism they would be then in Hell with Lucifer, rather than in Heaven. Henry and Conrad here express thoughts that were fermenting in the University of Paris, and preparing the way for the first Reform Council in Pisa, 1409, which declared a Council above a Pope, and deposed the warring pontiffs. The long struggle had begun between the autocratic Pope and a General Synod, representing the body of believers, a struggle which should end in the Protestant Revolution, on the one hand, and the dogma of Papal Infallibility, on the other.

II. THE EASTERN CHURCH.

The history of the Eastern Church, after the fourth century, is a field too much neglected by many students. A recent article¹ on the religious life of Alexandria, just before the Mohammedan invasion, as set forth in the biography of St. John of Alexandria, by Leontius, touches many interesting phases of this Oriental Church life.

¹Gelzer, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1889. H. I.

Looking back to the fourth century, much intellectual activity is still found in Alexandria. The philosophers still discussed theological problems, and the race of Rhetoricians and Sophists was not yet extinct. Zachariah of Mytilene opposed the theory of the eternity of the world, and the monk Kosmas tried to show that the earth must be shaped like a four-cornered box; though he was sorry to see that his orthodox friends still held to the heathen idea that it was round. The ancient prophets, soothsayers and necromancers reappeared among the monks, and the Emperor Theodosius, who had destroyed heathen temples, asked through an embassy, before the battle with Maximus, an Egyptian hermit about the result. The anchorite foretold rightly a great victory for him on Italian soil [389]. In the fifth century, Alexandria partly lost its cosmopolitan character, because in theological matters it took a separate, national position. In defending the Divinity of Christ, the theologians here lost his Humanity; the Council of Chalcedon was rejected; and Leo the Great of Rome called a coarse heretic. The Emperor Justinian first forced an orthodox Patriarch upon the Monophysite Church of Egypt by soldiers; the result was that two churches arose, which Gelzer compares to the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches in Ireland, in the last century: the Established Church, supported by the State, yet weak, while the true National Church, in the one case, the Catholic, in the other, the Coptic, was ignored. The imperial Patriarch ruled in Alexandria over courtiers, nobles, and time-servers; the national Patriarch, chosen in the secret places of the desert, was recognized by the people. Of course the conflict between the ruling Greek and the ruled Copt added much

intensity to the strife between the orthodox Imperialist and the Monophysite Egyptian.

The Patriarch John the Pitiful, who was over Alexandria, 609-616, showed himself the typical good man of those days by indiscriminate alms-giving. His warm heart also introduced order into public worship. The people, tired of the long liturgy, used to leave the church during the reading of the gospel. One day the patriarch left, too, and stood among the people talking outside. They were much embarrassed at his presence, but he said "Children where the flock is there also is the shepherd." Thus he stopped the evil. John's piety was so marked that he was made Patriarch while still a layman, and also married. This was a great tribute to his character, for it was then the custom in the East to fill such high places with monks. John was not under monkish control, yet he protected monks good and bad, just as he gave to the poor. So he sought "to realize a purely Biblical Christianity of self-sacrificing love."

The extreme type of the monkish devotee appears in St. Simeon of Emesa, also presented by Gelzer. He is a fanatic, who would be a fool for Christ's sake. Like the pillar saints, he appears as a survival of old Syrian Paganism, a Christian reproduction of Astarte worship. He shows, too, the common ground out of which such Christian saints and Mohammedan fakirs have both sprung. Here, in Syrian monasteries, we see also how mother wit could sport itself even under Roman despotism. We learn incidentally that the common people in Syria, in the seventh century, could often read. An oil dealer is spoken of as studying an essay on the discovery of the head

of John the Baptist. Among the higher classes Greek culture remained until swept away by Islam.

III. THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

Sell, in speaking¹ of the Roman Church of the Middle Ages, says, "Augustine is its philosopher and its prophet." His theology went into the cloister and labored to give the soul peace through sore penances. It went into the schools of philosophy, where the scholastics tried to prove their apprehension of it by dialectics. It ascended the Papal throne, and humbled all men before the sovereignty of God, then before his vicar, the Pope. This mediaeval system of thought embraced in its scheme of knowledge the present world and the world to come, and held them together by a sequence of reason, guaranteed by the Church, which had transmitted it. "The mouth of the Church speaks; what she speaks is object of faith, and is then grasped by the reason of the Church." Thus Augustine as an ecclesiastic was made to destroy Augustine the theologian. The drift of the Church into the monastic system of good works was in many respects inevitably a Pelagian drift; hence Reformers in the Papal Church, from Gottschalk (d. 868) to Jansen, have preached a return to the doctrines of Augustine. That was very distasteful to worldly prelates. In a writing of Hincmar against Gottschalk, just published,² he says that he "confounded God's foreknowledge and predestination, and held that the man predestinated to punishment could not escape, no matter

¹*Aus der Geschichte des Christenthums.* Darmstadt. Waitz. 1888.

²Cf. *Zftf. f. Kirchengeschichte.* Bd. X. H. 2. 1888.

how much good he tried to do, and no man predestinated to glory could be lost, no matter what evil he did." He taught that grace comes without our free will; salvation does not depend on good works; so, Hincmar adds, he leads to a ruinous security. A priestly church always opposes assurance of faith, for it frees the believer from sacerdotal interference. Gottschalk taught also "that the suffering of Christ was not for the salvation of the whole world, and by the grace of baptism original sin was not taken away from the non-elect. All God's promises of salvation were made to the elect." Hincmar thinks God foresaw the Fall of Man; but did not create any man to be lost. He held that man was made to take the place of the fallen angels.

The theological thought of the Middle Ages had its home in Italy and France; the theological thought of Modern Times, which began with the Reformation, started from the soil of Germany and England. The intellectual intimacy between these lands became, however, much closer towards the dawn of the Reformation, and what was fruitful in the thought of the South was carried by responsive hearts for further development into the freer North. From new information¹ about the University of Bologna we see that the communication between Germany and Italy was very active in pre-Reformation days. In 1502, there were 50 German students at the University of Bologna. We are told also that in the far north lands there was very early an atmosphere favorable to free thinking. Lindsay finds² that the Scotch were from ancient times anxious that the

¹Cf. *Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte*. Bd. X. H. 3. 1889.

²*Transactions of the Glasgow Archaeological Society*. Vol. I. 1888.

people should have instruction. Perhaps similar desire was present in England and Scandinavia. He thinks the Irish missionaries may have planted schools among the Celto-Saxon people, and so created a thirst for knowledge greater than is found in people touched by other civilization and of different pedigree.

IV. CHURCH LIFE.

As the Papal Church drew all kinds of transgressions of law into its jurisdiction, it must do a vast business of forgiveness, fines, penances, and other forms of discouraging wrong-doing. This subject receives interesting illustration from the "oldest list of fees of the apostolic penitentiaries," A. D. 1338.¹ The fees allowed papal secretaries for writing letters of absolution and dispensation run from two to seventy pounds, this last being for "a letter of general absolution" in many cases, and for a dispensation for the whole Order of Cluny. Among the cases classified are simony, murder of clergy, citizens killing a monk [20 pounds], wife murder [3], patricide or matricide [4], incest, rape, perjury [5], murderer coming to the Pope for the soul of the victim [3], for one emasculated [5], for a cleric mutilated [6], for a converted heretic [4], for ignorantly sheltering a heretic [5], for training the children of heretics [4], for those who carried wood to burn heretics [4], in case of suicide [4], personating a priest [6], for sailing to Alexandria against the command of the Pope [4], letter of absolution for one

¹*Archiv f. Lit. u. k. Gesch. d. Mittelalters.* Bd. IV. H. 3. 1888.

going back to a concubine 4, for people of a State who had celebrated mass during an interdict 30 to 40, for monastic vow taken after marriage 6, for adultery with the mother after marrying the daughter 6, for marrying a second time 4, for entering an Order because of infirmity, or fear of imprisonment 4, for those following Louis of Bavaria or an anti-Pope 8.

This system of dispensation, in which the man with money could pay and the poor man had to do the penance, left the door open to all kinds of abuses; hence in a quarrel between some English monks and the Archbishop of Canterbury he was called on to explain why he had excommunicated them when he had granted others the right to atone for part of their faults by getting letters of absolution.¹ There was one rule for the clergy and another for the laymen. The result was that in some respects the priests became worse than the people. The monasteries fell into decay, especially in the fourteenth century, some improvement appearing in the next century.²

The Papal Court, however, sent forth its pestilential influence right up to the days of Luther. Such worldly living must proceed from a worldly Church, and the Church must become more and more worldly as its head, the Pope, fought with Emperor and kings for a place as one of the rulers of the earth. Hence we find the growing temporal power of the Papacy opposed at every step by earnest Christians, on the one hand, who saw in it a corruption of the Church, and by political leaders, on the other, who

¹Cf. the *Rolls Series*. Yearbooks of the Reign of Edward III.

²Yet, for France, see Leroux. *Histoire de la Réforme dans la Marche et le Limousin*. Limoges, 1888.

considered it a menace to civil liberty. Bernard of Clairvaux pleaded with his pupil Pope Eugene III [d. 1153] to reform the Curia, and Arnold of Brescia drove this pontiff from Rome, in order to restore the Republic. This was not a sudden outburst of Arnold. He just boldly said what thousands thought,¹ when he appealed to the Church to give up its ill-gotten gains and become apostolic again. But the Papacy was too strong for the Pope, and Eugene could not effect reforms. Even so great a Pope as Innocent III could not get beyond traditional methods. He made Philip of France take back his wife, but he did so from motives of papal policy, rather than because of high moral reasons.²

This mediæval Church could arouse Christendom to enter upon the Crusades, which sacrificed millions of money and lives; and yet the fruits of those terrible campaigns were few; the Crusades were a failure. Döllinger finds³ the reason to be the lack of moral power in the multitudes that rushed to Palestine, the mistakes of their leaders, and, above all, the weakness caused by the conflicts between the Papacy and the nations. The idea that Islam was the most dangerous foe of Christendom was true and historic, but the Christendom that went out to vanquish Islam failed, because it had no gospel of genuine

¹Cf. Sturmhöfel, *Gerhoh von Reichensberg über d. Sittenzustände d. zeitgenöss. Geistlichkeit*. Leipzig. 1889. M. 1. 60; and Breyer, in *Hist. Zft.* 1888. pp. 121-178.

²See Davidsohn, *Philipp August II und Ingeborg*. Stuttgart. Cotta. 1888. M. 4.

³*Die oriental. Frage in ihren Anfängen*. Akad. Vorträge. I. Nördlingen. Beck. 1888.

catholicity, no bond of peace, no righteousness of life, which could successfully compete with Mohammedanism.

And yet this was also an age of mission work. Otto of Bamberg was friend and Chancellor of Henry IV, even after Gregory VII had put the Emperor under ban. He detected fraudulent contractors, who were building a church at the Emperor's expense in Spire in honor of the Virgin. He was a wise counsellor, a true German Churchman. It is pleasant, then, to see such a man made a prince-bishop of Bamberg by Henry, in 1101. When the ring and staff of the dead bishop came to the Emperor, he overheard some young men wondering why Henry would sell such a bishopric, instead of giving it to a man like Otto; just what Henry intended to do. The Emperor said "many mighty and high-born persons tried to buy the bishopric."

But he put all aside and placed the mitre upon the head of his godly chancellor. It is not true, as often stated, that Otto had already been offered the sees of Augsburg and Halberstadt, or that he vowed not to accept Bamberg unless he were invested into office by papal authority.¹ It is true, however, that Otto was a model bishop, that he labored in the streets and lanes to carry the gospel and its comfort to the wretched, that he left home and his high place, for more than a year, to evangelize the heathen of Pomerania, and that over his coffin the words were spoken, "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." A former missionary to Pomerania offended the people by

¹Cf. Looshorn, *Der heilige Bischof Otto*. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet. Munich, 1888, the 700th anniversary of his being declared a Saint.

appearing as a beggar and presenting Christianity in its ascetic forms. Otto avoided all such offenses. He appeared in Episcopal pomp. He was a friend of the Duke, at whose court he had spent seven years, and learned the language of the Poles. As he won converts in the winter season, he had them baptized in heated rooms and with warm water. He baptized the children himself, letting his companions baptize the adults. He searched the hearts of those coming into the church, asking the once heathen mothers if they had ever killed children, for it was customary to put infant girls to death. On a second missionary journey through Poland to confirm the churches, his life was attempted more than once by the heathen, but he was saved through the constant prayers of the monks in Michelsberg for him.

V. MONASTICISM.

Recent investigation has paid much attention to the monastic activity of the Middle Ages; and the energy of Irish monks, the splendid reform efforts that centered in Cluny, the work of Bernard and his Cistercians, the literary labors of the Dominicans, and the loving charities and free spirit of the Franciscans have all shone forth with new lustre.¹ These monks were the missionaries of the Middle Ages. Three kinds of missions may be distinguished; those of the early, the mediæval, and the modern church. At first missionaries went out one by one, or two or three together, caring for themselves, and

¹Cf., in general, Kurtz, *Church History*. Vol. II. New York. Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. \$2.00.

laboring to convert individuals to the gospel. In the Middle Ages, the monkish missionaries went out in bands, usually of twelve, under the lead of a man of experience. They built their cloister among the heathen, and while some cared for temporal things, the rest labored to bring the tribe to accept Christianity. Very often the Christian Emperor used his influence to bring the heathen prince to profess the faith of the monkish preachers. Our modern system is that of the Missionary Society. The monastic method has not a few advantages, and as used, especially by the Iro-Scottish missionaries, did valuable service. All students are familiar with the work of these monks in the conversion of the German tribes. Among others, Columbanus and his disciples, the usual account tells us, first carried the gospel to the Allemanni in Switzerland. But Heer now informs us¹ that the Irish missionary Fridolin brought the gospel to the Allemanni, in 496; more than a hundred years before Columbanus went up the Rhine. This tribe had just been conquered by Clovis, and the missionary began to preach under the protection of the conqueror. .

In reference to the conversion of Würtemberg, the prevalent view is corrected in the opposite direction. Bossert says² its evangelization was not the result of desultory work by Iro-Scottish monks, neither was it a steady growth; it came rather from a systematic effort made by Clovis and his successors, anticipating in this the policy of Charlemagne with the Saxons.

¹*St. Fridolin, der Apostel Allemanniens.* Zürich: Schulthess. Fr. 1. 1888.

²*Die Anfänge des Christenthums in Würtemberg.* Stuttgart. 1888. pp. 35.

These monasteries were mission centers, but they also became early centers of literary and artistic effort. Here, too, belief in the continuation of miracles in the Church found most characteristic illustrations and defenders. A recent book¹ by a Catholic writer gives a very full description of this many-sided cloister life in the eleventh century.

The work before us is based on the Life of the Saint written by Gilon five years after the death of Abbot Hugh (1109). Yet such a contemporary account is full of the miraculous. At the hour of the boy's birth, a priest offering mass "saw in the chalice the image of a little child, surrounded by a halo." Every turn in his life as a reformer was marked by signs and wonders, showing divine approval. It was a very corrupt age, as our author admits, and an ideal monk was the man to teach it the way to God. It was not the corruption of ignorance, for many monasteries and Episcopal schools in France were then seats of learning. At Angers and Toul, jurisprudence was cultivated, with other studies. In the abbey of Ardennes, the fine arts were taught. In Verdun, Simeon, a monk from Sinai, taught oriental languages. Medicine, music and architecture flourished under William, Abbot of St. Benigne of Dijon. In Laon, Anself labored. In Bec, Lanfranc was illustrious. These scholarly monks taught a multitude of young men; but the students knew that money, or illegitimate birth from some noble, put unworthy men into high places in the Church, and all pious people bewailed the low state of religious life. A reaction was inevitable, and earnest souls in the monasteries began to raise their voices

¹L'Huillier, *Vie de St. Hugues, Abbé de Cluny, 1024-1109*. Solesmes, 1888.

against the two great evils of the time, the immorality of the clergy, owing to enforced celibacy, and the sale of church livings to unworthy men. Hugh was one of the leaders in this reform movement, together with men like Anselm and Gregory VII. They felt that if the Pope was to work reform, he must have power; hence Gregory, the monkish Reformer of the Church, was the man who also took the highest ground in asserting papal supremacy, and died renewing anathemas against Henry IV. Cluny, as is well known, was a center of this reform effort,¹ and it is usually said that Gregory, when monk there, was thoroughly prepared for the new departure. But Huillier says that he was never prior of Cluny, neither was he a monk by profession of that monastery; he was only an associate there for a short time.

Passing to the twelfth century, and looking at it through the Life of its leading man, St. Bernard,² we see the same religious demoralization in the Church at large; and the monasteries, with all that was evil in them, still forming the reform centers of Christendom. But the element of change, of conflict, of transition, is now more prominent. Chevallier says the architecture of the twelfth century was a type of its life; it was a blending of Roman and Gothic, showing the marks of a civilization incomplete, but rich in signs of progress. Papal schism, imperial power assailing the Church, the Investiture Controversy, in which the civil

¹Cf. Bruel, *Recueil des Chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny*. In *Collection des documents inédits*, Vol., IV. 1888. It contains 859 Acts of 1027-1090.

²Chevallier, *Histoire de St. Bernard, Abbé de Clairvaux*, 2d Ed. Lille. 1888. 2 Vols.

ruler threatened to force political priests into bishoprics, as the Pagan Emperors once did, the Rationalism of Roscellinus and Abelard spreading unrest in the schools, and giving rise to Arnold of Brescia, Henry of Bruys, and others of their tendency, authority in both Church and State more and more lightly esteemed, the appearance of free cities, which inaugurated a municipal movement, that transformed social relations—that is the summary which our author gives of the transitional age upon which St. Bernard entered. Gregory VII sought to reform the Church by exalting the Papacy, making the clergy monks, and crippling the power of lay patrons. Bernard followed, seeking better things in the way of mystic piety, devotional separation from the world, and loving imitation of Christ. Then came Francis of Assisi, whose idea of reform rested upon the Church unmixed with the world, caring for the wretched, and going about doing good. Here are fruitful thoughts, which did not die, but rather revived in Reformation days, and helped produce Protestantism.

VI. SECTS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

The Sects of the Middle Ages have been treated by Döllinger,¹ with special reference to the Cathari, or the Gnostic-Manichæans of this period, and the Waldenses. The second volume is a store house of source material, largely from the archives of the Inquisition, shedding much light on this mediæval Protestantism. He finds in the

¹*Beiträge zur Sectengeschichte des Mittelalters.* 2 Vols. Beck: Munich, 1890. M. 22. Thorough, Vol II giving 711 pp. of Extracts from Sources.

Paulicians the proper connecting link between ancient Gnosticism and that of the Middle Ages. The Bogomiles, a sect of the eleventh century in Bulgaria, associated with the Paulicians, Döllinger says, taught doctrines which blended early Syrian Gnosticism with the views of the Messalians or Euchites, and formed a peculiar system chiefly Monarchian, not dualistic, as was the Paulician. This sect had now spread through the whole European part of the Empire, being especially strong in Bulgaria. After setting forth the tenets of the Bogomiles, Döllinger says that it is interesting to learn that some of their doctrines influenced orthodox Christians; especially the idea that Catholic baptism was powerless in itself. Every true Christian becomes such through instruction, initiation, and spiritual transformation. This movement in favor of a regenerate church membership, though joined to wild theories, was a wholesome and sound reaction against a worldly Church. Manichæism came from north Africa and the East into Spain, Gaul and Italy. It lingered in Italy and France into the Middle Ages; but its teachings changed, and contained only those doctrines which the old Manichæans held in common with the leading Gnostic systems. This modification came, through the Paulicians and Bogomiles, into western Manichæism or Catharism, the way being prepared, probably, by Priscillian teachings. It was this new Manichæism, stimulated by Priscillianism, and revived by Bogomile influences, that was active in Italy and France, in the eleventh century. It was represented in south France, from 1017 on, by the Cathari. This influence can be traced, Döllinger thinks, in Berengar of Tours' opposition to Transubstantiation. Peter of Bruys,

too, and Henry of Toulouse, usually regarded as founders of new sects, and forerunners of the Waldenses, were followers of the same later Gnostic tendency; they were Albigenses.

The Cathari in the West divided into three schools, the Drugurish, which was dualistic, the Bulgarian, which followed the Bogomiles, and was monarchian, and a middle school, the Slavonic, or Bagnolese, which was monarchian, but adopted two dogmas of the Dualists, the pre-existence of the soul before the creation of the world and its fall in a previous state, and that the Virgin Mary was a docetic angel, and Christ had only a heavenly body. Most of the Cathari in France were dualistic: but the majority, in Italy and north France, were monarchian.

By the close of the twelfth century, Döllinger thinks, there were Cathari in a thousand cities of the West. Similar sects, Zendics, Karmates, etc. appeared now also among the Mohammedans; and he shows that there was a close connection between the Manichæans in Christian and Mohammedan lands.

The Waldenses were a more practical school of Reformers. Creighton traces¹ their historic antecedents through the protests made against the unspirituality of the Church in the ninth and tenth centuries, by men like Berengar of Tours. Then came the Paterines in Milan, 1045, protesting against simony and clerical abuses under Gregory VII. This Pope did not hesitate to enlist these Puritans in his service, to impose clerical celibacy. Later, in 1110, an apostate monk of Zeeland, Tanchelm, went further and held that the sacraments were valid only when

¹Art. *Waldenses*, in *Encycl Brit.*, 1888.

administered by holy men. In France, Peter de Bruys, and similar men preached the need of primitive faith and practice. Amid such influences did Peter Waldo send out his lay preachers, who spread through France, Germany and Italy. He differed, Creighton says, from St. Francis in teaching the doctrine of Christ, while the Franciscans preached the Person of Christ. "Waldo reformed teaching, while Francis kindled love." Yet these Waldenses were not Protestants, for Protestantism presents Christ as in immediate personal communion with every believer; but they followed the mediæval view, that Christ is present in the orderly communion of the faithful; hence their emphasis of the proper administration of Word and Sacraments. Comba says¹ that the protest of the Waldenses aimed at first only at proclaiming the apostolic ideal, an ideal disowned by the Popes and abandoned by the Church; but that meeting with persecutions, it gave way quickly to a movement of dissent, which, though it did not at once culminate in schism, led finally of necessity to it. He, too, traces the forerunners of Waldo in the ancient Cathari. Vigilantius and Claudius of Turin, Arnold of Brescia, Peter de Bruys and Henry of Lausanne, as Waldo himself, looked towards the Reformation. The Waldensian movement was part of a general uprising against the corrupt Church, that appeared in the Beghards, the Humiliati, and various forms of voluntary poverty in those days. Troublous times, also, papal schisms, war with the Empire, besides the general moral laxity, favored such a movement.

¹*History of the Waldenses of Italy, from their Origin to the Reformation.* London 1889.

Haupt sums up¹ the final results of recent investigation respecting the Waldenses as follows: They started with Waldo, in 1173, who, from 1177 on, went out in company with his friends as a preacher of the Apostolic sort. This was forbidden, 1179, by the Archbishop of Lyons, by Pope Alexander III, and, in 1084, the first ban was hung over the Sectaries, who were now spread far and wide, especially in upper Italy. A division appeared, about 1200, between the French and Lombard Waldenses, in relation to self-government. In 1218, an attempt at union was made which failed, because the Lombards would not yield in their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, whose efficacy they made dependent upon the worthiness of the administrator, and would not recognize Waldo as a saint. The original Waldensian Brotherhood consisted exclusively of the traveling preachers, who vowed evangelical poverty, and lived as missionaries among the "Believers," who formed a loose body of adherents to the sect. There were no regular congregations. Later, by 1300, this relation changed, and both preachers and believers were regarded as Waldenses; the preachers were then called "Masters," or "Barbae." The priesthood of all believers was not taught. Neither did the "Believers," take part in the government of the Church. Not till the beginning of the fourteenth century, did the French and Lombard Waldenses agree to unite. The chief doctrines of the conservative group, the French, were, rejection of the authority of the Roman Church, rejection of Purgatory and Indulgences, the claim of the Apostolic messengers to reduce confession and make prominent absolution and consecration, absolute prohibition of

¹*Hist. Zeitschrift*, 1889. H. I.

lying, swearing, and killing. In Germany, the Lombard Waldenses called themselves "Friends of God," and were less sharply opposed to the Church than the Waldenses in Italy, who regarded her as the Beast of the Apocalypse, and held that the whole hierarchy had, since the time of Constantine, lost the priestly power, which was now claimed by the "Poor," the Waldenses. They rejected what the French Waldenses did, and added "ten commandments" of general moral import to the Decalogue. They went further and opposed the mediatorship and worship of saints and the Virgin, also Church ceremonies. All Waldenses had a hierarchy of bishops, elders, and deacons. The view that the Taborites were the spiritual sons of the Waldenses has good support. There were Waldenses in Bohemia, from the thirteenth century on, and they doubtless influenced the Taborites. Preger thinks their doctrines were the same as those of the Lombard Waldenses; but Haupt holds the influence of Wiclif must be more recognized among the Bohemians. In the Taborite movement, two elements, Wiclifite and Waldensian, met, the one influencing more the theologians, the other stirring more the common people. Müller thinks the whole Waldensian movement has been over-estimated in its importance for the Reformation. Neither in defining the moral ideal of life, nor in its treatment of the Church means of grace, nor in its view of salvation was anything changed by the Waldenses. But Haupt considers this is going too far. The Waldenses made a deeper use of the Bible than Müller supposes. It became the only Rule of Faith. In time their views of repentance became more profound, too, under study of the Scriptures. They, also, first gave the

people a vernacular Bible, three hundred years before Luther. And through opposing purgatory, the aid of saints, Indulgences, and the worldly possessions of the Church, the Waldenses, like the Bohemian Reformers, prepared the way for Luther.

Through the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Fridericq shows¹ the Inquisition fighting similar reform movements in the Netherlands. Waldenses were tortured as witches here, in 1460, twenty-four years before Innocent VIII issued his bull on the subject. The chief persecutor of the place said he thought more than one third of Christendom, including cardinals and bishops, were Vaudois. In 1025, we hear of Cathari summoned before the bishops in Utrecht. Early in the twelfth century Tanchelm appeared. In 1203, it was forbidden, in Lüttich to read books about the Bible in the vulgar tongue. In 1376, Gregory XI forbade any layman "to use any vernacular books respecting Holy Scripture." Edo of Haarlem, 1458, a "heresiarch," translated parts of the Bible into German. And a heretic of Tournay, 1472, appealed to a text "*in sua vulgari biblia.*"

So mediæval reforms grew towards the Reformation. But they nowhere reached Reformation ground. Villari claims² that Savonarola belonged to the new age,

¹ *Corpus Documentorum Inquisitionis Hæreticar Pravitatis Neerlandicar*, 1025—1520. Ghent. 1889. Fr. 15. A valuable collection of 446 papers.

² *Life and Times of Savonarola*. London: Fisher Unwin. 1889. 2 Vols.

Cf. also Poole, *Wycliffe and movements for Reform*, in *Epochs of Church History*. Longmans & Co: London. 1889; and Wiclif's *Sermons*, edited from MSS. by Loserth, Vol III. *Super Epistolas*. Koehler: Leipzig, 1889. M. 15.

that he was a reformer, an innovator, a man who made a New Departure in every direction, philosophy, politics and religion. He was an outgrowth of the Renaissance, he says, but he went back not to pagan classic writers, but to the Hebrew Scriptures, the ancient Prophets, and the Apocalypse, whose burning imagery gave flames to his eloquence. Yet Villari admits that Savonarola lived and died an unswerving Catholic, though working for reform. Hence his statue is out of place on the monument of Luther at Worms.

VII. MOHAMMEDANISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

We know that Charlemagne, the great Christian ruler of the West, and Haroun al Rashid, the great Mohammedan ruler of the East, made a treaty with one another; the consequences of that alliance have been treated recently by Görres.¹ As a rule, the caliphs gave the Christians religious freedom; though occasionally they were interfered with. Thus one ruler extended the command against the use of wine to Christians, and rejected the testimony of a Christian against a Mohammedan. The father of Haroun went so far as to persecute Christians. But his greater son introduces us to the broad, liberal follower of Islam. His treaty with Charlemagne showed religious tolerance: it showed also good statesmanship, for it was based upon mutual opposition to the caliphs of Cordova, on the one side, and to the Eastern Empire, on the other. Charlemagne was active in helping poor Christians in Africa, also

¹ *Harun al Raschid u. das Christenthum*, in *Ztft. f. wiss. Theologie*. 1889. H. I.

in the East; for this reason he sought the friendship of foreign rulers. He stood in a similar relation to both Haroun the Caliph and Hadrian the Pope. These two great monarchs had a strong admiration the one of the other; and their friendship could endure, for they had no differences to dispute about. Twice they exchanged embassies. The Patriarch of Jerusalem sent the keys of the Holy City and the holy sepulchre to Charlemagne, putting all symbolically under the rule of the Western Emperor. Haroun approved of this action, and permitted Charles to help Christians by hospitals and other means through all his dominions. He even gave full liberty to Christian pilgrims to visit Palestine. This liberty was extended to include Christians in his own lands. This was a wise policy, for many rebellions weakened his power.

Had the friendly relations of these great monarchs been fostered by their successors East and West, what wonderful chapters in the history of commerce, culture and learning, might have been substituted for the history of wrong and ruin commonly called the 'Crusades.

CHAPTER III.

THE MODERN CHURCH.

I. THE GERMAN REFORMATION.

Schaff's book¹ is the most important contribution in English to the history of the Reformation in Germany that has appeared during the year. He is in "essential harmony" with Ranke and Köstlin. Pre-Reformation Catholicism is related to Protestantism as pre-Christian Israel to the Church of Christ. Both were of divine origin; but both sank into gross error, and finally became hostile to light and truth. Schaff follows Kalmis in speaking of the three principles of Protestantism as justification by faith, the Bible, and the priesthood of all believers. Such truths came naturally to the surface with the revival of the Augustinian teachings. Sell emphasizes this fact (*l. c.*), that "in its religious relations the Reformation of Luther as well as of Zwingli, rests upon strict Augustinism, upon faith in God's absolute sovereignty over men. Man is not free before God, and his duty is unconditional surrender to God. What the Church had weakened away, by putting her own ordinances in place of God, was restored by the Reformation. Man exists entirely and only for God." On this position is based the moral responsibility of man,

¹*History of the Christian Church*. Vol. VI. The German Reformation, 1517-1530. New York: Scribner, 1888.

which is at the same time his moral freedom. "The man who belongs entirely to God is for that reason free from every claim but that of God, and the claim of God is none other than moral duty in the wide extent described by the Gospel." And this right and this duty are the same for all. There are no privileged classes, no churchly rules, which can free from moral obligations. All men are equal before God; hence the double morality of monks or clergy and ordinary Christians was cast aside; all are priests unto God. These were the far-reaching principles of the Reformers, which turned the world upside down. It was felt that apostolic teachings had returned; and gratitude for such a gift of God was the impelling power in the Reformation movement. Here lay its strength, Sell remarks, for it united hearts in love and did not divide them by jealousy. The multitude of pious souls were at once gathered together by it.

The Reformation was doubtless in an important sense a necessary outburst, a natural protest against despotic authority, though we can hardly agree with Beard,¹ that "the authoritative Church and the voluntary assembly of free men will always continue to exist side by side, each uttering an eternal protest against the other, yet both necessary to supply the various religious wants of mankind." Protestantism and Romanism are not equally legitimate. The Reformation was more than a makeweight in the balance of European civilization and ethical life.

The Reformers held the great Creeds, the Apostolic, the

¹*Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany until the Close of the Diet of Worms.* London, 1889.

Niceue, the Athanasian; and besides these the Church had none other to show. On the basis of these they fought the corrupt accretions of Papal superstition, and stripped off the tyranny, priestcraft, bigotry and uncleanness of centuries. How much there was to overcome may be conjectured from what still remained in the best of them. Even Melancthon, we are told, never lost his belief in apparitions of Satan, in sorcerers, in the interpretation of dreams, and in astrology.

II. THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND.

In England, as in Germany, the Renaissance led towards the Reformation. Erasmus, the great Humanist, was a friend of Sir Thomas More, who was one of a group, including also Wolsey, who loved the new learning.¹ Like Erasmus, however, these men could condemn the abuses of the Church, yet hold nearly all the Church doctrines. More condemned the whole position of the Reformers, though he at first doubted Papal Supremacy till persuaded by Henry VIII, as early as 1518. And strange to say, for this opinion, learned against his first convictions, from Henry, and not, as Protestants say, for refusing to recognize the children of Anne Boleyn, More died² by command of Henry. Like Erasmus, he feared all excesses. Luther's coarse reply to Henry, the Peasant's War, the Anabaptist movement, Tyndale's New Testament, spreading discontent in

¹Cf. Hutton. *The Religious Writings of Sir Thomas More*, in *The English Hist. Review*. Oct. 1889.

²So Alexander, *Die Englischen Märtyrer während u. seit der Reformation*. Paderborn. 1888.

England, all led More to take the lead in the literary defense of the Catholic Church. Hutton thinks the charges, that More was cruel as Lord Chancellor towards Protestants, and even guilty of illegal acts against them, are groundless.¹ He was a lovely character, a winning scholar, but not the man to cleanse and purge the Church of England. How much that Church needed purification appears afresh from manuscript² records of Episcopal visitations of English monasteries in 1526. Of the Cistercian monastery of Thame, we learn that the abbot gave some of its lands to his friend, J. Cowper; he kept young people about him and gave rise to evil reports; he gave H. Symonds a good position because he had married a woman named Cornyshe; he gave property of the cloister to promote the marriage of his friends; women visited the monastery causing scandal; monks strolled about, one of them, Chynnor visited Mrs. Barbour, a woman of ill-repute, as did other monks; they were idle and ignorant. The abbot admitted most of these things in such bad Latin that the bishop said he could often only guess at the meaning.

