Selected Papers:

A SERIES

OF THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS,

ETC.

London

PRINTED FOR THE EDITOR BY

THOMAS BAINES, FAIRFAX PLACE, SOUTH HAMPSTEAD,

1887 AND 1888.

Table of Contents.

	PAGE
Evolution and Christianity	3
The Apocalypse of John, a Jewish Writing worked up by a Christian Editor	11
The Bible and Chaldœan Astrology	18
In Palestine, from the Exile to Alexander	18
Moses: a Constructive Study	31
The Morality of early Buddhism	39
Professor Weiss on the Rise of the New Testament Canon	49
A Frank Talk about Criticism and Christolatry	61
What think ye of Christ?	72
The Chaldœan Genesis	85
Antiqua Mater	89
The Christ of a Free Christian	91
Notes on Pfleiderer's Synoptik	99
Isaiah and Zion: or, the Development of Thought in Isaiah, a Study in the History of Hebrew Religion	112
Wanted: A System of Christian Economics	140
Can there be a Science of Christian Doctrine?	147
David	151
The Protestant Idea of the Church	161
The Pastor of Hermas and the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit ...	165
The Christian Doctrine of Marriage	171
Philo Judœus	178
Poetry—Two Sonnets, "After Failure," "Outside"...	180
Elijah	181
The Lord's Prayer	190
The Religious Significance of Angels and Devils	198
The Broad Church Party of the Church of England and Bishop Colenso	208
Sir George W. Cox and the Natal Bishopric	211
Professor Pfleiderer's "Urchristenthum"	213
The Apostolic Age	215
The Great Monastic Stages, or, the Splendid Records of Asceticism	229
Index	247

EVOLUTION AND CHRISTIANITY.

Religious teachers often bluster about Evolution. What if we were, instead, quietly to ask ourselves what Evolution means, and what a belief in it involves? Should we not find that a measure of intellectual contentment would be added to our Godliness, or failing that, that we should be, at any rate, freed from the danger of that vague apprehension which seems as unlimited as its object is unknown, and quite as destructive of faith as the change of long-familiar conceptions? Calm and impartial enquiry would remove this danger.

Another reason why it were well for us to take up some such attitude of quiet investigation is that, of late years, although, unfortunately, too often only outside of the world of theology, men have been giving an increased attention to these matters. They are gradually acquiring an inclination to trust, because they can understand, the truth which science teaches, and tend more and more to hesitate about any form of belief which is not ready to go with them and maintain its office and life in that calmer and more dispassioned atmosphere to which they are becoming acclimatised. If the Church is to keep her hold on such as these, she must free herself at once from her unwillingness to approach the new world of Evolution in sympathy of spirit and from her cloistered dread of the result.

There has grown up around her an almost new method of historical enquiry. A fresh and non-theological school of criticism is bringing its light to bear on the dim traditions of her sacred literature. Her one and only true religion is being compared, as it never before has been in its genesis, growth, and results, with the other religions of the world. In these enquiries there is, morever, a calm, impartial confidence and a trustful fearlessness of results, which in itself wins men to think and to investigate for themselves. Ought we not to feel that these things make the unquestioning spirit of tradition impossible, and render it imperative for us to ask, if not "How far are these things true?" at any rate the simpler question, "If they be true what is the result on our faith?"

We ought to feel that the more we try to understand the meaning of the phenomena around us the more able shall we be to get rid of what is crude and rudimentary in our religious conceptions. It argues the worst form of unbelief when men fear a widening of our view of the world under the guidance of the faculties with which we are endowed. Let us, for such reasons, set our question before us: "If Evolution be true does the Christian religion lose or gain thereby?" We may thus, perhaps, bring our

faith into closer contact with what to-day is claiming so much of the thought and interest of our fellows.

We must, first of all, distinctly understand that Evolution does not in itself imply a negation of God, Atheism in any form. It is unfortunate that any such caution should be necessary, but terms like this, which were created as keen-edged tools for purposes of precise investigation, have been so freely handled as the brickbats of the godly Philistine that they are apt rather to call up prejudice than to convey meaning. Their influence over many is largely due to sheer force of sound, and when we hear a man assailed as a believer in Evolution we too often receive, instead of a clear idea of what that charge means, an indistinct consciousness of his being a dangerous character. The high-sounding indefiniteness of the term does not leave us in doubt, but only helps to increase the general notion of spiritual derangement.

The idea is not a new one. Plato was familiar with it. It underlies all the brilliant and fascinating speculation of that great school of idealism which, rising out of the critical philosophy of Kant, may be said to have borne its richest fruit in the teaching and influence of Hegel. Yet the idea is new in the form of which we here speak. Mr. Darwin made it so when he worked it out, not as a splendid and abstract generalisation upon an insufficient historical basis, but as the concrete presentation of a scientific law. Even in the stricter scientific sense, which those who have followed along Mr. Darwin's lines have given to it, the meaning of the word is, for our purpose, not easily defined. The scientific definitions—of which that which Mr. Spencer has devised is, perhaps, the most famous, and also, save to the student, possibly the most incomprehensible—will not avail us much. What we need is some sufficiently accurate, and yet intelligible, idea of what Evolution means, and especially of what it involves in its bearings upon the form and spirit of our religion. With this in view, a description to which a certain amount of freedom in presentation is allowed may suit our end better than a more accurate, though less graphic, definition.

Evolution may be described, then, as the theory that our universe has gradually unfolded, under the guidance, or perhaps, rather, by the varied co-operation of different forms of force which work along lines of unvarying law. What lies behind, as the ultimate and all-comprehending unity, we do not, and cannot in its fulness, know. It is, as it is in itself, unknowable. Yet all of which experience is the record, matter and the modes of matter, mind and the modes of mind, force in its thousand forms, are manifestations of this unknown ultimate. We are in every advance of our knowledge learning to refer the inter-connections of phenomena, and the transformations they undergo, to the working of an invariable order, or system, which, while it regulates the mighty sway of the planets in space, regulates also, in the secret recesses of the brain, the mysterious thrill which we call thought, or the quiver of man's meaning along the dull wire as the vibration of some swift electric tremor. This general idea, which has been worked out in minutest detail by Mr. Spencer and others, meets us in various forms. Its concrete applications are limited only by

the limits of our experience. The sharply drawn lines by which the various kingdoms of our world were divided one from another, and again internally sub-divided, are fading away, and retained only as convenient, but arbitrary, landmarks. We learn to trace successive minute changes, each responsive to diverse manifestations of energy, until in our world, organic and inorganic, we can account for the infinite variety of forms which at first seems simply to bewilder us.

Plant life does not consist of a huge and disordered aggregation of different kinds, nor the animal kingdom of a number of unrelated and clearly defined species. Beneath the disorder Evolution finds, hidden in the past, the clue which relates and explains all. Man, too, is to her ken only the crown of the animal kingdom. We are to unravel the mystery of our own being also along the lines which have proved so successful elsewhere, by investigating the relations which knit us to the environment of which we are so largely the product. The universe is thus presented to us as one great process, the continuity of whose growth is unbroken. Where we find strangest apparent violations of law, and differences of form so great as to seem to imply absolute distinctness of nature, a wider knowledge has again and again found only a wider verification. The old idea of Causation, or, as we might almost call it, of Creation, has, therefore, disappeared. Effects are only Causes under a new form; nothing is gained; nothing lost. The new is but a further movement of the great and increasing process whose beginning and end lie in the unknown land whither our thought cannot travel. That process in its increasing integrations and differentiations we call Evolution.

To no sphere has this talisman been applied with greater success than to the history of religions. The old division into two classes, common to almost all faiths—the one and only true religion (usually that of the classifier) and numberless false and idolatrous ones, is disappearing. Men are coming to think of religion as a whole, and of each special religion in particular, not as descending perfect out of Heaven from God in some far-off golden age, but as rising gradually from the dark soil of ignorance, superstition, and idolatry into forms more commensurate with man's wider knowledge and deeper need of satisfaction. And, therefore, no religion is perfect, no form final. We are here, too, only on the pathway which brings new and yet newer changes, corresponding to the demand of that newer and wider experience which calls them into being. Climate, history, racial temperament, all the numberless influences under which worship and Church and creed arise, are the factors which mould and account for at once the faith and the faiths of men.

Such, in hurried outline, is the scheme of thought which "Evolution" names for us. It means much more, it may in stricter Darwinian sense, mean much less. As we have outlined it, it represents a conception which is growing up around us, for which Evolution is perhaps the best name. In asking the question of this paper it is in this sense that the word is used. We need not, and, for our present purpose, do not intend to maintain that such a theory has been verified all along the line. It rose but yesterday

in our midst, and we are on all hands continually having our attention directed to the deficiencies of the general conception Mr. Darwin so ably formulated. For example: as yet we have not been able to discover by what interaction of known forces life arises from the inanimate. In many cases the origin of certain species is still involved in darkness. The transition from life to consciousness has not yet been traced, so that when we speak of our world as evolved out of the vibrating atoms of its nebular existence we speak, if we keep such defects honestly in view, only of a process which has not as yet been fully demonstrated. We have found and traversed long stretches of the road: parts are still unknown. We have no proof of entire continuity, only the strong presumption that the way which we lose here and find again continuing its course beyond continues even where we have no evidence of its existence, and can only suppose that it lies hidden in the mist of our imperfect knowledge. In its application to history we are met by similar imperfections. Especially does this seem the case in the most complex of histories, that of man's faith. We can see how the early Aryan superstitions, or primitive religious beliefs grow, and are modified into the polytheisms of Greece and India. In Greece we see how they gradually fade away as religion, while all that is noble in them arises as the spirit of national polity and speculation. But in India, unexplained and inexplicable, comes Gautama, sudden as though let down out of heaven, moulding men's faith into new forms, even for a while obliterating the course, explicable in its unfolding, which he breaks and well-nigh destroys. With Islam the case, though not so marked, is yet similar. As we trace its growth we do but come nearer and nearer to the person of its founder, and although we know the sources whence he drew the material of his faith, we cannot explain why to him specially it was given to found a new and mighty religion. Again, the Judaism of the first century A.D. is the rational outcome of the centuries which preceded it. We see prosperity and calamity, national independence and national slavery—Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, all acting and interacting about the Hebrew faith, and we understand the product. But when we go back to the edge of the desert, whence Israel emerges, the historical criticism which has done so much leads us to an initial change which it cannot trace—brings us face to face with a mighty apparently creative person, and leaves us there. Why Israel grew up into the religion of Isaiah, while her Semitic brethren grovelled in a degraded idolatry, and how she inherited that "genius for religion" which makes her history and literature unique, are things we can explain if we postulate Moses, but Moses we cannot yet account for. Evolution is not a complete or as yet adequate theory. Still it is supported by an enormous mass of evidence. It has in an incredibly short time done more than any other clue to unravel the skein of life and tell the sphinx's riddle of the world. It is strong enough to win acceptance in increasing measure from thinking men. In spite of the continued opposition of timid tradition in the form of truth and ecclesiasticism under the cloak of religion it is leavening in all directions men's conceptions of the world.

Let us, then, keeping these things calmly before us, ask what, if the theory just sketched win general acceptance, would be some of the probable results on the form of our Christian belief. First, our idea of God would be modified. We should so feel the mystery and wonder of what we know, and still more of the infinite unknown, that gradually it would become difficult for us to conceive what lies beyond, and embraces all, under the Anthropomorphic forms, which hitherto have proved sufficient for most of us. God would cease to be an Omnipotent personality outside our universe, creating one by one at His will its different forms of life, demanding homage from His creatures, and distributiug to them at length reward and punishment. We should feel that such a conception was not large enough, not full enough of possibilities to accord with our wider knowledge of what we grant are only manifestations. The centre and source of all would be more truly the God whom no man by searching can find out, and yet "in whom we live, and move, and have our being." We should grow more ready to confess that He transcends our knowledge; that as He is in Himself our limited thought cannot grasp Him; that words of ours can neither express nor define Him. Personality, impersonality, force, will, power—all are inadequate terms when applied to God.

In the second place, religion would cease to be based on Scripture alone as an infallible "Word of God." We should learn to trace the mode of the Genesis of our sacred books as we do that of the similar writings which other religions have produced. We should recognise their imperfections, their mistakes, their nature, as a complex of partial and erroneous, with true and noble thought and aspiration. Our Old Testament would become to us a record of the inner life of a nation, reflecting its growth from a rude origin to the level of a high and noble faith, showing us at length traces of its decline and fall. The New Testament, a record of the spirit and thought of that wider and nobler form of belief and life which arose from the ashes of the old. We should regard them as—like all similar records—imperfect; should test and examine for ourselves, and separate what can help and stimulate from what belongs only to the past.

Along with this there would probably in the third place come a growing disbelief in miracles. Partly because men would regard the evidence for them as insufficient as they learned to trace the origin of that evidence, and partly because the miraculous, as a whole, while involving phenomena, which are not uncommon, postulates the absence of that which alone makes such phenomena conceivable. And this change seems likely to lead us to regard the Christ as Divine rather in His grace and truth than as a personality, removed from us alike in His birth, His life, and His death.

At the first glance these changes seem stupendous. To men who have all their lives regarded the Bible as infallible, and, therefore, have never examined it, who have conceived God as the Old Testament conceives Him, with the addition of the tenderer attributes of the New, to whom Christ has all along been the mysterious second person in a supernatural and more or less inconceivable Trinity, whose Deity is evidenced by His miraculous birth and

power, such a change may even look like an overthrow of the Christian faith. But is it so? Do the Kingdom of God on earth, and our trust in the great Master, depend on these things? May not all that is holiest and best in the rule of the Christ over men's hearts prove to be like a strong tower, whose beauty and strength only stands out the more clearly because the ancient scaffolding has fallen away? Is not all that is essential in our religion independent of our creed? Does not belief in Jesus the Christ survive every change of belief about Him? A few suggestions of answer to these questions is all that can in this paper be even attempted.

May it not be true that for the highest and holiest reverence—the reverence which is as that of a child awed in wonder, and for the supremest trust—the trust which comes of an infinite sense of dependence—our idea of God has been too narrow? God as the infinite unknown, whose manifestations in themselves transcend our grasp is surely more akin to the "presence that disturbs us with the joy of elevated thought," than any more concrete and limited conception of Him. We need not have an undue fear of materialism, for assuredly if Spirit, the most complex product of the process of the world is a term inadequate to God, then matter, the name of the initial stage, is even less so. But when we learn our own impotence as we endeavour to comprehend the infinite about us, and simply bow in wonder and reverence, and lowliness of heart, perhaps the eager strife of those who fight for His name may seem empty in the presence of His nature unnamed, because unnameable. While thus in one sense further off, God is also in another brought nearer to us. All things are manifestations of the great Source. The very beauty of the dawn on snow-topped mountain crests, of storm and sunshine, of hill and valley, and woodland, becomes Divine to us. And human life in all its struggle and sin and sorrow wins a meaning often too deep for tears, near akin to that holiest silence of the heart which men have truly called the sense of God's presence. "The time vesture of the eternal" ceases to be a figure of speech and becomes a fact, God being near us when we know it not. Do not deeper and nobler religious possibilities open out before us here? and above all, does not this thought of God in its very vastness lead us to give greater prominence to one whom we can follow, and reverence and obey—to Jesus of Nazareth, manifesting supremely a life which, in realizing our highest hopes, tempts us to realize them too?

Again, the attitude toward the Scriptures—which I have suggested may become universal if Evolution convinces men of its truth—is rather a gain than a loss. If Scripture be not inspired, *ex hyp.*, as Scripture, may we not rest our belief in its authority on the evidence which the presence in it of the spirit—whose "inspiration" we find rather than postulate—affords? This, the rational test of inspiration, leaves us free from the difficulties with which, on the older lines, the student was continually confronted.

Throughout the historical portions of the Old Testament there are discrepancies as to fact, palpable numerical mis-statements, crude and unworthy representations of God. Formerly such diffi-

culties were well-nigh insuperable. When we approach the matter, however, from the unbiassed historical stand-point, these very difficulties become helpful, making the genesis of our records the living and natural outcome of lives that have passed away. And in proportion as we realize this naturalness, we feel the power and grandeur and humanity of writings which we no longer regard as authorative with an authority imposed from without, but authorative with the authority of the truth they contain.

Our Bible then takes its place, in virtue of the splendour of its thought and content, as one of those true books which arising from the heart of man, and speaking to man's heart form the Bibles of the world. Inspiration has become not a thing limited and rare, but in varying measure everywhere around us; the high meaning and noble stimulus which belongs to no one land and no one age, and with which the Bible, as the record of the nation which has been most highly dowered with the genius for religion, is pre-eminently permeated.

Turning now to the third point, we are confronted by our most serious difficulty. The idea of God as beyond human thought although everywhere revealed, is more or less familiar to all of us. The fetters of the mechanical theory of the origin and worth of Scripture have here and there fallen utterly away, and have almost everywhere been in some degree loosened. But with miracles it is different. We have so long looked on Palestine as the land of a special Divine operation in the past, and so accustomed ourselves to regard miracles as an integral part of the sacred history, and indeed, the chief pillar upon which Christianity rests, that we cannot easily ask with calm judgment what their loss would mean. Nevertheless, let us make the attempt. As soon as we understand the genesis of our Old Testament records as no longer the result of a special Divine agency, and compare them with other sacred books, or as histories with other early historical records, we come to understand that, in looking upon much of the miraculous element as myth, we are only following up a method which our treatment of similar elements elsewhere has made familiar to us. Such narratives as that of the sun standing still, of Jonah, of the taking of Jericho, are seen to be either later and figurative forms of some simple fact or relics of pictorial ideas, which have lingered on from the dreamland of Israel's childhood. We come not uneasily to feel that these are just the elements we should expect to find in a record which is the natural outcome of an early national life. Their pictorial or semi-mythical nature does not prevent, but rather helps our appreciation of their beauty, and their naturalness. The value of the account in which they stand is independent of this, its natural dress. But when we touch the New Testament cycle our intense and sacred reverence for the personality who at once created it, and is by it presented to us, prevents a like freedom of spirit. We cannot do more here than hint at one or two aspects of the matter which are worthy of consideration.