The Augustinian monasteries seem to have been just as demoralized. In these we hear of an abbot who had not said mass for three years. He had a clown follow him, even to church, and make jokes. Dominus Broughton was threatened with imprisonment if he admitted women to his room, "especially the wife of Edward Bathfield." Other monks received

¹For a R. Catholic account of these things, see Budgett's *Life of Blessed John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester*. London. 1888.

²Cf. *The English Hist. Review*. Oct. 1888.

like warnings from the bishop.¹ Gasquet, a Benedictine, tries to show² that the immoralities of English monasteries were not so great as here suggested. He thinks their popularity among the people is an argument against their corruption. But it might be answered, this popularity was chiefly in the north of England; and the free use by friends of monastery lands would help stifle criticism. He shows, however, that the statement—"two-thirds of the monks were leading vicious lives," is groundless. King Henry himself gave pensions to more than one-third of the monks named as criminal by his visitors. And yet Gasquet must admit not a few cases like the Abbey of Langton, where a woman was caught running from the monastery. It is estimated that twenty thousand monks and nuns were made homeless by the king's confiscations. By the suppression of the lesser religious houses alone property to the value of £30,000 a year was seized; while other spoils amounted to more than £100,000. It must be admitted that sometimes abbots of good character and loyal to the king were hung on a trivial pretext, and their property seized. The Charter House monks were dragged through the streets on a lurdle to the gallows, not hanged and dragged as hitherto described.³ The death of these heroic men, among them eighteen Carthusians, did not prevent royal supremacy in the Church, but it helped gain for us the spiritual liberty which we now have.

¹Cf. *Engl. Hist. Review.* April, 1889. p. 304.

²*Henry VIII and the English Monasteries.* 2 vols. 1889.

³See the account of Hendricks, a monk. *The London Charter House: its Monks and its Martyrs.* London. 1889.

III. PROTESTANT BENEFICENCE.

The monastic theory of life, by making poverty a virtue, not only encouraged Christians to help the wretched and those in want, but very greatly promoted the growth of the evil which it set itself to alleviate. It failed to encourage industry, honest self-respect, economy, and those frugal virtues which now especially flourish in Protestant lands. The mediæval method led to poverty; "through the worldliness of the clergy and through indiscriminate giving because of a false theory of the merit of alms, Church beneficence was brought into a false course."¹ Begging ceased to be a shame, and increased beyond all control. The monkish doctrine of poverty, the benefit of the prayers of mendicant friars, etc., so perverted thought, that the attempt was not seriously made to free the poor from indigence. Some efforts were made in the fourteenth century to limit begging; but it was the Reformation that first brought in correct views respecting wealth and poverty, property and alms, work and calling. The principle was now introduced, that we help the poor, not to promote our own spiritual gain, but for Christ's sake. The result was a new system of caring for the poor. Of 172 resolutions of Protestant Churches, collected from the sixteenth century, 55 have to do with the care of the poor. Nobbe sums up the beneficiary system of the Reformers in the following points:

(1). All help given the poor is to be associated with religious teaching, pointing towards any evil underlying the poverty.

¹See Nobbe, *Zft. f. Kirchengeschichte*. Bd. X, H. 4. 1889.

(2). Proper organization, for systematic collection of means and their distribution.

(3). Aid to all kinds of poor in the parish.

(4). Care of the poor in their homes; help them where they can help themselves best.

(5). The poor are to be helped by natural methods, by giving them work, &c.

(6). Poverty is to be prevented.

(7). No aid is to be given to beggars.

(8). Single congregations should unite for the care of the poor. In this general work all should co-operate, State, Church, Associations, Corporations, private men.

IV. THE HUGUENOTS.

The Huguenot movement was at first religious, then it became more political. A recent writer finds¹ the political factor come in after the massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572). The Huguenots now began to look for a permanent basis of resistance to absolutism, to get a philosophical justification of rebellion. For this purpose they advocated the German theory of government in opposition to the Roman theory, a limited monarchy, not an absolute, a ruler elected by the people, not a despot. This view puts supreme authority in the people, not in the crown. The king is an official; so is the Pope. They exist for the nation and the Church, not nation and Church for them. The appeal is, to return to the ancient system of Franco-Gallia,

¹*Political Theory of the Huguenots*, in *The English Hist. Review*. Jan. 1889.

and renounce the imported institutions which have corrupted the national polity. Government rests upon a triple contract, between God and king, God and nation, nation and king; hence the king has no rights which infringe those of God or the people. A ruler who forsakes God may forfeit his kingdom; and the people may resist such a king, in virtue of their contract with God. In doing so, they are to act through their representatives, the Parliament and the nobles.

Courtisigny estimates¹ nearly two millions of Protestants in France, in 1685. But in 1760, there were only 593,307 Calvinists in the land, a little less than the number of Protestants now in France. Between 1685 and 1787, most of the higher callings—lawyers, physicians, booksellers, &c.,—were shut to Huguenots; the upper classes forsook Protestantism, and so it waned. Yet it has always remained true to its idea of a religion founded on the Bible. One result has been the careful education of the young, that they might read the Holy Book.² As early as 1551, “the schoolmaster was regarded as an ecclesiastical functionary.”

When these Protestants received religious tolerance they demanded especially the right to open public schools. In the seventeenth century, such schools were very numerous. After the Edict of Nantes, the Catholics had laws passed allowing only reading, writing and arithmetic in these schools; then only one school in each place, and only one master in a school. Thus Louis XIV greatly crippled these

¹*Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français.* Oct. 15, 1888. See also Schott, *Das Toleranzedikt Ludwig's XVI*, in *Hist. Zft.* 1889, II. 3.

²Cf. Art. *Écoles Protestantes*, in *Revue Chrétienne.* Aug. 1889.

institutions, and they sadly declined, till in the eighteenth century only here and there a hidden school remained. After the Revolution, the Protestant Consistory of Paris led the way, in 1792, with "a free school for elementary religious instruction." By 1828, there were 392 Protestant primary schools in France; and there was great need of them, for 13,984 of the 38,135 Communes had no schools. When the Republic was restored, in 1871, there were 1,600 Protestant schools; but then the whole school system was changed, and these schools put in a much less favorable position.

This wonderful expansion of Protestant schools in France ran parallel with the general growth of the churches. In the years of restoration, 1802-1808, there were 196 churches, 201 pastors and 106 temples. Now there are 543 churches, 712 pastors, eight evangelists, 908 temples, 15 chapels, 121 Prayer-rooms, 762 Sunday-schools. Adding to these the Lutherans, Free Church, Methodists, Baptists and others, we get a total of 605 Protestant churches, 945 pastors, 1,329 religious buildings, 1,085 Sunday-schools, 1,741 primary schools, of which, however, 1,582 have been secularized by the Republic, and 220 benevolent enterprises.¹ Perrenoud says there were 428,036 Protestants in France, in 1802; now, he reckons 652,422, a gain of 224,366 in 86 years, in a population which is nearly stationary. Of these churches, Cyr says² 331 are orthodox, and 192 rationalistic. The creed test, adopted in 1871, was, "We believe in Jesus Christ, who died for our sins

¹For these statistics see Perrenoud, *Étude historique sur les progrès du Protestantisme en France*. Paris: Fischbacher. 1889. Fr. 5.

²Cf. *The Unitarian Review*. Jan. 1889.

and rose for our justification"; but the liberals denounce any creed.

V. THE CHRISTIANITY OF RUSSIA.

Probably no part of modern Church History is less familiar to the ordinary student than that of Russia. Slavs themselves speak of their nationality as "a Sphinx and Amorphes," yet to be developed, and threatening more than any other race to change the current of modern thought. Russia is not a Christian nation, like others in Europe, hence it claims special study. A recent work¹ illustrates this subject from the testimonies of Russians themselves. These writers agree that the Empire of the Czar is rushing "with dizzying haste, economically and morally towards destruction."

The Russian Church, far from giving life and light in such circumstances, is "isolated, shut off in a mouldy, cellar atmosphere, and so overgrown by a flora of the toadstool sort, that it cannot be recognized, as it lies buried in the death sleep of a thousand years." A terrible ritualism has killed it, and so thrust Christian doctrines into the background, that, as Prof. Ikonnikow says, in many places Russian orthodoxy cannot be distinguished from Finnish "Schamanenthum." Very few Russians, of any class, know the teachings of their Church. "As a matter of fact, Russian Christianity in practice has become a mere ritual Lamaism, fitted out with Christian terminology." Hence, Prof. Ssolowjow

¹Frank, *Russische Selbstzeugnisse. I Russisches Christenthum. Dargestellt nach russischen Angaben.* Paderborn: Schöningh. 1889.

says the Russian Church, from its beginning, has done absolutely nothing for the moral development of the Russian people. It has even contributed to the moral depravity of the nation, by serving blindly Russian despotism. It is essentially nothing more than a division of the State police. "Under her direct co-operation false doctrines have spread in Russia, which not only differ in particular dogmas from general Christian teachings, but are really un-Christian and anti-Christian heresies of the worst kind." The followers of these false teachings, in many places, together with the ritual Dissenters (Raskolniks), the rationalistic, Protestant, and Eclectic sects, make up the whole population. The question might even be asked, whether Russian Christianity is Christianity at all. Certainly it is a pitiful assumption, it is added, for such a Church to claim to be the sole possessor of pure orthodoxy.

Tschaadajew, d. 1856, "the first independent thinker of Russia," laments that the Russians have no history, no development behind them, no traditions, no psychological and moral rooting in the past, no general principles uniting them; all is individual, superficial, disconnected, hesitating and imperfect. "If we are considered," he says, "one might suppose that in our case the general law of nature had been suspended. We stand alone, having given the world nothing, added not a single idea to the mass of human ideas; but rather, perverted all that has come to us from the progress of humanity." He regrets that Photius tore Russia and the Eastern Church away from the unity of Catholic Christendom, and isolated Russia. Renaissance, Reformation, all these Russia has missed. Her Christianity is like that of Abyssinia; her civilization

like that of Japan; she has not grown with the rest of the nations into European Christianity and civilization. He continues: "Russia has had no religious wars, no Inquisition, but she is the poorer for such peace. Those bloody battles for truth have made a world of which Russia cannot form an idea, much less reproduce it." These writers agree that the regeneration of the Russian Church must precede the regeneration of the Russian nation. Forced orthodoxy must cease before intelligent belief can be reached. The present system, as Tolstoi tells us, has made the upper classes indifferent to all religion; the middle classes of officials and clergy are the chief supports of Nihilism; and even the peasants are becoming atheistic. These evils arise because the Russian Church is walled round from all intercourse with the West. The corrupt religion and dead morasticism which Russia received from Greece have been a fatal inheritance; the remedy must come from vital contact with pure Christianity and true culture.

It is very likely that here as elsewhere the Revival of Learning will be the forerunner of the Reformation in Religion. Already some signs indicate more serious thought in Russian literature. Milyoukov says² that the characteristic motive underlying all Russian Fiction is "to give a moral reason and principle to our conception of the universe." Hence, "Count Tolstoi is searching for a moral reason for the existence of the world, while our philosophical historians are searching for principles in the evolution of history, and prove the legitimacy

²*The Athenæum*, London, July 6, 1889.

of the ideal element in their explanation of the process." A similar tendency marks Russian philosophy. "The period of positivism and empiricism is clearly passing away and our philosophers are renewing the questions of old Slavophiles after some universal moral truth, in opposition to the scientific truth found by the 'West.' Metaphysical ethics with a mystical religious coloring is becoming the favorite subject of study with our young philosophers." In these speculations the fundamental idea is ever present, that the Russian national ideal is to play a leading part in the evolution of universal history. This national ideal, the new school says, consists in the search after "a universal organization of life according to truth." Such universal organization, Solovieff says,¹ is not a political system, but a Church. Hence, the first step towards the fulfillment of Russia's universal historic mission must be the re-establishment of the one Catholic Church, a union with the Western Church, by an act of national self-denial. How this is to be brought about we are not told.

VI. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Until recently Roman Catholics have admitted that their Church was corrupt in the sixteenth century, and that Luther was a brave, but extreme advocate of needed reforms; but Janssen now leads a school, which denies the need for reform, and even declares that Luther was in no danger at Worms, yet he appeared there and through the rest of his life as a coward, being so afraid of assassina-

¹In his work, *The History and Future of Theocracy*.

tion that it became a sort of monomania.¹ Few thinkers, however, will believe that these reformers were men who had not the courage of their convictions. It was not from their subserviency, but from their too tenacious clinging at all hazards to their particular convictions that division and weakness came to the cause which they represented. Wolf finds² in the jealousies of the Protestants the chief grounds for the success of the Roman Catholic reaction. This Counter Reformation set itself to accomplish two things: to regenerate the Church of Rome, and to recover the ground lost by the early successes of Protestantism.³ With the promulgation of the Decrees of the Council of Trent the first systematic attempt was made to obstruct the growth of Protestantism along the whole line. The Counter Reformation here put forth its full force, and that against a divided Protestantism. This movement of great energy, Ward says, closed with the collapse of the attempt of Philip of Spain to master western Christendom, and the granting of the Edict of Nantes by Henry IV of France. Rome then worked on in secret, and was prepared when the Thirty Years' War began. But in this struggle, the effort to reform Romanism was dropped in the attempt to regain what Rome had lost by Protestantism. At Trent, however, reform was in the air, and the Protestants though as schismatics, were still kept in mind in framing decrees. It is still a question, whether the decisions of Trent recognize Protestant marriages as lawful or not. Leinz con-

¹Cf. *Deutsch-Ernst. Blätter*. 1883. H. IX.

²*Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestanten, 1555-59*. Berlin. 1888.

³So Ward, *The Counter-Reformation, in Epochs of Church History*. New York. Randolph & Co. 1888. § 80.

cludes¹ that the Council declares such marriages null where the edict of Trent has been properly proclaimed and no impossibility is in the way. That is, they are null where such unlawful unions take place knowingly, and persons married ignorantly, when told of their error, fall into concubinage unless they obey the Church. A father confessor can, at any moment, tell the Catholic member of a mixed marriage of his wrong living, and set before him the alternative, adultery or full submission to Rome! In this Counter Reformation, as Sell points out *l. c.*, Spain took a leading place. Here both movements, that for the reform of the Papacy, and that for its restoration to full power, were organized. Spanish Catholic reaction ascended the papal throne in Hadrian VI, a Netherlander, and former tutor of Charles V. The Inquisition and the Index of prohibited books² were both inspired from Spain, which in 1600 to 1650, took the place of Italy in zeal. Then France assumed the lead of Catholic reaction, under Louis XIV. In Spain, Loyola founded the Jesuit Order, which labored as no other to crush Protestantism, and sought by missions in heathen lands to make good the loss of Protestant nations. In Spain, too, we see the system of Indulgences, which drove Luther to fight Rome, shoot up into rank, wanton luxuriance.³ There were indulgences for both living and dead. The receipt for one of the latter runs:

¹*Der Ehevorschrift des Concils von Trient.* Freiburg i. B. Herder. 1888. M. 2.

²For a list of these, see *Index librorum prohibitorum.* Turin. Marietti. 1889. §1.00.

³Cf. Lea, *Indulgences in Spain*, in *Papers of the Amer. Soc. of Church Hist.*, New York. 1889.

“Because you, N., have given the said two reals [ten cents] for the soul of N., and have received the bull, the said graces and plenary indulgence are granted to the soul for which you have given this sum.” The pretext for selling Indulgences was the war against the Infidel. These Crusade bulls have been a regular thing since 1457. When the Indulgences were sold, in 1519, by Leo X, the Pope agreed to take 24,000 ducats a year; the rest of the gains of the Crusade went to the king. It went on so till 1563, when Pius V tried to carry out the reforms suggested at Trent, and forbade the sale of Indulgences. He told Philip II the Crusade might raise up a Luther in Spain. But the Spanish bishops issued Indulgences of their own, in 1570, which gave pardon for a hundred years, that being the limit of a bishop’s powers. Pius was soon forced to allow the Crusade to resume. The profits of it amounted to about \$600,000 a year, nearly as much as the king received from the fabulous wealth of the Indies. And this was but a small part of what the people paid. A part of this revenue now goes to Rome; but the most of it is used to support the Church in Spain. About 3,500,000 bulls of Indulgence are now sold each year in Spain and her colonies—much less than in former ages.

The continuation of Bellesheim’s *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland*¹ leads us to look at the Reformation in that country as explained by a Roman Catholic. It is not so much the fundamental principles of Protestantism that are selected for animadversion, as the defects and ex-

¹ Translated with Notes and Additions by D. O. Hunter Blair, O. S. B. Vol. III., from the Revolution of 1560 to the death of James VI, 1625. Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh. 1889.

cesses that can be pointed out in the work of reform. We hear how the Reformers destroyed abbeys, chapels and monasteries in their mad zeal against idolatry. The people needed "sharp punishment" to reform them: yet it is admitted that Scotland became more and more Protestant. One of the real causes of the rapid spread of the Reformation comes out in a vigorous treatise of Winzot,¹ a Catholic of those days. He denounces bitterly the scandalous life of the bishops and the high Catholic clergy. The nobility were corrupt and greedy, and they filled the Church with priests like themselves. Next we hear that Knox was a coarse demagogue, who was involved in the plot to murder Rizzio. Mary might well regard him as a "blood-stained hypocrite." He and George Buchanan "were men of abominable practices and correspondent characters." The Reformation was largely the work of the unscrupulous nobility. The account of the Scottish nobles is hardly overdrawn by Bellesheim; but it might be remembered that these men were the product of full-blown Catholicism. Queen Mary appears in this book as sinned against, rather than sinning. It is true she was surrounded by a band of utterly base nobles, and yet it seems certain that, after all, her long sufferings were the pains of a sinning woman expiating her "criminal passion for a scoundrel."² Darnley was murdered as the result of a political plot of nobles led by Murray, yet Mary's hate of her husband and love of Bothwell gave her a guilty connection with it. Politics and religion were so interwoven, that even the Reformers, trained as they had been in the ways

¹ *Certain Tractates*, Reprinted for the Scottish Text Society, 1888.

² *Etudes sur l'histoire de Marie Stuart*, in *Revue Historique*, 1888-89.

of Rome, might well do things that seem to us harsh and cruel. The Catholics of Scotland thought it their duty to plot to overthrow the Protestant rule; hence the stern measures against them. When the Duke of Guise, the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Pope and Philip II could plan to assassinate queen Elizabeth, the statement of Bellesheim must be taken with some latitude, that "it was only aided by the pressure of penal laws that the Reformation was able to gain ground." The Catholic reaction, led by Jesuits, and connected with a proposed Spanish expedition, made Scotch Protestants take repressive measures.

The Jesuits led in this Catholic reaction and their policy allowed the use of all means that might insure victory. In this Order, the policy of expediency gave rise to a theology of *Probabilism*, which for two centuries has agitated the Roman Catholic Church. Through this controversy the Jesuit Order fell; but when the Jesuits were restored, this theology was restored, and now controls papal thought. The growth of this theology is outlined by Dollinger and Reusch as follows:¹ The Spanish Dominican Bartholomæus de Medina first taught, in 1577, that it is lawful to follow a probable opinion rather than a more probable, the probable opinion being such as "wise men assert and the best arguments confirm." This doctrine became the prevailing view in Spain, Italy, and Germany, in the seventeenth century. It was adopted by the Jesuits and applied to all forms of casuistry. In the second half

¹ *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der röm. kath. Kirche seit dem 16. Jahrh.* Mit Beiträgen zur Gesch. u. Charakteristik d. Jesuitordens. Auf Grund ungedr. Aktenstücke. Nördlingen: Beck. 1889. 2 vols. M.22. Vol. II, 398 pp. contains original documents.

of the seventeenth century, through Pascal and his friends, this doctrine was thrust into the background. Its opponents were now often dubbed Jansenists. But, in 1665, Pope Alexander VII condemned 45 lax opinions of casuists, and opposed Probabilism. Innocent XI, 1679, condemned 65 more opinions, and the Inquisition considered the matter. Now sides were taken. Since 1659, the Dominicans have held the doctrine of *Probabiliorism*, opposing the *Probabilism* of the Jesuits. The Dominicans were followed by Benedictines, Trappists, and Capuchines, who denounced the depravity and filth of Jesuit ethics.

The Jesuits next taught that Attrition, *i.e.*, repentance through misery of sin or fear of punishment, sufficed for receiving the sacraments, instead of Contrition, which meant repentance in view of the love of God, as the highest good. During the abolition of the Jesuit Order, Liguori continued the teaching of *Probabilism* in the Redemptorist Order. Bossuet led France to throw off such doctrines, in the eighteenth century, till, in 1829, the restored Jesuit Order had Liguori declared a saint, and in 1879, a Doctor of the Church, with Athanasius and Augustinus. He is now a "mediator between heaven and earth." His views "are accepted in nearly all parts of the Church, and almost all father confessors adopt his theories in the confessional." This is the theology that makes sinning easy. A seducer under promise of marriage need not keep his word, if he was of higher rank and the girl knew it, and if he did not intend to marry her. And Leo XIII could say, in 1879, "Liguori's ethics offer the father confessor a perfectly safe guide."

In 1864, Newman could not help saying, "Liguori

teaches that a double meaning is permissible, if a just reason exists. I will express myself on this point as openly as any Protestant can wish. I confess at once that in this domain of morality, however much I admire the good sides of the Italian character, I prefer the English rule of life." The Catholic defence of Liguori used to be, that he wrote for Italians; but now the low standard of morals, the double dealings of Jesuit Ethics, have been made the rule of life for the whole Church! Jesuit and Catholic, terms long distinguished, are now identical.¹ The extermination of Protestants has now become a principle of action. Busenbaum, a Jesuit, says openly, "when the end is lawful the means are also lawful." Any crime may be committed "for a reasonable cause." Mariolatry, a Jesuit doctrine, is greatly promoted.² In politics, the Jesuit views are followed by the Church; they are the Infallibility of the Pope, and the right of the majority of the people to rule. The people may upset any government, but they must obey the Pope. The policy of the Papal Church now is to use popular governments to promote papal Absolutism.

Another channel of Jesuit activity is the religious Congregations of the Church.³ It is remarkable how the female Orders have increased, since about 1850. Between 1820-72, male Orders, in Prussia, decreased from 20 to 18, while female increased from 22 to

¹Cf. Eisele, *Jesuitismus und Katholizismus*. Halle, 1888. M. 4.

²See Kolb, *Wegweiser in die Marianische Literatur*. Freiburg i. B. Herder, 1888. M. 2. Over 400 works on Mary have appeared in the past 40 years.

³E. Pfeleiderer, in *Deutsch-Evang. Blätter*. 1889. II. XI.

67; in 1888, these last had 792 places, with over 7,000 members. In Bavaria, where the Orders were abolished in 1803, they have grown from seven houses, in 1825, to 620, in 1873, of which ten were male, and twenty-two female, with 1,094 male to 5,054 female members. In Austria, between 1859-70, monks decreased by 515, while nuns increased by 1,703. Elsewhere similar growth is seen. Another feature of Roman Catholic methods is the increase, in recent times, of Congregations at the expense of the Orders. That is, the freer bands of workers are growing. Of the six classes entering Germany, only two are Orders; the other four are Congregations. In these latter the vows are only temporary, and the members are free to do all sorts of mission work. In Prussia, between 1830-73, the Orders decreased from 30 to 20, while Congregations grew from 12 to 65, and of the 65 Congregations 57 are female. In Bavaria, about 90 per cent of the sisters taught schools in 1873. And they are not very efficient teachers. In France, of 4,300 sub-teachers, only 413 had a certificate of qualification, and 7,000 of 8,000 female superintendents had no certificate.

The fruits of such teaching are in harmony with it. Brecht shows¹ the criminal statistics of Germany per 100,000 as follows: number of Protestants, in 1882, guilty of serious crimes 675; in 1885, the average was 675; the number of Roman Catholics, at the same times, was 773 and 830. In those four years, there were 2,123 convictions for perjury in thirty millions of Protestants, while sixteen millions of Catholics had 1,509; of crimes against religion the sixteen millions committed 559, while the thirty millions

¹*Papst Leo XIII und der Protestantismus.* Barmen, 1888.

committed only 462. We learn also¹ that German priests, between the ages of 26-45, 46-65, and 66-85, died in excess of ministers by 36.8, 54, and 17.7 per cent; a striking commentary on the life of the celibate priesthood. It is also worthy of note that while the normal number of Protestant students of theology in Germany is 1,320, more than twice that number are now in course of training, while Catholic Germany has not produced the normal number of students for the priesthood, 860, by 49.

VII. THE MODERN GERMAN CHURCH.

Lichtenberger, in his work on modern German theology,² finds that the "evolution of religious thought in Germany since the middle of the last century, combined with other causes not less powerful, has wrought a complete transformation in the ideas, manners, and institutions in that country." A chief mark of this transformation is "the gradual substitution of the principle of liberty in the place of the principle of authority, in religious matters." Christianity must here fight Naturalism, under all its forms, and in its development pass through three periods, marked by the appearance of Lessing, Schleiermacher, and Strauss. The first of these leaders "proved victoriously that Christianity rests neither upon the authority of a creed, nor even upon that of the Bible, but that its own essence suffices to

¹Kamp und Gollmer, *Die Mortalitätsverhältnisse d. geistl. Standes nach d. Erfahrungen d. Lebensversicherungsbank f. D. in Gotha.* Jena. Fischer. 1888.

²*Histoire des Idées religieuses en Allemagne depuis le XVIIIe Siècle jusqu'à nos jours.* Paris: Fischbacher. 1888. English Translation. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1889. \$5.60.

defend it and make it accepted." Schleiermacher followed the same direction, and "founded in theology the method of Christian Individualism." Strauss was a destructive critic. In an unsympathetic way Lichtenberger finds present orthodox Lutheranism marked by 1 a compromising solidarity established between political and ecclesiastical interests, to defend throne and altar against all radicals; 2 by a distaste of Pietism, "which it puts on the same level with Rationalism, treating both under the common name of subjectivism or individualism;" and 3 by holding no distinction of primary and secondary doctrines. This school goes beyond the Confession, he says, and corrects the Reformers' doctrine of salvation by faith alone, by exalting the visible Church and the sacraments. They build the Church rather upon baptism imparting faith, than upon faith professed in baptism. The Protestant doctrine of a universal priesthood is pushed aside by the theory of a clerical priesthood; and the ordinary church member is passive in the presence of a mediating clergy and sacraments. Dorner is connected with the Middle School, of whose doctrine of the Trinity he says, "We avow in all humility we cannot understand it." He continues, "Dorner is, in our opinion, a striking example of the radical impotence with which the Mediating Theology is smitten, for it pretends to reconcile modern thought with Church dogma, without abandoning one of the consecrated formulæ." It looks as if this critic is unable to grasp even all that is true and intelligible in Dorner's theology.

Of the Liberal School he speaks with affection. Its aim is "to break resolutely with what is past, to unmask boldly the errors, illusions and sophisms with which orthodoxy

hides itself, finally to combat without mercy the progress of clericalism of every sort, and thus to stop this fatal reactionary movement, which threatens to rob Germany of one of the chief glories of its history, religious freedom, the sincerity of Christian convictions." He finds different groups in this liberal school in Germany; that of Jena, "more scientific and less aggressive," represented by Hase, Schwarz, and O. Pfleiderer; that of Berlin, "devoted above all to the defence of the Union"; that of Baden, "to which the Protestant Association agitation has joined itself," led by men like Hausrath, Schenkel, and Holtzmann; and that of Zurich, the most radical of all, associated with Biedermann, Schweizer, and Volkmar.

Amid all these liberal tendencies, the theology of Ritschl is the only one that has had the power to form a school, and, in both historical and dogmatic lines, open up vistas that have attracted a compact body of enthusiastic inquirers.¹ Ritschl makes prominent two positions respecting God's revelation of himself: "God is love, for he reveals himself through his Son to the Church founded by Christ, to build it up into a kingdom of God," and, "All love among men arises, according to the Christian view, from the revelation of God in Christ." That means, as Pfleiderer says,² that the love of God is limited exclusively to the historic Christian congregation. He closes his critique as follows:—"Two questions occur naturally here. If God has revealed himself as love only in Christ, and if, according to Ritschl's teaching, God's being is only love, and all his revelation is only revelation of this, that he is

¹Cf. *Current Discussions*. Vol. VI. 1889, pp. 263-269.

²*Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*, April, 1889.

love, then the conclusion necessarily follows, that before Christ, there was no revelation of God at all. But whence then, I ask, had pre-Christian mankind, or if the heathen are to be left out of account, whence had Israel its religion, its knowledge of God? Did they all grow up wild without God? In that case it follows of necessity also that the consciousness of God in Jesus, which sprang from the prophets and the psalms, was only of human origin, and consequently the revelation of God in Christ, the only one which Ritschl will allow, is as groundless as all others. One can see how this positivism in its destructiveness digs the ground from under its own feet. If, further, all human love springs from the revelation of God in Christ, and if all moral communion in action consists in love, or springs from love, then the conclusion follows of necessity, that before Christ, there was no moral communion among men. Whence, then, I ask, had pre-Christian mankind all that right, and ethics, which we undeniably find among heathen and Jews? Was all that simply a product of social sagacity and calculating utilitarianism, *i. e.*, of social egoism? In that case, we would reach an extension of the principle of Augustine, that heathen virtues are but splendid vices; we would surpass Augustine himself. But Ritschl is so far from Augustine's doctrine of original sin, that he will not even accept a natural tendency to evil in man, but finds in the child only a yet undefined impulse towards good. Are we to say, then, that this highly favored human nature, in the whole period before Christ, never and nowhere attained to anything worthy the name of love or morality? And the people Israel, in whom the thought of a kingdom of God arose, had it, also, no moral communion, never any action

through love? All the warnings and consolations of the prophets for their people, all that did not spring from loving hearts, all that was not revelation of the holy love of God, simply because it did not spring from the revelation of the historic Christ? So Ritschl teaches us. In that case, the Church had better have followed the Gnostic Marcion and put the Old Testament out of the Bible, for he taught about the same as these necessary consequences of the words of Ritschl. If Ritschl will not accept these consequences, then at least he should admit that his theology is full of contradictions through and through, and only makes itself possible by everywhere denying and suppressing the conclusions of its premises." A theology that cannot stand its own conclusions, Pfeiderer adds, should be a little more modest in claiming to be the only possessor of "scientificness."¹

Frank thinks² Ritschl has done good in opposing Pietistic excesses in theology; in showing that the Atonement can be understood only by doing away with the one-sided, or mutual contradiction between the divine and human will; in separating from Kant, by making Religion not an appendix to Ethics; in holding that the standard of the scientific truth of Christianity is not natural religion or reason acting in innate ideas; in the conviction that a man must share the faith of the Christian Church in Christ, to do justice to his Person; and in teaching that the possibility of a proof of Christianity depends upon ethical pre-

¹Cf. also Graue, *Der Moralismus der Ritschl'scher Theologie*, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theologie*, June, 1889.

²*Über die kirchliche Bedeutung der Theologie A. Ritschls.* Erlangen, 1888. M. I. 20.

conditions. Hermann thinks¹ Ritschl also "first taught us how to grasp the sum total of Christianity according to the principles of the Reformation, which can give and is to give to the practical life of the Evangelical Church its form; and he has shown that this Christianity has in this alone the ground of its certainty, and the earnest of its truth, that we are by it raised up through God's revelation in Christ, and that the possession of this Christianity is for the human spirit fashioned for moral living, life in the Eternal one." But it is just from this practical side that Frank criticises the system of Ritschl in its relation to the fundamental facts of the Christian faith. He even raises the question whether "the Evangelical Christian can live should this theology become dominant over his faith." Ritschl thinks "Protestantism has not yet left the period of its baby sicknesses," for its practical, fundamental idea has not become sovereign in all the lines of Christian activity, especially not in the limitation and defence of theology against useless definitions. Luther himself did not understand the Reformation, as Ritschl does. In his works "lie a mass of theological expositions, in which the practical points, or the new Reformation ideal of life, is left out of view." Neither did Melancthon's theology set forth the true order of the reforming thoughts of Luther. The weak school founded by Melancthon was not a true exponent of the Reformation; for "the reform ideas were more concealed than revealed in the theological books of Luther and Melancthon." Frank thinks that were Luther told that he did not understand himself, and needed Ritschl to find the real doctrines of the Reformation for

¹Review of Frank's Essay, in *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1888, No. 23.

him, he would enter a protest that would leave no doubt of his opinion in the matter. Luther certainly knew that the doctrines of sin and grace were the foundation of his theology, just the doctrines so put in the background by Ritschl. And this central teaching kept its position as such in spreading the Reformation. Ritschl makes prominent the idea that through justification and atonement we are brought to a confidence in God which is a power in all the affairs of life, and which raises us above the world. Frank says this doctrine is true, in opposition to monkish, pietistic flight from the world; but it is not the doctrine of Luther that the Christian's blessedness consists in victory over the world, for the joy of the Christian springs first from unbroken communion with God, the supreme good, and only as a consequence of this communion, in superiority to the world. Ritschl makes communion with God rather a means to reach dominion over the world. Hence he regards sin as not in itself the greatest misery, and its forgiveness as not the chief thing for man; it is rather a hindrance to man's rule over the world. He thinks God can forgive sin without a Mediator and his work of expiation. Forgiveness is a matter of divine will, in which God chooses to remove the opposition of man, and turn it into communion, that the progress of his kingdom may not be hindered. The restoration of the kingdom of God is the final end, and taking away sin is one of the things done incidentally. "The higher grounds" upon which God forgives sins are considerations respecting the progress of his kingdom. Further satisfaction is unnecessary, for God and man were not originally in a reciprocal relation of law, which was by the Fall turned into a relation of general an-

tagonism. Such views are extra-Christian, he says, especially the false idea that death is the result of sin. Paul's view of this must not be made a theological rule; it is not a necessary element of the Christian view of the world, which regards death as neither a hindrance of blessedness, nor an object of fear, because of Christ's reconciliation and resurrection.

The idea of rendering personal sacrifice is unscriptural. He says we may have an æsthetic, but not a theological interest in the substitute theory of Christ's sufferings. Frank well remarks, "If this be true our Church is in a sad case. How, then, can we comfort a soul sorrowing because of sin? We must say, Dear Friend, your judgment of God is wrong. He has no need of expiation. For higher reasons, that is, to realize the aim of the world, which is also an end in itself, he forgives sin. Be at peace, and do not torment yourself with such mediæval notions." Ritschl says that forgiveness of sins is not a personal matter. It is a delusion to think "an individual can draw from the fountain of grace apart from the Church." He calls faith "an assurance of the value of the gift of God for man's blessedness, which faith takes the place, through grace, of the lack of confidence felt before in connection with the feeling of guilt." But how does the Church get man to Christ? Ritschl answers by speaking of the activity of the Church and the operation of the Word and Sacraments, but does not become very specific.

Of the conversion of the individual he can only say: "Nothing further can be taught than that it takes place within the congregation of believers through the constant work of the gospel and the specific continuous work of the

personal characteristic of Christ in the congregation, by which in the individual faith in Christ and trust in God the Father is called forth, which dominates the whole view of the world and man's self-judgment while the consciousness of guilt because of sin remains." Not very simple words for an inquirer. Zahn thinks¹ the discussions about Ritschl's theology show clearly that "the new Rationalism has no connection with the Bible and the Reformation." He finds Kaftan, Dorner's successor, looking for a new dogma,² which he regards as the dream of the future. The old dogma is forever gone by; and the new is not yet here. "Then," adds Zahn, "we are pretty badly off at present."

The difference between the old theology, the Biblical, the Confessional, and the new, the subjective, the rationalistic, Delitzsch³ sets forth as follows: The one starts from man fallen, sinful, God's mercy, Christ the Mediator of a restored communion with God, grace the name of God's action for us and to us, the purpose of which is to free us from the consciousness of guilt and the ban of sin service. The Christian life cannot begin; there can be no Christian self-knowledge except in the recognition of the deep antithesis of nature and grace; they are as essentially opposite as world and God.

The other, the new theology, starts by softening down the sharpness of these antitheses so as to make the distinction vanish. "It alters the essence of grace

¹*Theolog. Literaturblatt*, 1889, No. 22.

²*Glaube und Dogma*. Bielefeld, 1889.

³*Der tiefe Graben zw. alt. und modern. Theologie*. Leipzig, 1888. English, in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1889.

and makes everything nature. This is the deep gulf which parts the old from the new theology, and makes intercourse impossible." This division between nature and grace reaches the very center of the Christians' life in his struggle after holiness. The new theology does not know what to make of the utterances and experience of a man like Luther. Are they but extravagances? The new theology must regard experience going beyond the realm of actuality as imaginary; it is by its suppositions unable to experience and personally to test the worth of grace in the soul. This theology calls communion with God, personal fellowship with God in Christ, a mystic illusion opposed to experience. It puts for this a mediate relationship, effected through the Church. But this is contradictory to Scripture (John xiv, 23), to the testimony of believers in both Old and New Testaments, and does not agree with historical Christianity in referring redemption directly to the Church, and only indirectly to the individual. This reverses the true relations. It weakens every Biblical conception; it degrades the new birth; it makes the sweetest communion with God mystical and pietistic. The condition of the Christian as a new-born man is wanting in the new theology, which, in rejecting the metaphysical, so called, uses a language of moral shallowness when relating the actual facts of experience. Such a theology is not the historical theology, for in identifying grace and nature, it denies the reality of miracles; "for miracle has grace as its ground, property, and province." The miracle of grace in regeneration involves all the other miracles of redemption. So the gulf between the old and new theology coincides at bottom with the difference be-

tween the two conceptions of the world, the one recognizing the supernatural, two worlds of law and morals, the other holding only one world system, that of natural law, with which God cannot interfere. Hence the new theology rejects prayer, as having any effects upon external events. Nay, more; the new theology goes on to rob us of our Easter blessing, and says the "He is risen" is less probable than the sneer of the Jews, "His disciples stole him away." This central miracle must go with the rest. There is no compromise possible between such theologies; we must choose one or the other. Did Christ rise? We must answer, Yes or No.¹

Beyschlag finds² the weakness of the present German Church to be, first, its disfavor with the great mass of the people, and next, the disorganizations and divisions in it. Think of twenty-six different, more or less discordant Protestant churches in Germany! Then all the theological parties! Beyschlag pleads for comprehension. He says the conservatives hold the Church is a society, not of seekers and questioners, but of believers and confessors. The liberal party is too busy pulling down to build well. The middle school, to which he belongs, has, he says, a great mission for unity and peace, if it can hold the positive truths of the conservatives in the free spirit of the liberals. This school, he adds, is growing, and is full of promise. The old, timid, mediating theology is past. The new theology, which tries to tear faith in God and knowledge of the universe apart, is only a transitory thing, for there is

¹Cf. also Kübel, *Christlichen Bedenken über modern. Christl. Wesen. Von einem Sorgen vollen.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1889.

²*Deutsch-Evang. Blätter*, 1889. Hh. VI, & X.

really only one truth for both God and the world. The liberal school, running after natural science, and finding only a natural history of Christianity, is in danger of turning a means of criticism into an end, and landing in mere confusion. The movement of theology, however, since Schleiermacher, has been towards a new form of Christian doctrine, which has grown towards a living theology of faith, and not of unbelief. The field of Biblical Theology is especially hopeful; it is "a green field just sown between Criticism and Dogmatism."

Lipsius emphasizes¹ the same positive movement of liberal theology, in opposition to Rome. He says that the position of this theology in the great fundamentals of God, Christ, and the way of salvation is one with that of the conservative. The pantheistic transformations of the liberal theology are dying out; and the personal God, the heavenly Father, in whose paternal care we can trust, who guarantees his children a personal immortality and personal perfection, is grasped with increasing clearness. In like manner, he says, is the old Lessing theory of contrasts between eternal truths of reason and accidental truths of history, the notion that the idea of redemption could suffice, leaving its realization in Christ an open question, is disappearing, and the knowledge is pressing to the front that salvation can be found only in the fact of the truly Divine Man, who can assure sinners as well of divine expiation as he can the holy God of the sanctification of them that are His, only in faith in a personal Saviour, in whom we have the perfect revelation of eternal love. Beyschlag assures us that "in the matter of the way of salvation, the liberal

¹*Deutsch-Evang. Blätter*. 1889, H. X., p. 706.

theology, in its best representatives, stands throughout upon the fundamental article of justification by faith."

VIII. THE CHURCHES OF GREAT BRITAIN.

The literature of the past year adds little to our knowledge of the British churches since the Reformation. Shaw distinguishes¹ three periods in English Presbyterianism: first, Elizabethan Presbyterianism, or Cartwrightism; second, Civil War, or Covenant Presbyterianism; and third English Presbyterianism after the Savoy Conference and Act of Uniformity. This last is well known; though it is to be observed that pure Presbyterianism, implying (1) a disciplinary system in the parish, and (2) a Church system of graduated meetings, classes, synods, etc., in its entirety is not to be met with at any particular part of English history. The first two appearances were sudden and temporary, and there is no historic continuity of a Presbyterian party through the latter part of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth century into the Presbyterianism of post-Restoration times. The paper of Shaw proves this statement for the Presbyterianism of the time of Elizabeth. It was one of the many outgrowths of the Puritan principle, which was the principle of spiritual perception as against that of external authority. Until Cartwright, the Puritan stream flowed in protests against Romish ceremonies retained; now a new element came in, that of the Church system. "The operative impulse in this unexpected departure was from Geneva, and the immediate

¹*Elizabethan Presbyterianism*, in *The Eng. Hist. Review*, Oct. 1888.

agent, Thomas Cartwright." A pure Presbyterianism of the Geneva sort was now advocated, to a degree unapproached even by the Westminster Assembly. The movement had its center in a body of the clergy. It differed from the Separatist Congregational movement in allowing the ministry of the Church of England. In 1590, some ministers were summoned before the Ecclesiastical Commission, and the movement came to an end in five or six years, for lack of a leader and organization, and because Puritanism turned to fight gross immorality in the seventeenth century.

Ward's account of the Tractarian Movement¹ gives a picture of the struggle at Oxford, that ended in the secession of Newman and others to Rome. Ward was among the most subtle and unscrupulous of all the Tractarians. He sought to stay in the Church of England, and yet be a Catholic in belief. For this purpose he invented the theory of subscribing the articles in a "non-natural sense." While still in the English Church, he was full of Jesuitical casuistry, and openly defended such mental reservation in his book, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*. Members of the Anglican Church might hold all the doctrines of Romanism, even to belief in the supreme authority of the Pope. This last teaching the High Church party now vigorously reject, but thereby gain standing ground in the Church of England to preach about all else that belongs to Romanism.

Turning to Scotland, Sinclair tells us² that "the ice-bound Calvinism" there "is practically past." This result has been reached by various influences. The geolog-

¹ *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*. London, 1889.

² *The Unitarian Review*, March, 1889.

ists helped; "they struck probably the first effective blow at Bibliolatry" in Scotland, and taught that the Bible is not a text book in matters of science. Dr. Story is quoted as a representative of many in teaching that conscience is the supreme judge of truth, "and God's revelation in it a higher revelation than that in the Scriptures." We are assured that the sentiments of the community at large are much more liberal than those of the Church Courts; they are more often the antipodes of those in presbyteries and synods. One noticeable change in theological thought can be seen, we are told, in the doctrines of man's fall in Adam, his restoration in Christ, justification by faith, and the terms of the covenant, being passed by in sermons, in favor of a loftier morality based on a rational Christianity. "The Sunday question has been practically settled; Church worship has become inspiring and attractive; the Bible has been divested of a superstitious and pernicious reverence; the miraculous is no longer considered an essential element in religion; the doctrine of eternal punishment has fallen into discredit. The fall, the doctrine of the Trinity, the Atonement, are regarded as mysteries not involved in personal religion." In much of this Mr. Sinclair seems to speak rather for himself than for the people of Scotland.

IX. THE AMERICAN CHURCHES.

Full religious liberty is the first great contribution which America has made to the history of Christian progress. The struggle through the ages has been from tolerance to liberty.¹

¹ Cf. Schaff, *The Progress of Relig. Freedom*, in *Papers of the Amer. Soc. of Church. Hist.* N. Y. 1889.

Constantine tolerated Christianity; then came the Christian intolerance of the Middle ages; the Reformation gained tolerance for Protestants from Roman Catholic rulers, which was granted in turn to Non-Conformists; till finally, in America, tolerance, which is a concession, yielded to liberty, which is a right, and all religions reached a land where they have full legal equality. In an important respect this religious freedom is an outgrowth of the political freedom which the Puritan founders of New England cherished in a theocratic spirit, and taught the Republic. The Puritans led in the battle for religious liberty, and without them civil liberty would probably have dropped from the world. Fiske finds¹ the Oriental method of national growth to have been "conquest without incorporation." The Roman method was by "conquest with incorporation, but without representation."

The third national method is the English, which "contains the principle of representation." War was an essential part of the first two; this last can develop by peaceful means. Of this free method, he says, Puritanism is the consummate flower; for by it, when all Europe was darkened by despotism, there were brought the intensest religious convictions into the support of national liberty, and Cromwell triumphed at the "most critical moment in history." Everywhere else the Roman idea was dominant; here alone the English idea, in the hearts of Puritans, battled for victory. The exodus of the Puritans to America bore the English idea to the home of its greatest triumph, and prepared for its universal sway. This idea grew among the

¹ *The Beginnings of New England*. Houghton, Mifflin, & Co. Boston. 1889. \$2.00.

Lollards, through Wiclif's Bible, through Calvin's theology, "which left the individual man alone in the presence of God," and triumphed with Cromwell. The Puritan ideal was the theocracy, which should be a system of the highest ethical motives, built upon the Bible, as interpreted by reason. Every man must be a theologian, and theological discussions, in New England as in Scotland, bred a race of thinkers of far-reaching-influence. The Puritans regarded themselves as chosen soldiers of Christ, and as such could upset tyrants, and in a most practical way set up a Christian Republic. They were not theorists; with Bible in hand they could unite religious fervor with the English love of self-government, and, as no other men, give rise to our modern freedom. But there was an element of intolerance in these Puritans; they were so sure that they were right they had little patience with those that differed from them.

Their stern theology, especially, called forth opposition. Among the forms of reaction, from 1800 on, was Universalism. Foster begins¹ a review of this teaching with Rely, who held that as in Adam all died, so all are made alive in Christ. Murray, the father of American Universalism, adopted this position, saying that all the threatenings of the gospel belong to the domain of law, which was abolished through Christ. Huntingdon taught that the divine decree of election embraced the salvation of all men; all were chosen in Christ, the Son of Man, and through union with him all will be saved. Winchester, the second leader after Murray, joined Universalism to Arminian theology. He taught a

¹ *Eschatology of the N. England Divines*, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1888; Jan. 1889.

period of punishment, after the Day of Judgment, which should lead to the restoration of all men. The final stage of New England Universalism was reached in Hosea Ballou. He made it the culmination of the doctrine of the Atonement. He considered sin a finite evil, a violation of a law in the mind, "which law is the imperfect knowledge men have of moral good." The legislature prescribing this law is "the capacity to understand." He thinks all men will be saved because all desire it, all good men wish it; if any are lost, all who know it must be miserable; this world is a place of education from sin, and the Bible teaches it.

The replies of New England divines to Universalism began with Smalley, who opposed the "union" theory of Rely, that salvation is a matter of necessity, by saying that "eternal salvation is on no account a matter of just debt," and is therefore not necessary. He brought forward the Grotian view of the Atonement, now called the New England theory, that God in punishing for sin did not act as the offended party, but as a ruler; hence the atonement of Christ was not payment of a debt, but a penal example making forgiveness consistent with the authority of government, by giving the sinner no right to forgiveness. Thus Universalism led to the introduction of the New England theory of the atonement. The syllogism of Rely was: God is obliged in justice to save men as far as the merit of Christ extends, but the merit of Christ is sufficient for the salvation of all men; therefore, God is obliged in justice to save all men.

The new theory removed the major premise of this syllogism. Respecting the heathen world, Bellamy and the younger Edwards held that pagans have a sufficient pro-

bation in this life; they have sufficient motives to do justly and love mercy; it is their pride and sin that prevent the gospel shining among them. Christ has brought all men into a salvable state. Emmons viewed the heathen in the light of election; God chose to withhold the gospel from them. New England theology has followed chiefly the view of Bellamy here. After 1815, when Universalism became identified with Unitarianism, orthodox replies grew less frequent, for the danger was much less. The extreme position of this Rationalism answered itself.

Foster finds the following errors in Eschatology already buried by the New England divines: (1) Misconception of the benevolence of God, *a priori* reasoning on it. They held that divine benevolence must get its character from the facts of the universe and the Bible. (2) The realistic error, which makes salvation given without a special act on the part of God or man. (3) Errors as to the Atonement. (4) Errors as to man's ability to repent. They held that man might repent without the gospel, or the historic Christ being presented. He was responsible for the light he had. (5) False theories on the meaning of *αἰών*. (6) Various wrong interpretations of I Peter iii, 18-20. They all held the preacher here was Noah. (7) False theories of probation. The reply always was that probation was confined to this life, and rested entirely upon statements of Scripture. (8) Theories on the nature of punishment, that it was unjust, disciplinary, &c. The reply was drawn from the nature of virtue. (9) Annihilation.

¹Zahn, *Abriss einer Geschichte der evangel. Kirche in Amerika im 19 Jahrh.* Stuttgart: Steinkopf. 1889. pp. 127.

Coming to the wider field of American Church life in the nineteenth century, it is interesting to find the first outline of the History of the Protestant Church in America, in this century, written by a German.¹ He finds the rapid national growth here a proof that "the old States on the banks of the Euphrates and the Nile did not require such innumerable centuries to produce them." American religious freedom has developed a Christian worship which exercises greater influence upon the souls of men than the worship of any other land. Zahn approves of the American principle, which makes theological seminaries agree with the churches supporting them, and so avoids "the folly which is destroying the German Church, by putting Faculties and churches in conflict; or the State sides with the Faculties against the Church."

He praises the liberality of these free churches. He says, between 1800-1888, they gave for Foreign Missions \$75,000,000, for Home Missions \$100,000,000, and for Publication \$150,000,000. This great activity, intelligent, persistent, Zahn agrees with Hodge, in tracing to Calvinism, whose Republican ideas underlie American methods. Even Lutherans in America are under these influences. Dr. Walther, their ablest leader, "must finally accept predestination," and "the Episcopal system is everywhere broken by the independence of the local church." Gerberding, an American Lutheran, however, takes² another view of these things. He thinks "the bald and legalistic Puritanism" of New England was unable to hold its own children, and occasioned the unbe-

¹Zahn, *Abriss einer Geschichte der evangel. Kirche in Amerika in 19 Jahrh.* Stuttgart: Steinkopf. 1889. pp. 127.

²See *The Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1888.

lief and "vagaries of schismatics that now fill the region." If the Lutheran Church does her duty, he urges, "she will yet redeem New England, and infuse the new life of the pure old faith into its dreary intellectual wastes." For such work the Lutheran churches in America should unite. Some of the chief obstacles to such union he finds to be hyperorthodoxy, mere nominal Lutheranism, "personal grudges and animosities," the "lifeless formalism of many who claim to be rigid Lutherans," a false pride in consistency, a desire to please leading churches, sectionalism, and lack of loyalty in the Lutheran press.

Returning to Zahn, we find some of the dark spots in American life, as seen by him, set forth thus: "The horror of killing the fruit of the body, which is practiced just in Puritan New England, and causes the Yankee race there to die out, the daily blood-red calendars, the corruption of boodler officials, the brutal quarrels of profane youth, the frequent perjuries, the too free intercourse of the sexes, the lack of class distinctions, and in many things a superficiality, crudeness, and disproportionateness." Amid such things, he sees in the American Sunday and the Bible a great source of blessing. He thinks our Church activities are legal and businesslike in their methods. "The great Methodist Church is entirely a Church of law," in its call to conversion, church building—over 700 a year—and claims to perfect holiness. The cry, "We must do something for the Lord, because He has done so much for us," is too often, he says, taken up in a legal spirit. Largely through America, "English is the predestined language of the world." But the vast growth in material wealth he

considers a danger, that may smother the American Church. The worldly spirit so seizes the German Americans that only ten out of fifty go to church, and only one goes regularly. In the Episcopal Church here "the aristocracy of birth and money gathers" followers.

Coming to the rationalistic churches of America, we find their weaknesses summed up by Griffin¹ as laxity of fellowship, the passion for entertainment in the pulpit, an excess of amateur philosophizing, a spirit of compromise, which takes all meaning out of the minister's message through fear of man, and a lack of the missionary spirit. He later raises the question, why Unitarians do not plant Sunday-schools and churches on the frontier like others. He finds the chief reason in lack of Unitarian ministers, and "partly because no *ism* is so susceptible of misstatement." He suggests loaning pastors, able men, to start missions in the West. Controversy must be avoided. Crooker pleads² for a training school for Unitarian ministers in the North-West. It ought to be situated "in the very shadow of some great secular or State University." He recommends Madison, Wis., because of locality and library facilities, and because "the hospitality of the State University to the type of thought which we represent is exceptionally generous." It is said that the educated Germans and Scandinavians of the North-West are increasingly inclined towards Unitarianism. They find in it not only a variety of rationalistic tendencies from which to choose, but, the German especially, meet many currents of free thought which have come directly from their own lands.

¹*The Unitarian Review*, Sep. 1888.

²*Ibid.* Dec. 1888.

Allen finds¹ this new element in Unitarianism first clearly recognized in Norton's address, 1839, on "The Latest Form of Infidelity."

Three great departments of this foreign thought can be distinguished: first, the Transcendental influences, coming from Schleiermacher and Hegel. This speculative theology affected men's whole way of looking at religion. Then a more gradual movement appeared going back to Lessing. Critical theology came and gave rise to men like Noyes, Hedge, Th. Parker, James Freeman Clarke, against the protest of the conservatives, led by Prof. Norton. The third tendency may be called "the German theology of Erudition." Before German thought touched Unitarianism, it was provincial, content to be an influence, beginning to "ossify"; the new influence revived it; and the confidence of the spirit in itself, we are told,² looked towards the new teaching. The Transcendental movement had as its most characteristic feature that it took its rise among men "at once highly impressionable and broadly cultivated." Coleridge was influencing young minds in New England, transmitting thoughts also of Fichte and Schelling. All this was an "intellectual, æsthetic, and spiritual ferment, not a strictly reasoned doctrine." Emerson led in the movement, laying stress on inward recognition; he was opposed by Norton, who stood for miracles and external authority.

Tiffany thinks the root idea of New England Transcendentalism was the competency of the mind itself to recognize spontaneously what is good and divine in life. It was

¹*Ibid.* Jan. 1889.

²Tiffany, *Ib.* Feb. 1889.

the Absolute Imperative of the Sermon on the Mount. Allen says that, among other things, this German influence led Unitarianism to give up "Christianity as a special and supernatural revelation." Miracles are now given up, and the Bible explained accordingly. He says, "Within these fifty years, 1839-89, many of us have had thrust on us . . . first-hand testimony from believers of facts as distinctly miraculous as anything in the New Testament . . . yet we know perfectly well that such testimony, however vouched, would not stand one hour in any civilized court of justice, and so we quietly lay it by, whatever be our private opinion of its validity. It is just so with our treatment of the miracles of the New Testament. Thousands among us receive them with the same faith, comfort and reverence as of old, but belief in them is not made a line of Christian fellowship."

These free churches lay little stress upon doctrines, but put much emphasis on the moral life and beneficence. And yet a recent Unitarian writer¹ declares that he knows an orthodox church which gives for general religious work ten times as much as its rich Unitarian neighbor; and he thinks such cases are not exceptional. There seems to be a movement in this school of liberal theology towards thorough self-criticism, and, consequently, towards more positive beliefs and a more determined effort to spread its teachings and methods. Harvard College is becoming more conservative; while, strange to say, Yale is charged with growing liberalism. The Methodist Review² accuses it of being "the headquarters

¹*The Unitarian Review.* Jan. 1889.

²Sept.-Oct. 1889.

of American Rationalism." We are told "it produces more rationalistic literature than any other institution in the land, and thus determines the issue." Professors Ladd, Russell and Harper are named as leaders in this rationalistic departure. The first two teachers are charged with "unbelief respecting miracles." Professor Ladd replies,¹ "I have never written or taught orally one word in denial of the Supernatural and miraculous origin and character of biblical religion." The Reviewer calls this statement "literary sophistry," because "the biblical *religion* is not the subject," and continues, "We challenge Prof. Ladd to say that he accepts the supernatural and miraculous origin and character of the biblical books."

The Centenary (1889) of the Roman Catholic Episcopate in America has called attention anew to the growth and power of that Church in this country. It has now about 8,277,039 followers in America (so Sadler's Directory for 1890), but that is a small number, compared with the number of Catholics who have come to America. McElrone, a member of that faith, thinks² there are 12,000,000 Catholics in this country, of whom 8,000,000 are of Irish descent. But, he says, there should be 15,000,000 of such Catholics. No less than 7,000,000 have been lost. He thinks the chief cause of loss is "lack of organization."

¹*The Christian Advocate*. July 4, 1889.

²*The Independent*. June 6, 1889.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

PRESENT STATE
OF
STUDIES IN NATURAL AND REVEALED THEOLOGY.
BY
REV. GEORGE NYE BOARDMAN,
PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY,
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PRESENT STATE OF THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

A. PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS.

The unrest of the theological world, noticed in the last number of *Current Discussions*, has increased during the last year. There has been no lack of material sent forth from the press by those interested in the topics under debate. But thought has found its expression in newspaper articles or in magazine essays rather than in treatises of comprehensive form and of permanent value. A year ago there were several large works, issued by prominent publishing houses, inviting attention; of late we have had only treatises on subordinate topics. The year has indeed produced some works of interest, notably the lectures of Professor Mead on Supernatural Religion, but we have no works before us of the broad compass of Shedd's *Theology* or Böhl's *Dogmatik*, unless it may be the work of Kedney, to which we shall call attention, but which really belongs to the year preceding that now under review.

Before taking up specific publications, it will be well, if we would at all adequately survey the state of theology in the year 1889, to take into consideration the public sentiment on theological questions. What are the themes uppermost in the minds of preachers and of churchmen, of zealous Christian workers, and of the wise counsellors in the Christian community? What seems the aim

of the age? Towards what are the churches drifting? These questions cannot be answered very definitely; but there are some facts which amount to an approximate reply to them.

1. The Congregationalists.

There are many causes combining to throw this denomination into a ferment. The considerations demanding attention are so many that it is impossible to draw party lines; persons may agree on one point who differ on another. It may also be said that the questions in dispute are of such a character that there ought not to be, probably will not be, any rupture of denominational lines. All differences ought to be settled within the denomination. The ultimate question about which interest will finally centre and opinions will be finally tested, will very likely be that of polity. The points in dispute here probably will not be as to the original structure of the denomination, but as to the extent of its power.

A brief notice of events which have led to the present state of affairs will set the subject in a clearer light than a description in abstract terms. Some years ago a few prominent Congregationalists proclaimed themselves adherents of the doctrine of future probation. They thought by the aid of this doctrine a satisfactory theodicy might be constructed, while under the present current theology of the denomination the justice of God and the state of sinful men could not possibly be reconciled. The theory itself, however, has received but very little advocacy. Whether important or unimportant its adherents have made very

little attempt to enlighten the world by means of it. They have rather concealed than displayed the form, the grounds, the probable effects of the doctrine. They have assumed an altogether negative position and have thrown themselves wholly into the attitude of defence. The demand has been that those who hold the doctrine of future probation should be still accepted as teachers and pastors in good and regular standing among Congregationalists. The organization before which this demand has been most distinctly made and openly brought to an issue is the American Board of Foreign Missions. The friends of the New Departure, as it is called, have insisted that their peculiar views ought not to be a bar to missionary appointment. In this position they are sustained by many who have no sympathy with their doctrinal opinions. But the Board has decided that it ought not to take action that would in any way countenance the doctrine in question.

Persevering and earnest efforts have been made to secure a reversal of this decision or a disregard of it. The theory of future probation has been represented as a dogma not a doctrine, a hypothesis not an open position, a resort for those having personal doctrinal difficulties, not the basis of a satisfactory theodicy, as was at first claimed. On the other hand, attempts have been made to overbear the Board and its executive officers by public opinion, by exciting sympathy for missionary candidates who failed of appointment, and by effecting a change in the membership of the Board. The Board is a close corporation and fills its own vacancies. Members cannot be imposed upon it, therefore, from without. But it has no reason for existence except to serve the churches in carry-

ing forward missionary work by employing as missionaries the men furnished by the churches.

The question naturally rises whether the churches have not the right to appoint their own agents. And it is further asked, whether it is not their duty to appoint their own agents and to hold them to a strict account. Before these questions are answered another rises, whether the Congregational churches can appoint missionary agencies and sustain them as a part of, or an appendage to, their ecclesiastical organizations.

It is at this point that the topic touches systematic theology. We have in former volumes of *Current Discussions* noticed the new departure doctrines. The methods to be adopted in the management of the Board in the appointment of missionaries have no connection with this department of *Current Discussions*; but Church polity is one of the themes that may be treated here, and the relation of the Congregational polity to Boards of missionary labor is exciting present interest. Some maintain that the Board is now in reality, and should be in form, the creature of the churches. Others have favored the formation of new Board by the churches. Some would have the Board fill its own vacancies in accordance with its present charter, but adopt the method of selecting its members from nominees presented by churches or by organizations representing churches. This topic was ably discussed about fifty years ago; but the succeeding half-century has obliterated the arguments of that day and the present generation will need to repeat the debate. We shall not here consider the merits of the case, but merely bring forward some of the items that enter into the discussion.

1. The Board as now constituted is not in any sense an ecclesiastical body. It was not organized to fulfill the wishes of the churches, but to afford certain young men an opportunity to fulfill their desires to preach the gospel to the heathen. The General Association of Massachusetts appointed nine commissioners, of whom five afterwards met and organized themselves into a Board. About two years later this Board was made a legal corporation by the legislature of the State of Massachusetts. The Association did not represent the churches in this act, had not been charged with that duty, but merely designated men who might form themselves into an organization to forward missionary work if they chose. The Board, when formed, encouraged young men to preach the gospel in foreign parts, and appealed to the churches to furnish the funds needed for the undertaking. The churches have responded to its call and cherished it as a useful, perhaps we might say, a divinely appointed organization, but have never claimed it as organically dependent on themselves.

2. The Board is not an agent of ecclesiastical bodies of any kind. It is a self-constituted agency offering itself as an intermediary by which the missionary forces of this country may be made effective in unevangelized lands. It is, in fact, far more than this; it has become among Congregationalists the primal missionary force, the fountain of missionary zeal, the source of influences by which the churches have been roused to the conviction that they were under obligation to spread the light of the gospel; but this accumulation and movement of its energies has not come through any ecclesiastical connections.

On the other hand, the missionary interest of the churches

is the result of efforts made by the Board. Where it sends agents, there it generally secures contributions ; where it does not send, contributions are too often uncertain. There are many churches which contribute occasionally to the Board ; the number of those which never fail is small. It cannot therefore be an ecclesiastical force that moves the Board or in any way constitutes it a servant of the churches.

3. It is perfectly in accord with Congregationalism to employ agencies which are not ecclesiastical for the performance of Christian work. Each local church is complete in itself, and its ecclesiastical force cannot therefore reach to foreign lands. A local church must work through an agency not a constituent part of itself, if it is to work in a distant field. But it has a right to support and pray for an agency performing a desirable work which it cannot do. It may encourage a temperance society, or an education society, or a hospital, without demanding that they adopt any kind of an ecclesiastical structure. In the same way, it may, without impairing its own integrity or failing in the completeness of its form, employ a fit organization to do Christian work in foreign lands. It may entrust its money or its men to another organization to be employed by it, without thereby renouncing its Congregationalism. The strict ecclesiastical force of a Congregational church is confined to those who have entered into covenant with that organization ; the ecclesiastical element in associations and councils is derivative and dependent on custom.

4. The Congregational churches have no power to form a Board of Missions which shall, from its origin and structure, have a claim upon all the churches. There is

no Congregational church embracing all the churches, or any number of different churches. The churches might all enter into an agreement to support a certain organization, but any one could withdraw at its will. The members of a church could not bind their successors to support any organization unless they delivered a consideration with the obligation. Christian fellowship does not bind different churches to the same methods of Christian labor. Fellowship has no coercive power; *that* belongs to the covenant of the local church. The National Council—the best representative of the churches at large—has no authority over the churches; its existence depends on disclaiming any such authority. It could not form a board or committee having more authority than itself. Several churches—few or many—might establish a missionary organization and it might displace the American Board in its work for the churches, but it would not be an ecclesiastical body, and would draw to its support only those who should choose to adopt it.

5. The Board has a character of its own. It has a name, a charter, possesses property and has the power of self-continuance. The churches have, therefore, no power to destroy it. It is wholly outside the range of ecclesiastical forces. It might be less employed than it is at present, might be so forsaken that the continuance of its existence would be inexpedient, but it would still be a reality; and the employment of rival organization for a time would not put it out of existence nor render improbable a final return to its support by many of the churches.

There are still other questions of polity before the Congregationalists, but none that excite the interest that is

connected with their relation to the benevolent societies. The relation of the churches to associations is an unsettled topic of discussion. The denomination is spread over such an extent of territory that the denominational standing of a minister needs some other attestation than that of a local church, which might often be an obscure and unknown church. If an association is to furnish the desired credentials, to what shall it testify? And how long shall it be responsible for the testimony? Shall it report supposed facts or ascertain facts and report them? If associations are made indispensable parts of the denominational organization, are they thereby to acquire an ecclesiastical standing? Can a church be Congregational and have no connection with an association? If associations are necessary to the system, does not Congregationalism cease to be the polity of the New Testament? These are some of the questions under discussion at the present time.

2. *The Presbyterians.*

The Presbyterian Church is in a ferment more general than that of the Congregationalists. It is agitated over the question of a new creed, or a revision of the old one. Fifty years ago, it was divided into two bodies over the theological questions now before it, though a change of the creed was not thought of. About twenty years ago, the old and new school united on the basis of the old standards. At that time a suggestion of tolerance of New England theology was frowned upon as an impertinence. Now, the proposition of some is to substitute certain New England doctrines for some of those of the standards. The out-

come of the movement is uncertain; but when important presbyteries debate the subject day after day, and the leading men of the denomination are divided in opinion, it is natural to infer that the entire church will be affected by the discussion. The aim of the agitators will be understood when it is stated that the effort is to bring the creed of the church into accord with popular preaching, and that the popular preaching has of late drawn upon the Arminian vocabulary.