In the first place, is it not true that while the Divinity of Christ which our creed formulates is that based on miracle, the Divinity which actually satisfies our need, and creates in us that love,

reverence, and obedience which save us from baseness, and self and sin, is more or less independent of miracle? Faith in the theological Christ is demanded, not so much as based on our experience, or on what in that experience creates and satisfies the religious life, as on that which, lying beyond experience, touches us, as it were, only on the outside, or is inherited unquestioned as the tradition of our childhood and our Church. Now this inherited belief resting, where uninvestigated, on the authority of an external record, is fraught with the danger which always attends a system long established and dogmatic, that adherence of assent should take the place of adherence of heart and life. The children of the kingdom who are neither its founders nor its first citizens are apt to be content with the garb and speech of their country rather than filled with its spirit and life. And for the continuance of that inner temper of heart, what we need to insist on is not the supernatural birth or abnormal physical power, or glorious visible resurrection of the Christ, but rather the Divine self-sacrifice and humility, purity and love of Jesus. So far, moreover, as we can gather from our record, the Master Himself mistrusted the effect, and sternly forbade the spread of those reports about Himself which laid stress on outer and abnormal powers. He "straitly charged them" that they should tell no man. He wished to be known rather as the Son of God, whose Divine life is manifested in the teaching of the Parables and the Sermon on the Mount, than the God-sent Messias, whose testimony lay in signs and wonders. It was this that drew the disciples, and overawed those who said of Him, "Never man spake as this man." And the rock on which He founds His Church is the trust of which the final thrice-repeated test question is, "Lovest thou Me?" To Paul the truth of crucifixion, resurrection, and life, is far more the inner one of the crucifixion of evil in our hearts, the new nature springing into being under the sunshine of the love of Christ, the growing up into a Divine manhood under its power, than any mere credence in outward facts. True it is that he rests his argument for the resurrection after death on the resurrection of the body of Jesus; but, so far as our belief in a hereafter is concerned, may it not appear that it is founded upon another and less historico-physical basis. And if we have trust in that fulness of grace and truth winning our love and imitation, have not we too in the deepest sense beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father. It is not the miracles, nor those elements of physical power wherein He is made to differ from us, that make Christ the power of God in us unto wholeness of life. These things, alas, too often remove Him from us, make His nature unreal to us and unrealizable, lessen our sense of sympathy and brotherhood and help. We, after all, in our inmost hearts, love to think of Him whom His fellows knew as Jesus, the Son of the Carpenter, as tempted in all points like as we are, and yet noble and unselfish and Divine in His humanity to the end. Now these, the factors essential to our religious fellowship with Him, are elements which are all of them independent of a supernatural and mythical Divinity, rest rather on the truer Divine manifested in holiest and helpfullest life.

Such is but a dim suggestion of what seems not unlikely to be brought on us by the revolution in thought which is going on

around us. May it not mean that our faith, instead of losing by this change, becomes faith in a world which everywhere manifests God, unknowable save in such manifestation; a God-filled universe? And may not its highest manifestation be, not in signs and wonders, but in the supremely wonderful, the gradual unfolding of our universe, man, and the life of the human heart? That revelation is as old, and yet as new, as experience; comes to us day by day in all that is most truly of the highest. It inspires our record of man's aspiration and struggle and attainment in the Bible. Above all do we find it in Him in whom dwells the manifestation of the Most High, as a life realizing, under conditions like ours, what we, too, in love of Him, may strive after and, in the enthusiasm of devotion, each in our own measure attain.

Such a prospect opens a wider future for the Kingdom of God on earth, not as a creed or any one church, but as the brotherhood of those who, in reverence and lowliness of heart, worship God, the Father of all, and find a wonderful help towards living as men ought to live, in love and obedience towards Jesus of Nazareth.

What if this advance of thought, of which we have been speaking, be but the moving of the Great God in whom we live, bringing us yet nearer to the heart and spirit which Jesus set before men, and toward that Kingdom which is righteousness and joy and peace; while weaning us from the ways and forms whose value lies not in themselves, but in their service of that process toward a fuller and wider life of which they have formed a part, and by which they can be replaced in answer to a wider and less ignorant need.

Whether the idea of Evolution is or is not a main factor in this process, time and the growth of man's thought alone can reveal to us. In either case, let our attitude be that to which truth is most readily welcome, an attitude of calm unmoved trust in the goodness of what the unfolding of the years may bring to us, rather than that of the fearfulness which the Scriptures class with unbelief.

THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN.

A Jewish Writing, worked up by a Christian Editor.

Die offenbarung Johannis eine Judische Apocalypse in Christlicher Bearbeitung-von Eberhard Vischer, mit emèm Nachwort von Adolf Harnack. Leipzig, 1886; 137 pages; price 5 marks.

Only a few months ago there appeared the number of the 9th edition of the "Encyclopœdia Britannica," which contained the article, "Revelation." This article is the work of Prof. Adolf Harnack, then of Giessen, but now of Marburg. It may be assumed that this article represents the latest point which scholarship had then reached, and that it contains the result which the most recent criticism had attained. The result to which the writer of it comes, is that the Apocalypse "was written under Galba—that is, the conception and first draught of it date from this time, but that the seventeenth chapter was afterwards revised in the last

years of the reign of Vespasian, about 75-79, ... but afterwards underwent revisions, ... perhaps in Domitian's reign of terror, about 93-96." (Encycl. Brit., 9th edit., vol. xx., p. 500). The article contains no hint of the hypothesis, which has been lately introduced to us by Herr Vischer, or rather by Herr Vischer and Dr. Harnack together. For not only in the Epilogue to Herr Vischer's work does Dr. Harnack give in his adhesion to the theory which Herr Vischer has propounded, but he gives the theory his official *imprimatur* by getting Her Vischer's work published as one of the numbers in his well-known series, "Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur."

The history of this theory, which may not improbably be known hereafter as the discovery of the second key to the Apocalypse, is quite as strange as that of the discovery of the first key to the Apocalypse. The vast majority of critics are now agreed that the first key to the Apocalypse is to be found in taking the number of the beast (Rev. xiii. 18) as referring to the Emperor Nero. This discovery was first made by Fritzsche in 1831, but curiously enough remained quite unnoticed until in 1836 it was simultaneously and independently re-discovered by Benary, Hitzig, and Reuss. Since then the view has become familiar by the works of Renan (L'Antichrist), of Bleek (Lectures on the Apocalypse), and of Farrar (Early Days of Christianity), not to mention many others.

We may perhaps be excused if, for the sake of any general reader into whose hands this paper may come, we digress to point out the main lines of the secret, which the undoing of the lock by what we have called the first key of the Apocalypse discloses. This key consists in rightly understanding the number of the beast (Rev. xiii. 18.). This number is "the number of a man," and is 666. The value of the letters of the Hebrew spelling of the name, Nero Cæsar, add up to exactly this figure. The figure of the beast points, therefore, primarily to the Emperor Nero, the Antichrist, but refers in a secondary or derived sense to the world power of Rome, embodied in its head and ruler, the hated Nero. The idea of the Roman power as a great beast comes from the book of Daniel (Daniel vii. 7), which, dealing as it does almost wholly with the Messianic age, was most studiously read by the early Christians. The beast has seven heads (Rev. xiii. 1), and these seven heads are seven kings (Rev. xvii. 10), viz., Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, the one that is now; the eighth, who shall come again, is Nero (Rev. xvii. 2), who was popularly believed to be about to reappear; that belief was common and general, not only among the Christians. The seven heads have also another meaning—they are seven hills, on which sits a woman, and this woman is that great city which ruleth over the kings of the earth (Rev. xvii. 9-18)—this is unmistakably the city of Rome, placed on its seven hills. The ten horns of the beast are ten kings

נרון		קמר
Nero (n).		Cæsar.
ק	=	100
ם	=	60
ר	=	200
נ	=	50
ר	=	200
ר	=	6
ן	=	50
		666

(Rev. xvii. 12) coming from the east, and are presumably the Parthians, who were likely to rise in revolt at the time; they were beyond the Euphrates (See Rev. ix. 14). Nero was popularly supposed to be in hiding among them, till he should reappear and lead them against Rome. The other chief figures may be noticed: the Community of God (the Church) is a woman adorned with sun, moon, and twelve stars. The stars are the twelve tribes; from her springs the Messiah (Rev. xii. 1 *ff.*). The dragon is the devil, endowed with the marks of the beast—*i.e.*, of the power of the Antichrist Rome (Rev. xiii. 3). The second beast (Rev. xiii. 2) typifies false prophets, in league with the first beast, and with a resemblance to the Lamb of God in His horns, but speaking like the serpent or dragon—*i.e.*, the devil. The Lamb that is slain is, of course, the Messiah (Rev. v. 8.) The idea of the Lamb comes from the Paschal Lamb, and the words of prophecy as Is. liii. 7.

The elaborate colouring of the whole Book has its reason either in historical events of the time or in expected events which were shortly to come to pass. Many of the details, too, are taken from the language of the Old Testament; such as "the rod of iron" (Rev. xii. 5; *cf.* Ps. ii. 7 *ff.*), and "the Son of Man sitting on the clouds of heaven" (Rev. xiv. 14, *cf.* Dan. vii. 13) and the restoration to life of witnesses (in Rev. xi. 2) is after Ezekiel xxxvii. 5-10 (in the same verse "the three days and a half" seems a mistaken interpretation of the "time and times and half a time" of Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7). "That the expectations of the Revelation have not been fulfilled requires no proof. But the fact detracts nothing from our estimation of the enigmatical book, and the effects which have been produced by it. We cannot but regret the misuse which enthusiasts and fanatics have made of it, drawing from it, as they supposed, the whole history of the world and the Church to the end of time, and ever with special ingenuity fitting the Apocalyptic descriptions of the impious and ungodly to their own enemies for the time being *—a delusion which should now be relegated to a history of human folly. The Revelation, however, has not been without homage of a superior kind to this. In time of bitter persecution it was a Book of consolation for the confessors of Jesus, who was upheld and strengthened by its promises. Some of its most powerful utterances (*e.g.*, ii. 10, iii. 11-19, xiv. 13, xxi. 9) have ever had an awakening and uplifting effect upon religious minds. Finally, it has supplied both the impulse and material requisite for the production of lofty poetic figures and scenes, to not a few poets, both mediæval and modern, as, for example, Dante, Milton, Klopstock, and Schiller." (Dr. Krenkel in the Protestanten-bibel.)

The discovery of this interpretation, though it has explained most of the difficulties, and has afforded a point of view from which the general aim and tendency of the Apocalypse has become intelligible, has not sufficed for all difficulties, and has even been rejected by a few respectable critics; and why? Because, among other reasons, it was found difficult to reconcile this view with the tradition given by Irenæus (v. 30, 3), that the Apocalypse

* One instance may be quoted, a "conservative" commentator declares that Magog, in Rev. xx. 8, points to the modern "DEMAGOGUE."

was written under Domitian, for if the usually accepted interpreter of the number be accepted, then the date is almost certainly in Galba's reign (or less probably Vespasian's); and that tradition should have put the date of a book later than its actual date seems most improbable. Other difficulties, which still remained, were—that the Christology, which appears in places as primitive and Jewish, is in other places elaborate and far more advanced than that of Paul, attributing full Divinity to the Messiah; the very loose connection of the introduction (chaps. 1-3) with the rest of the work; the Jewish-Christian language in some parts compared with the Universalistic language in others. A second key seemed requisite to unlock the inner recesses of the Apocalypse. Herr Vischer has not improbably discovered that key.

In the Summer Semester of 1885 there came to Giessen a young Swiss theological student, not yet with more than a year's theological training, not yet in his 21st year. He was a member of Dr. Schürer's Seminar, in which class Dr. Schürer read the Apocalypse with his students. The question was there propounded, what is the theological stand-point of the Author of the Revelation of St. John? To Eberhard Vischer it appeared that the only solution to this question lay through the supposition that the Revelation of St. John was originally a Jewish Apocalypse, which has been interpolated and fitted with a new framework by a Christian writer. With this view, Herr Vischer came to Dr. Harnack, who naturally enough felt inclined to reject this idea of a student, who had made no study of the various authors on the subject, but had only read his New Testament carefully and thoughtfully (*cf.* Dr. Harnack's "Nachwort," p. 126, *ff.*). But, though he at first repudiated the young student's idea, Dr. Harnack is now convinced that the student was right, and (to make a long story short) Dr. Harnack has become a disciple of one of his students.

This theory of the Revelation may be said to start from the Jewish view of Apocalyptic literature (p. 1 *f.*). This kind of literature is a purely Jewish production; though Jewish so purely, it was accepted by the early Christian Church, and all the Jewish Apocalypses still extant were not only held in high honour by the early Church, but also re-touched and interpolated by Christian hands; therefore, to suppose that this has been the case with the New Testament Apocalypse, is by no means impossible, but rather very natural. Most, if not all, the Jewish Apocalypses bore the name of some well-known figure in Jewish history; it may be asked, why and how could the name of a Christian writer be affixed to an altered Jewish Apocalypse? But supposing that the Jewish form of the Revelation of St. John bore originally the name of some Jewish worthy, is it not only too likely that what was already a pseudepigraphic composition (as the Jewish Apocalypses invariably are) should suffer a change which would recommend it to the Christian readers, to whom the interpolator desired to introduce it? (p. 6 *f.*, p. 130). The theory of Herr Vischer being accepted as at least having more probability than the recent attempts after a 'Reduction-hypothesis,' which would explain that in this book various writings and fragments have been reduced by some editor or other—a

hypothesis which is rejected by the double-faced Christology which meets us through the whole book, and by the uniform style of Greek so peculiar yet so constant throughout the whole work—the first thing to be sought is a touchstone, by which the critic may discover the Jewish original (Grundschrift) from the Christian additions. The double-faced Christology affords this touchstone. No part of Herr Vischer's book shows more ability—one might say more genius—no part sheds more light on a really important question than where he shows that there are two conceptions of the Messiah in the Apocalypse, quite distinct and only loosely tacked together, (1) the conception of the Messiah, whose birth is predicted in chap. xii., whose appearance is predicted in chap. xix., whose death or passion are not only not mentioned, but even made impossible by chap. xii.; and (2) the conception of the Lamb, who has been slain, who is represented as sitting in heaven, and who has (strictly speaking) no part in the action of the great Apocalyptic Drama. The former is purely Jewish, the latter idea pre-eminently Christian. To those to whom the Christology of the Apocalypse has been hitherto a puzzle, and who have felt the great difficulty in accepting its teaching owing to its seemingly inconsistent utterances, this theory will come as a most welcome friend. It will be strange indeed if this part of Herr Vischer's work does not win him many adherents.

This critical discussion of the Christological question and the passages which embody it, is of course the key-stone of Herr Vischer's theory, and it is the very satisfactory way in which he deals with this question, and the way in which he discusses all the passages in which mention of "the Lamb," *το αρνιον*, is made, which gives us confidence in his judgment. In most of these passages he well shows how the words *το αρνιον*, *του αρνιου*, &c., when they occur in the Jewish portions, may be considered interpolations. The discussion of these passages results for Herr Vischer in the following conclusion: "by the elimination (of this name, *το αρνιον*) the context is nowhere disturbed, save in one single instance (Rev. v. 6), rather is it almost everywhere improved, and a satisfactory meaning is only reached by this hypothesis" (see p. 60, and the whole discussion, pp. 38-60). Examinaton is also made of the passages containing the word **Ιησους**, *ὑπομονη*, &c., where these words occur in the midst of the Jewish portions, and these are further determined as Christian interpolations. The Christian character of the beginning and close of the Revelation (*i.e.*, chaps. i.-iii., and chap. xxii., 6-21) is also proved. The last section of Herr Vischer's work deals with the character of the original Jewish work (Grundschrift), and shows that it forms a single and consistent Jewish writing, that is not a mere cento of Apocalyptic passages (pp. 76-91, *cf.* p. 37). Herr Vischer adds a very useful text of the Revelation, in which he separates the Jewish and Christian portions, and shows at a glance, by use of dark and light type, how the Jewish writing has been transformed into a Christian book.

Some minor points to be noticed in this work may be here just referred to. (*a*) Herr Vischer believes that the Jewish Apocalypse was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, and that the writer

of the Christian portions was also the translator into the Greek (p. 37, *f*). For the original being in Hebrew he relies largely on the testimony of Rev. ix. 11 ; xvi. 16, and of the many Hebraisms in the Greek. (*b*) The Interpolator and Translator, though a Christian, must have been of very conservative tendencies—*i.e.*, in his work he kept as much as possible of the original Jewish Apocalypse (pp. 57, 79). (*c*) Though Herr Vischer claims to have separated all the necessarily Christian passages from the Jewish work, yet he does not claim to have fixed permanently the line of separation between them, he will be ready to accept any further and more certain application of his theory (p. 71). (*d*) Lastly—and this is a very important matter—Herr Vischer concludes by saying (p. 90): "The apparently negative criticism which we have applied to the Christian book of the Revelation gives a really positive result. It was necessary under the pre-supposition that the Apocalypse of John is a purely Christian book to hold that this writing, which hardly differs in an appreciable degree from the contemporary Jewish Apocalyptic writings, was a characteristic expression of the eschatological expectations of the primitive Christian Church, which had known the immediate influence of the Lord and His Apostles ; but it now appears that all those features which seem foreign or contradictory to the Gospel of Jesus, are to be ascribed to a Jewish author, and that all those passages, which come from the Christian author, have the aim of spiritualizing the Jewish pictures of the future, and of placing them on a higher level." "Our enquiry gives a clear picture how the materially gross revenge and desire to recompense enemies and to reign on earth, belonging to those who held to the Jewish Messianic expectations, became spiritualised and placed in a new light by taking the standpoint of union with the Saviour, who was to appear again."