It is not two years since Professor Shedd published his *Dogmatic Theology* (noticed in last year's *Current Discussions*). He confessedly set out in his speculations from the Calvinistic theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He holds that the thinkers of that age were more profoundly theological than later writers have been, that the thinking of that age was more akin to religious truth than the thinking of the present age is. His two large volumes seemed to connect Presbyterian theology with the Reformed doctrines as they were stated before the rise of Arminianism. But his work was promptly reviewed by those who believe that the present century has more wisdom than the sixteenth, and, within a year from the publication of his work, the Presbyterian General Assembly sent down to the presbyteries the question whether they desired a revision of the creed. It will be readily seen, then, that there are differences of sentiment in the Presbyterian Church.

The criticisms upon Professor Shedd's work rather confirm than refute his position that the early Reformed theology is more theological than the later. Professor Morris, maintaining the superiority of the modern Calvinism, says:

“It is the old Calvinism, less closely organized around certain philosophical propositions, with larger biblical rather than speculative quality, allowing wider varieties of statement and explanation, less relentless towards opposition, exhibiting broader and stronger modes of defence at points where it was found most vulnerable, and possessing all in all many fresh elements of persuasiveness and power.” Traducianism and decrees are instanced as points at which broader and stronger modes of defence have been introduced, and the reviewer presents the series of substitutes for traducianism which have been devised. But he will hardly claim that scientific theology has been advanced by them when he closes the topic with this question: “And is it not much more probable that the Calvinistic teachers of this century and of succeeding centuries, instead of returning to this venerable yet embarrassing theory, will either cling to their later hypothesis, or perchance invent some other, or possibly rest at last upon the simple fact, as revealed alike in Scripture and in experience, confessing themselves unable to penetrate its unfathomable mysteries?” On the subject of decrees the conclusion to which Professor Morris comes shows that the advance made by modern theologians is in liberality of sentiment rather than clearer views of truth. He says: “While we all believe as heartily as he (Dr. Shedd) in the revealed fact of election, and still hold as firmly as ever the Calvinistic rather than the Arminian interpretation of this fact, we are not disposed to push the resulting doctrine out to its most rigorous extremes, or to urge it upon men in any exclusive form or temper.” And he gives as an accordant sentiment of Dr. A. A. Hodge the following:

"Many of us who are the staunchest Calvinists feel that the need of the hour is not to emphasize a fore-ordination which no clear, comprehensive thinker doubts, but to unite with our Arminian brethren in putting all emphasis and concentrating all attention on the vital fact of human freedom." The reviews of Professor Shedd's work bring to view other points on which the Presbyterians are unsettled and restless, but these may be better noticed in connection with the proposition to revise the creed.

A prominent member of the Methodist Church, in enumerating the causes for thanksgiving the present year, included the fact, that the Presbyterians seemed about to throw off the incubus of Calvinism. The discussions concerning the creed have disclosed an unexpected opposition to some of its teachings. Certain prominent pastors seem utterly horrified at the doctrine of reprobation. One would infer that they were surprised to find it among the Calvinistic doctrines. The privilege of preaching a free salvation, of teaching that whosoever will may come into the kingdom of God, is demanded emphatically by some, with the implication that the Westminster Confession does not permit it. The entire third chapter of the Confession "Of God's Eternal Decree," is offensive to many, and the third and fourth sections of chapter ten not less so. The assertion that elect infants and other elect persons are saved though not "outwardly called by the ministry of the word," has been violently assailed because of the natural inference therefrom that the non-elect are not saved. Professor Briggs says: "If we cannot tolerate in the Confession these doctrines of the damnation of the heathen and non-elect infants, now that none of us believe in them, there is

no other way than to blot out these sections altogether." He considers the Confession defective on the doctrines of the Trinity, the being of God, creation, on anthropology, on the work of the Holy Spirit, and on Christology, concerning which he says: "We are opening our minds to see that the Redeemer's work upon the cross was the beginning of a larger work in the realm of the dead, and from his heavenly throne whence the exalted Saviour is drawing all men unto himself."

With the question of a revision of the Presbyterian Confession may be noticed the recent work *Whither?* by Professor Charles A. Briggs, probably called forth by the agitations on this subject. We shall not attempt any criticism of the author, his Presbyterian brethren having undertaken that, but simply call attention to the topics which he suggests as deserving and calling for renewed consideration.

He thinks that Presbyterian and Congregational churches err in the neglect of the religious element. "They are at present marked by the present low views of the Church and its sacraments, and loose views and practices in public worship." He finds the doctrine of baptismal regeneration and the real presence of Christ at the Lord's table in the Westminster Standards as truly as in the Book of Common Prayer. On the real presence he is emphatic. "If there were any apprehension of the mystery and sanctity of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, the ministry and people would be more careful in preparing themselves and in inviting others." "I would rather partake of the Lord's supper with one who believed in the real presence of Christ, even though he were a Lu-

theran, than commune with one who denied the real presence, even though he were a Presbyterian." He calls upon Presbyterians to renounce the false, extra-confessional doctrines of the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures. The latter doctrine he considers peculiarly dangerous. Criticism has undermined the authority of the text both of the Old Testament and the New, has shown that the Psalter is the work of centuries, the books of wisdom occupied generations in their composition, and "the Pentateuch is composed of four parallel narratives with four codes of legislation." Inspiration of the Scriptures is not connected with their human authorship. Hence we cannot possibly establish the absolute correctness as to fact of every statement of the Scriptures, nor show that the words are the language of the Holy Ghost. The authority of the Scriptures must come from the Scriptures themselves. The evidence for them is divine evidence, the witness of the Spirit to each individual believer. This is the rock on which Christian evidences rest. One who apprehends Christ as made known in the Bible and finds God revealing himself in the sacred writings can believe in miracles and prophecy. They are just what he would expect in that state of things.

Professor Briggs sees in eschatology a theme of excited discussion in the coming time. He considers the prevalent opinion on this point crude and erroneous. The idea of a private judgment at death is wholly unfounded; the doctrine of the intermediate state is mostly undeveloped. Between death and the judgment the process of sanctification goes forward among the redeemed. The Bible should be carefully studied to discover the changes which

took place when Christ entered Hades and preached to the dead. Whether probation is granted in the next life depends on whether it is granted in this life. He thinks there is no probation in either, that those regenerated are regenerated in this world and that we must trust to the electing decree of God for the salvation of any. He thinks this a better foundation for a work of grace than the modern notion of probation. But he holds that the mass of mankind are embraced in the electing love of God.

If Professor Briggs apprehends rightly the signs of the times, we have already entered upon theological discussions that will largely revolutionize the Presbyterian Church. He will hardly be willing to rest till he sees American Presbyterian restored to the Westminster foundations, and the Westminster Symbols themselves purged of their unscriptural doctrines.

B. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

I. Treatises on Theology as a System.

The last year has not been prolific in comprehensive works on theology. The spirit of the time has turned attention to particular topics and given rise to hasty productions. Works that are as long in process of adjustment as the Children of Israel were in the wilderness,—works like those of Hodge, Smith and Shedd—appear only at long intervals. We have before us a survey of the broad field of theology, a hand-book of theology presenting a survey of a large portion of that field, and one volume which is a part of an extended treatise, to which we call attention.

*Christian Doctrine Harmonized*¹ is a most persistent effort to give a rational form to the doctrines of Christianity. Through two large octavo volumes of about 400 pages each, the author carries forward, step by step, his speculations in theology, with hardly a reference to the Scriptures except as he quotes here and there a sentence to show that they coincide with the views which he adopts. He says: "Dogmatics, in unifying its own content, must relate it so to all other truth, and so unify the whole, that no philosophic objection is possible. This self-coherence is the highest form of proof. The present author proposes so to treat dogmatic results as to show their harmony with all other known truth."² The idea that the test of truth is harmony, or a harmonizing force, pervades the book. "All truth is one. Every element of it illustrates and conditions every other. It is thus a rational system, and its inner harmony only can show it to be the absolute truth. This is the axiom of philosophy, which smiles at any attempt to gainsay it, and will go on in its unravelling and weaving career as long as the world endures."³

The starting point of philosophy he makes the ego—the mind as we are conscious of it, or in it, as a concrete entity. The thinking power is in relation to spirit and matter, it can not rid itself of the idea of either and accepts both. It also accepts the limitations under which it acts and the forces by which it is determined in its action. The mind desires and pursues, and so love and life are one.

¹ *Christian Doctrine Harmonized and its Rationality Vindicated*, By John Steinfort Kedney, D. D. Professor of Divinity in Seabury Divinity School. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1889. 2 Vols.

²I p. 2. ³I p. 160.

The mind must elaborate for itself a system of thought which shall hold in harmony the facts of human experience and the necessary ideas of the mind. In theological speculation three postulates are to be admitted. God, the first Principle, endowed with personality, the source of power; Man with the sense of responsibility, and with moral freedom; and sin.

The speculations of the author concerning the Trinity and other topics of theology are interesting and indicate much ingenuity of mind and persistence of thought, but these points we will pass, giving attention to his views of sin and the method of recovery from it.

The essence of sin he considers to be isolation from God, self-sufficiency, the attempt to make one's self an independent whole, a refusal to help in the realization of a perfect, harmonious universe. "It can not properly be called rebellion, unless there be a disputed dominion, which the rebellious spirit hopes to gain or to share. It may, indeed must, *become* a rebellion to keep itself from stagnation and barrenness of resources. It will, therefore, to enliven its own experience, seek fellowship and use power, and exert authority. But as long as it makes this activity and fellowship a need to itself, the rebellious one can still retreat, for this need implies the principle of good from which it thus far has not entirely freed itself. If convinced at length of its own impotence, it may either yield to the predisposition which it has repressed, or repel the same and retire upon its own spiritual independence, and have no need beyond itself. And then and thus does its evil become absolutely pure. It reigns thenceforward undisputed in its own realm, but this realm is only within

itself. Its choice of evil is thus deliberate and wilful, and it enters upon a career of perpetual shrinking of itself towards a point unattainable, *viz.*, cessation of being.”¹ We have quoted thus at length because the passage contains much of the author theologic philosophy. The process of shrinking towards a point not attainable when one gives himself over to pure evil is spoken of more at large in the second volume, where the condition of the incorrigibly wicked comes under discussion; and the expression “yield to the predispositions which it has repressed” points to his view of one method of recovery from sin. Man’s moral position being assumed by his own act, “while he has the desire and may have the will to make the right moral choice, his recovery from the force of adverse tendencies is still thinkable, and therefore possible. Instances of such recovery, so far as we can accurately judge from observation, have been frequent and numerous; instances of making choice of moral good from out the deepest abyss and heaviest ruin of moral evil.”²

The great question concerning evil is, is there a means of recovery from it, a means of expelling it from the universe, at least of repelling it from the range of human life. Humanity constitutes an organism, which is to be thought of as a member of a larger organism including God himself. But before the subordinate organism can fill its place and attain its full development, there is a contradiction to be removed. “Moral evil must be extirpated from it, in which case only can physical evil disappear, and the material universe be made correspondent.”³ The author finds in

¹I. p. 139.²I p. 32.³I p. 112

human experience an intimation of recovery from evil. Obedience to law produces happiness, violation of law brings suffering. "Thus the Divine love is seen to be so perfect as not to be indulgent, but severe to whatever is alien to itself. And besides, a close observation of human experience shows that to the morally obedient the suffering that comes from heredity and environment becomes remedial, purifying, and a means for spiritual strength. Such facts as these indicate that human obedience and moral recovery are in the Divine mind and heart, and render probable that the task of rectifying humanity has been undertaken." * * * Influences from the unseen and unknown must have come to it [human freedom], illuminating motives and supplying and strengthening the motive-spring. In this is the philosophic, or even the scientific vindication of a doctrine of grace.¹

How is this recovery of which nature gives a kind of promise to be realized? Man can keep the law, while subject to temptation, can obey and thus acquire a high, noble moral character, but can he go beyond this? Can he come into closer relations to the First Principle so that there shall be a coalescence between the Divine and the human? If the perfect idea of humanity is to be attained man must sustain a *filial* not a *legal* relation toward God. His *nature* must be assimilated to the Divine *nature*. The exhaustless depths of the latter must be opened to him. This is virtual *apotheosis*. Can this be secured in the mere course of nature, by development of the human? Even the progress in human elevation through obedience to law has been secured by external and changing influences, and "if

¹Pp. 1118, 119.

new depths of the Divine being are to be opened, if God and man are to be still further assimilated, it must be by a new condescension on God's part, bringing himself within the compass of man's actual and, thus far, limited faculties."¹ If this assimilation of man's nature to God's is to become a fact, and men are to become sons of God, the Eternal Son must become human and exhibit the pattern of eternal Sonship. "In accomplishing this incarnation, the Holy Spirit, as the life-principle of the universe, must be efficient." If the incarnation is to become effective in transforming humanity God must be one with the human race in its essential idea. "The Eternal Son must come through the whole sphere of human development. He must be born, be a child, grow physically, mentally, morally, religiously, and, since the contradiction has entered the world, must die and be raised again."² If Christ is thus incarnate and dies on the cross, a moral influence is brought to bear upon man which cannot be exceeded. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." In the incarnation is necessary, so the author holds, a *kenosis*. Only as we rightly appreciate this shall we properly appreciate redemptive work. Creation is a self-limitation of God, the creation of man with freedom of action and power to introduce a contradiction into the system of things, is a still more marked self-limitation. "The purpose of the creation is the production that can feel and respond to Divine love." Love is therefore the motive of God's self-limitation. When the self-limitation [puts on the form necessary for the redemption, for setting aside sin, the contradictions in the

¹I. p. 152.

²I. p. 163.

universe, it becomes sacrifice. This we see in the suffering and dying Christ.

Christ's growth in mental and moral power affected his physical nature and was redemptive. He was regenerated progressively through life. This explains his transfiguration. From him sanctified there goes forth a force which permeates humanity and transforms it. "The new and regenerated humanity may be regarded as summed up in its solitary and unique specimen, Jesus Christ, from whose side issues the Church, the bride, the extension of himself, and the propagation from himself."¹ This is but a meager sketch of a carefully wrought scheme of theological speculation. The course of thought is recondite and will be followed to its close by very few readers. It is, however, suggestive and indicates profound reflection upon topics of highest human interest. The ordinary Christian will think that it savors more of human wisdom than of simple faith, and it must be confessed that it cannot claim a very full reproduction in *Current Discussions*, for, however interested some minds may be in the abstruse meditations of the author, the work can never become one familiarly known to the public.

Nitzsch, *Evangelische Dogmatik*.² This work is one of a series of theological manuals published by Mohr. The aim of the work is to give the reader a knowledge of the present state of dogmatic theology. We have here the first volume, with the promise that the second shall follow as soon as

¹I. p. 329.

²*Lehrbuch der Evangelischen Dogmatik* von Dr. Friedrich Aug. Berth. Nitzsch. Ord. Professor der Theologie in Kiel. Erste Hälfte Freiburg i. B. 1889 J. C. B. Mohr.

possible. The author's purpose is to treat his subject in a way to give prominence to topics of special interest, not in accordance with scientific proportions.

The speculative tendency of theological thinkers in Germany is obvious from the fact that one-half of the present volume is given to a consideration of the origin and essence of religion, mainly to a presentation of different views of the subject. The greater part of the second half of the book is devoted to the doctrine of revelation—a statement of the elements of the doctrine, a history of the criticisms to which the doctrine has been subjected, and a reply to the criticisms. Theological students in this country would hardly select a manual of which one-half was taken up with religions in general and Christian apologetics. The work contains nothing of special interest for American readers except that it presents a clear view of the position of the more evangelical theologians of Germany. The author holds that the Scriptures are the norm of evangelical doctrine and that no criticism can deprive them of this dignity. He accepts the fact of miracles but seems anxious to hold that they, in some way, belong to the original plan of creation and are in accord with natural law. He speaks in terms of commendation of Rothe's view of revelation, which makes it consist of manifestation and inspiration,—God's manifestation of himself and an inspiration of man that enables him to discern the revelation. He maintains that the Christian religion is not revealed metaphysics or revealed ethics, yet that it implies metaphysical conditions and a moral state of the will. He makes conscience the complex of one's involuntary moral consciousness which reacts against conduct at war with one's ruling moral ideal,

He defines Christianity thus: "Christianity is that ethical monotheistic and universal religion in which participation in the kingdom of God, developed by Jesus of Nazareth, including divine sonship and love together with eternal divine life, is made the highest good and a saving good." His remarks upon natural religion are worthy of notice. "Christianity is, notwithstanding its universality, a special and definite religion. There is no so-called natural religion. What is named such is no religion at all, but a combination of popular philosophical phrases, and it is very questionable whether this is wholly free from myth. One seeks to reject what is peculiar to each religion and set up the remainder as the content of natural religion. But there never existed such a natural religion. There is no actual religion which belongs to all men as such."¹ The need of a religion is universal, but one should not confound this with its satisfaction, the vessel with its definite content.

A. Gretillat, *Théologie Systématique*.² This volume is the second published of the extensive work of Professor Gretillat, but is to be the third in the complete work; the second and fourth volumes are to be published as they are prepared. Professor R. A. Lipsius speaks of the production as in accord with modern orthodoxy, but it can hardly be the orthodoxy of this country. The sentiments, however, which are at variance with our current theology are not new and now occupy a pretty well defined position among us, while the work as a whole is acute, instructive

¹p. 104.

²*Exposé de théologie systématique. Tome Troisième. Dogmatique. I Théologie Spéciale, Cosmologie. Neuchatel. Attinger Frères, 1888.*

and serious. Though the author rejects decisively the idea that there is no relation between theology and metaphysics, he relies upon the Scriptures to a remarkable degree to support the positions which he adopts. The volume before us consists of two parts: a treatise on theology proper,—the doctrine concerning God, and Cosmology.

The point which will attract most interest with us in the first part is his view of the Trinity. He holds to the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead, and to the consubstantiality of the persons, but teaches the subordination of the Son and the Spirit. He considers that the unanimous and universal consent of the Church to a hierarchy in the designation of the Father, Son, and Spirit as first, second, third, implies also a subordination, if only nominal, of the second and third to the first.¹ But he holds to a subordination more than nominal. He finds a subordination of essence in the consubstantiality in John v:26, “As the Father hath life in himself: so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.” Here is ascribed, the author believes, aseity to the Son, which is yet given by the Father. This is a contradiction which mathematics rejects, but which perfect love has eternally solved. The Son eternally receives from the Father spontaneous existence.² He infers also a subordination of the Son in operation, in the expression, “the Word was with God,” *i. e.* unto God. This is interpreted as meaning, the second person acts with reference to the first.³ The words in Phil. v:6–7, “Who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation,” he interprets thus: “He did not regard it

¹p. 200.

²p. 201.

³p. 205.

as a good to be taken by force, to raise himself still higher, to an equality with God, by refusing to obey the decree which designated him as the mediator in the salvation of men, but he humbled himself, etc.”¹ He considers that the Spirit is subordinate to the Father in essence, as the Son is, and subordinate to both the Father and the Son in operation.²

Under Cosmology the author treats of creation and providence. The creative act is first considered, the account given in Genesis being accepted as historic. The product of the creative act—matter, angels, men—is then taken up, and to this is attached a subsidiary section on sin. Sin is considered under the two heads, demonology, and the fall of man. Providence is treated as including the preservation and the control of the world. The control of the world is such that miracles and the permission of sin have their place as possible and actual. The discussion of these topics is fresh, and often keenly intellectual while not very thoroughly argumentative. The author states his views boldly, sometimes without much attempt at explanation. We shall not attempt to give his course of thought but simply refer to a few points which illustrate the character of his speculations. One of the offices of matter he sets forth thus: It is the neutral medium in which actions and reactions, put forth and received in turn by finite spirits, gather themselves up and objectify themselves for a time sufficient to permit the object of the action to deliberate on the reception he shall give to the external movement, and to permit the subject to refrain from passing at once and wholly

¹P. 204.²P. 205.

into the effects of his action.¹ He adopts the scheme of trichotomy—body, soul and spirit, and attributes a reality and importance to the material substance as well as to the spiritual. This estimate of matter he supposes to be supported by the doctrine of the resurrection and the restoration of nature. He denies that the Scriptures ever set the two principles, matter and spirit, in opposition to each other as hostile and not reducible, the one to the other. In the Scripture view the susceptibility and unity in the two substances prevails over their incompatibilities. “The doctrines of the incarnation and of the resurrection of Christ himself, and of his redeemed, attest, in opposition to the two principles of dualism and of idealism, that the Scripture is at once spiritualistic and realistic.”²

The author infers from the narrative of the fall of man that there is an author of evil superior to nature and to man, but absolutely dependent upon God and amenable to his tribunal. The fall of the devil he does not find affirmed in the Bible, but clearly implied. It is proved from John viii: 44, “He abode not in the truth.”³ The existence of beings superior to humanity, devoted to evil, he thinks fairly inferrible from Gen. ii:15, where Adam is enjoined to *keep* the garden. The decisive proof, however, that the diabolic state is due to a voluntary determination is the divine judgment concerning it. The diabolic state is one of unmitigated wickedness. While men commit sin for the sake of an incidental good, in the diabolic state evil is the foundation and essence of its being, as a lie is the appropriate expression of its thought. A demon has

¹P. 432.

²Pp. 428-429.

³P. 523.

no participation in the good, but his simple existence is an opposition to the truth and a revolt against God.¹ His absolute subjection to evil is followed by successive degradations. In the Old Testament times Satan found a place amid the faithful angels and entered into their deliberations, as Judas was among the disciples, but Christ saw him, when he was on earth, fall like lightning from heaven. Since that time he is the prince of this world. Hereafter, at the appointed time, he will be cast into the abyss and confined apart from all that is good. There his existence will be life in death, and death in life, a life re-born without cessation that it may be consumed without cessation.

The author holds that man succeeded Satan in the inheritance of this world, so that Satan's lie in the temptation of Jesus, when he said the kingdoms of the world were given to him, was in his neglecting to say, that he had forfeited his right to them. Satan resolved from the first to recover his possession, and thought the surest way to effect this result was to draw man into an alliance with himself, and make him a partaker of his own fall. He succeeded partially in this endeavor. Some of the race are to be banished to the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, Matt. xxv: 41.² The fall of man is accepted, in this volume, as occurring precisely in accord with the narrative in Genesis. The story has the air of a historic reality and is accepted as such in the New Testament. Temptation came upon man from three sources, *the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life*. The fall was a

¹P. 530.²P. 537.

conscious and voluntary transgression of God's command. There was no necessity in the case, the transgression was preceded by deliberation and followed upon the presentation of definite motives. The consequences of the fall of man were a sentence of utter and irrevocable ruin upon the tempter; chastisements for the victims of the temptation, not as satisfaction to justice, but dictated by mercy and convertible into blessings.¹ The sentence upon man was death, involving spiritual death and the death of the body, but not eternal death, as the old Protestant theology has affirmed. The threatened punishment was simply physical death, but the immediate consequence was spiritual death. Eternal death was only a menace, the second death incurred by a prolongation of the moral death in this world. Physical death, however, may be made the chief of blessings, for it is the condition, for man, refused to the first rebels of the universe, of the promised redemption and of immortality acquired anew. The refusal of death after the fall would be a greater crime than the disregard of the menace of death before the fall.² Physical death is the curse entailed upon the race as a whole, and has no connection as a result with particular personal transgression. When one dies before conscious voluntary sin his death answers all the demands of justice, he needs no further vindication before the law.

What is to be the outcome of actual and conscious sin the author does not know. This, he says, is the absolutely insoluble part of the problem of sin in humanity. Still he knows that all the guilty have need of salvation and can be

¹P. 561.²Pp. 561. 569. 572.

saved only by grace. On the other hand, he holds that subjection to the wrath of God because of transgression is not irreparable and eternal, for there is only one sin irremissible in this world and the next, that is, voluntary rejecting of the grace of God in Christ.

The mistake of the old orthodoxy was, so our author thinks, in disregarding the differences in the various imputations of sin. It made eternal damnation the penalty alike for the hardened transgressor, for the occasional sinner, and for one dying in infancy. The fact that the gospel has survived such a doctrine, of which the Scriptures and Paul are innocent, is evidence of the indestructible vitality of the gospel.

The author's views of Soteriology and Eschatology are to be presented in a volume now in the course of preparation.

The Kingdom of God. Bruce.¹ Former works of Professor Bruce have been noticed in *Current Discussions*. The present volume does not require special attention. Indeed, it is one of the books that cannot be easily compressed; its value is in the remarks scattered through its pages, rather than in its structure or main idea. What are the religious ideas that Christ has imparted to the world? This volume attempts to reproduce and classify them as the first three Gospels bring them before us. The topic has relations to the entire range of theology, but we shall simply cull a few of the more prominent thoughts.

The kingdom of God which Jesus preached, our author

¹*The Kingdom of God, or Christ's teachings according to the Synoptical Gospels.* By Alexander Balmain Bruce D. D. Scribner & Welford: New York, 1889.

holds, was an ideal kingdom, spiritual in its nature, yet a kingdom for this world, open to all, the citizens of which were to be holy as well as prosperous and happy. Jesus used the expression kingdom of Heaven frequently to elevate the minds of his hearers above the range of ordinary Jewish thought, but did not intend to intimate that its realization was not to be in this world. The people did not sympathize with his exalted views; when he rejects a leadership in political independence, "The multitude melts away; and the eyes of Jesus are opened. It is all over with the dream of a theocratic kingdom of Israel, with himself for its king. What awaits him, he now sees, is not a throne, but a *cross*."¹

Professor Bruce's view of the Church as the realization of the kingdom of God, and his view of the wisdom of Christ in adopting it as the means of establishing the kingdom, will excite some surprise. Referring to Peter's confession and Christ's promise to build his Church, Professor Bruce says: "Jesus then gave utterance to three great truths; first, that the Church to be founded was to be *Christian*, or, to put it otherwise, that the person of the founder was of fundamental importance; second, that as such it should be practically identical with the kingdom of God he had hitherto preached; third, that in this Church the righteousness of the kingdom should find its home."² Farther on the author expresses the hope that the Church may never become "utterly savourless," but adds, "Should this hope be disappointed, then the visible Church, as we know it, must and will pass away, leaving the Spirit of

¹I. p. 61.²P. 262.

Christ free room to make a new experiment, under happier auspices, at self-realization. To be enthusiastic about the Church in its present condition is impossible; to hope for its future is not impossible; but if it were, there is no cause for despair. Christ will ever remain the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; the kingdom of God will remain a kingdom that cannot be moved."¹ He also says: "I am even disposed to think that a great and steadily increasing portion of the moral worth of society lies outside the Church, separated from it not by godlessness, but rather by exceptionally intense moral earnestness. Many in fact, have left the Church in order to be Christians."²

The author holds, that Christ revealed God specially as a Father, and that he saw in men qualities which respond in some degree to paternal good-will. While he was not Pelagian he was not scholastic. He did not look upon man as dead. "He saw in the sinful some spark of vitality, some latent affinity for good, an imprisoned spirit longing to be free, a true self victimized by satanic agency, that would fain escape from thrall. On this better element he ever kept his eye; his constant effort was to get into contact with it, and he refused to despair of success."³

Jesus' idea of the Messiah was derived from the Old Testament, so our author supposes, especially from Isaiah. He would see in the one holding that office especially the Servant of Jehovah; he was to conquer by the power of love and truth; he must meet the deepest want of man, not simply the desire of the Jews; he must be a man of faith, patience, hope, sympathy. Jesus from the first be-

¹P. 272.²P. 144.³P. 134.

lieved himself to be the Messiah. He must have felt himself called to that office by the Father. He in effect proclaimed himself the Messiah by the representations which he made of himself. He assumed to be the Revealer of the Father, the Judge of the world, the Saviour of the world, to be entitled to perfect allegiance on the part of his followers.

The author attributes so much to man's power and disposition, separating the divine activity to such an extent from man's salvation, making election, for example, a call to eminent usefulness, not to salvation, that one is not prepared to see so much attributed to the death of Christ; but on this point strict orthodoxy will hardly demur to his statements. He sees in Christ's death the ransom of the sinner, the source of a new life, the ground of the highest blessings, an offering for sin, the ground of the remission of sin and the means of reconciliation with God.

We have space here to indicate merely the drift of the book; it is the result of long study and repays perusal page by page.

2. *Theological Criticism.*

This topic might include review articles and pamphlets and book notices without end, but we simply call attention to three works, characteristic of the time, instructive because of their content, and critical rather than constructive in their aim. The works are not similar except in this, that they are estimates of theology rather than presentations of theology,

Kant, Lotze, and Ritschl. Stählin.¹ This work was written with the main purpose of subjecting the theology of Ritschl to a thorough criticism. We shall notice simply this portion of the book. This theology still excites interest and wins followers. It is the only scheme of divinity produced of late years which bears the name of its author. Parts of it have been discussed but the whole system had not, so far as we know, been weighed in a balance, till the work before us appeared. The opponents of Ritschl have commonly objected to his system because it does not recognize the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity; it has no place for original sin, for total depravity, for condemnation of those in sin, for expiation and substitution; but we have in Stählin an estimate of the positive contents of the system. He takes up its two fundamental principles and shows that in itself it is self-contradictory and absurd. He points out the inevitable result of restricting knowledge to phenomena, and of separating religious knowledge from a knowledge of the world. It is this theory of knowledge which distinguishes the scheme of Ritschl from that of the Church. Even in this his critic considers him inconsistent with himself, and to be really a follower of Kant while he supposes himself to be a follower of Lotze. He adopts as a fundamental principle the view that "we know things in their phenomena." This distinguishes things from phenomena, and if they are not *in* the phenomena where and what are they? Ritschl says the thing in itself is a merely formal conception. But he

¹*Kant, Lotze, and Ritschl.* A Critical Examination by Leonhard Stählin. Translated by D. W. Simon, Ph. D., Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark. 1889.

teaches that phenomena are a mere illusion unless a thing in itself appears in them. If, then, the thing in itself is a formal conception simply, the world of phenomena becomes the shadow of a shadow. "The reality of phenomena can no longer be maintained when once the thing itself as distinguished from phenomenon is declared to be a purely formal concept."¹ If the mind itself combines phenomena and they have no unity without the mind, then the thing exists only for us and has no objective being. "Ritschl's theory of cognition thus *ipso facto* disappears. *Phenomenon has no existence: the things given in perception as unities of phenomena have no existence. Things in themselves, too, are empty shadows; they are simply memory-images used perversely—memory-images, moreover, of actualities which themselves have no existence, save that of phenomena of consciousness.*"² The critic shows that Ritschl, carrying out his speculations on the basis of his theory of knowledge, falls into inextricable confusion. The heading of one of his sections is: "Limitation of knowledge to phenomena involves the elimination from theology of all claim to know the objects of the Christian faith as they are in themselves."³ When this theory of knowledge is applied to God, it destroys, so the critic shows, the very idea of God, it denies that God is love,—“God is love,” is a favorite text with Ritschl,—it destroys the personality of God, it makes God simply God for us, a creation of our own minds, it denies that God is the Absolute, which is to deny him deity.

Ritschl's theory of cognition is similarly destructive of our knowledge of Christ. It does not permit us to recog-

¹P. 176.²P. 181.³P. 186.

nize "the pre-existence of Christ in the sense of his eternal deity." When he ascribes eternal existence to Christ, it is only as an object of will, the object of God's eternal love to be manifested in time. "Prior to his human birth, Christ was as far from having real existence as was the church before it was founded."¹ The theology under review has no expiatory sacrifice, no satisfactory doctrine of substitution. The sufferings of Christ simply testified to his own faithfulness in the work to which he was appointed; they were an accidental accompaniment of his discharge of his office. Christ's relation to God was therefore simply harmony of will,—a moral unity. The kingdom of God on earth is established by bringing men into this same harmony and unity. "By initiating his adherents into the like relation to God and the world, he established the community of the kingdom of God, and thus his church expresses the two-fold significance attaching to him as the perfect revelation of God, and as the archetype of spiritual domination over the world, by conferring on him the predicate deity."² In accordance with such a scheme atonement and justification are merely subjective operations of the individual soul. Revelation itself, also, is merely a disclosure of the mind to itself.

Stahlin finds Ritschl's view of the separation of religious knowledge from the knowledge of the world as much at war with a system of theology as his theory of our cognition of things in themselves. Man is hemmed in by nature, to a great extent governed by it, yet as spirit rises above nature and domineers over it to live in the

¹P. 207.²P. 218.

spirit, war against the world is man's aim and proper destiny. To achieve this result he gives himself over to religion—faith in God—as his support and helper. But he cannot find this religion as a new element outside himself. Man is by nature religious or he can have no religion; religion cannot be apprehended as something apart from nature; man is not at once a part of nature and independent of it. When man strives to attain a position independent of the world he seeks not a good but a position directed by self, that is, he strives to satisfy his own eudæmonistic desires—an impulse at the basis of neither morality nor religion. “The explanation of religion, therefore, which was to establish it on a firm basis lands us at last in the denial of religion.”¹ The same result is reached from another position assumed by Ritschl. He says: “All forms of religious knowledge are direct value-judgments.” This must mean the thing known is of so much value or import to us. Let the judgment be: deity is to be ascribed to Christ: The true interpretation of that language is: such is the value which the Church sets on Christ. The attribute is not held as inhering in him, is no objective characteristic, but is simply the view we adopt concerning him. “The separation of religious from theoretical knowledge lands us accordingly in the same conclusion as that in which the limitation of knowledge to the phenomenal landed us, namely, *religious nihilism*. Ritschl's theory of cognition involves in the last resort the resolution of the objects of knowledge into unreal seeming. This same theory, with the two methodological principles deduced from

¹P. 250.

it, namely, the limitation of knowledge to phenomena, and the separation of religious from theoretical knowledge, applied to theology, leads logically to the dissolution of theology and religion alike into illusion and phantasmagoria."¹

*Undogmatisches Christenthum*² is a work which has excited some interest in Germany. Its object is to combat the error that Christianity consists in doctrine, to show that it is a matter of sentiment and may be maintained against all scientific objections. Its ruling idea is indicated by the following: "Where only a sigh of prayer rises from the bottom of the heart, or where one has a single time, purely for God's sake, made an offering, though no one else is aware of it, there the holy fire of religion is kindled, which all the systems of the theologians can only investigate and describe, but cannot sustain, cannot even kindle—that holy fire which eradicates sin and purifies the mortal being of man for immortality."³ The author holds that law prevails throughout nature in such a way that an intelligent man cannot believe in a miracle; that the orthodox idea of inspiration must be renounced, and teaches that any revelation we may have is a revelation of God, not a revelation of truth; that men need God, not knowledge concerning him. He says: "Does any one ask what we desire; it is this: entire freedom of investigation, unconditioned right of criticism in opposition even to the doctrines of the Church, the unrestrained privilege of acting according to one's own im-

¹P. 276.

²*Undogmatisches Christenthum*. Von Otto Dreyer, Dr. theol. Superintendent in Gotha. Braunschweig, 1888.

³P. 10.

pulses, not the impulses of another, and by the side of this, inseparably bound with it, full satisfaction of the need of genuinely religious authority."¹ After describing the religious man he says: "In such religious men religion abides, not in doctrines and knowledge, not in habits and practices, but in the innermost heart of the personality itself."² The author finds the contradiction between freedom and authority solved in personality, and here we find the possibility of religion; but it must be a personality which is sustained by communion with God—inspired.

"In the light of truth only the personality rooted in God and which flows immediately from it exists as religious."³ "The ultimate religious impulse can only be satisfied when knowledge comes to this point (*Durchbruch*) that God reveals himself to man in the man fully made one with God."⁴ This impulse in Christ was fully satisfied and he became our trusted leader, our perfect guide. "The need of authority in the pious soul is fully satisfied through faith in Christ."⁵ We have a trustworthy knowledge of Christ given in the Bible, though much concerning him must be rejected as mythical. The author's conviction of the worthlessness of the current orthodoxy and of the value of an undogmatic Christianity may be inferred from the following: "Honor to the young men who draw back from service in the sanctuary because they cannot discharge it with truthfulness! But greater honor to those who, because they are conscious of being in the presence of God, of standing in the eternal centre of Christian faith, do not avoid heavy work in the promotion of

¹P. 42.

²P. 69.

³P. 70.

⁴P. 77.

⁵P. 86.

its temporal, external forms, and who, possessed of the love of Christ, and filled with the spirit of the Reformers, are determined to accept all the consequences of bearing witness with unconditioned fidelity! On them rests the hope of our future.”¹

*Unitarianism; its Origin and History.*² This work consists of sixteen lectures by fourteen different authors. It is a very entertaining and instructive presentation of the present state of Unitarianism, for this is the summing up of the treatment of its origin and history. The protest of early Unitarianism against orthodoxy and the subsequent revolution within the denomination itself is a development in New England history worthy of careful study. The original movement maintained, in contrast with the orthodoxy of the time, so its advocates affirm, the substantial integrity and sanity of human nature. Man is looked upon as imperfect, sinful, but not a ruin. The philosophy of the system “assumes that not matter but spirit is the basis and background of the universe; that spirit is not the product of matter, but that matter is the manifestation of spirit.”³ The outcome of the development of spirit is love. This appears dimly in animal life, but in human life rises to devotion and self-sacrifice. The suffering of the world is not an accident, it is an evil but serves a higher good. This is manifested in the lower forms of existence, appears conspicuously in the self-sacri-

¹P. 52.

²*Unitarianism; its Origin and History.* A course of sixteen lectures delivered in Channing Hall, Boston. Boston American Unitarian Association. 1890.

³P. 343.

fice with which man serves his fellow-men, and reaches its culmination in the life of Jesus.

This was considered a rational philosophy and the basis of a rational religion. For a time it satisfied and delighted its votaries. "So delightful was the sense of the privilege of exercising reason on what had hitherto been forbidden fruit, such a fresh and unwonted sensation did it communicate, that no wonder it drew so many able men to embrace the profession of the ministry. The moral argument against Calvinism—what a glory in heroically calling (and it was heroism then) right, right, and cruelty, cruelty and tyranny, tyranny, in their own intrinsic nature! The contradictions and absurdities of the received doctrine of the Trinity—what a fine intellectual invigoration in subjecting these to the canons of a rational logic!"¹

But the animation produced in enthusiastic young minds by a religion of these dimensions could not last long. And nothing was more stale and flat than the pure Unitarianism of New England finally became. "We are good and let us be good" is a feeble gospel for fallen humanity. Channing himself expressed his disappointment over the result of the movement to which he had given his energies and his eloquence. Tiffany says in one of the lectures before us: "I beg everybody's pardon, but one more generation of the like, and Unitarianism would have degenerated into a simple gospel for the Philistines."² It was saved from death and decay by the infusion of new life at the hands of such men as Ralph Waldo Emerson and Theodore Parker. The works of these men were as alien to Unitarianism as to

¹P. 205. ²P. 207.

orthodoxy. They were stoutly opposed by such men as Professor Andrews Norton, but the denomination was in no condition to carry on a contest with the rising Transcendentalism, and finally yielded to and accepted its influence. The first period of Unitarianism closed, it is said, with Channing who died in 1842. Four years prior to that date Emerson delivered his Harvard address, which called out the vigorous protests of his former associates and signaled his separation from the religious fellowship of the Christian community.

Transcendentalism is described as the power to recognize the noble, the divine in life. This it insists upon: you must see with your own eyes the beauty and the glory. This principle it made co-terminous with the universe. To this movement Unitarianism owes its present vitality. "Transcendentalism melted quite thoroughly the crust that was beginning to form on the somewhat chilly current of liberal theology. Indeed, it is the great felicity of free religious thought in this country, in its later unfolding, that it had its birth in a sentiment so poetic, so generous, so devout, so open to all the humanities as well as to the widest sympathies of philosophy and the higher literature."¹

It is amusing to notice, that a liberal theology may not be liberal enough, that everyone who takes a stand finds that someone beyond him does not believe in *standing* anywhere. Mr. Salter, speaking of a National Conference of Unitarians, says: it "had the alternative distinctly before it, formally to avow those broader principles or to confess

¹P. 219.

“the Lord Jesus Christ ;” and it chose the later. Unitarianism thereby ranged itself among the Christian denominations—the freest indeed of them all, and allowing many varieties of belief, but all within the fundamental Christian limitations—and closed the door which was opening out on the religion of the future.”¹

3. *Apologetics.*

Under this head we call attention to two works, the first a work of special value: *Supernatural Revelation*.² C. M. Mead, D. D. This work of Professor Mead, consisting of lectures on the L. P. Stone foundation, delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary, is written with the purpose of showing that we have a revelation from God, and that it is confirmed as coming from Him by supernatural evidences. It is a treatise on the old subject of Christian Apologetics, and treats of the old evidences of Christianity as they have been known and trusted for centuries. The author is not ambitious to present new proofs of a revelation which has been the support of the Christian Church for fifty generations; but he does aim to rescue the old evidences from the doubts which have been thrown about them in modern times. In this attempt he has shown much learning and skill. He has followed through with patience the argumen-

¹*Ethical Religion*, p. 267.

²*Supernatural Revelation: An Essay concerning the Basis of the Christian Faith.* By C. M. Mead, Ph. D., D. D. Lately Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, New York. Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1889.

tations of rationalizing Christians, the subtle speculations of scientists, the dissertations of psychologists and philosophers, and has carried their reasonings forward into the realms of morals and religion, and has shown how inadequate their conclusions often are to explain some of the clearest facts of human life. While he accepts the products of modern research in history, in the investigations of nature, and in literary criticism, he shows that these work no changes in the substance of our religion or the validity of the evidence on which it rests. Whatever modification of former views concerning inspiration or the authority of the Scriptures he may embrace, these rise not from any validity of modern skepticism, but from a more cautious estimate of revelation and its evidences than that of some earlier defenders of the faith.

The author begins with remarks upon the nature of knowledge and attempts to show that God may be properly considered an object of our cognition. He says: "Sure knowledge is the product of the combination and comparison of individual cognitions."¹ "With regard, for example, to the reality of an outward world, everyone *seems* to have a direct perception of it. But this impression *may* be a mistaken one. One may be deluded by a purely subjective affection of his own nerves. If, however, he finds that everybody else has a similar impression, he sees that his experience is not to be explained as a delusion."² "All knowledge is thus seen to be a composite thing. It is made up of two elements: (1) the direct, immediate perception or impression which

¹P. 16. ²P. 17.

the individual has; and (2) the ratification and education of that impression by the general community of individuals." If either of these elements is wanting there is no assured knowledge. If the first is wanting the second must be also wanting. If the second should seem to exist as a concurrent testimony of mankind, it still would be a mere rumor, would have no force without the first. This holds true in reference to our knowledge of God. "Testimony concerning a Divine Being cannot be taken as an ultimate and adequate proof of the fact that there is such a Being. The faith in God may be, and is, a communicated faith; but we cannot reasonably rest our faith on testimony alone. There must be some more original and conclusive evidence of the divine existence than is found in the mere prevalence of the belief. If theism is founded in fact, then somewhere—either now and always, or at certain special times—there must have been a direct knowledge, an evidence, concerning the Deity, which serves as the foundation of the testimony and gives it its value." Can we find any such basis for the theistic belief? Can an individual perception or impression be pointed to as the basis, and can confirmatory experiences be adduced? The author admits that the perception of God is not analogous to the perception of the external world, rejects the idea that a knowledge of self is also a knowledge of God, or implies a knowledge of God, but holds that theism is a belief springing from the direct operation of the individual mind. We cannot, indeed, find when or how the first idea of God entered the human mind, for the possessor of that individual mind is gone, and we have the idea communicated to us before it can be developed within ourselves. Yet we

know what now defends the idea against assaults, and we may believe, what *protects* the idea would produce it. If this accounts for the origin of the idea, it excludes dreams and superstitious imaginings as well as intuition as the source of our idea of God. What is it, then, which maintains among men the idea of the divine existence? Let theism and atheism enter into conflict and theism only gives a meaning to the world and to life, while it impels us to go beyond any import which we can comprehend to believe in personal power which has a purpose accomplished in the entire process of the moral world. Of this power we may say that we cannot help believing in its existence; and this is about as far as we can go in knowledge of any kind. This belief, though it falls short of demonstration, would probably sustain the conviction that God exists. But we may confirm this belief by additional testimony, that is, by revelation.

As a factor in theistic belief revelation is evidence at first hand. "It is like the personal appearance of a man about whom we have heretofore known only by conjecture or hearsay. It is evidence in addition to that which is found in those innate tendencies which incline men to adopt theistic conceptions."¹ It is true that revelation will be at once rejected by the atheist, unbelief concerning God would carry with it disbelief in revelation. "But given a general disposition to believe in a Divine Being, given a general desire to be assured of the reality and of the character of a God already believed in, or at least conjectured—then a revelation will be effective and lasting

¹P. 58.

in its tendency to establish men in the sure conviction that there is indeed a God. The revelation when accepted as such, furnishes a ground of certainty concerning the Divine Being which exceeds and in a sense supersedes the belief which may have existed before.”¹ When Christ’s disciples came to believe in their Master, then they could accept his faith in God and make it their own. “Because *he* believed in God, because he claimed to have come from God and to have revealed the gracious purposes of God, therefore they could not but believe in God.”² The result in such a case does not depend on the genuineness of the revelation but on the belief in it. Any accepted revelation would have the same effect. It may of course be objected that there are many revelations and we cannot from this source acquire any trustworthy confirmation of our belief in God; but it may be replied, either that all revelations contain truth, being derived from primeval revelation; or that there is one which is genuine, perhaps more than one which we can distinguish from those that are spurious.

The author is inclined to hold to a primeval revelation. He says: “Analogy, we conclude, favors rather than otherwise, the theory of a primeval revelation.”³ He thinks it not best to be overawed by the assertion, that it is unphilosophical to entertain such a belief; and adds, that if it is easy to disprove such a supposition, the disproof has not yet been given to the world. He, however, gives his attention mainly to the evidences of the supernatural origin of Christianity, confining his thoughts

¹P. 59.²P. 60.³P. 78.

mainly to the external evidences, the *form* in which Christianity presents itself. He defends the old view of Christian evidences, what might be called the common-sense view, accepting the evidences as the mind naturally and spontaneously accepts them, as the Bible authors supposed they would be accepted.

About one-third of the book is devoted to the consideration of miracles. We shall not follow him through his elaborate treatise on this topic; it will be sufficient to notice a few salient points after remarking that he pursues those who reject miracles and those who tamper with them through all their winding, and patiently, clearly and convincingly answers their objections and exposes their faulty logic. In this part of the book he cites more than a hundred different authors, bringing under review opinions both new and old.

His definition of a miracle is broader than is sometimes given. "In general miracles are to be defined as events produced by special, extraordinary, divine agency, as distinguished from the ordinary agencies of inanimate and animate nature."¹ He rejects the idea that they are violations of nature, holds them to be independent of natural law, and therefore not to be described by their harmony with, or opposition to law. And whether they are the product of supernatural force, one is to decide by his judgment, not by his senses. He rejects all these explanations which refer miracles to occult laws in nature—the Strasburg clock theory, as he terms it—and accepts nothing as a miracle except that which is wrought by

¹P. 97.

the immediate intervention of divine power. He holds that no extraordinary evidence is required to convince one who accepts the being of God and the probability of revelation, of the fact of miracles, and cites the resurrection of Christ as a miracle firmly established. He thinks that those Christians who accept miracles with difficulty yet claim to have special admiration of the character of Christ stultify themselves. "He who admits the sinlessness of Christ, unless he does so blindly, because others have done it before, can find no justifying reason for his belief; unless he assumes, together with the sinlessness, a uniqueness of nature or of relation which involves all the essential works of a miracle. When, therefore, one is troubled by the allegations of particular miracles wrought by Christ, but is ready to admit Christ himself to be the one sinless individual of the race, and the one man especially commissioned by God to communicate the divine counsels to man, we can only call this a conspicuous example of straining *out* a gnat and swallowing a camel."¹

Professor Mead holds to the view of inspiration ordinarily entertained in this country,—an inspiration of the writers of the Bible specifically different from that of ordinary believers. The different books of the Bible, he believes, were prepared for the place they hold in the Church, and are not collected as simply the best among much inspired material which the world has produced. He holds also to the inspiration of the entire Bible, says that II. Tim. iii, 16 affirms the universal inspiration of the Old Testament. The arguments which he adduces in favor of his

¹P. 155.

position are not different from those found elsewhere, but the following is worthy of special notice. "The typical significance which Christ and his disciples found in the Old Testament indicates that they regarded it as divinely and peculiarly inspired. Even if one should disagree with them in their interpretation, the argument is not affected. The fact that they found a wealth of typical meaning in what might seem to be of slight significance indicates that they conceived the Scriptures to be in a peculiar sense inspired of God."¹

The author holds that the authority of the Scriptures is mediate, that is, is such as Christ imparts to them. "They are authoritative as a written edict is which purports to have come from a sovereign: the written words have no authority except as they make known the will of him in whom the authority resides."² Since the Scriptures were written by imperfect and fallible men their absolute inerrancy can only be maintained by showing that they were so inspired as to be guarded against error, but such an inspiration has not, as the author thinks, been proved. Still he considers that there is such a presumption in favor of the trustworthiness of the Scriptures "that the burden of proof may always be rightly thrown upon the man who brings a charge of error even respecting minor and incidental matters."³ He holds, too, that the Bible is an authoritative and ample fountain of religious instruction and religious life. While men must interpret as best they can, and may in some instances misinterpret, on the other hand, Christian truth is a revelation, and a revelation so given

¹P. 301.²P. 326.³P. 331.

as to be readily understood and as justly to claim acceptance as the regulative principle of human conduct. He does not, as some do, base the authority of the Bible on the bare assumption that it is the Word of God. This expression he considers comparatively modern yet admits its propriety, while he also accepts in an important sense the expression, "the Bible *contains* the Word of God." Whatever terms are used he holds the entire Bible to be inspired. "That there is a human element in the Scriptures we now take for granted. When, however, we speak of them as characterized by both a human and a divine element, how do we understand the two to be related? Can we sift out the human and leave the divine unadulterated? * * * * Such a mechanical mixture of the divine and the human is well-nigh inconceivable, and is certainly attested by no evidence. The union of the divine and the human must rather be regarded as a blending of the two into one,—an interpenetration which makes a nice dissection impossible."¹

One of the most suggestive and interesting of the chapters of Professor Mead's book is the last, on the conditions and limits of biblical criticism. We shall not take space to present his views in full, but the following conclusions to which he comes are important: "Neither critical research nor Christian insight will ever effect a reconstruction or expurgation of the Canon of Sacred Scripture. Both these forces operated in the original fixing of the Canon. * * * The times and the men are now gone that were best able to determine what books deserved to be reckoned in

¹P. 367.

the Biblical Canon. Criticism, however subtle and learned will never be able to prove the early Church to have been mistaken in its judgment respecting the authorship of any of the biblical books."¹ Again he says: "Criticism can never convince Christendom that pious fraud had an important part in determining the substance or the form of the Scriptures."² In this connection he shows that the *Tendenz* theory of the Tübingen school, besides being untenable on its own ground, is at war with the common sense of the world. He shows also that the Kuenen-Wellhausen theory of the origin of the Old Testament, instead of resting on a "legal-fiction," as its authors euphemistically describe its foundation, involves outright falsehood. In reference to Christ's endorsement of the Old Testament he says: "If Jesus was either so ignorant as not to know that the Scriptures to which he ascribed divine authority were vitiated by fraud, or so unscrupulous as to endorse them although he knew the fraud, then he can not be the Truth, the Way, and the Life."³

We have given the more space to Professor Mead because he is familiar with the latest phases of critical and skeptical thought.

*Witnesses to Christ.*⁴ This work seems to us one of the happiest defences of Christianity. The argument is not formal, but persuasive. It presents the considerations in favor of Christianity in such a way as to show that it is

¹P. 363.²P. 370.³P. 385.

⁴The Baldwin Lectures. *Witnesses to Christ*. A contribution to Christian Apologetics. By William Clark, M. A., Professor of Philosophy in Trinity College, Toronto. Chicago. A. C. McClurg & Co. 1888.

natural, easy, and really for a thinking man, almost inevitable to believe in it. One asks, on laying down the book, what philosophy of life can be equal to Christianity? What philosophy can approach it? Unbelief, irreligious culture, materialism and pessimism are shown to be unsatisfactory, debasing, inhuman. The Christian faith is shown to be elevating, cheering, promotive of present happiness as well as of the hope of future blessedness. The scheme is shown also to be consistent with the demands of the intellect, that is, to coincide with the fundamental principles of thought and to make no undue tax upon the credulity of those spiritually-minded.

The author's mode of argumentation may be shown by a reference to one or two of the topics which he brings into his discussions. In comparing heathen and Christian civilizations he says: "It is true, indeed, that in Plato's view the moral life of a well-ordered state was the highest conceivable morality, and that in the ancient state every citizen was bound to sacrifice himself, if necessary to lay down his life, for the good of the community, and thus it might seem that individualism and selfishness were condemned."¹ After pointing out the limited range of the privileges of citizenship he concludes: "Thus a system which seemed likely to destroy selfishness and build up a religion of humanity, turns out to be merely constitutive of a privileged and limited aristocracy."²

One of the most interesting of the lectures before us is that on *The Unity of Christian Doctrine*. The author points out with much ingenuity the oneness of sentiment at the

¹P. 57. ²P. 58.

foundation of diverse doctrines. Though he may express some views from which many would dissent, his thought is none the less valuable. He notices that there can hardly be more perfectly contrasted parties than those which stand opposed to each other on the doctrines of election, original sin, and eternal punishment. Yet he shows that they all stand upon the same fundamental principles and that the different views may be so stated as not to contradict each other. What he says of one of these topics is implied as true of the others: "But we believe that a careful examination even of the extreme theories which have been enunciated on the subject of human depravity will satisfy us that some portion of the difference may be removed by a more careful definition of the terms employed, and still more by taking into account the different points of view of the conflicting theories."¹ On this subject, depravity, however, he does not think unity of sentiment is to be attained wholly by compromise. "It is very curious to note how, in recent years, science has come to the aid of theology against a shallow view of the nature of man. * * * It is satisfactorily established by the research of the scientific students of man's nature, that, instead of coming into the world pure and clean, as some have asserted, we do indeed come with tendencies to all kinds of conduct inherited from the character and constitution of our forefathers. There are few things more remarkable than the way in which thinkers of all schools are coming to an agreement on this subject."²

The author's interpretation of the categories of thought

¹P. 133.

²P. 135.

is worthy of notice. The mind combines the facts revealed in the sense through the ideas of cause, substance etc. These ideas or categories of thought are furnished by the mind, not received through the senses; but they furnish the principles by which that which comes through the sense is organized and classified. These principles of classification are laws of nature. Whence came these laws? The mind furnishes them but does not create them. "They are influences of mind from the phenomena of nature. They have a certain kind of existence, for they are actually operating. Where then do they exist? There can be but one answer to that question. They exist in a Mind which bears a certain resemblance to our own. The mind of man perceives in nature the working of a mind to which it is itself akin."¹ Aside from this method of perceiving the divine being we know Him, ascending to our author, as the basis of all thought. "God is the necessary and universal postulate of all human life and thought and action. He is the ground of all our knowledge; for all thought becomes confused when He is banished or ignored."² The perception of God through the categories would find less acceptance than the idea that He is the postulate of all our thinking, but we doubt the practical efficiency of either, except among those who already believe in His existence and providential government.

C. ETHICS.

*Ethical Religion.*³ This work consists of seventeen lectures "given for the most part before the Society for

¹Pp. 161-173. P. ²176.

³*Ethical Religion*, by William Mackintire Salter. Boston. Roberts Brothers, 1889.

Ethical Culture of Chicago." It represents a movement which may well attract the notice of thinking men, a movement aiming to make morality the religion of humanity. The author of the lectures manifests a profound sympathy with his fellowmen, especially with the needy and suffering. He exhibits a most earnest desire to see and to promote the advancement of the race in virtue and in happiness. He shows a keen appreciation of morality in its purest and most delicate forms. His lectures were addressed to a society inaugurating a movement towards the perfection of humanity. Contrasting ethics with science, he says: "Science is not ultimate. It tells us simply what is; it tells us nothing of what ought to be. What ought to be—that is reported to us by a higher faculty than that of scientific observation; it is an assertion, a demand of the conscience. Here, then, is to my mind the true basis of our movement. It is the rock of conscience, the eternal laws that announce themselves in man's moral nature. * * * It may be that our senses have never revealed to us a perfectly just man; that we have never known or heard of an absolutely just government. None the less does conscience say to every man: 'Thou oughtest to be just.' And if it could find voices clear and strong enough, it would publish aloud to every community and every state to-day, 'There is no other law for you save that of absolute justice, and in the measure that you fail therein, you have no sanctity and no defence.' Conscience, in a word, ushers us into an ideal realm. Genuine Ethics have in this respect more in common with art than with science. * * * Art is the reali-

zation of the beautiful; Ethics means the realization of the good. As we look on men and women, we see the possibilities of the perfect that are in them—we think of what they are meant to be, rather than what they are. We are to regard ourselves and society about us as plastic material, in which the divine ideas of goodness have begun to take form, but have never reached adequate form, and are so hemmed in and hindered, that if we judged with the senses alone we might doubt if they existed; and yet to the eye of the soul are still there, and need only to be seen and believed in to again stir and move, and to shape human life to finer forms and nobler issues.”¹

We have quoted somewhat at length, because the passage may be considered the confession of faith of a church which hopes to become the universal Church of humanity. Everyone must regard so high aims with sympathy, even if they ought to be still higher; and everyone must wish success to noble endeavors, though the means adopted for their attainment tend to defeat rather than success.

In order to attain to the full enjoyment of this religion of humanity there are some things valued in other religions which are to be renounced. We can have no longer an over-ruling personal God. “Duty is ordinarily divided into duties to man and duties to God. But there are no duties to God in the sense implied, nor have we reason to suppose that God as so conceived exists. ‘God’ is the infinite element in all duty, its eternal basis, without which duty and man and the world would alike disappear.”²

¹P. 295-6-7. ²P. 308.

“There is a God in every man, and it is for us to let him speak, and to hear him; and not till we do this is the true aim of our being carried out.”¹ Prayer also must be given up. “If we must pray, let us pray to men; for there all the trouble lies.”² “A voice from out the unseen itself seems to say: ‘Arise, O Man, from thy knees and act! I call thee to be not a suppliant, but a creator.’”³ The Bible is of course a worn-out book. Its commendation of righteousness is certainly to be approved, and was once effective, but the book is no longer of value, its style is not adapted to the age, its narratives can no longer be accepted as true, no one can now believe its promises of future earthly prosperity or its doctrine of the kingdom of Heaven. Religion as it has been known is to be renounced, though the ethical school would retain the name and make it mean a longing after the ideal of humanity. It is the homesickness of the soul, its claim to a place where harmony and peace prevail, but religion as it has been known on earth is to be detested. “I think nothing can be clearer to the student of the early history of man than that religion and morality were altogether distinct in their origin, and that religion was simply a contrivance to ward off danger or to win advantage for one’s self or for one’s tribe.”⁴ Christianity must of course fall in the general wreck of the old religious ideas. It was really destroyed by Protestantism and the freedom of thought which it encouraged. But Protestantism is itself doomed also, though it performed much noble work. It has no fundamental idea of its own to commend it to humanity. And Unit-

¹P. 178.

²P. 19.

³P. 127.

⁴P. 91.

rianism, the truest form of Protestantism, has dried up also, and is a failure. It has voted itself to be Christian, and must be laid away with Christianity as a relic of the past."

Mr. Salter confesses to an admiration for Jesus, in which he differs from some of his friends. Jesus is to him "no paragon, no model of spotless virtue or of infallible wisdom," but he is to him an inspiration. Jesus believed in miracles, in Providence, in a kingdom of God, all which are to be rejected, but still he stirs the heart and wakes the mind to noble thought and the struggle for better things. Mr. Salter would have all the race bound together in one religious body by the creed "*Duty binds.*" This must be supreme. In other things there must be liberty. Men may be theists or atheists, deists or Christians, as they like, but they must bow before this truth, *Duty binds*

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

PART I.

PRESENT STATE
OF
STUDIES IN HOMILETICS.

BY
REV. FRANKLIN W. FISK,
PROFESSOR OF SACRED RHETORIC
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

The aim of the writer, in this paper, is to give such an impartial review of the volumes noticed, as may be helpful to young ministers. This is the exact object of the paper which is mostly confined to books in this department, published during the last year.

CHAPTER I.

THEORETICAL HOMILETICS—PREACHING.

COLLOQUIES ON PREACHING.¹

The twenty Colloquies in this volume are valuable both for the instruction contained in them, and for the insight given into the condition of preaching in the Church of England. These Colloquies are represented as having taken place between persons of very diverse social position, culture, and employment, so as to reflect the general sentiments of the community. They are written in a vivacious, though somewhat diffuse style, and they set forth with great frankness many of the defects of a style of preaching not confined to the English Church.

In Colloquy the First, between the Rector and the Vicar, the rector speaks in a despondent way of the inattention of his people to his preaching, and of its small visible results; to which the vicar replies that, while laboring on in the patience of hope, "We ought to ask ourselves whether there may not be methods of preaching to which we have failed to attain; methods scarcely perhaps better in themselves, but better suited to the days in which we live."

In the Colloquy between the Lawyer, the Doctor, and

¹*Colloquies on Preaching.* By Henry Twells, M. A., Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral, Rector of Waltham, Leicestershire, and Rural Dean. London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1889.

the Merchant, the lawyer is made to say that, "The inefficiency of our preachers has unfortunately made them a standing target for ridicule;" the doctor that, "Recent church progress has not affected preaching as one might have thought it would;" and the lawyer agreeing with him "confidently affirms that the London pulpit has considerably deteriorated during the last quarter of a century." But the merchant is "not prepared to admit the standard of clerical proficiency is below that of other professions," and is "even inclined to think it may be above it." Yet he thinks that "Young men in training for holy orders should be more practised in methods of composition, clearness of articulation, and all the qualities which combine to make preachers."

In The Conclave at the Club, C. is of the opinion, that "If they (the parsons) caught up the events of the past week, and gave them a sort of moral or religious turn, they would scarcely have the listless audiences that confront them now." But A. would have "the clergy use their great opportunities to popularize science," "instead of floundering in the traditions of the past." D. would have "the clergy preach morality," while what E. "craves after is to learn to live and die as a Christian man." He wants "to hear the true sense of the teaching of prophets and apostles, aye, and of One greater than they," and his companions partly admit that he is right.

In the Colloquy at the Clerical Meeting in the Library of the Rural Dean, F. (who seems to have good homiletical sense) is made to say that "It has become the fashion of late years to ridicule the old custom of dividing sermons into distinctive heads. The result has been in many instances unfortunate. A great deal of

modern preaching is painfully discursive. There is an utter absence of method in its arrangement, and as a consequence, it leaves no sort of impression behind it."

As to the proper length of sermons, the Dean thinks that "The most common length for ordinary occasions seems to have settled down into twenty minutes, and perhaps that, on an average, is free from objection." But what can be done in twenty minutes to treat properly many themes that should be discussed in the pulpit? In some churches, the elaborate services forbid a suitable treatment of well-nigh any subject.

In the Colloquy between a Rector and his Son on the evening of his ordination as deacon, many things are said worthy of notice. In reply to his father's injunction to preach what the people need, rather than what will please them, the son says; "Hereby would be swept aside a great deal of attractive and fashionable oratory. Many are drawn to church out of curiosity to see how far clergymen of the Church of England can go in the way of disparaging creeds, and proclaiming a sort of universal salvation." It is but just to add that such hearers and such clergymen are not confined to the Church of England. Then, too, the father goes on to say, the preacher must not seek acceptable words by an undue straining after novelty. His sermons should not resemble the leading articles of newspapers, nor should he seek to make his words acceptable by any artificial or exaggerated method of delivery, but by giving his hearers what they most need. He should exert to the utmost such abilities as God has given him, to commend, to diversify, and to illustrate the message with which he has been entrusted. And, then, he should set before him-

self good models and examples, above all the Master himself. He must not be a servile imitator, but thoroughly natural in all he says. His preaching must be accompanied by faith and prayer. Then his sermons, delivered with or without a manuscript, will be with power.

In the Colloquy held by the Bicyclists in regard to the various kinds of preaching they had heard in their tour, one of them remarks that dissenting ministers, being aware what stress their people lay upon preaching, after having been specially trained for their work, take much pains in the preparation of their discourses, while it is otherwise with the church Clergy. "Preaching is an element, but only an element, in their responsible duties. It is seldom that they are specially trained for it. Their reputation as useful men is not dependent upon it." Their sermons, he thinks, are ordinarily too stilted and artificial.

But there are many exceptions. In the Colloquy of the Squire and his Guest, the host says in commendation of his rector, that "He just stands up and talks to you. It seems as simple and easy as possible, and yet by and by you find your heart beating, and your eyes filling with tears." Yet, though an able preacher, his modesty has stood in the way of his promotion in the Church.

At Lady Gossip's Party, we have a Colloquy well worth reading, in which views are expressed that are more prevalent in certain circles than is generally imagined. This from the Hon. Mrs. S. is worth quoting. "Have you ever heard Mr. Filchurh? I make a point of hearing him whenever he preaches in town, though it is always difficult to get a seat. He has a most powerful delivery. His words come out whirling, tumbling, seething, hissing, till

you are regularly carried away with them, and don't know in the least where you are. It is impossible to remember what he said afterwards, but that is of little consequence, because he has been so eloquent. They say that he always faints away in the vestry, and that his temples have to be covered with brown paper, dipped in brandy." It is to be feared that quite a number of the Rev. Mr. Filchurch's ministerial brothers have migrated to the United States.

Colloquy the Seventeenth, entitled *The Detectives*, is carried on by two gentlemen and a lady in a railway carriage. A. has again caught his rector pilfering, delivering a sermon of John Henry Newman's, and says that, from considerable knowledge of facts, he has arrived at the conclusion that we can seldom be sure of a preacher's sermon being his own. "The clergy preach to us laymen the obvious duties of honesty and straightforwardness; yet they stand up in the pulpit, and seek to gain credit from what has really come from the brains of other people."

But B. interposes that young clergymen, when they have much preaching to do, are not unfrequently recommended by their Bishops to adopt the practice of writing one original sermon a week and borrowing the other! Then, replies A., why not let the information that they are preaching another man's sermon be publicly given? A. is right. How a man who professes to preach the gospel of truth, and to be an ambassador of Him who is *Truth* itself, can stand up before a congregation and preach as his own a pilfered sermon, passes comprehension. If a minister is reduced to the pitiful necessity of being obliged to use another man's sermon, let him stand up like a man and say that the sermon is not his own, and give due acknowl-

edgment to its author. This is the only course at once upright and safe.

In the last Colloquy, between the Bishop and the Archdeacon, they both agree that, "While the average standard of preaching has decidedly improved, the habit of hearing has most emphatically deteriorated." This change they in part account for by the fact that the sermon, which half a century ago was regarded as by far the most important feature in church-going, has been, as the result of the Anglo-Catholic revival, dislodged from its former position, and placed below worship and the sacraments. The marvelous development of the public press, and the character of popular literature, are regarded as hostile to preaching. Yet the Bishop believes that the English pulpit has a great future before it. He thinks that there may be methods of proclaiming and enforcing the gospel of Christ specially called for by the age in which we live; that the younger clergy should search out these methods, should pray for greater love of souls, should be close students of the Bible, and should cultivate such a style and delivery as will give greatest effect to their discourses. The Bishop (who doubtless represents the views of the author) closes with the expression of the wish that he "may yet live to see the beginning, though not the development, of a material alteration in the efficiency and influence of the pulpit. The nation calls for it. The Church requires it. It cannot be longer delayed without danger to both."