This new key to the Apocalypse must be understood and tried before it can be really judged. It has been long before this very simple theory of Herr Vischer's has been alighted upon ; the only strange thing about it is that some one has not attempted long ago to explain the Apocalypse by using it. It must now be applied exegetically to the whole of the Book of Revelation, and each verse of the Apocalypse must be examined in the light of it. If the theory can stand such a test, it will make a very strong claim indeed upon our acceptance. The further development of this hypothesis may be expected to clear up some dark places : among these must be Rev. ii. 9, where the synagogue of false Jews sounds suspiciously Jewish (or Jewish-Christian) ; Rev. ii. 24, where the 'none other burden' has been referred to the partial observance of the Jewish ceremonial law, and the very strong belief—certainly un-Pauline, if not anti-Pauline—in a retribution according to a man's works (Rev. xxii. 12 ; ii. 23, &c.), must also be canvassed in the light of this theory before its full value is known, or its complete bearings are realised. When the world of critical theology has had time to consider and discuss this view, we shall be better able to see the true importance of this new discovery.

This is not the place to attempt more than an explanation of Herr Vischer's work, and with a view of explaining his position

this *resumé* may be concluded by an enumeration of the passages which Herr Vischer counts as the Christian additions; all not included in the following list are part of the original Jewish Apocalypse. The following are Christian additions :—

Revelation i. 1 to iii. 22 (in toto).

v. 6, *αρνιον* and *ὡς εσφαγμενον*.
v. 8, *ἀρνιου*.
v. 9, to 14 (in toto).
vi. 1, *το ἀρνιον*.
vi. 16, *και ἀπο της ὀργης του ἀρνιου*.
vii. 9-17 (in toto).
ix. 11, *Εβραιστι* and *και ἐντη Ἑλληνικῃ ὀνομα ἐχει Ἀπολλυων*.
xi. 8, from *ὅπις καλειται* to end of verse.
xi. 15, *και του χριστου αυτου*.
xii 11, (in toto).
xii. 17, *Ἰησου*.
xiii. 8, *του ἀρνιου του ἐσφαγμενου*.
xiii. 9, 10 (in toto).
xiv. 1 to 5 (in toto).
xiv. 10, *και ἐνωπιον του αρνιου*.
xiv. 12, 13 (in toto),
xv. 3, *και την ᾠδην του ἀρνιου*.
xvi. 15 (in toto).
xvi. 16, *Ἑβραιστι*.
xvii. 6, *και ἐκ του ἁιματος των μαρτυρων Ἰησου*.
xvii. 14 (in toto).
xviii. 20, *και οἱ ἀποστολοι*.
xix. 7, *του ἀρνιου*.
xix. 9, 10.
xix. 11, *καλουμενος πιστος και ἀληθινος*.
xix. 13, *και κεκληται το ονομα αυτου ὁ λογος του θεου*.
xx. 5, from *και τας ψυχας* to *του θεου και*, and perhaps also the rest of the verse and also verse 5.
xx. 6 (in toto).
xxi. 5, from *και λεγει*.
xxi. 5-8.
xx. 9, *την γυναικα του ἀρνιου*.
xxi. 14, from *και επ' αὐτων* to end of verse.
xxi. 22, *και το ἀρνιον*.
xxi. 23, *και ὁ λυχνος αὐτης το ἀρνιον*.
xxi. 27, *του ἀρνιου*.
xxii. 1, *και του ἀρνιου*.
xxii. 3, *και το ἀρνιου*.
xxii. 6-21 (in toto).

THE BIBLE AND CHALDÆAN ASTROLOGY.*

A REMARKABLE little book has just been published, called "Astrology in the Apocalypse." The author is no professed theologian, but an artist and an Oxford graduate, who was (we believe) for some time secretary to Professor Ruskin. He has hit upon a new vein in the mine of Biblical science—a vein which may prove very rich. His idea is simply this, that many of the allusions, symbols, &c., in both Old and New Testaments, are explained by Chaldæan Astrology.

We do not desire here either to explain or criticise the views of Mr. Collingwood's book, but only to point out the nature and bearings of the question he propounds. When he finds the beasts of the book of Daniel to be derived from the constellations, or the symbols of Chaldæan Astronomy, when he derives much of the imagery of the Apocalypse from the same source, when he shows that the jewels of the High Priest's breastplate and of the foundations of the walls of the heavenly city (Rev. xxi. 19 *f.*) are the jewels of the Chaldæan Zodiac, when again he connects the story of the Magi and the star in the East with Chaldæan learning and lore, he is bringing a new test to the solution of old problems. We need here only point out that this new application may possibly have important results, especially in Pentateuch criticism, if it can be shewn when certain astrologic doctrines found in the Old Testament were developed; and when we know more of the dissemination of such doctrines, we shall have another help to the dating of the various elements in the Pentateuch; and again, when more is known of ancient astronomy generally, and when in the light of it the Jewish Apocalypses and the New Testament Apocalyptic passages are carefully examined, we may find that many old difficulties begin to disappear. The subject needs to be fully worked out by a well-read theologian; till that is done, we must be content to wait; for Mr Collingwood's sketch is so slight and in many points so weakened by lack of strict historical method and of theological learning, that it can hardly be regarded as doing more than suggesting a new and most interesting question.

IN PALESTINE, FROM THE EXILE TO ALEXANDER.

NOTE.—The writer wishes to acknowledge the help he has derived from Dr. de Lagarde's works, especially his "Orientalia," ii., pp. 13-27.

THE debt of the world to the Hebrew race will never be measured, for it is inestimable. But the singular fact is, that while the race had, as we may say, a double bloom, the first blossom, which was the more natural, and in many respects the more brilliant, blushed unseen, and well-nigh wasted all its sweetness in a lonely mountain

* "Astrology in the Alpocalypse, an Essay on Biblical Allusions to Chaldæan Science." By W. Gershom Collingwood, M.A. Published by George Allen, Sunnyside, Orpington, Kent (Price 3s. 6d. post-free.)

air, while the second has thrilled the world with power and grace. The first flower bud began to swell within its swathings far away back in pre-historical ages, and hasting slowly through many a century, then hastened on with strange speed through the few generations till it burst in magnificent beauty, in all unparalleled thought and words, vision and insight, in the great Hebrew prophet Isaiah. The whole world was astir then, busy, building homes, laws, poetry, and philosophy. Assyria was most busy over her libraries, Greece was just conscious of the value of her own story in 776 B.C., and Rome was just conscious of her destiny in 753, when, in 760, Isaiah thought his first transcendent thought of God and man. Yet Greece and Rome heard nothing of Isaiah or Isaiah's home for many a century, and the thoughtful, eager Assyrians of Isaiah's day knew nothing of Israel, save as a field for the slave-hunter. The Hebrew race learned something of its own destiny from the galaxy of thinkers who sprang then from its bosom; and the race sought, indeed, to run towards the high goal, moved by the silvery or iron compelling words of such orators. The singularly thoughtful people echoed the hopes of their seers and made their words law; but they did not know the supreme value of each individual soul. Only a few dreamed of each soul's creative value; the many let that kernel of all life, personal and national, lie cramped and dormant. There was no abiding, staying power within, and the fierce slave-hunters from without did their pleasure in the capture and exile of the whole.

It is hard to tell why Cyrus, the Medo-Persian conquerer of Babylon, was moved to send some of the Hebrew Exiles back to build Jerusalem. Perhaps he wished a faithful outpost on the borders of Egypt. We know that between 536 and 530 B.C. he did so send; and we know that nearly 100 years later two notable men, Ezra in 458 and Nehemiah in 444, led another caravan of some 6,000 of the Exiles' descendants across the deserts from Babylon to Judah. There had been carried into Babylonian slavery in 599, we are told, first 10,000 men of some rank and from 1,000 to 7,000 soldiers and craftsmen, with, of course, their families—some 80,000 souls in all—at the first deportation; then, secondly, in 588, nearly all the remaining population of the kingdom of Judah, save a few who escaped to Egypt. How many souls the whole population of Judah might number then we scarcely know; but we read that by David's time Judah had some 500,000 men. We learn that there returned, at the close of the captivities, some 40,000 and more souls, and 80 years later, with Ezra, perhaps 6,000, say in all 50,000 persons, to form the new Jewish state. These figures may not be like the reliable statements of the statistician, but we may assume that they present fairly the relative proportions of the Exiled and the Restored. Let us assume that if the Exiled were 300,000, the Restored were some 50,000, and we learn that we are to study how so tiny a colony of freedmen worked out the beginnings of the new Jewish life, in the place where, down to a century earlier, the old Hebrew life had grown, bloomed, and withered in a population six times as numerous. I have said that the older life flourished all unseen of outer peoples. The new life became a centre of world interests, sending out strong colonists to many

lands, yet holding them fairly devoted to fatherland and mother-tongue, and far more, still, to character of race and national religiousness. The new people and their possessions became as much as ever the desire of the great world's greedy slave-hunters; but in the end, Jerusalem has become, or is yet more fully to become, the centre of all the civilised world's reverence.

It is unquestionably true, and momentous, that the concentration of world interests about Jerusalem is a concentration which culminates in time in the first 33 years of our era. But that culmination was conditioned by the population of that land in those years. He who does not know the house—mental, spiritual, as well as physical—in which the great Head of Christianity, Jesus, sprang, does not know Jesus and Christianity as a thinker must know him. And that house, mental and spiritual, was built and greatly furnished in the years between the Exile and the Battle of Issus.

I.

It has been an almost impossible task for narrators to picture to us those days quite objectively. The times lie between two brilliant periods, and the brilliancy of these dazzles the eyes that try to see the little border time. The extraordinary devotion of many a student to the first Christian Century, causes an overlooking of this little time of origins, as we may term it; and either its valuable pictures are judged and under-estimated by the later standard, or later conceptions are read into that earlier time, with distortion for result. In other words, for example, the theologian of to-day is easily misled to speak of the cessation of prophecy as a fact that marks God's temporary cessation of inspiration and of interest in mankind; or, again, the doctrine of the Messiah as it was coloured and drawn out in the later years of our 1st Century, is supposed, even by excellent theologians, to have been the well-known and well-discussed possession of those post-exilic generations.

But if the judgment of the student is much warped, much more tangled are the materials for study. The brilliant pre-exilic age dazzled the eyes, and carried away the pen of the post-exilic narrators. Here let us dive *in medias res*, and say that the Books of Chronicles, with their pendants, Ezra and Nehemiah, are the great and almost only source of definite information on those Persian-Jewish days from 530 to 330. But to the Chronicler the great task worthy of a historian's search and pen was not so much his own day as the great golden age of his fathers. He set himself to write, as it were, a new Bible, which should swiftly course along and tell how from creation onwards God had hasted to build the beautiful Hebrew house, the nation of the days of David and his sons. He begins with Adam, and seems to purpose a new edition, perhaps a replacement, of the story of the great Books, Genesis down to Kings. Let us note in passing the sign that he knew better than we do the purpose of that great series of books. We speak of the books of the Law, and we have been gradually led by our interpretation of that word "law" to dream of the Pentateuch as one great code, and of the prophet Moses, the great Deliverer

and man of prayer as, for the most part, a Legislator. It is true that the LXX translation of Torah by Nomos has caused this, but perhaps Nomos itself may bear the real meaning of Torah, which is "instruction." The Pentateuch is a great narrative, a book of instruction for the people concerning God's wonderful Providences and Leadings of the Hebrew fathers and children. Stories of legislation this, of course, includes. Here is a clue for the expounder of Paul's Letter to Rome wheresoever he strikes against the Nomos stumbling stone.

The Chronicler set about writing a new Torah. The project was certainly bold, but it was anything but sacrilegious, and it may be a noble, worthy example for any to-day who fear to criticise the historical Books of the Old Testament. The Chronicler wrote "A Book of Instruction concerning God's Providence to the Hebrews in the past," from his own point of view. His narrative runs from the Creation through the days of the Patriarchs, giving large space to the Edomites, none to the Exodus, and much to the settlement of Palestine, especially by the sons of Caleb in south Judah, the ancestral seat of David's house. Then he expands at great length the story of David and his sons and kingdom, and the rival kingdom in the north; he recounts the fall of Samaria in 720, and of Jerusalem in 588, the return, under Cyrus, in 536, and under Artaxerxes, 80 years later; and gives a sketch of the post-exilic government by the Davidic line, and of the priestly service of the Aaronites down to the days of Alexander.

I say he gives narrative, but often this is a bare list of successive office-holders. Yet by this means we can give the writer's date, and with it his point of view. Thus in 1 Ch. iii. 19-24, are recorded at least seven generations (the LXX says twelve generations) of the successors of Zerubbabel, who was Prince at the return, in 536; and thus the last-mentioned of these, Hodaiah and his brothers, must have been governing about the year 310 B.C. The writer who records these things must have lived a little later. Again, in a passage in the Book of Nehemiah, which is probably from the same hand, we find (Neh. xii. 22) a list of priests, and these evidently chief priests—to wit, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua; but this Jaddua was High Priest in the time of Alexander, as we may gather independently from each of the two sources, the Book Nehemiah (xii. 22), and Josephus (Ant. xi. 8, 7). We may conclude that the author was living about the year 300 B.C. Probably some devout Jew felt then the need of a new record of God's leadings which should tell the whole story from the beginning down to his own time, and should account for the religious faith and ceremonial practice of his own day; and thus the Books of Chronicles were probably produced about the year 330 B.C.

It is very evident that the result was not esteemed in the writer's day, nor by any of his countrymen in later days, as of equal accuracy with the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. The work stands in their Hebrew Bible, but it is not only excluded from the two great classes of Torah and Prophetical works wherein those other books stand, but it is relegated to the very lowest place possible, in order of honour, standing last of all

in the whole collection, at the very end of the third division of the Bible, the collection of Hagiographa, which includes the Psalms, Job, Proverbs, and also Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, &c. Nor does this subordination surprise the reader; for the Chronicler's description of the kingdom of David and his house is often very different from the story of the Books of Samuel and Kings. Indeed, at times the two reports contradict each other, as in 2 Chron. xxiv. 25 compared with 2 Kings xii. 21 (burial of Joash), 2 Chron. xx. 36 compared with 1 Kings xxii. 48 (the ships of Jehoshaphat); 1 Chron. xx. 5 compared with 2 Sam. xxi. 19 (the slayer of Goliath at Gob), those being but one or two cases among a multitude.

But let us spare needless illustration that we may hasten back to a clue already suggested, which explains at once their differences along with others that are more important, and explains, also, actual ultimate recognition of such a record as a truly religious utterance.* The chronicler's work was, we may say, both truly religious and religiously true. We should indeed have lost valuable historical data for our period under consideration had the work been rejected and destroyed by its first audience, but, moreover, its contemporary readers could not well have rejected what was a real, although startling utterance of their own faith.

The important clue to its nature and value, and its acceptance is that it was written from the writer's point of view, as it must needs have been. We need find little difficulty in explaining his contradictions of the Book of Kings if we remember that his religious aim must have been to exhibit the importance of obedience to Jehovah. To him there was no such infallibility in the Books of Samuel and Kings as would prevent him from altering the statements of these books if they seemed too light in condemnation of disobedience. Many have since woven round these books almost a verbal infallibility, but the Chronicler did not know it. Indeed, even 400 and more years later the authority and reliability of these Samuel and Kings records was counted as far less than the authority of the Pentateuch, for the Talmudic decisions impute an almost infallible inspiration to the Torah, but quite a secondary inspiration to the so-called Prophetic books. The Chronicler saw in Samuel and Kings sources of information which he counted not always correct, but often needing correction. He may have had other sources of information of which we know nothing, but he had a great faith in national obedience, in the duty of it, and in the general fact of it in the past; and he told his fellows a story which he believed ought to be true. He might have claimed this, had his narrative been questioned, yet it is not even necessary to think of him as at any time scientifically testing or questioning his own narrative. For he wrote a faith rather than a study; a sermon indeed rather than a history. The imagination has a license ever at command, and both imagination and license are used by the wisest men of all ages when they would paint the ideal. To the

* And as we turn let us note points gained by our search so far. (1) Each of the variations just now quoted marks the evil of disobeying the God of Israel, but adds increased condemnation. (2) The Chronicler rejects or corrects the reports of the Books of Samuel and Kings when his own higher authority demands it. (3) His higher authority is "the religious need," and his product is not history, but exhortation.

writer the ideal is true, and the imagination may honestly picture it to win men to truth; but, of course, the picture is not history.

It is not my purpose to present an apology for the Chronicler, and for the inclusion of his book in the Jewish, or in the Christian sacred Scriptures. I have accomplished all my desire if I have shewn that this age produced earnest religious exhortation. We need not here examine the quality of the religion, whether it was exalted or debased: that is to say, we need not now examine the writer's conception of God, whether it was all, or less than all, that we now believe to be the character of the Great First Cause. The complete answer to that enquiry depends on the sum of all the writer's conception of duty which we have yet to consider. But we have gained two preliminary valuable answers to that enquiry:

(*a*) The Chronicler felt and obeyed the impulse within him to set a conception of God before men, and by this conception to move them to devotion.

(*b*) The Chronicler exalted the importance of his own idea of God above, at least, the most of the religious records of the past.

The first of these results is substantially this, that the age of Prophesy had by no means departed. The acknowledged prophets, either of the most sublime order, like Isaiah, or of the feeblest, like Haggai, were men of controlling faith in their God's authority and in His sure guidance of their own mind and word. I need scarcely add expression of my own mind that such a faith is the noblest possible; it is not only the truest faith, but it is absolutely true, and may well be called the fruit of Divine Inspiration. But these men were always men of their own time. Isaiah was a brilliant thinker, a keen student, a far-sighted seer, a brilliant writer; but he belonged to a brilliant age. Haggai was not, indeed, a servile writer, but he was timid, clinging, fearful of offence; and he belonged to a little band of newly-freed slaves. So the Chronicler was a prophet, a man of devoted faith, busy, building a new state, eager to teach what men ought to do to be saved from evil, more deeply moved by God's present inspirations than by His inspiration of the past. I may colour the man and the age too highly, but I cannot quench a great admiration for the religiousness, and the manliness, and the beauty of the Jews of Alexander's day. Those two centuries after the Exile were days of rich growth and high hope. No wonder that the Maccabean heroism sprang out of them, and that then the thoughtful days of Hillel and Paul cried out a cry for true righteousness and life which no imperfect speculation will satisfy.