The volume is entertaining in parts, and, as a whole, quite suggestive and instructive.

HISTORY OF PREACHING.¹

To one who would become in the pulpit “a workman that needeth not to be ashamed,” the study of the history of preaching is next in importance to the study of the art of preaching. The Rev. Dr. Ker has therefore done good service, not only to young men in preparation for the pulpit, but also to the ministry at large in his *Lectures on the History of Preaching*, delivered to students in the Theological Hall of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

Of the twenty-one lectures, included in this large octavo volume, the first seven have to do with the general history of the Pulpit before the Reformation, while the remaining lectures are confined wholly to the history of the German Protestant Pulpit, the lamented author having left his work unfinished.

In his first lecture Dr. Ker treats of the advantages of the study of the history of preaching, one of which is that the advance of preaching gives ground of encouragement that the pulpit will attain to still greater power. He holds “that, as a whole, the pulpit has brought home more of Christian truth to the circumstances and wants of men, during the last fifty years, than in any half century since the beginning of Christianity.” He thinks that “All great revivals, all true advances in the Church, have come from the simple, earnest preaching of the gospel of Christ.”

He closes his lecture on the Ancestry of Preaching in

¹*Lectures on the History of Preaching.* By the late Rev. John Ker, D. D., Professor of Practical Training in the United Presbyterian Church. Edited by Rev. A. R. Macewen, M.A., Balliol, B.D., Glasgow. Introduction by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1889.

the Old Testament with the thought that, "If there be any power under God to save the world, it is a living church with faithful ministers who shall fearlessly witness for the living God."

In his lecture on *The Earliest Christian Preaching*, he shows that we should not expect to find the New Testament preaching in shape and form like that which prevails among us, since sermon-material is there given in the ore, and left to successive generations to put into all the shapes needed for the wants of men. Yet we may learn much from Christ's preaching—its great simplicity, variety, sympathy, faithfulness, and adaptation. All the preaching of the Apostles centered on Christ, and aimed at the salvation of men.

Then followed the hortatory and inferior preaching of the Apostolic Fathers, soon to be succeeded by a period of great pulpit power, with such men of might as Origen, Basil, and Chrysostom, in the Eastern Church, and Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, in the Western. The sermon, though often faulty in exegesis and discursive in thought, was full of vigor, addressed to the conscience, and adapted to the age.

In his two lectures on *Oriental Church Preaching*, the author, after noticing the marked change in the intellectual and rhetorical character of the preaching of the Eastern Church, resulting from various causes, treats at length of the characteristics of the preaching of Origen and Chrysostom, the representatives respectively of the schools of Alexandria and Antioch. The main defect of the preaching of both these schools, was a want of naturalness. Then came the decline of preaching in the Eastern Church,

caused by bitter polemic strife, dogmatism, ecclesiasticism, and failure of the missionary spirit.

In his lecture on Western Church Preaching, Dr. Ker, after giving several reasons for the slower development of the power of the pulpit in the West, describes the characteristics of the great preachers, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Augustine.

Of the great preachers in the Western Church during the Middle Ages,— from the death of Augustine to the Reformation,— the author names Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, and Bede, in the earlier half of the period, and, in the last half, Thomas Aquinas, Bernard of Clairvaux, John Tauler, Berthold of Ratisbon, John Wycliffe, John Huss, and Savonarola. The lowest period in preaching was from 800 to 1200 A. D.

In his lecture on the History of German Preaching from the Reformation, Dr. Ker puts Luther in the forefront of the long line of eminent German preachers, and analyzes the elements of his power. His great aim was to preach the great saving truths of the Bible, and to preach them clearly and simply. "He had one overmastering thought, and that thought was Christ."

Then followed a period of decline in preaching, caused in part by national and political disquiet, doctrinal disputes, and dogmatism, which decline Philipp Jacob Spener, "the reformer of the life of the German church," wrought mightily to arrest.

Although he was partially successful, his work developed "the Pietistic School, and led to a wide and deep reaction from which Germany is only now emerging." Of this school, Francke of Halle was a distinguished representa-

tive. Incessant in his pastoral, university, and orphan house work, he did much to promote spiritual life in the people, and spiritual power in the pulpit.

But sad days for the German Church and preaching followed, in the recoil from fervid pietism to the opposite extreme of rationalism, which Bengel and Zinzendorf did much to counteract.

The author devotes a lecture to the Preaching of Illuminism, of which the historian Mosheim, Johann J. Spalding, Georg J. Zollikofer, and Franz V. Reinhard, were eminent representatives. Their preaching was much the same as the ethical preaching of the "Moderates" of Scotland, whose best representative was Dr. Hugh Blair.

Yet underneath this prevailing Illuminism, there was, here and there, the hidden life of faith, which welcomed, as the dawn of a better day, such preaching as that of Schleiermacher, which, with all its defects, "taught men that there is something more in religion and the Bible and Christ than the easily understood commonplaces which Illuminism declared to be the whole."

Then came the "Mediating School," trying to reconcile religion and science, faith and reason, whose representative preachers were Karl Immanuel Nitzsch and Friederich Augustus Tholuck. Nitzsch's views of preaching, given in his *Practical Theology*, and quoted by Dr. Ker, are worth remembering. "In every sermon, the preacher should consider: (1) The aim; an aim which can be briefly stated, and which must be kept in view throughout; (2) the collection of material bearing on this, which is to be found principally in the Bible and in the heart; (3) the arrangement or division of the material, which

should be simple and yet comprehensive; (4) the carrying out of the plan under each division, and in this the main aim should always be kept in view; (5) the language; and (6) the action."

The language of preaching, he thinks, should be largely that of the Bible, and the sermon should be delivered without use of manuscript.

Tholuck, famous as a linguist and exegete, was probably the best preacher of his time in Germany. His sermons, evangelical, full of feeling, and teeming with illustrations, took captive the hearts of his hearers. The author well cites Tholuck's ideal of a sermon. "A true sermon has the heaven for its father and the earth for its mother. Why is it that so much of our preaching goes coldly over the head and heart? Because earthly affairs are treated only in the light of this world. They have the earth for their mother, but not the heaven for their father. And why do other sermons go over the head and heart altogether? Because, though heavenly things are dealt with, they are not carried into the streets, the homes, the workshops of the earth. They have the heaven for their father, but not the earth for their mother."

In the great variety of religious life and preaching in Germany, Dr. Ker regards Ludwig Hofacker and Claus Harms as continuing the "Unbroken Testimony" of the doctrine of Luther and Spener to our time.

The preaching of Hofacker, though he died at the age of thirty, produced a marvelous effect. Although destitute of the arts of oratory, it was impassioned, earnest, sympathetic and direct.

Harms was a powerful preacher. He set forth the

central themes of the Bible with deep conviction of their truth, and in a simple and direct manner. He held that the first requisite of a preacher is a right spirit—a deep, holy earnestness; that the Bible should furnish the chief material for preaching; that the language of the sermon should be that used by the people—simple and natural—and that the delivery should be without notes, natural and easy.

Rudolf Stier and Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacker the author terms pre-eminently “Biblical Preachers.” Stier maintains “that the Bible is the living fountain of all Christian teaching, and that wide, deep acquaintance with it is the first qualification for preaching.” The pulpit should keep close to the thought and to the language of the Bible.

The preaching of Krummacker,—the Guthrie of Germany,—was largely illustrative, and in manner highly dramatic. His “sermons are like a gallery of paintings. Every truth is thrown into a figure.” His method is thus described by the author. “The introduction is generally short and vivid, leading right up to the text; the divisions are briefly expressed and memorable, while the close is also brief and telling, the application being given throughout the discourse.” He would have the preacher use three books—the Bible, his own heart, and the people.

In the lecture on Recent and Present German Preaching, Dr. Ker, after noticing the influence of Kant and Hegel on German thought and preaching, describes such representative preachers of the different religious bodies and schools as, Franz Thiermin, Karl Schwarz, Ludwig Harms, Rudolph Kögel, Julius Müller, Karl von Gerok,

Johann T. Beck, Luthardt, Steinmeyer, and Uhlhorn. Present German preaching is delineated as striving after more simplicity and clearness, without becoming less instructive; varying in form between the textual and the topical methods, according to the mental structure of the preacher; and becoming more Scriptural and evangelical.

In the closing lecture on Lessons for Our Preaching, the author, after giving a resume of his lectures, gathers from them several lessons for his pupils, which he sums up in his closing paragraph. "Let us, then, preach salvation by faith, and regeneration through the Holy Spirit; let us seek to search the depths of the soul with the Gospel of Christ; let us bring all God's truth to bear on the life of men in plain, practical speech; and we shall be workmen that need not be ashamed."

These lectures of Dr. Ker on the History of Preaching are able, discriminative, instructive, and worthy of careful reading by young ministers.

SERMON STUFF.¹

This volume contains fifty-five plans of sermons, and two discourses delivered on important occasions. These plans, given quite fully, have been taken from sermons preached by Dr. McConnell, and now offered to others for use. In the preface we are told, "The author can claim for these outlines of sermons but a single valuable quality,—they have stood the *experimentum crucis*. They have been used, and have been found to be sufficiently coherent

¹*Sermon Stuff*. By S. D. McConnell, D.D., Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1889.

to be intelligible. All proprietary right in them is hereby renounced. If anyone can find in them either material or arrangement to serve his purpose, they are his."

Now, though this is very generous of the author, yet we cannot but think that the long-suffering congregations whose preachers resort for aid to these skeletons of sermons, have some rights which their pastors are bound to respect. These churches have called these ministers to become their pastors, and have taken upon themselves their support, that they may give themselves wholly to the study of the Divine Word, and to the preaching of it out of their own heart's experience, and they have a right not only to all that is best in their pastors, but also that they should at least be so far honest as not to palm off upon them other men's plans of sermons as their own. If such ministers have not mind enough to make a decent outline of a sermon, or are so pressed for time that they cannot make one, then let them stand up before their congregations like men, and state frankly that they have taken the outline of their sermon from another. If they take any other course, they will in due time almost certainly come to grief, and besides dwarfing themselves intellectually and spiritually, will lose, if not the respect of their congregations, the respect of themselves.

These outlines of sermons have considerable variety in form. Few of them can be said to have strict unity of thought. They rarely develop a proposition, but oftener consist of remarks on the general subject of the discourse.

From these plans we gather that their author does not regard probation as limited to the present life (pp. 9, 10, 80,); and that he thinks "the theological device of

the Fall unscriptural and unsatisfactory. The transaction called by that name was clearly an advance upon what preceded." (P. 136.)

The two discourses (Baccalaureate Sermon and Convention Sermon) with which the volume closes, are able and practical.

CHAPTER II.

PRACTICAL HOMILETICS—SERMONS.

QUESTIONS OF THE AGES.¹

In this little volume of a hundred and thirty pages, the Rev. Moses Smith has, in nine discourses, attempted to answer the following questions: What is The Almighty? What is Man? What is The Trinity? Which is The Great Commandment? What is Faith? Is there Common Sense in Religion? Is there a Larger Hope? Is Life Worth Living? What Mean These Stones?

These questions the author discusses with ability and candor. He brings to the discussion a keen intellect, judicial impartiality, good sense, a happy way of setting forth the truth, and a vigorous style. He condenses much thought into few words. He makes the great doctrines of which he treats appear reasonable. Perhaps, in his efforts in this direction, he may at times go too far. It is a little perilous to attempt to illustrate the mystery of the Trinity in the Godhead by a reference to man in his various relations.

One of the best sermons in the volume is that on, "Who is my Neighbor? or, Life Worth Living?" It is very suggestive in thought, and vivid in style.

The book will well repay reading.

¹*Questions of the Ages.* By Rev. Moses Smith. Chicago: New York: Fleming H. Revell.

ON BEHALF OF BELIEF.¹

Of the twelve sermons contained in this volume by Canon Holland, the first four,—Concerning the Resurrection,—the author modestly says, “may possibly suggest to some the coherence of the entire (Apostles’) Creed which knits its ideal and its historical elements together into a unity so close and compact that it is impossible to effect a severance—impossible to separate, by any analysis, kernel from husk, where each element is kernel and husk by turns.”

These four discourses are upon, Criticism and the Resurrection; The Critical Dilemma; The Gospel Witness; and The Elemental Enigmas. We know not where else can be found within so small a compass as popular, instructive, and convincing a treatment of the great facts and truths of the resurrection of Christ as is contained in these four discourses. That on The Gospel Witness,—“*Whereof we are all witnesses*,”—is especially excellent.

In the four sermons which follow,—Concerning the Church,”—on Corporate Faith, The Pattern in the Mount, Our Citizenship, The Building of the Spirit, the author sets forth “that necessary and vital correspondence between faith and the Church which is universally assumed in apostolical writings.” In the first sermon he shows that faith and a church are correlative and not antithetical terms, and that they imply and involve one another. He affirms “that all genuine faith in Jesus Christ holds within

¹*On Behalf of Belief.* Sermons preached in St. Paul’s Cathedral, Concerning the Resurrection—Concerning the Church—Concerning Human Nature. By the Rev. H. S. Holland, M. A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul’s. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1889.

it the secret, the germ of the Church; its inner construction anticipates a Church; its type, its form, its character, prepare it for insertion into a society, a body, a system, an order. Deprived of this, it must miss something of its perfect development; it cannot be attaining to all its proper fruit. Something is lost; something lies dormant and unused. There are gifts in it which are not exercised, and possibilities which remain unfulfilled." This thought is, we think, finely put, but it is questionable whether "The type, the form, the mechanism, the framework of the body of Christ," into which he hopes all Christians will be finally gathered, will correspond to his conception.

The subject of the second sermon,—The Pattern in the Mount,—is found, the author thinks, "in three or four metaphors, invariably occurring throughout the Apostolic writings, which most certainly convey the mind of the Lord about His Church, as His Apostles understood it." "They are the figures of the household, the family, the body, the temple," each of which topics he develops in this and the following sermon in a very interesting and instructive manner.

In the last four discourses,—Concerning Human Nature,—the author, in discussing the themes, Made under the Law, The Divine Sanction to Natural Law, The Word was made Flesh, The Nature of the Flesh, "endeavors to justify and interpret that loyalty to natural facts which, far from being traversed, is rather sanctioned and confirmed by belief in a Risen Master, and in His Redemptive Church." His endeavor seems to us successful. The last sermon, on The Nature of the Flesh, appears to us very able and worthy of careful reading. Indeed, the volume, as a whole, is very suggestive and instructive.

THE HOUSE AND ITS BUILDER.¹

The Reverend Samuel Cox, D. D., has given in this volume the last ten sermons that he preached near the close of a pastorate extending over a quarter of a century. They are mostly expository, and have those excellent characteristics of thought and expression for which Dr. Cox, as an expositor, is justly celebrated.

The first seven of these discourses—on *The House and its Builder*; *The Origin of Evil*; *A Working Hypothesis*; *The Groans of Nature*; *The Groans of Humanity*; *The Groans of the Spirit*; *Inferences and Uses*; *Mercy and Justice*,—are, the author says, “addressed to those who have been infected by the doubts which are in the very air of the time, doubts which every thoughtful mind is, sooner or later, compelled to face.” These seven sermons, with the exception of the first, are a series of able expositions of the difficult passage, Romans viii, 18–27.

In the sermon on *The Origin of Evil*, the author favors the hypothesis “that moral evil is, at least, an inevitable risk, perhaps an inevitable accident, in the creation of such a world as this;” that if man is made with freedom of will, he may abuse that freedom and sin. That he did so, Scripture affirms. And the Apostle Paul “asserts that the moral fall of man had physical consequences or concomitants; that by, or for, his sin, the whole creation was reduced, against its will, into that bondage to imperfection and corruption in which we find it; that in this bondage it

¹*The House and its Builder, with other Discourses: A Book for the Doubtful.* By Samuel Cox, D. D. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1889.

labours and groans, longing for deliverance, struggling up toward a freedom and a perfection which it never quite attains; but that it solaces itself under the miseries of its bondage by cherishing an indomitable hope of rising into the freedom and perfection for which it yearns, when the redemption of man from his bondage shall be complete."

In his instructive discourse on *The Groans of Nature*, Romans viii. 19–22, Dr. Cox, after showing that Nature is, according to the Apostle, in bondage to vanity and corruption, and that Science affirms the same, inquires how it comes to pass that in a world made by the perfect God all things bear some mark of imperfection; that in a world made and ruled by the living God, all things die. The answer, he thinks, is suggested by the Apostle: "*Not by its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it.*" The creatures were not *made* for this bondage, or they would not strive and groan under it. The living perfect God did not intend this bondage when He made them; or, at least, this is not the end for which they are and were created. They have been *forced* into it, but not by Him; and they submit to it with an utterable reluctance, an intolerable shame." The author, it will be noticed, makes man, and not God, the one who thus subjects nature and brings it into bondage. In this view, he is at variance with such authorities as Meyer and Alford.

In the sermon on *Mercy and Justice*, James ii. 13, "Mercy glorieth against judgment," the author, in accordance with his theory of "The Larger Hope," takes the position that the purpose of God in inflicting punishment is, and always will be, to induce penitence and a better mind. "If God is forever the same, if He is to be true to

Himself, if He is not to sink below the level of his own commandments, He who Himself found out the remedy for all the sin and all the sorrow of the world, *must* make that remedy effectual, and restore all his erring and infected children to an eternal health and an eternal home." But how will this be brought about if some men will persist in sin forever?

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.¹

Under this title the Rev. Dr. Alfred Plummer has given to the press an octavo volume of four hundred and thirty pages, containing thirty-seven expository chapters or discourses, (for such he twice terms them), on the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

In these expository discourses, the author takes up in their order the more important portions of these Epistles, and expounds them in a learned and thorough manner. He aims rather at a full discussion of the topics treated, than at their practical application. Yet his expositions take more the form of discourse than commentary. They are at once instructive and interesting, and show their author to be a ripe scholar and able theologian.

In his twenty-fourth discourses on Titus, iii, 4-7, the author stoutly maintains that the phrase "through the washing of regeneration" means "the Christian rite of baptism, in which, and by means of which the regeneration takes place." He adds: "We are fully justified by his (the Apostle's) language here in asserting that it is *by*

¹*The Pastoral Epistles.* By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham; formerly Fellow and Senior Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1889.

means of the baptismal washing that the regeneration takes place; for he asserts that God ‘saved us *through* the washing of regeneration.’ The laver or bath of regeneration is the instrument or means by which God saved us.”

In his expository discourse on II Tim. i, 15–18, Dr. Plummer, in expounding the parenthetical sentence, “(the Lord grant unto him (Onesiphorus) to find mercy of the Lord in that day),” concludes “that, according to the more probable and reasonable view, the passage before us contains a prayer offered up by the Apostle on behalf of one who is dead,” and that “we seem to have obtained his sanction, and therefore the sanction of Scripture, for using similar prayers ourselves.” But he cautions us that we must use similar prayers, and adds: “On what grounds can we accept the obligation of praying for the spiritual advancement of those who are with us in the flesh, and yet refuse to help by our prayers the spiritual advancement of those who have joined that ‘great cloud of witnesses’ in the unseen world, by which we are perpetually encompassed (Heb. xii, 1)? The very fact that they witness our prayers for them may be to them an increase of strength and joy.” We cannot but think that the author is here treading upon uncertain and dangerous ground.

Throughout these expository lectures, the author shows great candor and catholicity of spirit, united with varied scholarship.

THE IMMANENT GOD AND OTHER SERMONS.¹

This little volume comprises eight discourses on 'The Immanent God ; The Unsearchable God ; The Manifest God ; Law, Providence and Prayer ; Satan or the Genius of Trial ; Self-Abnegation ; The Way where the Light Dwelleth ; and the Heart's Plea for Immortality Accepted.

They are rather essays than sermons. The author discusses subjects in a very interesting manner. His style is delightful. His spirit is admirable. But we cannot quite agree with him in some of his views.

In his sermon on The Immanent God, he represents his own childish conception of God as essentially that formed by many modern theologians and Christians. "Calvin's arguments and Edwards' sermons and Moody's exhortations imply it. The theology that has ruled Christendom for fifteen centuries is builded on the conception of an 'absentee God,' a God outside of, detached from, far away from his world. Formed in another age, and thence handed on, cherished by scholars and thinkers as brave as have ever lived, there it is, the haunting, the prevailing thought." Now, of all men, President Edwards is the last against whom such a charge can justly be made. His writings abound in sentiments just the opposite. For example, in writing of his own experience soon after his conversion, he says: "The appearance of everything was altered ; there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast or appearance of divine glory, in almost everything. God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity and love, seemed to appear in

¹*The Immanent God and other Sermons.* By Abraham W. Jackson. Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1889.

everything: in the sun, and moon, and stars; in the clouds and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, and trees; in the water, and all nature; which used greatly to fix my mind. I often used to sit and view the moon for continuance; and in the day spent much time in viewing the clouds and sky, to behold the sweet glory of God in these things; in the meantime, singing forth, with a low voice, my contemplations of the Creator and Redeemer." Also in his History of the Work of Redemption, President Edwards thus reviews, near the close, the course of the events that he has been tracing: "We began at the head of the stream of divine Providence, and have followed and traced it through its various windings and turnings, till we are come to the end of it, and we see where it issues. As it began in God, so it ends in God. God is the infinite ocean into which it empties itself."

In his sermon on Law, Providence, and Prayer, the author takes the position that only prayer "for the things of soul" will be answered, that it is foolish to imagine that "things of body"—that any so-called laws of nature, will be suspended, or in any way modified by prayer. But may not the Author of natural laws have so constituted them at the first, that they shall work out, throughout all time, the answers to such petitions as He, foreseeing that they would be offered, should think it best to grant?

In his discourse on Satan, or The Genius of Trial, the author avows his belief that Satan as a person has no existence. He is simply trial personified. "He seems to be a Persian conception, and was adopted into Jewish thought, perhaps in the time of the captivity. The early Christian writers, conspicuously John in the Apocalypse,

without stopping to discriminate his real character, foisted the attributes of devil upon him, and sent him down the ages the personalized principle of moral evil. These attributed are now stripped off, and we are compelled in honesty to give Satan a better name, if not a more sympathetic fellowship. If we cannot love him more, we at least should speak him fairer." "In the temptation of Jesus there was really no Devil, only the Satan of trial applying his tests to Jesus. Conscious of great powers, he has retired to the desert to meditate on the use to which he will devote them." And the author goes on to add, "Now that there was ever such a being as Satan, I suppose few to-day believe. And the reason why we have ceased to believe in him is, that we have left behind the habit of personalizing principles which we find always with man in the early stages of his development." How the author can reconcile these views with the express teachings of the New Testament on this subject, and especially of Him who is "the truth," is beyond our comprehension.

The last sermon in the volume, *The Heart's Plea for Immortality*, we regard as the ablest.

We cannot but think it a defect in these sermons, that they have so small a spiritual element in them.

THE LAW OF LIBERTY.¹

The twelve discourses of this volume which Dr. Whiton has given to the public, are upon *The Law of Liberty*; *Solomon*; *Helping God*; *Spiritual Barbarism*; *The Mys-*

¹*The Law of Liberty and Other Discourses.* By James Morris Whiton, Ph. D. New York, Thomas Whittaker, 1889.

tery of Evil; The Assurance of Immortality; The Transfiguration; Is Deception ever a Duty? The Trinity; Balaam; The Advent of the Christ; The World's Balance-Wheel.

These subjects are discussed with great freshness of thought and illustration, and in an attractive manner. The author's varied and exact scholarship appears throughout these sermons. They are very suggestive and instructive. The style is excellent, and the plans of the discourses are, in general, good. But if, in some of the sermons, the subjects and the main heads had been given greater conciseness and prominence, we cannot but think that it would have given the hearers more easy possession of the thought.

The last discourse on The World's Balance-Wheel, from the text "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is, in matter and form, one of the ablest in the volume.

Some of the positions of the author seem to us hardly tenable. His view of the inspiration of the Scriptures is such as to be consistent with error as to causes and ideas. For example, "The historian (of the Books of the Kings) records not only the rise and fall of the Hebrew monarchy, but also what appeared to him to be the cause of its decline. This he found in a decay of orthodoxy by the intrusion of heathen modes of worship. He traces the evil back to Solomon, and attributes the great rebellion, which divided the kingdom in his son's time, to the anger of God at the allowance which Solomon had granted to the idolatrous worship of his foreign wives. A closer study of the history gives us a different view of the matter, and a different idea of what Solomon's apostasy was." In

the discourse on The Transfiguration, in advocating an immediate resurrection after death, he says: "The Jewish belief was of a remoter resurrection, at some world's end, as Martha thought. Traces of this old way of thinking colour some of Paul's sayings." So also the author believes that, "with this fact of an accomplished resurrection goes the corresponding fact of an accomplished judgment."

In his sermon on The Trinity, the author regards the three designations, "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," as in no respect representing "three Persons" in the Deity, but simply the result of "a progressive revelation of God, of which the names given to Him at successive periods mark the successive advances, till the revelation is completed by Christ in his announcement of the Triune Name of '*the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*'" So in a foot note on page 185, we read: "In the Scriptural term '*only begotten,*' as applied to Jesus, we cannot take '*only*' to mean exclusively, without contradicting the Scriptural truth which Paul discovered in a Greek poet, '*We also are His offspring.*' Not exclusiveness, but pre-eminence is meant here by '*only.*'" And yet the author says: "Let none of us imagine that anything essential has been left out of our account, because the usual phraseology about '*Three Persons*' has been discarded." "The thing is here, all that Jesus taught us, '*the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,*' the Three personal agencies of God, not three individual agents—the Three personal activities of God, not three individual actors."

In the able discourse on Balaam: The Moral Cross-Eye, Dr. Whiton takes what appears to be stated as simple

facts, in a highly figurative sense. The voice of God to him is simply the voice of conscience, and he says: "We must regard Balaam's conduct as evincing nothing more in the action of his beast than a brute nature in terror is capable of. So the dumb creatures often speak to us by looks and cries, inarticulately, but eloquently and intelligibly.

But though we dissent from such views as have been named, we regard these discourses as, in the main, very suggestive and helpful.

THROUGH DEATH TO LIFE.¹

In this volume of ten expository discourses on the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the Rev. Dr. Reuen Thomas sets forth his views of the Apostle's teaching in that remarkable portion of Scripture. "My great aim," says the author, "was to present and enforce what to me was manifestly Paul's teaching in the great Resurrection chapter. * * * All I have aimed at is to 'give the sense' of St. Paul in a way suited to the necessities and competencies of a listening Christian assembly."

This we think he has well done. Taking up in succession the parts of the chapter which he is to expound, he sets forth with clearness and force the Apostle's thought, often felicitously blending with the exposition practical suggestions. Thus in his second discourse, which he terms

¹*Though Death to Life: Discourses on St. Paul's Great Resurrection Chapter.* By Reuen Thomas, D. D., Boston: Silver, Burdett and Co.

“Personal,” in which the Apostle gives an account of his own life and experience, the author says, “I think that there is a needful suggestion here for ourselves in these modern days. Often and often, with great want of wisdom (so it seems to some of us), have men been set to public preaching to others immediately after, in some revival meetings, their emotions have been stirred and confession of Christ as their Lord been publicly made. And the more of badness there has been in the previous life, the more notorious the men have been, the more needful it has seemed by their advisers that their case should be made public. In the light of the retirement into Arabia of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, I am compelled to make confession of my belief that such sudden precipitancy of an untried man upon the public is all wrong. If any such men have gifts which can be utilized, let them, ere using those gifts, go into some Arabia for three years and get to know themselves. Unless a man’s conviction is able to go into retirement for three years and grow, it is not of much account.”

In some of his expositions as, for example, in the discourse on Baptism for the Dead, the author is at variance with such high authorities as Meyer and Alford, yet he always presents his view with frankness and modesty.

These discourses, though generally informal, follow closely the course of the Apostle’s thought, and are good examples of expository preaching. The last discourse on Certain Reward, is a fine example of textual sermon.

The style of Dr. Thomas is simple, clear, forcible, and well adapted to the pulpit. Very infrequently are found

such expressions as "Firstly," and "His body was not grossly material like our bodies are now," that mar his style.

The volume will abundantly repay reading.

THE THRESHOLD OF MANHOOD.¹

This is one of the best of the many volumes of sermons addressed to young men, that we have read. The author, himself a young man, is in heartiest sympathy with young men, and his ministry of five years in London brought him into "special contact" with them, and thus made him able to speak to them with a somewhat full "knowledge of the temptations, struggles, and needs of city youth."

The fourteen sermons contained in the volume are on Decision; A Young Man's Difficulties; Impulse and Opportunity; The Testimony of Fact; What it is that Endures; Purity; The Sin of Esau; Sins of Silence; The Character of Judas; Job on Pessimism; Nathan and David; The Impotence of Revolt against the Truth; The Fatherhood of God; The Use of Mystery. These subjects the author treats in a fresh and interesting way. He deals faithfully and plainly with young men, and does not shrink from applying the truth to their needs. Yet he shows that he is in fullest sympathy with them in the temptations and struggles through which they are passing.

¹*The Threshold of Manhood. A Young Man's Words to Young Men.* By W. J. Dawson, author of "A Vision of Souls: with other Ballads and Poems," "Quest and Vision: Essays in Life and Literature," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1889.

His style is attractive. He abounds in pertinent illustrations. He has the imagination of a poet, and uses it often with fine effect.

The plans of these discourses are largely textual, and some of them are very good. In some cases, the plans are not sufficiently distinct and terse.

In the sermon on The Sin of Esau, the author takes the phrase, "he found no place of repentance," to mean "no way to change his (Esau's) mind." "His desire changed, but his environment was fixed; he changed his mind in one sense of the phrase, but he could not change his condition." In this view, though he is in accord with such modern authorities as Delitzsch and Alford, he is at variance with Meyer, who maintains that the passage means, "Esau did not succeed in causing his father Isaac to change his mind, so that the latter should recall the blessing erroneously bestowed upon the younger brother Jacob, and confer it upon himself the elder son; in this he succeeded not, though he sought it with tears." He insists that this interpretation "is most naturally suggested by the context itself, yields a clear, correct thought, and best accords with the narrative in Genesis."

The sermons in this volume, which we have read with greatest interest, are those on Decision; A Young Man's Difficulties; The Testimony of Fact; What it is that Endures; The Character of Judas; Nathan and David; and The Impotence of Revolt against the Truth. Indeed, there is not one of these discourses the reading of which again and again would not be a great benefit to a young man. We hope that the book will find its way into the hands of many a youth.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. PAUL.¹

In this volume of twenty-five chapters or sermons—for such they seem to be,—the Rev. Dr. J. Oswald Dykes has given fine examples of expository discourse. The author goes through the first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, taking up consecutive portions of it, and aiming “to make clear in popular language the precise connection of the Apostle’s thought.” This he has admirably done. Having evidently studied in the most careful and thorough manner the Apostle’s great argument, and brought himself into closest sympathy with the spirit and aim of the writer, he sets forth the Apostle’s wonderful sweep of thought and cogency of argument with great clearness and power.

In this respect these discourses are worthy to stand beside Dr. Chalmers’ *Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans*, while they are superior to them in general form and style. No one, we are sure, can read these expository discourses on the most profound and difficult epistle of the Apostle Paul, without being both instructed and charmed by the clear setting forth of the thought, and the attractiveness of the style.

As an example of the author’s style, take the following on Christians being “Joint-heirs with Christ.” “The wonder is that a hope so magnificent does not dazzle earthly eyes. For plain people, full of faults, who in this strutting world of little men count for nothing, to be gravely assured that their destiny is to be associated within a year or two

¹ *The Gospel According to St. Paul.* Studies in the first eight chapters of his Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes, M.A., D.D. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1888.

with the present condition of the Eternal Son of God, is a prospect the unearthly brilliance of which might well ravish any of us so as to leave scarce interest enough for present affairs. One might suppose that such a future, if a man believed in it, must dwarf into utter nothingness the ambitions and losses of this world, reconcile his patience to any calamity, and elevate his mind quite above the petty rivalries and turmoils that vex the days of common men. Let a clear soul, sure of its celestial parentage, only fasten its vision on the inheritance which within so brief a space is to be its own, and fill itself full with the idea of that approaching elevation, with its sacred delights, its superhuman companionships, its passionless repose, its stainless purity, its ceaseless and saintly occupations : surely such a soul may be expected at least to draw into itself something serene and godlike, a little of the peace and more than a little of the sanctity of heaven !”

It is a good omen for the pulpit that expository preaching seems to be coming into increasing favor with the people, and such discourses as those contained in this volume of Dr. Dykes, must aid not a little in making expository preaching popular.

PAUL'S IDEAL CHURCH AND PEOPLE.¹

Into this volume of less than three hundred pages, the learned author has condensed a brief commentary on the

¹*Paul's Ideal Church and People.* A Popular Commentary. With a Series of Forty Sermonettes on the First Epistle to Timothy. By Alfred Rowland, LL.B., B.A. (London University). New York: E. B. Treat, 1888.

First Epistle to Timothy, followed by "Forty Sermonettes," consisting of a series of popular expositions of the Epistle in the order of the text.

The "Expository Notes" occupy the first thirty pages of the work, and are scholarly and helpful. The "Sermonettes" so-called, (a word which we think should have no place in good English), though so short that they could each be delivered, on an average, in fifteen minutes, yet are packed with excellent and suggestive thoughts. It would be difficult to find elsewhere so many practical thoughts and suggestions in as short sermons.