II.

Turn now, again, to the Chronicler's relation to the ages before him.

I have claimed for him great beauty, and this appears in his esthetic difference from earlier days. I have said that he exalts the importance of his own conception of God above that of earlier records, and this difference of his point of view from that of earlier narrators finds its most important illustrations, not so much in contradictions of former records of events, as in descriptions and implication of a new order of ceremonial observances.

The Chronicler points constantly to the Torah of Moses as the standard of religious observance. But it would be a keenly interesting task to compare his whole picture and ideal, both of story and sentimental duty, with those of the Pentateuch. That task would be too difficult for us, but an easier and more fruitful still lies near at hand. I will not even institute a narrow comparison between the ceremonial of the Book of Kings and that of Chronicles, for that also is much complicated by the possibility of post-exilic touches added here and there to the earlier of these books. But even a rough comparison would be very striking, for we should find the highly organized system of Temple servants, which is the very framework of the Chronicles, almost altogether lacking in the Books of Kings. It is well-known that the narrative given in the end of Kings of the adoption and national establishment, under Josiah, of a hitherto unobserved law, implies by everyword that that law was substantially our Book of Deuteronomy. This assumption does not in the least beg the question of the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch, but simply affirms, according to the tenor of the whole of the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, that nearly all of the Mosaic ceremonial laws were unused until in Josiah's day Deuteronomy was nationally put in force. Thus we find that down to Josiah's days many sanctuaries besides Jerusalem were frequented by prophets, kings, and people, and the chief sacrificial office was often held by the patriarchal chief of the company of worshippers; but, with the establishment of Deuteronomy, Jerusalem was established as the only sanctuary, and the priestly office was confined to the body of Levites. On the other hand, the Chronicler pictures the times of even David and his sons as furnished with an elaborate priestly system, not merely more complex than that of Deuteronomy, but more elaborately complete than that of the Levitical portions of the Pentateuch.

The clue for explanation is, of course, as before, the Chronicler's point of view. In the three and a quarter centuries which rolled away between the Josian adoption of Deuteronomy and the days of Alexander and the Chronicler, not only had the returned exiles adopted the whole of the Pentateuchal ceremonials as their ceremonial law, not only had they learned to obey the Levitical portions of the Law of Moses, but there had been a ceremonial development much further still. The Pentateuch does not provide for nearly all the observances of the Chronicler, yet the Chronicler regarded the full observances of his own day as all of Divine origin, and even as Mosaic also; and believing that the nation in David's days must have observed them, he supplements the books of Kings by his ideal chronicles. To him there was no doubt that his picture of the past was real, for, although the evidence of the Books of Kings might be deficient, the evidence of facts was before his eyes in the ceremonial, which he saw and shared, and which he believed to be Divine.

But I may not leave the impression that a comparison of the Chronicles with the Kings, or Leviticus, is our most reliable or most satisfactory source of information on the developments of those times. By reason of the late re-editing of the Books of

Samuel and Kings, already suggested, and by reason of the ordinary difficulty of conceiving how the Levitical Books of the Pentateuch could be entirely in abeyance so long, these comparisons are extremely unsatisfactory sources. But a perfectly satisfactory source is at hand, and easy to use.

The Book of Ezekiel is largely occupied with its writer's ideal of ceremonial; and this was written down during the Exile, some sixty years after the Deuteronomic Reformation. We may rely upon Ezekiel, who was a priest, and a very priestly man, to give us a picture of the most elaborate ceremonial which could possibly be current at the beginning of the Exile. Of course, none could be actually used in the Exile. The Ceremonial of Ezekiel is, therefore, approximately a picture of the mind of the people in 530 B.C., while the Chronicles give a picture of their practice in 330. The differences will be the amount of elaboration due to the two centuries now under discussion.

To compare here these books in all detail were impossible. Let me pass by Ezekiel's pictures of the Temple and of the Prince, and turn (*a*) brief attention, firstly, to his Priesthood. His priests are to be only such Levites as are sons of Zadok. The Deuteronomic system had made every Levite dwelling in Jerusalem a priest, therefore Ezekiel's plan proves that the process of limitation is still progressing. In Chronicles, indeed, while the Levites are not to be all priests, the limit is broader than with Ezekiel, for with the Chronicler all the descendants of Aaron, including the Zadokites, are priests; and, again, in both plans, all the remaining Levites are to be servants of the priests and of the people. But with the Chronicler there is a higher elaboration than in Ezekiel, for there is in the later of these two a higher office than that of priest. The head of the Aaronic family has become the "High Priest," with special and exclusive functions; and, on the other hand, in each of the lower divisions of Priests and Levites there are now, in 330 B.C., many sub-divisions.

(*b*) In these numerous gradations and sub-divisions lies the most striking feature of the system known to the Chronicler. The Aaronites were sub-divided into twenty-four sets, each, doubtless, serving in the Temple for a fortnight, and this division lasted down to the destruction of Jerusalem. The Levites were sub-divided into singers, gate-keepers, treasurers, and judges. These had, again, their sub-divisions, but among all the most notable are the classes of singers and musicians. Even the priests had trumpets of a certain sort called Chaçoçer, with which they gave, not music, but the signal for reverence to God at the moment of His revealing Himself. From the name of this signal comes our good English word Hallelujah, and the Hebrew name Tehillim given in later days to the Psalms.

(*c*.) The Levites, again, were largely musicians—Meshorerim—either "choristers," or, perhaps, more truly "instrumentalists;" and let us note, by the way, that the very name of their tribe—the Levites—would bear the sense of "The Accompanists." Thus

the old word had an ever new meaning and beauty. Again, these "Accompanists" were duly arranged by family and for duty, for the songs were part-songs, and the beauties of harmony were probably felt and sought. So the Asaphites, a family of Gershonites—that is, descendants of Gershon, the son of Levi†—played upon Meçiltaim, that is, doubtless, "cymbals," or pairs of castagnettes; and these, moreover, apparently of two sorts, high or keen, and deep or heavy, as Ps. cl. seems to say. Next in this orchestra stood, or, more likely, sat, the Hemanites, a family of Kohsethite Levites, who played the Nebhalim, which were most probably instruments of the zither sort, and precursors of our piano. Beside these were next arranged the Ethanites, sometimes called Jeduthunites, who played the Kinnor, and this instrument, say the Arabs, was the same as (al 'ud), whose name is heard with us in the word "lute." When the priests gave the Hallel, to indicate, I fancy, that El had anew revealed to the Kohen his character as Yahweh,‡ the threefold orchestra led the great answer of Praise, called Yhwh.

We cannot now pursue comparison of Ezekiel with the Chronicler, although study of the different sets of Festivals, and of the views of sacrifice, would be of great interest; suffice it to say, that the fundamental difference lies in the advance in elaboration, and this marks no careless age, but a people profoundly thoughtful, profoundly eager to understand and do the things that please their God and make themselves true men.

III.

It was an age when one might gladly live, for it was a grateful age of meditation and of song. It was, perhaps, more meditative than creative of speech and song, but that meditation ensured those collections of the earlier oratory and poetry, which we count to-day so precious. Surely the formation of such collections was itself a creation.

We need say nothing here of the arrangements of the historical and prophetical writings, beyond a note of the clear evidence from the LXX that the collectors and arrangers of these books lived between the Exile and Alexander. Their work was a noble literary service. But it was, doubtless, in this age also that our Psalter was collected and arranged, nearly as we now have it. (*a*) It is well-known that we possess a really five-fold Psalter, and that the various books close each with a Doxology, viz., at xli., lxxii., lxxxix., cvi., and cl. Careful observation will show that each of these books is, or contains, a distinct Liturgy. (*b*) The first has, as a preface, two introductory meditations—Psalms i. and ii.—then it begins with four evening songs, wherewith the choirs may lead the worship when the day begins at even (*cf.* Lagarde). (*c*) Various Psalms are repeated in the different books, as we might repeat the same religious song at different

† It is to be remembered always that the Hebrew term "son of" does not necessarily imply natural filial relationship, but often—perhaps most often—means merely membership of a "guild" or "sort" of persons, or beings.

‡ *cf.* the ceremony of the Jews of to-day. On the Day of Atonement all whose name is Cohen hold up the hands, with fingers extended, somewhat in the shape of the letters Hodhah.

kinds of religious gatherings, and in different liturgies. If the Psalm books had been mere collections, such repetition would have been avoided. (*d*) Again, the 1st Book uses almost exclusively one Divine name—the personal name of the God of Israel, "Yahweh"—while the 2nd Book uses the generic Divine Name, "Elohim," almost utterly excluding the personal name, and altering the word when a Psalm contained in the first Book or Liturgy is used again in the second. A reason for this must be found in the purpose for which each liturgy or book was used. Again, the 1st Book is a "David" Liturgy, sung, doubtless, with constantly intervening readings from the story of David, as contained in the Books of Samuel and Kings, to illustrate God's care of His children, and so to prepare the soul for the duty of the day. Hence have come, I think, the headings of these Psalms. The 2nd Book is similar, save that the "David" Liturgy is preceded by a short set of songs, to be rendered by the Korah portion of the choir, and at the end of this Book the close of the "David" Liturgies is announced. The Hebrew note says, "Finished have the David Prayers." Note, it is not the David-Psalms, but the David-Liturgies. Probably the former Liturgy was used for services when the personal name of God was the more appropriate, and when with no fear, but full of trust, like children and friends of God, the people felt that their God was manifesting His loving face in His own home in the midst of them. The second Liturgy is more solemn, more stately, and severe, sung when God appeared above, afar, high, or even dreadful. (*e*) I need not tell in detail the story of Book III., which combines a Liturgy for the Asaph choir, and one following this for the Korahites. (*f*) Book IV. has a peculiar interest, for its songs seem to have been sung at the reading of the story of the Exodus, and fitly it is introduced with a prayer for wisdom, to be gained by that tale of the long past and of the ever-fleeting ages. Thus this prayerful prefix to the "Moses" story and song has come to be entitled in later days "The Moses Prayer." (*g*) Book V. contains several Liturgies, one to accompany the reading of the laws, with a monastic-like, acrostic chant, in Psalm cxix.; a second Liturgy for festival conventions of people from the towns far and near, and a final collection of Praises. (*h*) The composition of many of these Psalms dates from long before the Exile, and I love to think of Jeremiah and Isaiah as poet-contributors to our present song. But many contributions are from the very period now before us, as the strong tinge of Aramaic language tells (see Psalms cxvi. 3, &c.), for that new speech was now sifting in among the Hebrews from the Aramaic—*i.e*, Syrian—peoples, who filled Palestine during the Exile. At the date under consideration, the Jews were becoming a bi-lingual people, as the composition of the "Ezra" pendant to the Chronicles shows. Thus the language of these Aramaic-tinged Psalms proves that the collections were made, and the Liturgies arranged, in our period. This result is abundantly confirmed by the fitness of these Liturgies to the Choral and Liturgical methods of the age, as seen in the Book of Chronicles, and, finally, the collection could not well have been made after Alexander's day, for we find the Chronicler (1 Chron. xvi. 8-36) using Psalms cv. 1-15; xcvi;

cvii. 1 ; and cvi. 47-48, with the Doxology already attached, and we conclude that the Chronicler had Psalm Book III., already in complete collected form, before him, in (say) 300 B.C. We find that the LXX translators possessed the Psalter soon after Alexander's day, completed as we have it, and ready for translation into Greek. It need scarcely be added that the collection, with its Aramaic hue, could not have been written either in the Exile or before it. (*i*) Such graceful duty, therefore, did these Exiles undertake; they were surely men of worth who could do it. The horizon of their thought was narrow, but upwards they gazed and yearned with a longing that was sublime.

There is a touching mark of the religiousness of the age in that choice of a name of God which we observe in this Liturgy or in that. It was a time of meditation on God's name, which is His nature. Not with them indeed did this begin, for in the Book of Jeremiah, just pre-exilic, written say 620 to 590 B.C., you may read again and again a meditation on the meaning of the great Tetragram, the Mysterious, Personal Name of Israel's God. Of like significance is the care taken by the skilful writer of the Book of Job to use such a Divine name at each point of his drama as shall be fitted to each phase of his story. Thus we find the personal, beloved name, "Yahweh," in the prologue and the epilogue, that tell of the sun-light of joy still beaming, or returning after the storm; but the grave, dread, distant name of "God" alone is used, when the darkness hangs down heavy and close. Nor did this writer use the old generic plural name, Elohim, that summed collectively all the Divine powers, but rather the singular name, Eloah, to designate the one only almighty, awful God, and Him afar, to whom the feeble soul cries out with outstretched hand and longing. That Book of Job is probably of exilic date, not from Babylonian soil, but from Edom, whither some had fled, escaping a worse exile. After the exile, the returning Jews seem to have felt a great fear that the God whose covenant grace had brought them home, was, nevertheless, chiefly a God of Judgment, whose rod their own folly might bring down again. They knew, and spoke, and sang, of the personal name so precious in their bright, trustful hours; but often they were afraid, and then they used the solemn, distant name. Not yet, indeed, had come the time when, in reading the sacred records, the personal name was passed by in fear, always outspoken; on certain days, in certain ceremonies, the Priests and the Levites, and perhaps some others, might use it. Surely not until a much later day was it that only once a year, on the great Atonement Day, the High Priest alone might speak the word; for even in Christian times there were Greeks who had heard it pronounced. In any case, the solemn regard for fitting use of the great names in speech and song proves a truly devout solicitude concerning God's character and His relation to men. Was the Kingdom of God afar off? Could it ever come near to men? Should it ever come to hold all in a mighty love-embrace?

This is but one phase—although certainly a fundamental phase—of the wide-spread and spreading activity of mind. An

individual self-consciousness was emerging, and a sense of the value of a life was dawning. I may point especially to the sign that lay in the growth of patriotism from the year 600, when Jerusalem fell, to the year 200, when the Maccabean heroes were born. Herzfeld, in his "Geschichte der Juden," says truly that the fall of Jerusalem would never have meant the fall of the whole kingdom and the enslavement of the whole people unless that people had utterly lacked patriotic spirit. Indeed, only the singular strength of the rocky fortress of Zion prevented a far earlier catastrophe. There was scant patriotism before the Exile. But in spite of 50 to 150 years of Exile and enslavement, there was born and nutured during the Persian supremacy and the succeeding kindly sway of the three Ptolemies, so high a self-estimation in the little nation and in its individuals that the oppression of Antiochus, and the greedy folly of traitorous officials in Jerusalem, only struck out from the flinty Maccabean soul a fire that swept out and held out the haughty, cruel Syrian, and shone on as light of joy in Jerusalem until the terrible Romans came. Even then the story of the Cæsars' prudent handling of Palestine on the one hand, and the awful scenes of A.D. 70, under Titus, on the other, tell of a spirit that demanded life, and could find it even in death if love demanded, yet could nourish a hate that knew no law.

I have tried in the earlier pages of this Essay to show how this eager Judaic spirit strove to grapple with all the needs of life, as it searched out all duties that should be done. Such strivings were born of the same growing respect for life and self. Its fuller outcome was that strange Mishna, or second law, whereby the teachers of ceremonial law supplemented the Mosaic order. Its constructors believed it to be God's gift through tradition and through their own eager investigation, and they believed that God demanded obedience to all its instructions from those who would be perfect. Yet it was a burden fit to break the spirit and kill the life of its devotees. In the strange, ever-unsatisfied and ever selfish yearning of the age to be righteous, there was a wonderful cry to God for His own Light, in life that was dark and weary. Surely God bends tenderly to such a cry; surely He is ready to forgive men who stumble in such dark wanderings. Amid this struggle it was that men learned to personify evil. The hard path, the bitter hindrance seemed too hard and bitter to be ever set before men, save by a hard and bitter spirit. Only a devil could have laid this evil plan. It may be that the Jews learned much of their theory of evil spirits from the Persians in the two years of Persian supremacy. But men learn that toward which they lean. It was when bound in exilic slavery, and amid the trembling hopes of later days that the Jews learned to picture that personal adversary, or Satan, who scarcely appears until we read the post-exilic prophets and Job, and who is seldom a-missing in the post-Biblical writings. The conception marks men of eager vision, stern to grapple even with unseen powers.

I may not stay to speak of the philosophical spirit, wise and unwise, that speaks in Ecclesiastes, the later Proverbs, the Wisdom of Sirach and of Solomon. A closer knowledge of the heart of the

age is gained by study of its so-called Messianic hope. It is of first importance here to avoid reading into pre-Christian times that Messianic doctrine which pervades and flows so wonderfully from the latter half of the first Christian century. (*a.*) The very word Μεσσίας is a warning to caution. It is not a Hebrew word at all, it is a word-form which Hebrew never constructs. If it were Hebrew it would be the only word of its form known in Hebrew. It is not even Aramaic. It is an Arabic form, and doubtless arose in the east Jordan country after the fall of Jerusalem. It has been adopted, not translated, but transferred literally into Greek, in addition to the word χριστὸς already existing in the LXX., as if there were a consciousness that the word χριστὸς, which may represent the Hebrew *Māsiach*, did not quite cover the same meaning as the new word Μεσσίας. The new word Μεσσιας symbolised a new doctrine. Our duty in studying the pre-Christian age is, therefore, to trace the significance of the utterances concerning the *Māsiach* avoiding carefully pre-judgment through later influences. (*b.*) The Old Testament term *Māsiach* is used constantly of any one who is anointed to any office in consequence of an inborn right thereto, and kings, Jewish or foreign, the Hebrew David, or the Medo-Persian Cyrus are named *Māsiach*. So, too, are the anointed priests. (*c.*) Now observe that while early prophets like Isaiah had predicted the coming of a better Prince than all whom they had known, that hope seems to have waned in exilic days. The worthless sons of Josiah had almost ruined the royal hope, so Ezekiel prophesies of the reign of a Prince, but he is to be a semi-priestly officer, and the princes of the return sink almost into insignificance beside the leading of the High Priests and the teachers, like Ezra. This is significant. A sense of the importance of sacrifice far above that of throne and sceptre was waxing strong. The greatest prophet of the exiles, the writer of Isa. xl. to lxvi. declares that the nation's highest hope lies in the Servant who suffers for men's sin. The great Law of Life is dawning. He who sacrifices to bless has and gives blissful life. (*d.*) Now turn to a work of one who gathered in his soul the influence of all the post-exilic meditation on such themes. In the Book of Daniel, which is a picture of the thought of say, the year 200 B.C., there is a strangely wondrous story of a son of the gods; that is, of one who is of the nature of God, who enters the furnace of destruction with three convicts, and there at once shares their form and their suffering, and brings them safety and cheer. The hope that was growing in those days in the hearts that longed for help, was not altogether a hope for the advent of a king who should vanquish all enemies, but it was a hope that a son of the gods would come to share the sufferings of the sons of men, and give them Divine forgiveness and joy.

Of the Maccabeans and Romans' days I may not now write, but the age from the Exile to Alexander was full of longing and of striving, of beauty and of tenderness.

MOSES: A CONSTRUCTIVE STUDY.*

Lord Macaulay has likened the history of a nation to the course of a great river. A broad and stately waterway for many hundred miles, able at its mouth to accommodate the navies of the world, throughout the greater part of its career the most striking natural feature of the continent through which it flows, its upper reaches and its source are yet unexplored. They are incorrectly and variously laid down in the charts and uncertainly reported of by native rumour; and even should the explorer ascend the narrowing stream, he finds it ere long half lost in swamps, or buried in subterranean passages, or branching into many and uncertain heads. The last fountain-spring of the flood which rolls with such majesty into the waiting ocean deludes him. It is not to be found by man, or, at best, it is only to be tentatively conjectured.

This comparison, which fits so well the beginnings of general history, applies with no less fitness—one might almost say with more—to our sacred history. The stream of modern religious life is wide enough—extending over the many continents of the Christian world—and deep enough—outfathoming all our profoundest speculations; and as we trace its course back through many centuries, we find it still the broad belt across the history of mankind, the medium of intercourse amongst the nations, the cleansing and fertilizing power of human life, "the river of God" which "is full of water." But as we press backward and ever backward, we see the banks draw nearer, and the current shrink to ever thinner and shallower dimensions; we follow it with cautious steps along the treacherous ground of tradition and of legend, we half-lose its winding thread amid the rank growths of primitive imagination; we climb yet higher and higher the arduous slope of the unmeasured past, only to be more baffled by the dwindling and dividing mountain brooklet, until we lose ourselves amid the clouds which swathe the first beginnings of all human things and mingle them with the embosoming creative mystery of Heaven.

But although we cannot trace the furthest rills by which the distilling moisture of the sky trickles down to feed the growing stream, yet, when we have become accustomed to the chill and misty gloom, even under the shade of the Eternal Cloud, we find the well-head, a rocky cistern, where, clear, bubbling up, the water rises from mysterious depths and weaves with its own silver course the liquid threads which, mesh-like, creep down the slope from unknown heights. That we may hail as source of the mighty "river the streams whereof make glad the city of God." When we

* The writer wishes to do no more in the present sketch than throw out suggestions for the beginning of constructive work on the earliest period of Israel's religious history. He hopes that the dropping of this small grain into the solution in which all things Mosaic are now held may occasion a larger and much more perfect crystallization in other minds. He would also express his obligation to Professor Stade's "Geschichte des Volkes Israel."

mark how scant the portion it receives from the upper rills, and how full and steady its own outflow, we may say it is indeed a stream struck out of the rock by the rod of God.

To change the metaphor: let us go back over unnumbered years, and let us view the scene where at a date which is too remote to be computed the foundation of the Divine Society was laid. There is little to forecast the splendour of the progress which that society should achieve in man.

We see a few tribes of Semitic origin, who have in the course of their roving life wandered over the borders of Egypt and pastured their flocks and their herds in Goshen. We can learn with certainty very little about them, but from the little we do know they seem to belong to one of the simplest and most primitive types of man. They possess the rude and austere habits of Desert life; their morality is necessarily most rudimentary; their social organization is scarcely worthy of the name. Their religion is apparently of a very low order. There are pretty clear signs of fetish-worship having prevailed among them; traces remain down to historical times of a devout regard for stocks and stones which were not images. These early Semites had not yet risen to the height of idolatry; there is much that points to their being still on the low plane of ancestor-worship and of religious reverence for certain animals. The names and ensigns of the tribes were thus taken from animals, and remnants of the old superstition linger to the present day in the distinction of clean and unclean beasts. One may say they were little, if anything, better than savages: of the early, not debased type; wild men of the desert, who roved from place to place seeking new pasture for their cattle; who lived on the milk and flesh of their herds, not scrupling to add to these by predatory wars upon their neighbours.

But now a check has been put upon their roaming propensities. These simple folk, as yet not even on the threshold of civilisation, have come under the power of the grandest and most imposing civilisation of the early world. The massive structures of ancient Egypt abide to this day, as they bid fair to abide to the end of time, a witness to the high and complex state of manners and society in that far-off age. The valley of the Nile was the cradle of Greek, and, therefore, of all western civilisation, and the power of its rulers was as great as its progress in the arts of life. Its people had advanced beyond the pastoral into the agricultural stage—had passed on to commerce and architecture—had become a nation of great wealth and great cities. You can imagine with what slight scruple and scant notice so great a power might impose its yoke upon a few scattered shepherd tribes, wanderers from the wilderness. You can also imagine how sorely the restraints of civilisation would gall these untutored children of the wilds, and how with the passion of freedom which is born of the boundless desert they would resist ought that savoured of thraldom.

Now it is this group of rude pasturers, so poorly endowed, so unfavourably situated, which we are compelled by the course of subsequent events to describe as "the chosen people." They were

the raw material out of which was to be built the Kingdom of God on earth. For among them the Founder appeared—to them was given the man with the great creative idea.

He came from the Desert as they had done. He was one of them—a clansman of the tribe of Levi, but his were a soul and a mission which raised him far above the level of his time and race. What these were became more apparent in the later life in the wilderness, and we shall then investigate them more fully. For the present suffice it to say that this shepherd of the waste, by the power of his own unique personality, and still more of the new faith which he brought with him, rallied around him those oppressed tribes, defied the might of the oppressor, and after a series of deeds, the wonder of which ever grew and deepened in the national imagination, led forth Israel from the land of Egypt. The people were once more in the wilderness as free as of old.

But great as was the work of emancipation, the work in the Desert was far greater, and far more surely shows the impress of a master soul. The pressure of a foreign yoke which had banded the tribes into unity had been removed, what was to prevent the sudden combination from falling into its constituent atoms?

Well, when these roaming tribes, this cluster of clans, had been restored to their old freedom in the wilderness, and when they had resumed their former nomadic life, there were three things which stood between them and general disintegration. There were two great causes, and one occasion which was itself the product of the causes. The occasion was the recent memory of a marvellous deliverance from Egypt. This made them feel their one-ness by binding them to the leader who had accomplished it, and to the religion which had inspired it.

Let us now examine the first great cause we have referred to—the religion of Moses. It is extremely difficult for us who live in the noonday of the Gospel to get back to the dim dusk of the Mosaic dawn. It is hard for us to realise how poor and imperfect a notion first attached to that Jehovah whom ultimately Jesus recognised as His Father. We can only do so by keeping well in mind how low were the state and temper of the Israelites. The step from their poor substitutes for worship to the worship of Jehovah was a step immeasurably great.

For Moses brought to those early Hebrews what was essentially a new religion. This fact is indicated to us in the statement that he brought to them a new name for the object of their worship. The various cults to which their fathers had been attached must now give way to the one worship of the God whose name Moses brought. That name has been called the Ineffable Name, simply because the later Jews refused, from motives of reverence, to pronounce it. We have it commonly as Jehovah. That is assuredly wrong. The best scholarship would pronounce it YAHWEH. This name was probably in existence before Moses used it; perhaps it was the name of Deity among the Kenites or Midianites, but it was new to Israel. The meaning of the sacred word has been most

variously rendered,—He that is—the Eternal One, He that will cause to be, The Living One, The Cause of Life, He that causeth to fall (of the thunderstorm). Or simply an emphatic personal pronoun "He"—the else nameless one. But the word is so old, and may have come from one of such different sources of speech, that we cannot pronounce with certainty upon its meaning; we must content ourselves with the knowledge that it was a new name to the Israelites, and represented a new religion.

The seat of Yahweh was Sinai. His activity was not limited to that spot. He made his presence felt elsewhere; but he did so by sending his Angel or Ambassador, who wrought for him. His habitual residence and fixed abode was Sinai or Horeb just as much as Olympus was the dwelling-place of Zeus. It was called significantly "the Mount of God."

This primary belief which Moses probably took over with the name was continued in Israel long after the settlement in Palestine had been effected, when other sanctuaries were built, and even the great temple of Jerusalem had been opened. Thus at the great uprising of the united tribes under Deborah and Barak, we find the bard-prophetess describing in her stirring verse how Yahweh marched northward to battle from Sinai. Thus Elijah is represented as travelling in the period of dejection to Horeb the Mount of God, and there meeting with Yahweh. Thus even Habakkuk, who lived after Isaiah had declared Zion to be the chosen abode of Yahweh, spoke of the God's stately progress from the south where Sinai lay.

The God then whom Moses introduced to Israel was named Yahweh, and he dwelt in Sinai. He was furthermore a God of terrific power. Of that he had already given proof in liberating the people from the might of Egypt. It was continually signalized in the striking display of elemental force. The most terrible of these—the thunderstorm—was chosen as the usual manifestation of Yahweh. He was not simply the personification of the thunder, like the gods of mere Nature-worships. He was more than the thunder; he was the person who wielded the thunder; but all the solemn and terrific paraphernalia of the electric storm are attributed to him. He holds the lightning in his fists. The peal of thunder is his voice. The torrent of rain, the avalanche of hail, the thick, stifling canopy of gloom which accompany the thunder cloud are signs of his presence. When he marched forth to the help of his people and to the discomfiture of his foes, it was almost always attended by the pomp of elemental terrors. The thunder God was also the war God; he was Yahweh Zebaoth, the Lord of Hosts.

Another feature in Yahweh's character which followed naturally from this terrific might, was his unapproachableness. He was wrapped in inaccessible majesty. To stumble into his presence, to touch any sacred thing of his—the ark for instance—was to expose oneself to a fierce and fatal outburst of his fitful lightning-like indignation. To see him was to die, except in cases of special favour; so the story runs that even the mountain of the thunder-

storm, Sinai itself, was fenced about to keep the people off, and an unwitting beast which trespassed within the awful limit was smitten through.

The name, the might, the unapproachableness of Yahweh might have belonged, and probably did belong, to the old Nature god. But there was one feature in the new religion which must be attributed to Moses' initiative; that was, Yahweh was to be the only God of Israel; Israel was to be the people of no other God. This is the distinctive element in the faith of Moses; it is absolutely unique in the history of religions. No other nation has had a religion which bound it to the service of one God alone. Here lies the secret of the germ of Israel's greatness. Not that Moses said Yahweh was the only god in the world. Other gods were recognized in other nations, but in Israel Yahweh must be God alone, not only supreme, but sole. This was not a monotheism theoretically considered; it was what has well been called monolatry—sole worship of one, but it was a practical monotheism.

From this great idea flowed the other ruling features of the Mosaic faith. As the sole God of Israel, Yahweh himself exercised all the functions which in other peoples are frittered away among many one-sided gods; hence his character was from the first larger and fuller and more complex. He was the God of the sky to give Israel the rain and the dew. He was the God of war, to give Israel victory. He was Judge, to maintain order in the State. He was Guardian of his people, who came to their help, and so he was, in an awful and distant way, their Friend. Here were the first gleams of tenderness which as yet capricious and limited were to grow into the sunlight of the love of the New Testament. Such was the religion. You see at once how it must make for unity. All these tribes, however roving they might be, were bound together by their one God.

But neither unity nor religion was independent of the great personality who embodied both. The character of Moses, so far as we can trace it, seem to have been singularly complementary to and corrective of the character of Yahweh. His human nature seems to have made up many of the deficiencies, and to have toned down many of the excrescences of his idea of God. Of course it is difficult after this lapse of time to bring ourselves anything like face to face with this lone grand shepherd of the mountain of God, yet through the mist of antiquity we can see the outlines of a nature which is altogether extraordinary. He was a man who defied the might of kings, who faced the terrific Yahweh, who stamped the everlasting impress of his personality upon his people. Yet he was a man of gentle retiring disposition, distrustful of self, utterly unpretentious, one might almost say, of selfless heart. I say, he must have deserved the title of meekest of men, else how could it have been imputed to him? How could those narratives of his timid depreciation of self, of his self-sacrificing pity, of his humane and beautiful spirit have arisen unless there had been a great deal in his character to correspond to them? They are about the last stories in the world to be invented for a man who did such wonder-

deeds as he. Unerring prescience and continuous miracle might readily be ascribed to the deliverer and founder of Israel, but not that timorous humility and disparagement of self which marks the Moses of the Bible.

Humanity in its humanest sense, and humility at its humblest (we take it) make up a large part of the character of Moses. He was the type, and in no small degree the creator, of those beautiful souls which adorn the course of Israelitish and Christian history: men emptied of self that they might be full of fellowman and God: men who would shrink and tremble to say a word for themselves, but who would defy the world in tones of thunder on behalf of human helplessness or Divine decree. So into his large heart, whence self had flown, he could welcome all his brother tribesmen —he could bear with all their low ways, their worrying insubordination, their petty rivalries. So his humility secured what authority could not—the love as well as the obedience of the tribes.

This tenderly humane and lowly spirit often makes him appear far more divine than the God he served. More than once when the people of Israel sinned, and Yahweh in a fierce burst of rage would have swept them from the face of the earth, Moses interposed with true Christ-like self-sacrifice to shield them. Yahweh appears vindictive and vengeful: Moses forgiving, vicarious, and saving; and the New Testament teaches us which character is liker God.

It is difficult to estimate the ennobling and purifying influence which Moses' gentleness must have had on the future course of his religion. The thought of the gentle mediator would go side by side with that of the stern and unapproachable Yahweh to mollify the worship and the attitude of the worshipper. Just as the beautiful spirit of the Buddha, who declared there was no God, created a religion which numbers more adherents than any other; so the humane and humble temper of Moses would tend to develop the best side of Israel's faith.*

Such was the man, then, who impressed himself and his faith upon those uncultured Hebrews amid the thunder-smitten region of Sinai. He stamped upon their hearts in characters which could not be erased his awful idea of God. He taught them to hear in the thunder His rolling voice, to see His hand in the lightning, to feel His breath in the breeze. He made them tremble at the burning jealousy of Yahweh, which would admit of no god but himself in Israel. He made them rejoice in the avenging might with which Yahweh fought for them. And what that terrific Will

* Against this general position it has been argued: "It is difficult to conceive how an idea of such a Yahweh could possibly be revealed through such a Moses. An idea must largely represent the spirit of the man through whom it is revealed if revelation is to be other than mechanical." But my critic has forgotten that it is precisely the more rational and humane elements in Yahweh's character which I attribute to the revelation through Moses, while the more terrible features I refer to the pre-Mosaic Yahweh. My words are: "The name, the might, the unapproachableness of Yahweh might have belonged, and probably did belong, to the old Nature God." That the humble and humane spirit of Moses prevailed on the stern and reluctant Deity to follow milder counsels, only expresses in narrative form the way in which the personality of Moses modified the old notion, and so revealed a new notion of God—a God who, though terrific, was yet also, if unwillingly, amenable to reason and pity.

had uttered to his heart he imparted to the awe-smitten Hebrews as the oracle of God.

We find, then, in this Moses our first great soul in sacred history. He was indisputably a great soul: perhaps one of the very greatest souls in all history. The glimpses we can get of him through the haze of ages, even the shadowy outlines of his character and life reveal a man exceptionally great. But the work which he has done in history, the result of his life which abides throughout all time, are the most certain as they are the most eloquent witnesses to the supreme grandeur of his soul. He was, in a human sense, the maker of Israel. All its many-sided greatness may be traced back in more or less measure to him. He was in no official, but in a very real sense, prophet, priest, and king to them.

He was their judge. The people came to him to try their cases of dispute, whether these were what we would call civil or religious. He was Yahweh's spokesman, and the decisions which he made became the precedent and guide to judgeship in later generations. His judgments and judicial practices were naturally enough lodged deeply in the hearts of his people: they became a floating amorphous mass of case law. He was also priest, was the father of a line of priests, and his answers, when he was appealed to on points of religious observance, were treasured with punctilious care. These priestly and judicial precepts would be handed down from father to son, from age to age; expanded, modified, interpreted, finally codified, as changing circumstances demanded, until every law and statute was quite naturally attributed to him. In the age of Christ Moses was believed to be the author of a most elaborate and systematized code of ceremony, of sanitation, and of morals; while a still more impossible mass of tradition was referred to him and his 70 elders. So he was the founder of the legal life of Israel. "The law came by Moses."

That growing and expanding law was one of the ways by which his potent personality created and maintained the nation. The consciousness of national unity which he originated, and its almost incredible permanence, are some of the most significant monuments of his greatness. The people he made has never yet been destroyed. They straggled through the Desert into Palestine; they mingled with more civilized races; the kingdom they eventually formed was broken in twain; both divisions were one after the other licked up by conquering world powers; the people were deported to distant lands. The few which were restored finally lost their city and temple and were scattered throughout the world. Yet through all the changes of migration, invasion, disruption, devastation, exile, effacement, and dispersion, the people of Israel have survived an unbroken unity!