The author has the happy faculty of setting forth in a vivid, interesting, and instructive manner, the course of the thought in the passage expounded.

Several of the plans in these expository discourses are admirable, and are worthy of close study by young ministers. Take, for example, the text 1 Tim. i. 15,—*"This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief,"* which he terms *The Gospel in a Sentence*, and which he treats textually thus: I. THE MISSION OF THE SON OF GOD is here set forth—He *"came into the world."* II. THE PURPOSE OF HIS MISSION could not be set forth more clearly and concisely than in the words, He came *"to save sinners."* III. THE EXEMPLIFICATION OF THIS PURPOSE, given by Paul, is drawn from his own experience. He says, respecting himself, of sinners *"I am chief."* *Conclusion.*—The truth that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, is *"worthy of all acceptance."* *"It is a faithful saying."*

In the expository sermon on 1 Tim. v. 17-22, entitled

Duties Towards the Ministry, the following are the chief heads: I. ITS FAITHFULNESS SHOULD BE HONORED.—“Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour.” II. ITS REPUTATION SHOULD BE CHERISHED.—“Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses.” III. ITS ASPIRANTS SHOULD BE APPROVED.—“Lay hands suddenly or hastily on no man.”

In the sermon on The Christian Contest, from 1 Tim. vi. 12, “Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses,” the author gives the following plan: “This exhortation reminds us— I. THAT THE CHRISTIAN LIFE IS A CONTEST. II. THAT THE CHRISTIAN LIFE BEGINS WITH A CALL. III. THAT THE CHRISTIAN LIFE DEMANDS CONFESSION. IV. THAT THE CHRISTIAN LIFE RECEIVES ITS CROWN.”

The style is simple, clear, direct, and well adapted to expository discourse.

We commend to young ministers this volume as a valuable aid in acquiring skill in expository preaching.

SERMONS BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR.¹

This volume (Contemporary Pulpit Library) contains eighteen discourses recently delivered by the eminent Archdeacon of Westminster on such practical themes as, Christian Responsibility; How to Deal with Social Dis-

¹*Sermons.* By the Ven. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon of Westminster. New York: Thomas Whittaker. London: Swan, Sonnenschein and Company. 1889.

treasure; The Regeneration of the World; The Signs of the Times; The Church and Her Work; Doers of the Word; London Life; Hosea's Message; and Religion and Religionism.

These sermons show Archdeacon Farrar to be a very practical and close preacher. Few Puritan divines ever pressed home the truth more faithfully upon the heart and the conscience. Although loyal to the Church of England, he cares not for mere rites and ceremonies, and avows himself in hearty sympathy with all who, in whatever communion, show the Christian spirit.

In these sermons he dwells much on the practical duties of life and on social problems, especially those of London life. In all these great social questions he is intensely interested, and, relying mainly upon the Gospel for their solution, he urges his hearers to carry its blessings down among the wretched masses of the great metropolis.

These sermons disclose the ripe scholarship and wide reading of their author. They abound in illustrations. The style, though somewhat diffuse, is attractive.

The plans of these discourses are not, in general, equal to the material. The sermons that we have read with most interest are those on How to Deal with Social Distress; The Sinlessness of Christ; The Might of the Spirit; London Life; and Christianity Triumphant.

It is no small commendation of the sermons in this volume, to say that they are worthy of their distinguished author.

SERMONS BY CANON LIDDON.¹

Canon Liddon, as is well known, has long been regarded as one of the ablest preachers of the Church of England. In varied scholarship, in profound and suggestive thought, and in felicitous diction, he has few if any superiors in the English Pulpit. In these two latest volumes from his pen, he has permitted a large number of readers to enjoy the discourses which instructed and delighted the large audiences that are wont to gather Sunday afternoons at St. Paul's.

In the first volume of fifteen sermons, the preacher treats of such themes as, The Disobedient Prophet; Adoration; The Premature Judgments of Men; The Beginning and the End; The Place where the Lord Lay; Holding by the Feet; The Pharisee and the Publican; Stewardship; Foreign Missions; The Incarnation, and The Dignity of Service.

The second volume contains fourteen discourses on such subjects as, The Obligations of Human Brotherhood; Death and its Conquest; The Knowledge of the Universal Judge; God's Justice and the Cross; The Christian Warrior; Human History and its Lessons; Christ's Demands, and four sermons on The Magnificat.

In the discourses of both these volumes Canon Liddon is at his best, and gives us the ripest results of his scholarship and thinking. We are impressed by his wide reading,

¹*Sermons.* By H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L., Canon of St. Paul's. *First Series* (Contemporary Pulpit Library). London: Swan, Sonnenschein and Co., 1888.

Sermons. By the same author. *Second Series* (Contemporary Pulpit Library). New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890.

exact and varied scholarship, profound knowledge and insight of Scripture and skill in setting forth its meaning. His expositions are often remarkable. His illustrations, though not numerous, are choice and vivid. His development of his subjects is quite full and very suggestive. He is always fresh and instructive, whatever be his theme. As he advances along the pathway of his discourse, he often gives to his audience charming vistas of related truths on either hand. In applying the truth he is at once faithful and tender.

We cannot but think that not a few of these sermons are defective in form. Rarely do we find a subject stated clearly and concisely. Although many of the plans of these discourses are excellent, few of them have their main heads so clearly and tersely expressed as to give the reader, much less the hearer, ready command of the course of the thought. This frequent want of a prominent and concisely worded subject and plan, we regard as the chief defect in these excellent discourses.

SERMONS BY BISHOP MAGEE.¹

Few prelates of the Established Church of England are as noted for eloquence in the pulpit as is the Bishop of Peterborough. A man of fine presence, able and well disciplined intellect, varied culture, affluent imagination, forcible style and fervid delivery, he is a very attractive and persuasive preacher. The writer well remembers the deep

¹*Sermons.* By the Right Rev. W. C. Magee, D.D., Lord Bishop of Peterborough. (The Contemporary Pulpit Library). New York: Thomas Whittaker. London: Swan, Sonnenschein and Co., 1888.

impression made by the eloquent Bishop in a discourse to a great audience in Westminster Abbey, a score of years ago. He usually preaches without notes, and in a direct and familiar style.

The volume before us includes sixteen discourses, of which five are Sermons on the Creeds; seven on The Church's Catechism, and the remaining four on Abraham's Faith; The Kingdom of Christ; National Idolatry, and Jacob's Wrestling. These last are occasional discourses, and are longer and more elaborate than the others.

These sermons, as a whole, seem hardly equal to the fame of their author. Most of them were printed from reporter's notes, as they were delivered to the large congregations that gather Sunday afternoons during Lent in the Peterborough Cathedral, and they are too brief to admit of a thorough discussion of the subjects of which they treat. But they all have the marked characteristics of Bishop Magee as a preacher.

We cannot agree with some of his views as set forth in his sermon on baptism. "Every baptized man is a Christian. He is a member of Christ; he is a child of God; he is an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." Now, in a very loose and general sense of the term, a baptized man may be called a Christian by profession; but in the exact meaning of the word as commonly understood, a Christian man is a regenerated man, one whose heart is right with God, and whose supreme purpose is to do the will of God, and we cannot but think that the use of the term in the signification given to it by the author, even though sustained by "The Church catechism," is misleading and injurious.

The discourses on Abraham's Faith, and National Idolatry, are suggestive and excellent.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.¹

The thirty-six sermons and three addresses of Dr Manning, contained in this volume of 542 pages, we have read with much interest. They were selected by Mrs. Manning from among the many discourses left by the lamented author, and though differing considerably in merit, they may be supposed fairly to represent the preaching of Dr. Manning during the quarter of a century in which he occupied the honored pulpit of the Old South Church, Boston. They were published, we are told, at the earnest request of the many friends and parishioners of Dr. Manning.

Although, as has been said, these sermons are unequal in ability, yet they are worthy of their distinguished author, and manifest his earnest Christian spirit as a man, his faithfulness as a preacher, and his loving care of his flock as a pastor. They show him to have been a man of good parts, of fine intellectual and esthetic culture, of affluent imagination, and of felicitous expression. He must have been a very manly man, with a keen sense of justice and right, true to his convictions, and fearless in expressing them. He believed and therefore spoke.

The material of these sermons is excellent, and is taken in no small degree from the Scriptures. Indeed,

¹*Sermons and Addresses.* By Rev. Jacob Merrill Manning, D. D., Pastor of the Old South Church, Boston, Mass. Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1889.

these discourses are thoroughly Biblical and practical. They have chiefly to do with the great verities of the Gospel, and apply them with singular faithfulness and tenderness to the characters and lives of the hearers. They disclose the wide reading of their author, and the ample store of apt illustrations at his command. He was a devoted student of nature, and gathered thence not a few of his most pertinent and beautiful illustrations of the truth.

The plans of these sermons, taken as a whole, seem to us to be hardly equal to the material. While some of the plans are admirable, and clearly, briefly and distinctly expressed, others appear to be deficient in these respects, and do not give us easy possession of the thought. There is a pleasing variety of construction in these discourses.

Were we to select from this large number of sermons those that have most impressed us in the reading, we should name those on the following subjects: Sons of God through Christ; The Structure of the Epistle to the Romans; Conscience; The Beginning and End of Sin; The Ideal Life; The Spirit of Christ; The Story of Naaman, and its Lesson; Completed Lives; We all do Fade as a Leaf; and Christian Missions and the Social Ideal—a sermon preached before the American Board.

The three addresses with which the volume closes, on Samuel Adams, John Brown, and a Eulogy upon Henry Wilson, delivered in the State House, Boston, are able and discriminating, and show their author to have been a man of great integrity, strong convictions and undaunted courage.

We are glad that these Sermons and Addresses of this noble man have been published, and believe that “the

earnest hope that the truth as presented in them may find a response in many hearts, and thus prolong his influence and memory in the world," will be fulfilled.

SIGNS OF PROMISE.¹

In this volume Dr. Lyman Abbott has given to the public eighteen of the sermons that he preached during the first two years of his ministry in Plymouth Church, in response to requests for their publication. They were delivered without notes, taken down by a stenographer, and revised by the author for publication.

In respect to the topics and the unity of these discourses, the author says: "The first two sermons are in the nature of personal tributes to my predecessor in Plymouth Pulpit, the greatest preacher of our age if not of all ages; a man to whom I owe the greatest debt one soul can owe another—the debt of love for spiritual nurture. The next two contend for the right and duty of progress in religious thought and life, and indicate certain laws which govern real progress, and certain characteristics which distinguish it from mere movement. The next four deal with some aspects of the fundamental issue of our day, that between Naturalism and Revelation, between religion that is a human product and religion that is a divine gift and growth. The next two treat of the Church of God, the visible incarnation and manifestation of his gift to mankind. The remaining eight deal with

¹*Signs of Promise.* Sermons preached in Plymouth Pulpit, Brooklyn, 1887-89. By Lyman Abbott. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert, 1889.

problems and experiences of the spiritual life in the individual soul."

These sermons are largely practical. They are the farthest possible from doctrinal or theological. Indeed, the author seems to omit no opportunity to warn his hearers against the evils of any kind of systematic theology. "It has been assumed" he says, "that we can have a complete and perfect knowledge of the universe. The very phrase, "systematic theology," is a misleading phrase. Theology—science of God. Systematic theology—systematic knowledge of God. The ant-hill undertaking to measure the garden!" But may not one derive great benefit from systematizing whatever knowledge of God he may obtain from the Divine Word, however imperfect such knowledge may be? Do we not take a similar course in Geology, Biology, and all the other sciences without for a moment imagining that we know all about these subjects?

Throughout these discourses we see continual evidences of the great influence which "the greatest preacher of our age," as the author lovingly estimates Mr. Beecher, has had on his thought and style. His views of the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the continued inspiration of Christians, of the theory of evolution, and of "the silence (of the finally impenitent) in an eternal grave from which there is no resurrection," are, as nearly as we can gather from these discourses, very similar to those of his late pastor and leader. But his views, against some of which, as we read, we find ourselves protesting, are set forth in a loving and catholic spirit.

Some of the author's exegesis we must think a little faulty. For example, in his sermon on Salvation by

Growth, from the text, Ephesians ii, 3, "We were by nature the children of wrath, even as others," we are told that the phrase, "children of wrath," means simply that "We have come out of wrath; it is the birth, the very cradle, as it were, in which our childhood was rocked." "We are children of our own appetites, of our own natures." Thus the phrase does not assert the Divine displeasure. In this view the author is at variance with such high authorities as Meyers, Ellicott, and Alford.

While in the case of those who finally reject God's mercy in Christ, the author can "see naught but death," yet he repudiates the doctrine of endless sin and conscious suffering, as shown in the closing sentences of the last sermon of the volume. "When at last mercy has achieved its end, when they who have resisted its every influence unto death are silent in an eternal grave, from which there is no resurrection, then in the song which shall go up from the ten thousand times ten thousand, from every creature in the heavens above and on the earth beneath and in the waters under the earth, there will be no discordant note, no spiritual dissonance, no sullen silence; there will be no remote and far-off corner of the universe where, behind locked doors, the groans of an endless misery and the wrath of an endless sin shall prove that the devil has won a victory in some small corner of God's dominions; but God shall be all and in all, and life shall reign, and death shall be put forever under feet. When that hour comes, will your voice be hushed and silent in eternal death? O, may it rather join in the new song, 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive glory, and honor, and power, and riches, for ever and ever!'"

Dr. Abbott has made the plans of most of these sermons clear and prominent. They give easy possession of his thought. His style is simple, vigorous, and often beautiful. He abounds in pertinent and forcible illustrations. He does not weary his hearers or readers. He has the enviable art of saying just what he wants to say in a terse, clear, forcible, and natural manner, and without the aid of a manuscript.

We are especially pleased with the sermons on Grapes of Gall; The Religion of Humanity; The Dogmatism of Paul; Christ's Law of Love; and The Peace of God.

.

.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

PART II.

PRESENT STATE
OF
STUDIES IN PASTORAL THEOLOGY
BY
REV. G. B. WILLCOX,
PROFESSOR OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY AND SPECIAL STUDIES
IN
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

Prof. Wm. M. Paxton, of Princeton, in *The Presbyterian Review* for January 1889, opposes strongly the view that "men are called to the ministry in the same way in which they are called to be Farmers, Merchants, Lawyers or Physicians." He insists on a mystical intimation of the Divine Will, in some sense, though he does not tell us in what that differs from the evidence that a Christian physician may expect, that he is the line of God's direction. His argument from the Scriptures is not convincing. His instances from the appointments of prophets and apostles are irrelevant to the case of an ordinary pastor. And the few instances in which disciples of Christ are mentioned as called to the work of teaching or preaching, are easily paralleled by language equally strong, in the call of others to other vocations. When he comes to the *evidences* of such a Divine intimation as he requires, he finds them chiefly in such physical, intellectual and spiritual gifts as, under the view he opposes, would be requisite. Under either view no one would be justified in entering this office without earnest prayer for the Divine direction and profound belief that he had found the leading of the hand of God. The notion of a specially distinct call from on high to the ministry, as a specially sacred and exalted work, is full of the danger of spiritual assumption and pride, with which, in every age, the clergy have been beset. It would seem to

have been a constant aim with the Divine Master to reduce the distinction between sacred and secular things ; and that, not by leveling down the former but by leveling up the latter. He would have had all days consecrated, all places holy, all callings sacred. It is dangerous to intimate to a layman that his vocation lies less near to God than that of his pastor. Most laymen have already too much of that perilous notion.

FORMING A MINISTER'S LIBRARY.

On this important matter Prof. J. O. Murray, of Princeton College, discourses in *The Homiletic Review* for January, 1890. We incorporate some of his suggestions with others of our own.

First, then, purchase deliberately. Be not driven to rashness by any alarm-cry that the book will be sold out of the market. Neither conclude, simply from a great name as the author, as to the value of the book. There are multitudes of poor books from good authors.

Have always, in purchasing, an intelligent plan. Do not buy accidentally. Even if a book be valuable, it may be in a department of literature in which, at the expense of some other department, you are tolerably supplied.

Reference books (which, indeed, should constitute the main part of a small library, economically gathered) should be in substantial bindings. But a given amount of money may be made, by the selection of *other* books in cloth bindings, to cover a larger number of volumes.

Many a young minister, by buying *sets* of books (as the

complete works of an author) only two or three of which are of value, wastes his money.

To subscribe for books issued serially, in numbers, is very rarely wise. They will be found, when the whole set has been taken, and bound, to have been extravagantly costly. These issues in numbers, with a call for only twenty-five or fifty cents at a time, are a trick of the trade.

A pastor may induce his people to found a pastor's library. They can be made to see that it will be a valuable investment to enrich their own pulpit and enhance their profit from it.

Prof. Murray has, appended to his article, several brief, but valuable lists of books, in different branches of learning, recommended by able scholars.

REFORMS IN FUNERALS.

At a meeting of the Richmond, Va., Evangelical Alliance, representing the Protestant churches of that city, a committee reported on possible improvements in the conduct of funerals. The report speaks of a growing disinclination to funeral sermons. They are usually of little profit. A young, inexperienced minister is apt to hope, in great confidence, for saving impressions on such occasions. The solemnity of the scene he takes for a most promising, providential opening for such impressions. But the fact is that the attendants are, many of them, drawn by sheer curiosity to see what disposition the preacher will make of the departed. And many go as they would to a tragedy

in a theater. They *expect* to be moved to tears. That is part of the programme. Any deeper impression than this—any movement beyond the sensibilities—is almost hopeless. Dr. Lyman Beecher is said to have remarked that, of all the hundreds of funeral sermons he had preached, he could hardly remember one to which he could ascribe any fruit. And with the embarrassments when one stands by the bier of a man who lived a godless life every experienced pastor is familiar. It would be better to confine the funeral service, mainly, to Scripture reading, prayer and hymn. There are, however, instances in which a funeral, held on the outskirts of a community, is attended by so many who are never seen in a church, as to offer an opportunity that no faithful preacher can forego, for showing the need of truth.

Needless and dangerous exposure, on damp ground, in chilly weather perhaps, at the grave, also comes into this report for notice. This is an evil often endured by mourners; when they would gladly retire, out of the fear that some one will count them wanting in respect and affection for the dead. A pastor may render excellent service by gently reminding them of the danger to health and leading them away.

Another evil, mentioned in this report, but with no suggestion of any adequate remedy, is the burdensome expensiveness of funerals. This heavy cost, when perhaps the only bread-winner of the family has been taken, is one of the most cruel of all the tributes levied by fashion. The effectual recourse is to a burial at some other hour, or day, from that on which the funeral service is held. The obsequies may then be made, without embarrassment, to correspond with the resources of the household.

A CONGREGATIONAL RITUAL.

The *Churchman*, of New York, recently discussed, from the Episcopalian position, the apparent desire in the Congregationalist churches, for some enrichment of the order of worship. The *Churchman* assumes that, as the extempore prayer offered by a pastor is not shaped in its utterance by the people, it is *to them*, as they worship through it, nothing else but a form. So the editor holds it to be superior in no respect to a prayer-book; and, in that it depends on the ability of the minister, far inferior to the book. Very poor reasoning, as it appears to us. For it takes account of only one of the evils of a form, viz: that it is not language shaped at the moment by the assembly. That, of course, so far as an evil at all, is a necessary evil. But the worst evils of a form are quite different. They are two-fold. The first is that the form is inflexible. Whatever event may have recently happened, whether great calamity, or thrilling piece of good fortune, whether the congregation has gathered in tears or joy, there is an unbending cast of sentences with which they must approach the Mercy Seat. Extempore prayer, on the contrary, allows the minister, and the people with him, to give utterance to the feeling that fills every heart. We had a single instance, in both kinds, on the Sunday following the death of President Lincoln. The whole nation was plunged in depths of grief. But, while the non-ritualistic churches were worshipping in words befitting the occasion, the churches which used a ritual were in a sore strait with the Jubilations of Easter put into their lips.

A second evil of forms of prayer is that they become

too familiar. They are learned almost by rote. Like well-worn coins they lose their impression. Even in regard to the Lord's Prayer, for example, everyone using it must be aware that *really to pray* in these touching and beautiful words, requires a positive effort of the mind and heart. They slip from the tongue so glibly that the danger is that of reciting them thoughtlessly as one does the alphabet. It is seriously doubtful whether our Lord ever intended that those words should be used as they now are so generally used—whether He did not design the Prayer only as a schedule of natural and fit subjects to take into our petitions.

Hardly any change is so much needed for the enrichment of our service as fuller *Bible exposition*. A pastor who will inquire of even prominent and intelligent men will be astonished to find how ignorant they are of the results of the latest and best Christian scholarship. Let the Scriptures be twice read at each service—once for devotional use, responsively, and once for exposition. Let the pews be well provided with Bibles. Then while the people follow him, each one with the book open, let the minister, after careful study, briefly expound about a dozen verses of Scripture. In some churches the choir and the congregation alternate, the former chanting a verse, the latter reading the next, and so on. There is no difficulty, with a little invention on the part of a pastor, in devising as much variety as is needful or profitable in the whole service.

RELIGIOUS TEACHING IN SCHOOLS.

Bishop McQuaid, of Rochester, N. Y., has, under this title in *The Forum* for December, 1889, a characteristic

Roman Catholic onslaught on our Public School system. It is quite evident that that Church is coming, more and more clearly, to see that the diversion of the public funds, for the support of parochial schools, is a matter "*vel stantibus vel cadentibus ecclesiæ*." Their hue and cry that the public school is a Protestant institution and opposed to the "Church," is true. Not at all in the sense in which they use the words. As to its design and administration, it is as impartial towards all religious sects as it well could be. But it is so distinctively for the education of the people, whom the Romish Church leaves, and always has left, in ignorance, it is so thoroughly pervaded by the free, American spirit, as to bear heavily against the imperious assumptions of the Roman Church. For the same reason that southern slaveholders refused education to the negroes, the hierarchy would refuse it to the children of their own people.

This is not an unfair or uncharitable judgment. The idea that the Roman Church would, if it had the power, restore the Inquisition, is, indeed, we believe open to that charge. Protestants as well as Romanists did, in the Middle Ages, what no Protestant would defend to-day. It is certainly easy for Roman Catholics to insist that the Inquisition was due, not to their Church, but to the barbarism of the age. But no such reply will meet the charge that ignorance for the people is the policy of that Church. The condition to-day of Italy, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, South America, where the priesthood has had, for centuries, almost unlimited control, where the management of whatever little education has been allowed has been in their hands, is a tremendous fact that, like the ghost of Banquo, will not "down." It is easy for Bishop McQuaid

to tell us that "future generations will listen to no silly twaddle about Ireland, Italy and Spain, about the Pope, the Inquisition and danger to our liberties." No wonder that the mention of those countries, with their damning record, stirs the Bishop's ire. It is a very disagreeable subject, no doubt. And so much the more, as it shows what is the policy of his Church, not three centuries ago, but *to-day*, wherever that Church still keeps its power.

His reverence insists that the Catholic parochial schools are as far advanced and as effective as those of the State. It is doubtless true that they are better than any system ever attempted in any Roman Catholic country. They are forced up by competition, by public sentiment, and, in many cases, by being made responsible to the public inspectors. But that they are notoriously inferior and inadequate is proved by the simple fact that Roman priests are constantly, to keep the children of their own parishes in these schools, threatening the parents with excommunication. Their great difficulty is to drag their people into co-operation with themselves in their crusade against our public schools. They could, if they should choose, perhaps, make the parochial equal to the public instruction. But the remedy would be worse than the disease. It would be the precise thing which their Church most deeply dreads—an effective education of the people.

The bishop pronounces the public-school system "thoroughly godless in name and in law." To him and those like-minded, anything that should not teach the dogmas of his Church would be godless. But that such a character belongs, as a matter of fact, to our public schools is a gross and groundless slander. The practical moral im-

pression made on children and youth in our schools depends immeasurably more on the teacher than on any book or course of study. And our teachers, especially the female teachers, who are an immense majority of the whole, are, very largely, Christian persons and exerting over their pupils a Christian influence. The cry of alarmists that, because a chapter of the Bible is not daily read, the school must be adjudged godless, is much like a similar cry about the mention of the name of God in the national Constitution.

The bishop gives us two or three pages of invective against what he calls "the unadulterated communism" of our public schools. He is disgusted that a man's children should be educated at the expense of his neighbors. He might as well complain of a man who happens to have a street-lamp in front of his house as enjoying illumination at the expense of his neighbors. If the State (for its own interest, observe, not for that of the child), to provide itself with good citizens, establishes schools, somebody who is father of a family must enjoy the benefit. And the idea that he is "pauperized" by it is a figment of the bishop's imagination that will never impose on the American people.

Another absurd assumption of the bishop is that his co-religionists "do not ask for a division of the school fund. Indeed, they fear the State." (Is it an accident, by the way, that he always writes "State" with a small s?) "They ask simply for their own money, unjustly taken from them for the education of the children of infidels and Evangelicals." We waive the point that they do *not* ask, and their priests cannot induce them to ask, any such thing. But, if they should, what would that be but asking, with true Jesuit in-

direction and evasion, for public funds? Does the Bishop mean to say that lawful taxes, lawfully collected, are a *present* to the State? That it has no right to them? To assume that, whenever citizens are dissatisfied with the use made by the government of their tax-money, they may demand to be relieved of the taxes, would be a new position under the sun.

The fact is, and the Catholic hierarchy may as well understand it, that the record of their Church in countries where they have, and for centuries have had, supreme control, puts them before the American people under the grave suspicion of being enemies of popular education. Until they reverse that record, their arguments against our Public School system are not likely to carry much weight in the United States.

PROTESTANTISM AND EDUCATION.

Mr. John Vienot, in the *Revue Chretienne* for April, 1889, has an interesting sketch of the more recent educational work of the French government, together with some discussion of the relations of Protestantism to primary school instruction. The best authority, as he states, covering the history of French public education, since 1870, is the "Dictionnaire de Pedagogie et d'Instruction Primaire," compiled by M. F. Buisson, and published within the last year. The public school, as the typical and necessary out-come of the Protestant principle of the right of private judgment, is here finely outlined. Compulsory education was vigorously urged by Luther. "I affirm," he said, "that it is the duty of the authorities to compel those un-

der their rule to send their children to school." So with Melancthon and Bugenhagen. The excellent service, in this direction, of the Moravian bishop, Amos Comenius, early in the seventeenth century, is here commemorated. He insisted upon instruction by the mother in every house, upon a primary school or commune, upon a gymnasium in every city, and upon an academy in every considerable province. A man intelligent enough to urge, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, such strides of progress, deserves the name of the father of modern systems of education.

But M. Vienot has serious apprehension from the complete secularization of the French public instruction. That word means in France what it cannot mean in the United States. The immense dimensions of our Sunday School work, involving, as is stated on another page, 8,000,000 teachers and scholars, or half the whole number on the globe, is a strong safe-guard for the children. But a still more effective protection is the pervading Christian sentiment of the American people. Tens of thousands of our teachers are Christian men and women. Though they offer no prayers, read no Scripture, in the schools, their influence is that of prayer and Scripture, day after day. But neither Sunday Schools nor Christian sentiment is, in France, strong enough to do such service for that so long priest-ridden land. The danger is serious. The remedy is not in attempting to make the schools religious in any ceremonial observances. That, in France, would mean only putting them under the Romish clergy. The remedy is in evangelizing the French people. Only so can their public schools be saved from becoming hot-beds of infidelity and godlessness.

THE AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL.

Under this title, Rev. Dr. M. H. Hutton, in *The Presbyterian Review* for April, 1889, discusses our Sunday School as a peculiar, native institution. He denies any connection between it and either the post-exilic Jewish Bible schools of the Jews, the catechumenical training of the patristic Church, or even the work of Robert Raikes at Gloucester, England, early in the last century. The immense success and power of the Sunday School among us appear in its numbers, which are almost half those of all the teachers and scholars on the globe. In 1887, there was a total of about sixteen and a half millions, with eight millions of them in the United States. M. Buisson, chairman of a commission from the French government to investigate our whole system of primary instruction, in 1876, reported that "the Sunday School" among us, "is not an accessory agent; it is an absolute necessity." "All things unite," he added, "to assign to this institution a great part in American life." Laveleye, before Buisson, had said, "The Sunday School is one of the strongest foundations of the republican institutions of the United States."

As points of weakness in the American school, Dr. Hutton notes: 1—that it fails to educate systematically. Portions of the Bible are neglected. The knowledge conveyed is fragmentary. But this strikes us as hypercritical. Large portions of the Book are not fitted—were never intended to be fitted—for use in the instruction of children. It by no means follows, if a Sunday School graduate might be tricked into looking for "the book of Hezekiah" among the Minor Prophets, that he has not a very large and rich acquaintance with his Bible.

2. A second weakness, as Dr. Hutton urges, is the lack of grade in the school. Though this is true, there is constant improvement going on. Most schools have two, and many three or four grades of scholars.

3. A fourth defect he makes to be the average youth of the teachers. He questions the wisdom of assuming that young men and young ladies either can instruct as well, or hold as strongly in their influence, the younger children, as the fathers and mothers in Israel. But the ripe adult who retains enough of the enthusiasm of youth to interest the little ones, is too rare a treasure to be relied upon in one's general plans. Dr. Hutton criticises, also, the devotional services in many schools, and the quality of the books in the libraries.

OUT-OF-TOWN MISSIONS FOR CITY CHURCHES.

In *The Andover Review* for August, 1889, Mr. John Tunis objects to the method of aiding feeble, rural churches by our large, charitable societies. That, as he claims, is the work of a corporation. It has no more vital, sympathetic touch on the struggling church than by an annual check from a treasurer. There is no stimulus in it. The weak brotherhood comes to feel itself entitled to the periodic payment. Little close supervision is possible, to discover whether the members of that brotherhood bear their full share of their expenses. There is, as this writer holds, a more excellent way. Let some strong city church take this weaker, rural body under its care. Let the pastor make the personal acquaintance of its pastor and the flock. Let there be occasional meetings in the country parish, to

which a good-sized delegation shall go out from the foster-church. This brotherly interest, accompanied by such pecuniary aid as may be advisable and possible, will do immeasurably more than any commercial draft from a distant charitable corporation to infuse new life into the veins of the body ecclesiastical in the rural community. It is quite certain that we have delegated too largely to our societies and agencies the brotherly fellowship that should be maintained between the local churches. Instead of coming heart to heart we have touched one another at arms' length.

SOCIAL DRAWING ROOMS.

In *The Forum* for October, 1889, Bishop F. D. Huntington has a "Drawing Room Homily" on the frivolities and jealousies and inanities of the fashionable drawing-room entertainment. It repeats largely, and somewhat vigorously, the line of diatribe in Mr. George William Curtis' "Potiphar Papers."

The higher is one's Christian position, the more thoroughly he will deplore the manner in which too many of these entertainments are conducted. It seems to be a sort of unwritten law that to pass, in conversation, beyond the commonplaces, the weather, politics, dress, or the latest newspaper gossip, to enter on any matter that cannot be disposed of in a five minutes' chat, is a social felony. All together are put into a routine-drill, in which there is about as much liberty of motion and conversation as a parade of militia.

The idle waste of wealth is an added evil. One host

competes with another in the costliness of a gustatory triumph, which the fashionable caterer knows how to augment. To go to and fro from the scene without a carriage is hardly less than to risk one's social standing. Young clerks and tradesmen, of slender means, are exposed to fearful temptation of embezzlement.

The entertainment provided is for the body with its appetites.

The idea that the soul is of chief rank and importance—the body a mere appendix to that—is not so much as recognized. Very likely, if any rational conversation is attempted, it is drowned by the orchestra in such a din of sound that one might as well address his remarks to a tornado.

But if we are rational creatures; if we believe, what all so readily assert, that the soul is of immeasurably greater account than the body, why not recognize that fact on occasions like these? Why not let the physical entertainment be kept moderate and plain, while the intellectual shall be of as high an order as possible?

It is quite certain that, except in a gathering of scientists and other savants, the intellectual pabulum furnished by mere extempore conversation is not likely to be of a high order. There ought to be something presented on which previous thought has been expended. Let that have the precedence. Then let conversation, having been thus nourished and stimulated, come in as a somewhat incidental matter. We have already, and, apparently, in increasing numbers, small associations or circles, meeting perhaps fortnightly, in which a valuable paper is read, followed by remark and discussion, a modest collation is

served, and the company retire with the consciousness of an evening rationally and usefully spent.

John Foster somewhere speaks, in his diary, of his commiseration of young lovers who come together point-blank, to say only "I love you and you love me." Why can they not, he asks in substance (for we quote from memory), meet on lines *converging* towards some one grand aim or interest, which draws them together because both are drawn toward that? It is a question that may well be put to our fashionable society in its entertainments. When the guests meet for some end beyond gossip and chat, they will gather with keener zest and part with higher self-respect and mutual esteem.

WOMEN AMONG THE EARLY CHURCHES.

Principal Donaldson, of the University of St. Andrews, contributed a valuable article on this interesting theme to the *Contemporary Review* for September, 1889.

The Church of the earlier Christian centuries rather fell back from, than advanced beyond the respect for woman shown in Apostolic times. As Christianity was itself a daring revolution, it might have been expected to work a beneficent revolution in favor of the emancipation and elevation of the oppressed sex. In the churches of the first century women were accorded a quite prominent part. But presently they began to appear only as martyrs and deaconesses. Their astonishing heroism as martyrs, amidst the most appalling tortures, need not be here recounted. As deaconesses, they co-operated with their brethren, not only in the distribution of alms, and the

care of the poor of their own sex, but in the spread of the gospel. Paul calls several of them his fellow-laborers—probably in this latter capacity.