This leads us to a yet grander achievement of Moses. The unity of the nation reposed upon unity of worship. The religion was a far greater creation than either law or people. By insisting that Yahweh was the sole God of Israel, Moses paved the way to hi being regarded as the sole God of all men. Monolatry opened up

the way to monotheism. Yahweh was believed to be able to do all that was needed for the help and safety of Israel, and when Israel came into contact with the great world powers of Assyria and Chaldea, then came the thought, enlarged on by the prophets, that Yahweh was the God of all the nations of the earth. The prophets were the truest continuators of Moses. They aimed, like him, to speak with God face to face. They embodied his humility and humanity, and gradually made clear the moral perfectness of Yahweh, until Hebrew thought achieved the height,—there is but one God, and He is absolutely perfect.

Into the heart of this great monotheistic society, many ages after Moses had lived, was born the Christ. He made pure and clear to us the Divine character which Moses had roughly outlined; he showed in its nameless perfectness the human nature which Moses had worn. Nay, his life identified the two. He taught us that not only power and kinghood and justice are Divine, but humanity, humility, tenderness, love, are also Divine. The gradual approximation of God and man which Moses began for Israel's history has ended in complete unity; the slow incarnation of the ages culminates perfect in Jesus.

So he universalized from Israel to man the Divine Society which Moses founded. Moses and Jesus are the two great starting-places—if one may be pardoned the awkward expression—of God in history. The first begins in a particular race the society and faith which the second perfects and makes open to all. While the Christ stands absolutely unique, yet, perchance, the next place to his in all history may be awarded to Moses. The Song of Moses and the Lamb may be fitly regarded as the music of redeemed humanity.

It is well-nigh impossible to compute the greatness of the work of that far-distant Semitic soul. Think of all the holy affection, the philanthropic endeavour, the sublime thought, the happy homes, the purified lives, the saved souls, the elevated societies, which make up the meaning of that word Church; and remember that Moses was the far-off originator of it all. All springs in the last resort from his initiative. His doing, his thinking, are quite without parallel in the history of religion—stand absolutely unique.

Now we believe in a God. We cannot, therefore, believe that so vast and so Divine a chain of causes came into the world by chance, without His ordering, His inspiring act. The work of Moses was one of the most momentous events in the career of this world, and if the Moral Governor of the world have not arranged and intended, and inspired it, what becomes of His moral government? We believe that God sent His son to be the Saviour of the world, and He sent him into the society which Moses founded, to inherit the faith which Moses brought. We must believe, therefore, that that faith and that society, as essential parts in the great purpose of salvation, have been purposed and originated by God. We cannot trace the thought and act of Moses to any earthly cause; we can find no parallel to it in the broad page of human history; there is, so to speak, in Moses an absolute beginning.

How can we explain it? We can explain it only in one way: and it was Moses' own way. God gave that unique thought to him, and gave it to him direct. God imparted to him a special distinct revelation of Himself and of His will. Imperfect, no doubt, and tainted with traits of natural forces and human vice, that revelation was, but it contained the Divine germ of the Church of Christ. We can say of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that "He made known His ways unto Moses."

That beautiful soul of Moses, so lofty and remote,—that wellhead of sacred history—was fed with the water of life which flowed from the throne of God.

THE MORALITY OF EARLY BUDDHISM.

[In the preparation of this Paper those books have been read which represent early Buddhism among "the Sacred Books of the East," edited by Max Müller, viz.:—The Dhammapada, Sutta Nipata, and Buddhist Suttas. The first is cited hereafter as D. P.; the second as S. N.; and, under the third, "the Book of the Great Decease," is cited as BgD., and "The Kingdom of Righteousness" as K. of R., and in each case the reference is to the section or verse.]

THE Crux, in the interpretation of much in early Buddhism, is the meaning assigned to the term *Nirvana*. It is unnecessary to show here the worth to religion of transcendental ideas, or how these act so powerfully as practically to determine the character of any religion. So long as these ideas represent the living faith, and have not yet become traditional dogma, they are man's interpretation of human life in its highest form. Here God is but man in ideal aspect. In the earliest forms of religion, the powers of nature are regarded simply as magnified human powers. Similarly, the interpretation given by Buddhists to Nirvana, or the future, is an indication of their estimate of human life. The manner in which the issue of life is conceived only represents their conception of human life itself writ large. The interpretation of the term Nirvana, then, is important in rightly estimating the moral strength of the religion.

Yet, in reading the Buddhist Scriptures, first one interpretation of the term, and then another, is fixed upon as the true one, and we find ourselves face to face with seemingly contradictory expressions. Very often life seems to be spoken of as representing simply the *changefulness* of experience, and what is meant by cessation of being seems to be simply cessation of the "flux," the attainment of eternal peace. What we call eternal *life* would apparently be given another name, and "equable calm" would be understood by it—destruction of the body of sensation, passion, and desire, and yet a continuance in life, similar to complete absorption in contemplation, when you are conscious of the object of contemplation, but of nought else that is passing around you. In this aspect it is similar to the Neo-Platonic "mystical absorp-

tion into Divinity or the One"—it is a "trance or swooning into the Absolute."

There is an amusing description of one Alâra Kâlâma, who, absorbed in contemplation, is said not to have heard the sound of 500 carts passing by, and this is quoted as parallel to the Blessed One's (Bhudda's) experience, which is described as follows:—

[1]"But just now the falling rain began to beat and to splash, and the lightnings to flash forth, and the thunderbolts to crash, and two peasants, brothers, were killed, and four oxen. Therefore is this great multitude of people gathered together. But where, Lord, were you?

'I, Sir, have been here all the while.'

'But, Lord, did you see it?'

'I, Sir, saw nothing.'

'But, Lord, did you hear it?'

'I, Sir, heard nothing.'

'Were you then, Lord, asleep?'

'I, Sir, was not asleep.'

'Were you then conscious, Lord?'

'Even so, Sir.'"

In the Akhankheyya Sutta, or the Sutta entitled "If he should desire ——," this "*ecstasy of contemplation*," gained by insight and in solitude, is said to assure to the Bhikkhu or Mendicant that he become popular and respected among his fellow-disciples; that he receive all necessaries; that departed relatives believing in him find great fruit and great advantage; that he become victorious over discontent and lust, and over spiritual danger and dismay; that he realise the bliss of the future even in the present world; that he reach with his body and remain in those stages of deliverance which are incorporeal, and that he pass beyond phenomena; that he be no longer liable to be reborn in a state of suffering, and that final salvation be certain; that on his first return to this world he make an end of sorrow; that he become an inheritor of the highest heavens there to pass entirely away, thence never to return; that he be able to pass *through* material obstacles (*e.g.*, a mountain), and reach in body even up to the heaven of Brahmâ; that he hear with clear and heavenly ear sounds both human and celestial; that he comprehend by his own heart the hearts of other beings and men (*e.g.*, discerning the passionate mind to be passionate, the calm calm, &c.); that he be able to recall his various temporary states in days gone by; that he, by himself and even in this very world, know and realise and attain to Sainthood (Arahatship), emancipation of heart and of mind.

The points which seem to tell for some kind of existence in the ultimate future are that spirits[2] free from passion are said to witness the death of Tathâgata (Buddha); the well-doing householder[3] is reborn into some happy state in heaven on dissolution of the body: a Karma, or fate, or resultant effect of the present life[4] realising

1 BgD., iv., ch. 41. 2 BgD., v., 14. 3 BgD., i., 24. 4 BgD., iv., 57

itself in some future form, is spoken of as redounding to inheritance of heaven; to be *reborn*[5] in the happy realms of heaven is spoken of as reward. Again, Nirvana[6] is spoken of simply as cessation of natural desires, and the Bhikkhu or Mendicant is said to reach Nirvana by a consideration of the origin and destruction of the elements (Khanda) of the body; and, when the Brâhmana is urged to stop the stream of desires, he is told that, when he has understood the destruction of all that is made, he will understand that which is not made. The doubt which remains on consideration of these passages, along with others, is as to whether the ultimate or only a temporary future state is here referred to. Then a future life of meditation[7] seems to be granted in the contrast between meditation and holy works. In this life the two are combined, but "the meditation which they call uninterrupted, there is no meditation like this." The immortality which Sakyamuni (Buddha) attained being composed, there is nothing equal to that Dhamma (Law). Conceit and doubt, and whatever he has got of *virtue and holy works*, is left behind by one attaining to the bliss of the right view. Lastly, the destruction[8] of decay and death is called Nirvana.

On the other hand points may be cited which tell for complete annihilation. The attaining of supreme[9] insight and utter passing away are spoken of as distinct; the supreme goal is said to be reached in this life, and after the present life there will be no beyond. The words could hardly be stronger. They refer to the reception of Subhadda into the higher grade of the order by the Blessed One. He attained the supreme goal in this life and "became conscious that birth was at an end, that the higher life had been fulfilled, that all that should be done had been accomplished, and that after this present life there would be no beyond." Again, the Blessed One[10] says "now this knowledge and insight has arisen within me. Immovable is the emancipation of my heart. This is *my last existence*. There will now be no rebirth for me!" "Desire for reiterated existences" is denounced. When asked distinctly whether there will be consciousness for one who has left everything and been "delivered in the highest deliverance by knowledge," Bhagavat (Buddha) answers: "As a flame blown about by violence of the wind[11] goes out, cannot be reckoned (as existing), even so a Muni (Sage) delivered from name and body disappears and cannot be reckoned (as existing)." Further, Nirvana[12] is attainable in *this* world.

Now, if any kind of existence whatsoever is to be understood by Nirvana, then we can only say that, in these passages, so strong has been the desire to express annihilation of the present changeful and passionful existence, that the terms have been strained beyond the exact truth sought to be expressed. When cessation of life is so emphatically spoken of and it is said there will be no beyond, it is possible that what is meant is, that what we *now* term life or existence will not be repeated; the future, so different to the thoroughly

5 BgD., v., 22, 28. 6 DP., 368, 374, 383. 7 SN., 225, 224, 230. 8 SN., 1,093.
9 BgD., v., 68. 10 K of R., 23. 11 SN., 776, 1,072, 1,073. 12 SN., 1,085-6.

emancipated one, cannot be named by these names. If we recur to the description of contemplation already given (p. 40), we see that Buddha protests *he* was there and conscious though not conscious of anything going on around him. There is doubt about the matter, but this seems to be a picture of the Nirvana hoped for by the noble and attained, even in this life, by Buddha and the favoured few; namely, absorption in contemplation of the Supreme Law.

T. W. Rhys Davids at the end of a not very clear article in the *Contemporary Review* for January, 1877, gives it as his conclusion, that "the Nirvana taught by the early Buddhist was a moral condition, a modification of character to be brought about by personal self-control, and self-discipline of mind and heart; a state of peace and goodness and wisdom attainable here, in this life, and in this world." He sets this over against taking for granted that the summum bonum *must be in a future state*. It is quite clear that Nirvana was attainable in this life, but does it not extend into a future life? It would seem that it does, and that the goal is an unchangeable state of existence. When Nirvana is reached in this life the person does not cease to exist, but he has risen to a state of independence of the affairs of this life.

Dr. Fairbairn in his "Studies"[13] accepts the doctrine of annihilation as the faith of Buddhism. If this be correct, why should Buddha, when fully emancipated, when he reached Nirvana, not have ceased to be? Dr. Fairbain says Nirvana cannot be absorption, for Buddhism knew no world-soul, no Brahmâ. It is true, it was not absorption into a person distinctly so conceived, but absorption in contemplation of the pure Dhamma (law or righteousness). He says, the loss of consciousness was the goal of Buddha's ambition, and that is true in the sense in which Buddha, in contemplation, was not conscious of what went on around him, but he protested that he both was and was conscious. Buddha's contemplation is comtemplation of the good way, he is not given to metaphysical speculation. Pfleiderer says that[14] "the ordinary opinion that Buddhism hoped for release in annihilation (or ceasing to be) is just as much an error as to think that it believed in "Nothing" (Das Nichts) as its god. Neither view is psychologically thinkable or historically tenable."

Pfleiderer says further that the question as to what should become of Buddha (who had already found Nirvana)[15] when death came, has not been left untouched by the Buddhists: but *it does not stand for them in the foreground of religious life*. They look upon it as one of those questions of the worldly mind, respecting which the Blessed One had revealed nothing, because it did not minister to salvation, to piety, to release from the earthly, to annihilation of desire, to rest, to knowledge, to enlightenment, to Nirvana. In these views Pfleiderer seems to be correct. The questioning about the future life was to Buddha too much like a return to selfish passion—to desire for reward—and the question was disregarded. The Buddhist's answer to our inquiry would be: the Scripture

13 Studies in Philosophy of Religion & History, p. 163. 14 Philos. of Religion, vol. ii., p. 73.
15 Vol. ii., p. 73.

saith, [16] "Better than sovereignty over the earth, better than going to heaven, better than lordship over all worlds, is the reward of the first step of holiness."

There is a very strong *Stoical element* in Buddhism, [17] "It is of no use bemoaning death, we cannot alter it, and do not know its issue." The highest knowledge is the knowledge of the indifference of things where equal and unequal have disappeared.[18] Whether touched by happiness or sorrow,[19] wise people never appear elated or depressed. [20] "Let therefore no man love anything, loss of the beloved is evil. Those who love nothing and hate nothing have no fetters." The [21] great object of search, so far as this world is concerned, is the equanimity of indifference. [22] "Considering the *misery* that originates with affection (*i.e.*, for son and wife, father and mother, &c.), let one wander alone." Yet over against this last there is the injunction [23] to wander about glad and thoughtful with a clever companion, an associate righteous and wise, if one such be acquired. One remembers here Christ's question, "Who is my mother? and who are My brethren?" and His saying, [24] "If any man cometh unto Me and hateth not his own father," &c. Yet in Christianity there is nothing of the stolidity of indifference; what of hardness is there comes from the stern call of the higher and wider duty. It is still for love of man and of human life in its truth that the disciple is to leave those nearly related by blood. The saving passion is not so strong in Buddhism. Buddhist preachers are sent out to proclaim the true doctrine, but for the most part Buddha is represented as the mystic living apart, absorbed in contemplation. He is sought out by those who desire to know the truth. Love and pity for humanity move him at first to the search of truth, but once having discovered the mystery of life he enters the calm, which is not even disturbed by the passion to communicate his discovery.

Allied with this element of Stoical indifference are two others. There is the doctrine that each man is working out his own destiny. This is not fatalism, if we mean by that, that evil is irretrievable. By long self-denial, and by the exercise of love, or, rather, goodwill towards all, evil may be overcome. The influence of the Saviour on the sinner here is, however, simply in leading him to the right view. [25] "The wicked man burns by his own misdeeds, as if burnt by fire." [26] "When his good deed has ripened then does the good man see happy days." [27] "The virtue of good people never approaches destruction." The triumphing power of the good is everywhere asserted, but self-emancipation is the only gospel. The vicarious office of another's love and goodness is not regarded.

Again, with large elements of popular sympathy, Buddhism is still self-centered. There is something grand in its conception of sublime self-mastery. [28] "Self is the lord of self, who else could be the lord?" One is reminded of: [29] "He that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city." The Dhamma Pada says, [30] "a

16 DP., 178.
17 SN., 582.
18 SN., 843.
19 DP., 83.
20 DP., 211.
21 SN., sec. i., 3 (whole).
22 SN., 35 and 59.
23 S N., 44.
24 Luke xiv. 26.
25 DP., 136.
26 DP., 120.
27 DP., 151.
28 DP., 160.
29 Prov. xvi. 32.
30 DP., 42.

wrongly-directed mind will do us greater mischief" than any enemy or hater. The rule of Christ over Christian souls, however—the service which is perfect freedom—and the practical saving spirit in Christianity both stand here in contrast to Buddhism.

The stolid indifference, the fatalistic element, and the self-centred character of Buddhism are all more closely allied with Stoicism than with Christianity.

Parallel to the high and dry philosophic position of Stoicism runs the practice of *asceticism*, although they are different elements in religion. The philosophic calm of indifference has passed in asceticism into positive and often passionate mortification of the body and rejection of natural objects of desire. The Stoic holds himself indifferently to the ordinary objects of passion by assuming a lordly attitude in the midst of the world; the Ascetic withdraws himself from the world with a growing sense of detestation. The Stoic may become hard, and yet a certain element of grandeur remain in him. The Ascetic becomes sour rather than hard, and tries to make the best of the next life by making the worst of this. If he has not before him, in Buddhism, distinctly an *other*-worldly aim he has, at least, a *supra*-worldly one. Again, the Ascetic assumes another order and type of manhood for himself, whilst the Stoic may remain a good citizen. Buddhism finds its parallel here in the Roman Catholicism of the Middle Ages. The position which the monastic held then is the position which the Bhikkhu holds here. Virtue is only attainable in a secondary way by the householder. Regulations are indeed made for him; he was necessary to the existence of the mendicant, but what would have happened if half the world had been true to Buddhism, the Blessed One does not seem to have asked himself. The human body, too, is despised even to loathing. The descriptions of it are simply sickening. It is mere excrement.[31] That it was at all to be honoured, even in a secondary way, as abode or temple of the Spirit is not within sight of the early Buddhist. Home-life is despised: [32]"from house-life arises defilement." Sexual intercourse is to be avoided. [33]"He who leaving human attachment has overcome divine attachment, and is liberated from all attachment, him I call a Brahmana." [34]The householder is contrasted with the unselfish virtuous man, and is described as intent on the destruction of every living creature. [35]The world is a bubble. Wealth or possession being a source of care[36] is not to be held. We are reminded here of Christ's saying, "It is hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of Heaven." But His teaching seems to be directed against absorption in the pursuit of riches. See Luke xii. 17-21, connected with the admonition, "Take heed and keep yourselves from covetousness." This is the interpretation given in 1 Timothy, [37]"Charge them that are rich in this present world . . . . . that they be rich in good works, that they be ready to distribute, willing to communicate." There is nothing in Christianity of distinct advocacy of retirement from the world; its

31 SN., 192-205. 32 SN., 206, 817. 33 SN., 641. 34 SN., 219.
35 DP., 170. 36 SN., 33. 37 vi. 17.

ambition was certainly to rule the world by its spirit. It is, in essence, the furthest removed from Asceticism. Again, passion and hatred are said, by the Buddhist scriptures, to arise from sensual pleasures; you may do nothing but cut off the sources absolutely. [38] "Some wise in the world say purification is the principal thing; some annihilation; the expert say that the highest purity lies in Anûpadesa"—that is the five attributes or means of sensation being removed. [39] "A wise man should leave the dark state (of ordinary life) and follow the bright state (of the Bhikshu.)" The Christian injunction is, IF thy right eye or hand causeth thee to stumble pluck it out or cut it off and cast it from thee; the Buddhist doctrine is that it cannot but cause to stumble. This separation of the Church from the world was one fatal characteristic of Buddhism. The mendicant and mystic alone could be saintly.

In the Buddhist's[40] *relation to his fellows* there was to be no friendship with evil-doers. It was useless, [41] the fool would remain fool though he associated with a wise man all his life. Yet the presence of evil could not contaminate the good. [42] "He who has no wound on his hand may touch poison with his hand." [43] The companionship of the righteous and wise was to be sought. There was to be no retaliation: [44] "Let us live happily then, not hating those who hate us!" [45] "Patience is the highest penance, long suffering the highest Nirvana." Yet this passed to Stoicism. In the struggle of life victory breeds hatred. "He who has given up both victory and defeat, he, the contented, is happy." This sounds strangely over against the admonition: "Let a man overcome anger by love, let him overcome evil by good, let him overcome the greedy by liberality, the liar by truth." One can only explain the contrast by saying that all virtue was regarded for the most part as being of the passive order. By Buddhist "love" we must not understand the redeeming activity of Christianity and similarly with the other virtues. This is one of those passages which, when quoted in an Anthology, sounds so Christian, yet is not really so. Pfleiderer says: [46] The Buddhist ideal of virtue is more the feminine ideal of passive morality than the masculine ideal of active morality; quite suitable as a "quietiv" for binding the rude natural impulses, but not equally so as "motiv" for the quickening of moral action in overcoming and reforming the world. Homely and worldly duties are indeed part of the religion. [47] The *rich*, for example, are to support father and mother when aged. It seems to be implied that no such filial duty rests upon the mendicant, who lives on the charity of others. The vow of poverty was, at least in the early stages, somewhat strictly kept by the mendicant order. [48] The *householder*, again, is not to kill (the cow is specially mentioned: diseases have been multiplied from three to 98 by slaying cattle), [49] he is to refrain from hurting all creatures, not to thieve, to avoid unchastity, not to take another's wife, not to speak falsely or approve untruth (*cf.* Ex. xx. 13-17: there the order is murder, adultery, stealing, false witness, coveting), not to take

38 SN., 876.
39 DP., 87, 88, 89
40 DP., 78.
41 DP., 64.
42 DP. 124.
43 SN., 44, 45.
44 D.P., 389, 399, 197.
45 DP., 184.
46 Vol ii., p. 75.
47 SN., 97 and 123.
48 SN., 310, 311.
49 SN., 357-403.

intoxicating drinks or cause others to drink, not to use perfumes, to lie on a couch spread on the earth, to observe the feasts, to give according to ability to the Bhikkhus, to maintain parents, and practice honourable trade. It is to be remembered that a householder who fulfils all this is only in a secondary degree virtuous, and cannot obtain Arahatship or Sainthood thereby.

It is well known that though Buddhism established a new religious order of men separate from the world, it was distinctly *opposed to the priesthood and to sacrifice.* The laws against killing were also laws against sacrifice. [50] "Innocent cows are slain, the sacrificing (priests) have fallen off from the Dhamma." [51] Homage for a *moment* to a man whose soul is grounded (in true knowledge) is better than sacrifice for a hundred years "month after month with a thousand." A whole year's oblation was not worth a farthing. No outer observances can purify a man, [52] "neither the flesh of fish, nor fasting, nor nakedness, nor tonsure, nor matted hair, nor dirt, nor rough skins, nor the worshipping of fire, nor the many immortal penances in the world, nor hymns, nor oblations, nor sacrifice, nor observance of the seasons." The "one thing needful" is to conquer doubt, to know the true Dhamma (Law).

The loyalty to the man of true knowledge, referred to just now, seems at first to promise a better principle of religion than mere intellectualism; but the true knowledge meant is true intelligence. It is, of course, intelligence of the *moral* law, but we know how vain it is to seek that apart from activity for others and apart from the tenderest and warmest affection. As a matter of fact, the life of contemplation, undisturbed by affection or any worldly relation, became the ideal of Buddhism. The supreme thing is to conquer doubt. The foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness lies in right views, aspirations, speech, conduct, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and contemplation. The right effort and mindfulness are also of the intellectual order. The instruction as to founding the Kingdom, too, is primarily given to the Bhikkhus, and we must interpret the law in accordance with the whole character of the Order as established by Buddha.

On its more purely *spiritual side*, Buddhism has many beautiful elements. The life of the faithful householder is characterised by these four [53] virtues: truth, justice, firmness, and liberality. The religious hypocrite,[54] he who "without being a saint, pretends to be a saint (and is) a thief, in all the worlds, *including that of Brahman*, he is indeed the *lowest* outcast." Notice the words just emphasized and connect these with the reference to the sin against the Holy Ghost (Mark iii. 29.) Then compare both with these words from the Dhammapada, [55] "If a man has transgressed one law and speaks lies, and *scoffs at another world*, there is no evil he will not do." Again, against mere outer observance there is the exclamation [56] "O fool! . . . . . Within thee there is ravening, but the outside thou makest clean" (*Cf.* Matt. xv. 10, and Matt. xxiii.) Max Müller's contention in his "What we may learn from India," that the Hindu nature is truthful to the core, notwithstanding its unfavour-

50 SN., 311. 51 DP., 106, 107. 52 SN., 248. 53 SN., 187, 188.
54 SN., 134. 55 DP., 176. 56 DP., 393.

able reputation for lying, finds confirmation, at least, in these Buddhist books. Such penetrative words as they contain in reference to truthfulness could hardly have been uttered in the midst of a nation deceitful throughout. Again, the mote in a brother's eye, we are told, is easy to perceive: [57] "a man winnows his neighbour's faults like chaff, but his own fault he hides, as a cheat hides the bad die from the gambler." [58] Kindness and compassion and love for love's sake are enjoined. [59] Truth and love are continually insisted on. [60] Universal and unselfish love towards all, and like that of a mother, who, at the risk of her own life, watches over her child, is required: yet this love seems to be rather a far-reaching sentiment than a devotion in life to one's fellows. The true heaven, [61] according to a passage already quoted, is the reward of the first step of holiness. [62] The highest blessing lies in cultivating the society of the wise (wise, of course, as to moral goodness), in having done good deeds in a former existence, in a thorough study of oneself, in great learning and skill, well-learnt discipline, and well-spoken words, in waiting on father and mother, protecting wife and child, and in a quiet calling, in giving alms, in living religiously, and in blameless deeds, in ceasing and abstaining from sin, refraining from intoxicating drink, in reverence and humility, contentment and gratitude, in hearing the Dhamma at due season, in patience and pleasant speech, in religious conversation, penance and chastity, in discernment of the noble truths, in having a mind not shaken, free from sorrow and defilement, secure—in these the highest blessing consists.

It is to be remembered that throughout a kind of intellectualism rules the conception of religion. The theory that knowledge is virtue would find many a passage to support it in these early Buddhist scriptures. [63] "There is a taint worse than all taints—ignorance is the greatest taint." This is not to be confounded with the intellectualism of Greece, for throughout it is in earnest about moral truth and not about metaphysical speculation. In Greek thought it only finds its counterpart in Socrates, in whose teaching speculation is throughout subordinated to the moral end. A clear parallel is to be found in the Rabbinical teaching of the Jews, with its dictum that knowledge of the law is eternal life, and the scornful saying of the Pharisees, [64] "this multitude which knoweth not the law are accursed."

We have now passed in review the moral system of Early Buddhism. The object in doing so was simply to set forth its *real power as a religion*. The stability of any religion and its power among men will not rest in the extent to which it appeals to the miraculous, as ordinarily understood, but in its power to rule the life of man for good. This depends on the character of its moral system and the power which is brought to man to aid in the realization of the ideal set forth. These two things are intimately related. The pure moral ideal rises out of the pure life. Each preacher of a new gospel among the religions has, in very large sense, been the embodiment of his own gospel. It is only in

57 DP., 252.
58 SN., 72, 74.
59 SN., 115, 121.
60 SN., 148-150.
61 DP., 178.
62 SN., 257-268.
63 DP., 243.
64 John vii. 49.

Christianity that the person and the system are quite inseparable, and that faith in the person may truly be termed a "fulfilment of the law." [65] Pfleiderer says truly that had the Buddhist Church not possessed in the personality of its founder a popular religious power, which could not be fully destroyed by all the dreary waste of theological scholasticism and monkish casuistry, the maiming effect of its scholasticism would certainly have shown itself earlier and more fatally.

But the founder of Buddhism had not reached the true and final solution of life's problem, and he included in his religious system a fatal division of men. Neither true humanity nor true divinity had yet been discovered. The final test of every religion, then, lies in the character of its founder. A mere system of morality will not save; the living might of love and responsive devotion to that will. It is only by a study of the religious systems as systems of vital morality, and by a knowledge of their founders, that we may vindicate our own as that by which perfect sonship to God may be attained along with perfect freedom.

Buddhism *has many sides*. It is related to Comtism in its endeavour to build up a moral system without reference to a future life—at least as an impelling motive; it has elements which might satisfy the ascetic, the mystic, the Stoic, and the Neoplationist; it contains much with which the Christian has fullest sympathy. It was the wide sympathy of Buddha which made it so many-sided, and this characteristic is only testimony to the greatness of the founder. It is its moral basis which has won for it the name of a universal religion. It has indeed a theological basis, for it is pantheistic rather than atheistic, and yet is without a distinct theology. Its many-sidedness would not have been fatal to it had its varied elements been harmonious. It sought to be a universal or popular religion, and yet was an aristocracy after all. In the place of the aristocracy of the priesthood it put the aristocracy of the contemplative mystic. It left a fatal division among men and cannot become the faith of all.

It may be interesting to note that parallel with New Testament wonders we find in the early Buddhist scriptures a transfiguration of Buddha [66] *connected with the announcement of approaching death*, [67] a crossing of the river, and a vanishing out of sight in miraculous fashion, [68] and an earthquake at Buddha's death. In these early scriptures we have not noted any account of miraculous birth.

References and quotations could not be further multiplied within the limits of this paper, but the author has taken care not to state any point unless it was supported by more than an isolated text. Each point could be abundantly verified. It needs further to be stated that the author is no expert in Buddhist literature, and cannot speak of the relative importance of the books used to others which might be cited. The translators say they have made a selection of the most important, and it would seem that, so far as they know, we have all here which is most necessary for the understanding of Early Buddhism. The dates of the various books are still much discussed, and criticism is, in this sphere, only in the first stages of its work.

65 Vol, ii., p. 76. 66 BgD., iv., 48. 67 BgD., i., 33. 68 BgD., vi., 14.

PROFESSOR WEISS ON THE RISE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

Dr. Weiss, the well-known Berlin Professor, has lately published his "Einleitung in das Neue Testament." English, as well as German, readers are already acquainted with the Berlin professor's views on most critical questions connected with the N. T. books; his latest work adds nothing very material to what he has already written or suggested on these points. But there is one part of the book which is of especial and new interest. It is that section of the book which is devoted to tracing the rise of the N. T. Canon.

Many students must have felt that however little injury might be done to Christianity as spiritual and religious truth by such books as "Supernatural Religion," the traditional view of the rise of Christianity, and especially the credibility of the Gospel narrative, was seriously shaken by this line of attack. The evidence (or should one rather say "the comparative silence"?) of the second century is very hard to reconcile with the position of even so liberal a believer in the Gospel history as Dr. Weiss. We propose in this paper to sketch in outline the way, by which Dr. Weiss holds the Church was gradually led to recognise its Apostolical writings as canonical. We need only preface our account by pointing out what seems to be Dr. Weiss's key to the whole question: it is that the Church only slowly and gradually accumulated and made canonical the books of the N.T., because it only slowly and gradually found the need of the Canon, as its oral tradition slowly and gradually became indistinct and uncertain.

Perhaps, as little is taught or written in England on the subject of the Canon—except on quite traditionalist lines—it may be the best plan here to set down at some length the main position, taken up by Dr. Weiss, and to tell as much as possible in his own words what he considers to be the history of the rise of the N.T. Canon.*

Section A.—*The Canon of the Lord's Words.*

Christ left nothing written behind Him; He found among His nation a collection of Holy Scriptures, from which it drew its religious knowledge and edification. . . . . The duty of the Apostles lay in preaching by word of mouth; the activity of the twelve, which was confined for long to Jerusalem, and could be easily enough superintended by them personally when it spread further, made all written teaching unnecessary. . . Only when Christianity was extended in wider circles, and the Apostles could not be everywhere, where matters of the doctrine, life, and discipline of the Church, or where need of comfort, confirmation, or advice called for them, did it appear necessary to use written means. Thus arose an epistolary literature. . . . Most certainly the Gospel literature rose later than the Epistolary. Paul knew nothing of written Gospels, but bases on oral tradition (1 Cor. xv. 3 *ff.*). And the Gospels were, originally, like the Epistles, meant for a small circle of readers; the writings of Luke, indeed, are dedi-

* The first part of Dr. Weiss's Einleitung is headed "Entstehungsgerchichte des N.T. lichen Kanon." In the account given in this paper we observe his own division of sections."

cated to a single man (Luke i. 3; Acts i. 1). . . . But so long as the Churches still enjoyed, with greater or less frequency, the personal presence of the Apostles, the thought of their writings being deliberately circulated could never have occurred, and still less could there be any talk of their being collected. . . Tischendorf's notion of a Canon, consisting of the Pauline letters, the Gospels, 1 Peter and 1 John, at the end of the 1st Century, and Ewald's notion of a collection of Pauline epistles, circa 100 A.D., are perfectly unhistorical fictions. . . . Without doubt it was not till after the middle of the second century that the Church had no other Canon, *i.e.*, no other standard of authority which could be placed beside the O.T. but the Lord's words (Herrenworte). . . . This is particularly clear in the homily which used to be styled 2nd Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. Here we continually find the εντολαι του Κυριου, observance and fulfilling of which is constantly enjoined, and which are introduced with λεγει ο Κυριος. The sources from which these words of the Lord were drawn, were certainly not exclusively, or even primarily, our written Gospels. Certainly Paul never drew the words on which he bases his position from them, and even Papias says that the commands of the Lord ought not to be derived "so much from books as from the living voice" (Eusebius, H.E. iii. 39). . . . In no case can it be said that there was any Gospel Canon, *i.e.*, a closed collection of Gospel writings, which could compare in importance and respect with the O.T. writings till the middle of the second century. . . . When the Gospel of John appeared, which arose in the last decade of the first century, just about the time of the 1st Epistle of Clement, the oral tradition of the Lord's words had already received for more than twenty years a distinct stamp in the other Gospel writings spread abroad among the Churches, especially in our Gospel of Matthew. . . . It is just this Gospel of John which we find influencing the writers of the second century in all its theological and literary characteristics more than any other N.T. writing. All the early literature shows how early and how wide was the influence which the Johannine writings exerted in the life of the Church.

SECTION B.—*The Earliest Traces of the N.T. Epistles.*

At the outset of his literary activity, Paul had taught his churches to hold to that which he had taught them in the name and spirit of Christ, whether this teaching was by word of mouth or by writing (2 Thess. ii. 15), and had spoken later of obedience to his epistolary orders (2 Cor. ii. 9; vii. 15). But only once does the N.T. speak of apostolic (Pauline) epistles, where a warning is given against their falsification (2 Peter iii. 15 ff.). . . . A regular reading (in public) of the apostolic letters was not even contemplated when Clement's epistle was written. . . . Indeed, no one yet felt the need of exactly defining the original form, in which the apostolic tradition was contained; hence the peculiar fact, that it was quite incidentally that the Apostle's letters were referred to, and even then there was no thought of using them as authoritative scriptures. As far as they were known they appear to have been

much read; their thoughts and expressions were increasingly valued by writers; but they were not yet regularly cited. It must always be of high importance to consider the literary relationship between the so-called Apostolic Fathers and the N.T. writings. Where such relationship can be demonstrated it proves, of course, nothing for the genuineness, or even for the canonical position of these N.T. books; it is evidence only of the *existence* of these writings, and it affords a view of the range of their circulation and use. . . . It appears from an examination of the Apostolic Fathers that the Epistle of Paul, which is most important theologically, the Epistle to the Romans, is by no means the one which exercised most influence on the literature of Apostolic times. Clement, of Rome (circa 100 A.D.), for instance, who betrays most knowledge of it, has a theological position quite unaffected by its teaching. The first Epistle to the Corinthians is much more used; the Galatians very little, the Ephesians considerably more, but the Pastoral Epistles seem used most of all. Very remarkably, the Apocalypse is nowhere recognised. As long as the gift of prophecy was a living power little importance could be attached to it. . . . . But we must remember that the Apostolic Fathers show us not citations from, but only evidence of a knowledge of the N.T. Epistles.