Also we begin to read of widows," who constituted a peculiar sort of office-bearers, with a special work (I. Tim. v, 3—16). But gradually widowhood fell in the esteem of the churches and virginity rose. In Tertullian's time, virgins were elected for the duties of "widow" and called widows.

To the end of the second century, there were no public buildings for Christian worship. Disciples met in private houses. But when, in the increase of numbers and wealth, churches were built, the care of them devolved on the deacons, assisted by the deaconesses. The latter acted as ushers, and saw that all were quiet and reverent in behavior.

The widows had no spiritual functions. They were not to teach. The widow's occupation is covered by the words, "She is to sit at home, sing, pray, read, watch, fast, and speak to God continually in songs and hymns."

The deaconesses, too, were prohibited from teaching. But they had greater liberty of movement than the widows, who were enjoined to be obedient to them.

In this exclusion of women from every sacred function the early Church was behind both the heretical sects and the heathen. The priestesses and the Vestals were high in position and in honor. And for centuries the Church was able to do but little to relieve Christian women, who were slaves, from the degradation to which, by Roman law, they were doomed. Though slaves could not be legally married, the Church, despite the law, married them and, to the

last degree possible, maintained the sacredness of the relation.

From the first it was evident that our Lord and his apostles put honor on marriage. There could be no question of that. But as Gnostic, and, later, Manichaean, notions of the evil inherent in matter fostered asceticism, marriage fell into lower repute. Children are seldom mentioned, at all, in the Christian writings of the second and third centuries. Naturally all this bore heavily against a due respect for woman. She came to be regarded as a siren, laying perilous snares for the godly. Virginity was exalted to high honor, and celibacy lauded as the heavenly state. Tertullian addressed to woman such language as this: "You are the devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of that forbidden tree; you are the first deserter of the divine law; you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack."

The only protection from so dangerous a character was to shut her up. Into seclusion therefore she was remanded. The Christian writers of the time insist that she shall not appear at banquets, at marriage feasts, at the theater, the public baths, or on streets. She must remain at home. If she would have exercise, Clement of Alexandria teaches her to "spin and weave and superintend the cooking." "Women," he says, "are, with their own hand, to fetch from the store whatever we require: and it is no disgrace to them to apply themselves to the mill." In short, she was to fill her function in making herself as meekly and usefully as possible a household drudge.

According to Principal Donaldson, there is, through those earlier centuries, a striking absence of appearance of

any cheerful, Christian home life. "No son succeeds his father; no wife comforts the wearied student; no daughter soothes the sorrow of the aged bishop." He ascribes to this homelessness the prevailing hardness of heart, in which men disputed with bitterness, even ferocity, minute points of doctrine which are now counted incomprehensible and matters of indifference. Beyond question, the rise of woman in our happier era, to the respect and influence that belong to her, has softened and sweetened the social life of our day.

DEACONESSSES IN AMERICA.

A valuable article, by Elizabeth R. Holden, in the *Christian at Work*, gives information as to these "Sisterhoods."

The attempt of the honored and reverend Pastor Fliedner, of the Kaiserswerth Deaconess' House, in 1849, to establish a like work in this country seems to have met but ill-success. Two of the sisters were appointed to labor in Pittsburg, Pa., and three or four others joined them. But beyond those, there were no considerable accessions.

A splendid property, however, has been given, in Philadelphia, for a "Mother-House of Deaconesses," and Mr. John D. Lankman, a German Christian philanthropist, who is its patron, seems unwearied in his gifts and endeavors.

In the Episcopal Church are sixteen Sisterhoods. Their work is the care of the sick and the poor, young ladies' schools, refuges, reformatories, and other like enterprises. They have in all about 250 Sisters and novitiates. The

Sisters take the triple vow of "chastity, poverty and obedience." The largest of these bodies is the "Community of St. Mary's," in New York, with 90 members and novitiates. There are Deaconesses, also, whose vow is for only a term of years. That of the Sisters is for life.

The Methodist Church, which, though, naturally, not in sympathy with these stringent and irrevocable vows, is deeply responsive to suffering and want, has taken measures looking in the same general direction. The General Conference, in May, 1888, authorized the founding of an Order of Deaconesses, who should have mainly the same duties with those above mentioned. Two years of continuous service were prescribed by the Conference as requisite for a member of the Order. Three, who were consecrated in Chicago, in 1889, were graduates of the "Chicago Training School for City, Home and Foreign Missions." There are about thirty Deaconesses, in the four Homes which have been founded in Chicago, Minneapolis, Cincinnati and New York.

The Presbyterians, both in the last "General Council" and the last General Assembly, have spoken in warm commendation of the recognition of Deaconesses in their Communion. It is to be hoped that they and the other Christian Denominations will take practical measures toward an agency which is so seriously needed and may do so beneficent a work.

REACHING THE MASSES.

The work which Mr. D. L. Moody has undertaken in Chicago, with the training-school he is inaugurating,

will raise some signally important questions. His object, like all the objects he cherishes, is above praise. He hopes to reach with the gospel the mechanics and other laboring classes, who are not now, for various reasons, found in our churches.

As he states to the reporters of the press, he seeks "men of business-training," who "understand the book of human nature, what the people need, and how to reach them." He says, "The Rebellion never would have been put down by West Point graduates alone. We had to have volunteers. Just so it is here. We cannot do our work with nobody but the graduates of our seminaries. We must have volunteers." "A young man with a good, English education, ought to be ready for his work in one or two years." "Women are better qualified than men for this work. A woman can go to a woman, right into her kitchen, and sit down by her wash-tub and give her help."

Mr. Moody has buildings for his school, in Chicago, which cost \$100,000, with \$125,000 more for endowment.

Now every Christian will eagerly hope that this noble work may succeed. No exception can be taken to anything said by Mr. Moody in support of it. But there are some possible complications and embarrassments which must not be thrust from sight. They are not likely to beset any of these lay evangelists who do their work only at odd hours, while depending for their livelihood on some other business. No such embarrassments as those to which we refer will trouble Christian women, graduating from this school. But young laymen who adopt evan-

gelistic work as a profession, by which they live, will occupy an anomalous position. They will be neither clergy nor laity. On a ridge between the two, they will require, if they are to walk steadily, remarkable equilibrium. The danger is, that they will begin to look, and their wives, when they marry, will still more eagerly look, toward the dignity and social prominence of a pastor's position. They will wish to be ordained as ministers. Church authorities will incline to ordain them. And the result may be an influx of half-furnished men into a profession which vitally needs to be kept, as to ability and learning, at its very best. Mr. Moody, himself, of course, is liable to no such contingency. He is in no need of any prestige or prominence. His name is known around the world. And, if it were not, he is a man of such absolute self-forgetfulness and marvelous balance of character, as to be fully content with his lot. He is probably far more useful without ordination, than he could be with it. But it is by no means certain that he will be able to infuse his own admirable sense and judgment into the graduates of his school. If his grand enterprise escapes the danger here intimated, we believe it will accomplish a work for Christ in which all good men will rejoice with thanksgiving.

TAXATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY.

This matter was ably discussed by Mr. Henry C. Vedder, in the *Magazine of Christian Literature*, for February, 1890.

He wastes no time on the plea often thrown in by well-

meaning but short-sighted religionists, that it is hard if, in a Christian country, we cannot have something held sacred from the tax-gatherer's hand. He clearly sees that, if the exemption of ecclesiastical property from assessment cannot be defended (without regard to religious sentiment) on broad grounds of economic policy, it must and ought to be abandoned.

This discussion has been revived of late by the passage, in Quebec, of the Jesuits' Estates' Bill, by which a gift of \$400,000 was made, direct from the public treasury, as indemnity for the confiscation of Jesuit property, by the government of George the Third, in 1791. The Canadian Baptist Convention, indignant at that bill (which seems to have been one of obvious equity,) passed a resolution in protest. Their resolution does not really touch the main question of exemption. It only complains of favoritism to a single church. But the controversy has stimulated interest afresh in the whole matter of exemption.

There are one or two important principles which Mr. Vedder touches too lightly and briefly. The first is that no government has ever pretended to tax, *equally, ad valorem*, all the property of its citizens. The general welfare, and the bearing of the impost on that, have been the sole tests in levying on any particular species of wealth either a heavy assessment, or a light one, or none at all. Any argument for taxing church-property, based on the sole ground that other property is taxed, is therefore futile.

The second principle is that the State not only confers no proper benefit on the Church by exemption, but remains, after it, still *under heavy obligation to the Church*. "Who

does not know," says Mr. Vedder, "that the presence of a church in a locality increases the value of all the surrounding property? So fully is the fact appreciated that speculators in real-estate willingly give lots for the building of a church, in the full persuasion that they will reimburse themselves by the sale of the remaining lots at higher prices." This, however, as every candid man will acknowledge, is but a small part of the benefit conferred by a church on the public. In toning up popular sentiment, in raising the grade of public morality, it is constantly working to reduce the number of criminals and paupers, to care for the aged, for orphans and blind and insane, and so, to relieve the cost of government and the burden on the tax-payer. Churches, therefore, like hospitals and asylums and colleges, are a *valuable kind of growth* for the State to cultivate for *its own interest*. And exemption from taxation is the method of cultivation. This exemption the wise legislator will aim to carry just so far as, no farther than, it will contribute (without the least regard for the Church, or for religion, as such) to the public welfare. But it must still be remembered that the exemption leaves the State, or the public, largely indebted to the Church. To say that when public-spirited citizens have expended, say \$100,000, on an edifice which, with the work done in it, will so greatly relieve taxation, the government discharges itself of the obligation conferred on it by simply refraining from requiring those citizens to give an additional sum in taxes annually, is absurd.

Mr. Vedder seems to feel pressed by the objection that "to exempt church-property from taxation is the same

thing in principle, as direct state aid to the church." In his reply to this, he seems not very happy. He says "government may give indirect aid to institutions and enterprises to which it can give no direct aid. Thus, it would not be constitutional to lay taxes on the people for the sake of paying subsidies to manufacturers, but it is constitutional so to lay taxes as to afford incidental protection to American industries." He evades the issue. It is not one of constitutionality, but of *principle*. As to even the constitutionality, unless we take thorough free-trade ground, he is incorrect. No protectionist, certainly, would deny the right of the government to grant a subsidy to a new line of steamships which the public interest might require, and which private capitalists, without such subsidy, would not venture. We are not aware that anyone questioned the right of Congress to encourage by heavy grants of public lands the building of the first Pacific railroad. Bounties on the killing of wild animals are abundantly common. The fact is that, though indirect aid to churches may be *constitutional* and direct not, yet in *principle* there is no difference between them. It is in principle the same thing whether a church is aided by the grant of \$1,000, or by exemption from taxation to that amount. We all object, and rightly, to the Church and State policy. But the meaning of that has always been, the public endowment of some single church, as the Roman Catholic or the Church of England, to the exclusion of others. There are sufficient objections, on which we need not dwell, to that. There would be sufficient objections, also, to aiding *all* churches indiscriminately, from the public treasury. But the

objection would not be that such aid would differ in *principle* from the taxation exemption now under discussion.

The real and all-sufficient ground for this exemption is that the State, without interest in the churches, as such, finds exemption good policy. It is business. It pays. But a popular and plausible objection to this vindication has escaped Mr. Vedder's notice. "If a new church," it is said, "raises the value of property around it, so does a new manufacturing establishment greatly benefit a town. Why should not that, also, be exempted?" For the simple reason that the State can get, *without* exemption, the factory with all its benefits. The owners of it expect profit from their investment. Self-interest is a sufficient motive. But churches, besides working far more efficiently than factories, to reduce crime and pauperism and so relieve the public treasury, pay no dividends to those who build them. Self-interest would never erect them. In short, they are an exotic, with valuable fruit, on our earthly soil, which the State must be careful not to discourage in its growth. But the factory is a plant that will grow wild.

The plea that exemption enables the Roman Catholic Church to hold an enormous property free, is more sensational than sound. By an estimate, made, says Mr. Vedder, about a dozen years ago, that Church held in the United States, some \$61,000,000 worth of property, while the Protestant churches held \$294,000,000 worth. And the growth of the wealth, as well as members, of the former is more and more rapidly falling behind the latter.

INDEX.

- ABBOT, Ezra. 65
 Abbott, Signs of Promise, 371
 Acts of Apostles. 72, 75, 81, 83, 84, 85
 Ages, Middle, Sects of, Döllinger, 212
 Ages, Question of, Smith, 345
 Agrapha, of Gospels, Resch, 61
 Alexander, on English Martyrs, 223
 Allen, on Unitarianism, 264
 Allies, Formation of Christendom, 175
 Angelology of Paul, Everling, 129
 Amelineau, Egypt. Christianity, 189
 America, R. Catholics in, 266
 Apocalypse, The, 67, 72, 75, 81, 94, 117, 118
 Apologetics, Mead, 309
 Apostles' Decree, 123
 Archiv f. Lit. u. k. g. d. Mittelalters, 196, 198, 204
 Arnold, Nero's Persecution, 146
 Art. Early Christian, 180
 Astruc, 11
 Athenæum, The, 232
 Augustine's Account of Creation, Raich, 163
 BÆTHGEN, Semitic Religious History, 49
 Ballantine, 107
 Baudissin, on Pentateuch, 17, on Name of God, 51
 Beard, Life of Luther, 222
 Beginnings of New England, Fiske, 257
 Belief, on Behalf of, Holland, 346
 Bellesheim, Catholic Church in Scotland, 236
 Bells, Use of, Morillot, 182
 Bernard, Life of, Chevallier, 211
 Bert, Homilies of Aphraates, 185
 Beyschlag, on Ep. of James, 93, on Germ. Church, 252
 Bible, The Expositor's, 24
 Bibliotheca Sacra, 10, 107
 Blaikie, on Samuel, 25
 Board, The American, 271
 Bossert, Conversion of Württemberg, 209
 Brecht, Criminal Statistics, 271
 Briggs, on Confession of Faith, 279, on Eschatology, 281
 Britain, Great, Churches of, 254
 Bruce, Kingdom of God, 125, 296
 Buisson, on French Education, 386
 CANON, of New Test., Zahn, 68
 Clark, Witnesses to Christ, 318
 Clement, of Alexandria, Love, 161
 Clergy, Morals of, in M. Ages, 206
 Chevallier, Life of Bernard, 211
 Chiapelli, 135
 Christ, Witnesses to, Clark, 318,
 Christendom, Formation of, Allies, 175

- Christenthum, undog., by Dreyer, 304
 Christianity, History of, 135,
 Origin of, 145.
 Spread of, 141
 Chronicles, Books of, Oettli, 30
 Church, Christian, History of,
 Schaff, 221.
 Early, Organization of, 166,
 Early, Teaching of, 169
 The Eastern, Gelzer, 199
 Life, 204
 Paul's Ideal, Rowland, 362
 of Middle Ages, 190
 Roman, Dods, 67.
 The Rom. Cath., 233,
 and World, 146
 Churches, Early, Women in, 392
 Churchman The, on Ritual, 381
 Colloquies on Preaching, Twells, 331
 Comba, on Waldenses, 215
 Congregationalists, Discussions among, 270
 Corinthians, Epistles to, Dods, 108, Sadler, 109
 Cox, House and its Builder, 348
 Coxe, The Early Church, 169
 Creighton, on Waldenses, 214
 Criticism, Negative and the Bible, 136
 Criticism, Theological, 299

 DAHMEN, on Gregory II., 190
 Dalman, on Adonai, 52
 Davidsohn, on Innocent III., 206
 Dawson, Threshold of Manhood, 359
 Deaconesses in America, 395
 Death, Thro' to Life, Thomas, 357
 Demonology of Paul, 129
 Delff, on Rabbi Jesus, 120
 Delitzsch, on New and Old Theology, 250
 Delitzsch, on Pentateuch, 14, 16, 19, 47
 Deuteronomy, 16, 18
 Dialogues, bet. Cr. and Jew, 187
 Diehl, Exarchate of Ravenna, 190
 Discussions, Public, in Theology, 269
 Doctrine, Christian, by Kedney, 283
 Doctrine, History of, 154
 Dods, on Creation, 24, New Test. Introduction, 66, I Cor. 108
 Dogmatik, Evangel., Nitzsch, 288
 Döllinger, on Crusades, 206,
 on Mediæval Sects, 212
 and Reusch, on R. C. Theology, 238
 Donaldson, Women in Early Churches, 392
 Donation of Constantine, 193
 Drawing Rooms, Social, 390
 Dreyer, Undogmat. Christenthum, 304
 Dykes, Gospel of St. Paul, 361

 EARLY CHURCH ORGANIZATION, 166
 Ecclesiastes, by Volck, 29
 Edersheim, 123
 Edessa, Church of, 144, 145
 Education, Prot., Vienot, 386
 Ehrle, on Council of Vienna, 196
 Eirainer, on Ephraim the Syrian, 165
 Eisele, on Jesuitism, 240
 Empire, Roman and Christianity, 146
 Encyclopedia of Living Divines, Schaff, 26
 England, New, Beginnings of, Fiske, 257
 Ephesians, Epistle to, Dods, 67, Pfleiderer, 80
 Ephraim, the Syrian, Eirainer, 165

- Epistles, Catholic, Zahn, 75, Pfeleiderer, 81
 Epistles, Pastoral, 74, 75, 80, 89, 90, 114
 Epistles, The Pastoral, Plummer, 350
 Eremita, The Apocalypse, 118
 Eschatology of New Eng. Divines, 258
 Esther, Book of, by Oettli, 32
 Ethics, 321
 Evanson, 85
 Everling, Pauline Angelology, 129
 Exarchate of Ravenna, Diehl, 191
 Exegesis, New Test., 102
 Exegesis, Old Test., 24
 Exell, Epistle to Galatians, 111
 Expositor, The, 111, 141, 173
 Ezekiel, by Orelli, 27
 Ezra, Book of, by Oettli, 31
- FARRAR, Epistle to Hebrews, 90, Sermons, 364
 Findlay, Epistle to Galatians, 111
 Fiske, Beginnings of N. England, 257
 Forum, The, 382, 390
 Foster, on Eschatology of New Eng. Divines, 258
 Frank, on Ritschl's Theology, 246
 Frank, V., on Russian Christianity, 230
 Freedom, Religious, Progress of, 256
 Freeman, Patriarchate of Pippin, 190
 Friedrich, Gift of Constantine, 193
 Fridricq, on Inquisition, 218
 Fridolin, Apostle of Allemanni, Heer, 209
 Funerals, Reforms in, 379
- GALATIANS, Epistle to, 85, 111
 Gasquet, on English Monks, 225
 Gaul, Christianity in, 145
 Gelzer, on East. Church, 199
 Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums, Loening, 170
 Genesis, Dods, 24
 Gerbert, Letters of, 193
 Gerberding, 261
 Gilbert, on Job, 20
 God, Kingdom of, Bruce, 125, 296
 God, The Immanent, Jackson, 352
 Gore, Ministry of Christ. Church, 173
 Gospel, The Fourth, 73, of Hebrews, 82, 83, of John, 73, 101, According to St. Paul, Dykes, 361
 Gospels, Synoptic, 82
 Graf, on Pentateuch, 18, 19
 Graham, on the Apocalypse, 117
 Grassmann, St. Augustine, 164
 Greek, Biblical Essays in, Hatch, 59
 Green, on Pentateuch, 5, 10, 11
 Gregory, Prolegomena to New Test., 65
 Gregory II, Dahmen, 191
 Gretillat, Syst. Theology, 290
 Grifflis, Song of Songs, 21
 Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte, Harnack 166
 Grimm, Lexicon in N. Test., 57
 Gunkel, Paul's Doct. of H. Spirit, 130
 Gwynn, Hippolytus, 188
- HAGIOGRAPHIA, Historical, 30
 Hagiographa, Poetical, 28
 Handbuch der theol. Wissen., 183
 Handmann, on Gosp. of Hebrews, 83

- Harnack, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 93, 137, 166, 178, 184, 186
 Haroun al Rashid, Görres, 219
 Harper, on Pentateuch, 10
 Hatch, Essays in Bib. Greek, 59
 Haupt, on Waldenses, 216
 Havet, Letters of Gerbert, 193
 Hebraica, 10
 Hebrews, Epistle to, 73, 74, 75, 90, 92, 112, 113
 Hebrews, Gospel of, 82, 83
 Hendricks, on English Monks, 225
 Heer, St. Fridolin, 209
 Hermann, on Ritschl, 247
 Hesse, on Past. Epp., 89
 Hexateuch, The, Kuenen, 22
 History, Church, Text Book of, Moeller, 148, Church, Readings in, Stone, 154, New Test., 120, of Preaching, Ker, 336
 Holden, on Sisterhoods, 395
 Holland, on Behalf of Belief, 346
 Holtzmann, 62, 82, 101, 105
 Homiletics, Theoretical, 330
 Houghton, John the Baptist, 120
 House and its Builder, Cox, 348
 Hugh of Cluny, Life of, L'Huil-
 lier, 210
 Huguenots, The, 227
 Huguenots, Polit. Theory of, 227
 Huntington, Social Drawing
 Rooms, 390
 Hutton, on Sir Th. More, 223
 Hutton, The Amer. S. School, 388
 INDULGENCES, in Spain, Lea, 235
 Inspiration, Curtiss, 13
 Introduction, Old. Test. 5, Riehm, 13, Strack, 18
 Isaiah, by Smith, 26
 JACKSON, The Immanent God, 352
 Jahrbücher f. Prot. Theol., 137
 James, Epistle of, Beyschlag, 93
 Jesus Christ, the Divine Man, Vallings, 122
 Jesus, Rabbi, Hist. of, Delff, 120
 Job Book of, Gilbert, 20, Volck, 28, Hatch, 61
 Joel, Prophecy of, Kuenen, 22, Orelli, 27
 John, the Baptist, Houghton, 120, Epistles of, 81, 93, 111, Gospel of, 73, 101
 Johansson, the Bible and Negative Criticism, 136
 Jonah, by Orelli, 27
 KANT, LOTZE, AND RITSCHL, by
 Stahlin, 300
 Kedney, on Christian Doctrine, 283
 Keil, on Pentateuch, 19, 28
 Ker, History of Preaching, 336
 Klöpper, on II. Thess., 89
 Kingdom, The, of God, Bruce, 125, 296
 Knoke, Past. Epp., 114, 116
 Koenig, History of Israel, 49, 51
 Köhnecke, Wibert of Ravenna, 194
 Kommentar, Hand, z. N. Test., 82, 101
 Kuenen on Hexateuch, 22, on
 Monotheism, 49
 Kurtz, Church History, 208
 LAMENTATIONS, Book of, by
 Oettli, 29
 Lanciani, on Ancient Rome, 152
 Lazarus, Resurrection of, Stein-
 meyer, 106
 Lea, on Indulgences, 235
 L'Huillier, Hugh of Cluny, 210
 Liberty, the Law of, Whiton, 354
 Library, Minister's, Murray, 378
 Lichtenberger, on German Theo-
 logy, 242

- Liddon, Sermons, 366
 Lipsius, on Liberal Theology, 253
 Literature, Christ. Magazine of, 398
 Theological, 183, 282
 Literaturblatt, Theol., 181, 193
 Literaturzeitung, Theol., 162, 172, 178
 Livius, St. Peter, Bishop of Rome, 169
 Loening, Early Church Organization, 170
 Loofs, History of Doctrine, 166
 Looshorn, Otto of Bamberg, 207
 Love, 161
 Luther, and Reformation, Beard, 222

 MAC EVILLY, on Gospel of John, 101
 Magazine of Christ. Literature, 398
 Magee, Sermons, 367
 Manhood, Threshold of, 359
 Manning, Sermons, 369
 Mark, Gospel of, Pfeiderer, 80
 Martin, Church of Edessa, 144
 Martyr, Justin, Purves, 157
 Masses, Reaching the, Moody, 396
 Matthew, Gospel of, Pfeiderer, 81
 McConnell, Sermon Stuff, 342
 McGiffert, 187
 McQuaid, on Rel. Teaching in Schools, 382
 Mead, Supernatural Revelation, 309
 Meinhold, 30
 Meyer, Commentary, 82, 84, 85
 Millennium, Idea of, Chiapelli, 135
 Ministry, Call to, Paxton, 377
 of the Christ. Church, 173
 Miodonski, Anony. adv. Aleatores, 184
 Missions, Out of Town, 389

 Moeller, Text Book of C. Hist., 148
 Mohammedanism and Christianity, 219
 Moody, Reaching the Masses, 396
 Monasticism, 208
 Monuments, Christian, in Phrygia, Ramsay, 141
 Moral Controversies in R. Cath. Church, 238
 Morillot, on Bells, 182
 Morris, on Calvinism, 277
 Movement, the Oxford and Ward, 255
 Müller, Max, 50
 Murray, Minister's Library, 378

 NEHEMIAH, Book of, by Oetli, 31
 Nero, Persecution under, Arnold 146
 Nitzsch, Dogmatik, 288
 Nobbe, on Prot. Charities, 226

 OETTLI, on Solomon's Song, 29, Chronicles, 30, Ezra and Nehemiah, 31
 Orelli, on Ezekiel, 27
 Organization of Early Church, 166
 Origin of Christianity, 135.
 Otto of Bamberg, Looshorn, 207.

 PAGANISM, Influence on Christianity, Purves, 157
 Papacy, History of, 190
 Papers of Amer. Soc. of Church Hist., 160
 Passages, Difficult, in N. Test., Riggs, 110
 Paul, Angelology of, Everling, 129,
 on Harnack's Hist. of Doctrine, 136
 Paul's Doctrine of Holy Spirit, Gunkel, 130,

- Paul's Ideal Church, 362
 Paxton, on Call to Ministry, 377
 Pentateuch, The, Westphal, 5
 Perrenaud, Prots. in France, 229
 Persecution under Nero, Arnold, 146
 Peter, Bishop of Rome, Livius, 169
 Pfeiderer, on Prim. Christianity, 77
 Pfeiderer, E., on R. Cath. Orders, 240
 Phrygia, Early Monuments in, Ramsay, 141, South, Antiquities of, Ramsay, 144
 Pippin, Patriarchate of, Freeman, 190
 Plummer, Past. Epistles, 90, 350
 Poole, on Wiclif, 218
 Prayer, in Old Test., 127
 Preaching, Colloques on, Twells, 331,
 History of, Ker, 336
 Presbyterianism, Elizabethan, 254
 Presbyterians, Discussions among, 276
 Priesthood, Old Test., Baudissin, 17
 Priscillian, Schepss, 161
 Property, Church, Taxing, 398
 Prophets, Minor, Orelli, 27
 Protestantism and Education, Vienot, 386
 Purves, Paganism and Christianity, 157
 Prutz, Order of Templars, 195
 QUARTALSCHRIFT, Röm., 181
 Quarterly, Lutheran, 169
 RAICH, Augustine's Doct. of Creation, 163
 Ramsay, Phrygian Antiquities, 141
 Readings in Church History, Stone, 154
 Reformation, Counter, Ward, 234
 Reformation in England, 223,
 The German, 220
 Reforms, in Funerals, 379
 Religion, Ethical, Salter, 321
 Religion in Rome under Severi, Renville, 149
 Reimensyder, on Didache, 169
 Renan, on God of Jews, 38, on
 Origins of Christianity, 139
 Rendall, Ep. to Hebrews, 90, 113, 128
 Resch, N. T. Agrapha, 61
 Resurrection, The, Pfeiderer, 78
 Resurrection, of Lazarus, Steinmeyer, 106
 Reusch and Döllinger, on R. C. Theology, 238
 Revelation, Supernatural, Mead, 309
 Review, Andover, 389,
 English Hist., 169,
 Homiletic, 378,
 Presbyterian, 377, 388, 157,
 Unitarian, 155
 Renville, Relig. in Rome under Severi, 149
 Revue Chrétienne, 386,
 Historique, 151, 195
 Riehm, Old Test. Introduction, 13,
 Old Test. Theology, 33
 Riggs, 110
 Ritschl, Theology of, 244
 Ritual, Congregational, 381
 Rolls Series, 205
 Rome, Ancient in Light of Discoveries, Lanciani, 152,
 Religion in under Severi, Renville, 149,
 Society in under the
 Caesars, Inge, 148
 Rothe, 15
 Rowland, Paul's Ideal Church, 362

- Russia, Christianity of, 230
 Ruth, Book of, by Oettli, 31
- SADLER, Epp. to Corinthians, 109
 Salter, on Ethical Religion, 321,
 on Unitarianism, 308
 Samuel, Books of, 25
 Savonarola, Life of, Villari, 218
 Schaff, Encycl. of Liv. Divines, 26,
 Ref. in Germany, 221, Prog. of
 Rel. Freedom, 256
 Schepss, on Priscillian, 161
 Scheuffgen, on Pap. Schism, 198
 Schlottmann, Old Test. Theology,
 33
 Schools, Prot. in France, 228, 229
 Schools, Relig. Teaching in, 382
 Schultz, Old Test. Theology, 33
 Schultze, Chr. Art, 180, 181
 Schwarzlose, Papal Wealth, 176
 Scott, Syncretism in Early Chr.
 Theology, 160
 Scotland, Hist. of Cath. Church
 in, 236
 Scriptures, Holy, and Negative
 Criticism, 136
 Seeberg, Donat. Constant., 193
 Sects in Middle Ages, Döllinger,
 212
 Sell, Hist. of Christianity, 35,
 on Reformation, 202
 Sermon Stuff, McConnell, 342
 Sermons, Farrar, 364
 Liddon, 366
 Magee, 367,
 Manning, 369
 Shedd's Theology, 277
 Signs of Promise, Abbott, 371
 Simcox, Language of New Test.,
 58
 Sisterhoods, in America 395
 Smith, on Isaiah, 26
 Smith, Moses, Questions of the
 Ages, 345
 Society in Rome under the
 Caesars, Inge, 148
 Sommer, Apost. Decree, 123
 Songs, Song of, Griffis, 21
 Spirit, Holy, Paul's Doctrine of,
 Gunkel, 130
 Spitta, The Apocalypse, 93, 94
 Stahlin, on Kant, Lotze and Rit-
 schel, 300
 Steck, Ep. to Galatians, 85
 Steinmeyer, Resurrection of Laz-
 arus, 106
 Stone, Readings in Cl. Hist. 154
 Strack, on Pentateuch, 18
 Studies, Word, in N. Test., Vin-
 cent, 64
 Stuff, Sermon, McConnell, 342
 Sunday School, American, Hut-
 ton, 388
 Surmhöfel, Clerical Morals in M.
 Ages, 206
 Syncretism, in Christ. Theology,
 Scott, 160
- TEACHING, The, of the Apostles,
 57
 Teaching, Religious in Schools,
 382
 Temple Order, Prutz, 195
 Theology of New Test., 125
 Terry, Introd. to Pentateuch, 12
 Testament, New, Canon of, Zahn,
 68,
 Introduction, Dods, 66,
 Language of, Simcox,
 58,
 Lexicon of, Grimm,
 57
 Prolegomena to, Gre-
 gory, 65,
 Word Studies in, Vin-
 cent, 64,
 Difficult Passages in,
 Riggs, 110
 Testament, Old, Prayer in, 127
 Testaments, Both, Thousand
 Years in, West, 118
 Tixeront, Church of Odessa, 144

- Texte u. Untersuchungen, 185, 186
 Thayer, N. 'l. Lexicon, 58
 Theology, Old Test., 33
 Theology, Systematic, Gretillat, 290
 Thessalonians, Epistles to, Klöp-
 per, 89
 Thomas, Thro' Death to Life, 357
 Thought Religious, in Germany,
 Lichtenberger, 242,
 Theological, in M. Ages, 202
 Thousand Years in both Tests..
 West, 118
 Tiffany, on Unitarianism, 264
 Tunis, on Missions, 389
 Twells, on Preaching, 331

 UNITARIANISM, in America,
 Griffin, 263
 Unitarianism, its Origin and
 History, 306
 Urchristenthum, Das., Pfeleiderer,
 77
 Usener, Christmas, 177

 VALLINGS, Jesus, the Divine Man,
 122
 Vedder, Taxing Churches, 398
 Vienot, on Protestant Education
 386
 Villari, on Savonarola, 218
 Ville, Cirot de la, Christianity
 in Gaul, 145
 Vogelstein, on Priests and Levites,
 18
 Volek, on Job, 28

 WALDENSES, 214, 215

 Ward, Counter Reformation, 234
 Ward and Oxford Movement,
 255
 Weizsäcker, Ep. of James, 93
 Weiss, on Mark's Gospel, 62, Ep.
 of John, 93, Ep. to Hebrews, 112
 Wellhausen, on Pentateuch, 11, 16
 Wilpert, Chr Art, 180, 181
 Wendt, on Acts of App., 84
 West, the Millennium, 118
 Westcott, Ep. to Hebrews, 92, 113
 Westphal, on Pentateuch, 5
 Whiton, the Law of Liberty, 354
 Whither, by Briggs, 280
 Wibert, of Ravenna, Köhncke,
 194
 Wielif, by Poole and Loserth,
 218
 Witnesses to Christ, Clark, 318
 Wölflin, 184
 Wolf, on Reformation. 234
 Women, in Early Churches, 392
 Word Studies, in N. Test., Vin-
 cent, 64
 Worship, History of, 177
 Würtemberg, Conversion of, Bos-
 sert, 209

 ZAHN, Hist. of N. Test. Canon, 66
 Zahn A. on Church in America.
 260,
 on Ritschl and Kaftan, 250
 Zechariah, by Orelli, 28
 Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte,
 176
 Zöckler, Manual, 18, 183
 Zschokke, on Chokma Lit., 53