Section C.—*The Gospel Canon.*

With Justin Martyr († 166 A.D.) the authority of the prophetic word has always the authority of the words of the Lord as its counterpart. He bases on the O.T. scriptures and the words of the Lord, but in a manner different to any that preceded him; the proof of prophecy lies in the details of the life of Jesus; and these he takes from the "Memorials of the Apostles." . . . . From Justin we first discover that the memorials of the apostles and the prophetic writings were read at the Sunday gatherings of the Church. Without doubt this public reading originally had only the object of preserving the oral tradition of the gospel-history, which was gradually dying or becoming uncertain. It was first through the reading of the Gospel writings at public service that it became usual to appeal expressly to the gospel narratives. That Justin knew and used our three first gospels is a fact beyond all doubt, and since the researches of Thoma into the literary relationship between Justin and John's gospel, the assertion once so obstinately made by the Tübingen school, that Justin did not know our fourth gospel must be definitely set aside. . . . . In the same measure that Justin insists upon the written "Memorials of our Lord," he appeals also to the oral preaching of the apostles. A collection of Apostolic Epistles, or a willingness to regard any such collection as canonical, and similar to the O.T. or even to the gospels, was still far from the mind of Justin. . . . . But it is not only that Justin does not know any canon of Apostolic writings; he knows no gospel-canon even; for, supposing he really used our four gospels and no others, he used them as the earliest historical sources, but not as holy scripture. He regards the four gospels indeed as a complete and sacred whole, but not as canonical

authority. That our four gospels were used by church writers and teachers does not, of course, necessitate that they were all four present and used in all churches; rather it was enough to possess only one gospel, as is clear from such formulæ as "Ye have in the gospel" (Didache xv. 3, 4), &c. And many textual variations are doubtless occasioned and stereotyped by those who knew the words of the Lord from different gospels changing or amplifying the gospel in their hands. . . . . Only gradually did a fixed gospel-canon grow up, *i.e.*, our four gospels slowly gained the exclusive regard of the Church. The date when this became determined and general cannot, of course, be exactly fixed, but it may be noted, that at the end of the second century Bishop Serapion would no more tolerate the use of the "Gospel of Peter" in the churches of Rhossus in Cilicia (Eusebius H.E. vi. 12, *cf.*; Irenaeus iii. 11, 8.). . .

The clearer one recognises under what circumstances it was that the collection comprising the four gospels gained the recognition of the Church during the third quarter of the second century, the more impossible is it to imagine that at this time there already existed a collection of N.T. epistles with a similar authority in the Church to that of the O.T. writings. Melito, of Sardis, took pains to gain and give adequate intelligence concerning the number and order of the books of the old covenant (Eusebius, H.E. iv. 26); but we hear nothing of a similar labour on the N.T. writings, though he must already have known of books under the name. . . . . In the literature of the second century there appears no necessity for falling back direct on the authority of the Apostolic writings; this shows very clearly that it was not until after the third quarter of the second century that there were any of the conditions necessary to the collection of a Canon of epistolary writings. How strange appears then the explanation given by the Tübingen school, that it was by a literary practice which was appropriate to the spirit of the time, that in the first half of the second century numerous writings under Apostolic names were set in circulation, whereas it is hard to see what aim such a practice could serve at a time when no sort of need was felt to have any written statement of Apostolic doctrine at all!

SECTION D.—*The Canon of the Tradition of Apostolic Teaching.*

In the course of the second century Gnosticism grew and spread out into different sects. Ebionitism now became a sect also. In the strife with these heretical tendencies neither the authority of the Holy Scriptures of the O.T.—for its authority was variously attacked, and the allegorical method of exegisis allowed of its being very variously interpreted—nor the simple words of the Lord were able to overcome the danger. Besides, the Gospel Canon, now gradually rising into its place, proved of doubtful value, since it became another Holy Scripture, and in turn gave boundless play to allegorical interpretation; consequently, there was a natural reaction to the teaching of the Apostles . . . Their teaching, as it was to be found in the tradition of the churches, now stepped forward alongside of the regulating authority of the O.T. and of the words of the Lord, or rather in the place of the latter. The Church

was still conscious that the Apostolic preaching was originally oral, and that the Apostles had only afterward set it in writing . . . . So Irenaeus based the true tradition of the Apostolic doctrine in the Church on the *successiones presbyterorum*, which might be traced up to the Apostles themselves (adv. haer. iii. 2, 2, 3, 1). Tertullian based it on the witness of the Churches founded by the Apostles, which have the *tradux fides et semina doctrinæ*, and on their further plantings (de præsc. haer. 20, *cf.*, also adv. Marc i. 21, iv. 5). But they always called to witness the unanimity of the Church tradition in antithesis to the motley variety of the false teachers' doctrines . . . . The heretics were consequently compelled to go back to the writings of the Apostolic time, in hopes that by reading into, and perverting them, they could prove their doctrines as Apostolic. The fact that they are the first to quote the Apostolic writings as such, and that they grounded their views on these as the standard of authority, is explained by the Church knowing its doctrine to be in accord with Apostolic tradition orally preserved, and so feeling no necessity to appeal to single writings of the Apostles. This is confirmed by the further fact that an interest in exegesis first appears in heretical circles: only when the Apostolic writings began to be used as the authority and form for questions of doctrine, could it be necessary to treat exegetically the sense of their statements . . . But the heretics must soon have become convinced that this course did not profit them much; they turned to falsify and pervert the Scriptures . . . We hear, for instance, in the Muratorian Fragment,* of a free composition of doctrinal writings with the Apostles' names. But the literary movement could have little influence on the Church . . . Defeated again on this ground, only one way remained for the heretics, viz., to break with the Apostolic authority altogether. Now the Church had always recognised the prophetic authority as well as the Apostolic, and the gift of prophecy was not exclusively assigned to the Men of God in the O.T., it lived on in the Church. Justin quotes on his behalf prophetic sayings of the Apocalypse; prophetic words of Paul were cited before any other of his sayings. Thus Basilides pretended to have received his wisdom from two prophets, by means of whose barbarous names he inspired on his foolish hearers (Eusebius H. E., iv. 7). . . But another means was employed along with this prophetic gift to oppose the authority of the Church. This is seen in the action of the ultra-Pauline Marcion (floriut circa 140-160 A.D.), who cites the Epistle to the Galatians to prove that the original Apostles lacked faith because they had mingled *legalia* with the words of the Redeemer: thus the step was taken which must lead to the subordination of Apostolic authority to criticism, and to undermine it altogether. Now Marcion was absolutely the first to constitute and close a Canon of N.T. writings. He recognised the Epistles of Paul and these alone as the regulating authoritative Scriptures. Marcion's Canon consisted of the following:—Gal., 1, 2, Cor., Rom., 1, 2, Thess., Eph. (or rather Laodiceans as he called it), Col., Phil., and Philemon. This strange phenomenon is due to the fact that the heretics first saw the necessity

* Various dates from 160 to 210 A.D. are assigned to the Muratorian Fragment.

of appealing to the Apostolic writings in support of their doctrines and found their standpoint could only be justified from them by choosing parts of these and rejecting others . . . Only thus, through heretics falsifying and rejecting certain Apostolic writings, did the Church become conscious of its rich possession in the writings of the Apostolic time. It then began to view them in the same light with which it viewed the O.T. writings; it regarded them as parallel to the prophetic books of the O.T. For in these the spirit had spoken through the Apostles as by the prophets of old; it began to quote them as the writings of the O.T. The first who did this with full and clear sense of the principle it involved is Theophilus of Antioch († circa 181 A.D.). While the Gospels became Holy Scripture because they were read in churches, the Epistles were read in churches after they had acquired the position of Holy Scripture.

SECTION E.—*The N.T. at the end of the Second Century.*

When the Apostolic writings were thus regarded as Holy Scriptures, and their importance equal to that of the O.T., there were already *Novæ Scripturæ*, which, because of their confirming and containing the words and history of the Lord, had stepped into a place beside the *veteres*. These were the Gospels. So it was possible to denote the new as τα ευαγγελικα και τα αποστολικα as it was the custom to denote the old as νομος και προφηται (Irenæus, adv. hær. 1, 3, 6). As the law and the prophets composed a complete whole, so the Gospels and the Apostolic writings were soon regarded as such also (*cf.* Irenæus, adv. hær. iii. 19, 2, and Tertullian, adv. Marc. i. 19). Thus there was a New as well as an Old Testament, but the N.T. collection was still, so to speak, of an indeterminate size. Close study of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clemens Alex shews that there was no closed Canon, in our sense of the term, in their time.* But though Tertullian states most emphatically the principle that the Apostles were the authors of the Gospel instrument, and were endowed with this special function of preaching the Gospel by the Lord himself, it was impossible to apply the principle of apostolicity, which lay necessarily in the idea of the Canon, to all the four Gospels, two of which were, without doubt, the work of pupils of the Apostles. So, too, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, Tertullian did not know of any one regarding it as Pauline; and, consequently, as he regarded it as a letter of Barnabas, it was not to him a holy scripture of the N.T. But the fact that this writing was much received in his circle makes it clear that the principle of recognising only apostolic writings as authoritative could not be everywhere strictly carried out.

Thus it cannot be said that there was yet a completed and closed collection of writings out of the early apostolic circle; but certain writings are now repeatedly quoted and recognised as authoritative; such were 1 Peter and 1 John, but not the Epistles of James nor Jude. But since the gospels were on other grounds regarded as holy scriptures, and since the ultimate claim to be such lay in their imparting true apostolic doctrine, it became

* The death of Irenæus was in 202 A.D. or earlier; Tertullian died about 220 A.D.; and Clement of Alexandria about or before the same time.

impossible to reject, as holy scriptures, writings which taught that doctrine truly and purely, as the oral tradition coming from the Apostles had done before. From still another point of view, however, the circle of the N.T. holy scriptures was to be enlarged. The Apocalypse of John had belonged to the Christian συγγράμματα since Justin Martyr, but neither because apostolic in origin nor from its teaching pure apostolic doctrine was this writing so important to the Church, but because of its prophecies concerning the future of the Kingdom of God. We find it quoted by all Church writers of this time as holy scripture. In the same way the Pastor of Hermas, though lacking an apostolic origin, is repeatedly quoted as holy scripture by Clemens Alex. and Irenæus.

There was no need as yet to discuss the question why certain books belonged to the N.T., because the diversities of character and standpoint in the N.T. scriptures were not yet perceived or had caused no difficulty. When the time came for such a discussion the Church was too much bound up with its past history to reject works which it could not justify as essentially apostolic. It was just this period of the growing Canon which left to the period that followed a legacy which gave occasion to permanent doubts and made a fundamental principle of distinction impossible.

SECTION F.—*The first forming of the N.T. Canon.*

With the Church reading in public of the N.T. writings, and with the consciousness that these writings formed a complete whole over against the O.T., there arose of course, too, the necessity of collecting these writings into MSS., from which to read in the public service of the Church. We possess none of the original copies of the MSS., which were made at the beginning of the third century, but in the Syriac translation, known as the Peschito, which was undoubtedly made for Church use, we can see what N.T. writings were then read in the Syriac Church. These were the four gospels: the Acts, the thirteen Pauline Epistles with the Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 John, and James. Through the order differing in various MSS. we cannot, alas! discover the exact original order of the books. The absence of the Apocalypse can only mean that the book was not read in the Syriac Church services—not that its apostolic authorship was disputed. At the same time a Latin translation of the Bible was made for the Latin-speaking churches, but its order and contents can be no more exactly fixed. From this time we possess also a most remarkable document, which represents the first attempt (known to us) to distinctly define the list of those N.T. writings which should be read at Church services, and so represents the first attempt at a regular formation of a Canon in the Church. This is the so-called Muratorian Fragment. Its origin and date are very uncertain, but that it belongs to this period of the growth of the Canon and to the Latin Church is clear enough. Its date may be approximately fixed as the beginning of the third century, A.D. . . . . We may note that the Epistle to the Hebrews is absent from its list because it is not apostolic, and the same is the case with the epistles of Clement and Barnabas. The Epistles of James and Peter are not mentioned; an Apocalypse of Peter, as well as the Apocalypse of John, is accepted by the

author, but neither are universally approved for Church reading: a Book of Wisdom is named to be accepted—a most perplexing statement which baffles our best explanations—and Hermas' Pastor is recommended for private, but not for public, reading.*

But if the testimony of the Muratorian Canon is uncertain, and its date a matter of dispute, this is not the case with the evidence of the great church-writer Origen. Here we stand on firm ground. Origen (b. 184, d. 253 A.D.) says expressly that the Θειαι γραφαι of the O. and N.T. are the proper sources of proof for Christian doctrines, in so far as the sacred books are not the συγγραμματα of men, but written εξ ἐπινοιας του αγιου πνευματος. Here we see the same point of view, from which these books were later on regarded as the Canon; but that he called them by that name is very uncertain. Origen does not exactly regard the Κανων Πης κατα την διαδοχην ἀποστολων ἐκκλησιας as the sum of apostolic doctrine, as was done at the end of the second century, for him the *ecclesiastica regula* is the *apostolicæ traditiones*, and these are already regarded as essentially contained in the *libri ecclesiastici*. Hence it was imperatively necessary to know what writings belong to the *scriptura*. Origen is the very first to express his adhesion quite decidedly to the principle, that the *prima et ecclesiastica traditio* decides those writings to be the *scripturæ*, in which *Christianus omnis consentit et credit*. . . . Origen gives a strong warning to reject all apocrypha on the authority of 1 Thess. v. 21. . . . He says, too, *nemo uti debet ad confirmationem dogmatum libris, qui sunt extra canonistas scripturas*. But it is important that Origen had no scruple in using *ad confirmationem dogmatum* books, which he held for apostolic, though they could make no claim to *ecclesiastica traditio* or to general recognition. Origen exhibits this rather strange position that the principle of apostolicity, the original test of canonicity, could not be applied strictly to all the books of the N.T., and so the principle of tradition was only left, and this again had to be set aside in certain cases where apostolic writings came only slowly and late into use. Origen reckons among the books μονα ἀναντιρρητα ἐν τη εκκλησια του Θεου the four gospels: the Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews (not as Pauline but "the thoughts are the Apostle's," *cf.* Eusebius, H.E. Vi. 25), 1 Peter, 1 John, James, and Jude (but neither as apostolic in the strict sense), the Apocalypse (as a work of the Apostle John) and the Pastor of Hermas (as *divinitus inspirata*), besides these he reckons 2 Peter as *scriptura* and as Peter's writing (but recognises that it was doubtfully accepted; he doubts (says Weiss) the apostolic authorship of 2nd and 3rd John, which he never quotes; he rejects the inspired authority of 1st Clemens and Barnabas; he never mentions any Apocalypse of Peter.

There constantly meets us in considering the relation of Origen to the Canon this thought, that his position is a strange one. He cannot carry his principles out; whether he takes the unanimous consent of the Church or the apostolic origin as his principle, it is a principle which he cannot apply in every case. So he attempts to stand upon the principle of the apostolic origin of the books,

* On the Muratorian Canon, see Charteris' "Canonicity," p. lxxix. *ff.*, and p. iii. *ff.*

while he makes this principle the form by regarding it as the unanimous tradition of the Church. His great influence as a Church-teacher contributed above all else to the result, that as a matter of fact the origin of the N.T. writings became regarded as something more or less fixed and certain, for his pre-supposition that such a belief existed gained more and more regard as time went on.

SECTION G.—*The Close of the Canon in the East.*

The influence of Origen shows itself in no point more strongly than in this, that soon after his time it must have been the custom to regard the Epistles of Peter, John, Jude, and James, not only as canonical, but as forming a complete collection over against the Pauline letters. This follows without doubt from the way in which Eusebius speaks of the seven Catholic Epistles (Eusebius H.E., ii. 23, and vi. 14). . . . If one desired to treat with completeness the principle of Origen, one would be obliged to investigate the result of it in individual churches in order to discover what writings were used in them, and to read through the Church Fathers to see what books they used and what they said about their origin and authority. This is what Eusebius did in his Church history (circa 324 A.D.); it resulted with him in recognising three classes of writings: (1) The Homologonmena, or those writings which could directly claim to be Holy Scriptures; (2) The Antilegomena, *νοθα*, or doubtful books; and (3) The books to be rejected as "altogether spurious and foreign to apostolic orthodoxy" (Eus. H.E., iii. 25, vi. 23). The second of these divisions forms a middle-class, which he inserts between the two classes of Scripture recognised by Origen. As Homologonmena, he names the Gospels, Acts, the Pauline Epstles, 1 John and 1 Peter. Among the Antilegomena, Eusebius numbers the Epistles of James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and *doubtfully* the Apocalypse (in this case of the Apocalypse Eusebius follows the doubt of Origen) . . . . The importance of Eusebius for the history of the Canon has been much over-rated almost everywhere; it is true we owe to him a rich store of materials for the history of the Canon, but these are often most incomplete and indistinct. So far from his lists and researches being "epoch-making" for the history of the Canon, he was entirely dependent on the custom of the Churches in his time, as is clearly shown by his doubtful judgments on certain points, notably the Apocalypse. . . .

Certain it is, however, that from the middle of the fourth century the need of strictly defining the list of Holy Scriptures became more and more pressingly felt. In the East from this time the Canon is virtually closed, except in regard to the Apocalypse, upon which opinions varied some while longer, but as a matter of fact no official enumeration of canonical books was given. This is abundantly proved to have been the case by the lists of books given by Chrysostom and others, by the Council of Laodicea (in 363 A.D.) forbidding the reading of *ἀκανονιστα βιβγια* in church, and the 85th Canon of the Canones Apostolici, &c. Quite at the end of the fourth century Isidore of Pelusium writes, "we view the Holy Scriptures as the Canon of truth:" this expresses the feeling which

made the Scriptures the norm of teaching which the Apostolic oral and traditional teaching had been formerly, and this uses the word Canon in the same sense as we use it to-day. The term Apocrypha, used in a wider sense by Cyril and Athanasius, now received the meaning of what the church refused to consider canonical. As long as it was in men's minds that much of what was now not held canonical had been formerly highly prized, a middle-class of writings must needs arise; into this middle-class came the Apocrypha and some sub-apostolic works. In all the lists of the second half of the fourth century an essential agreement is found as to the position that the four Gospels, Acts, fourteen Pauline, and seven Catholic Epistles (*i.e.*, our N.T. without Revelation) belong to the Canon. The lists of Cyril, Gregory Nazianzene, Chrysostom, and others, do not include the Apocalypse. Indeed, after this time the Canon in the Eastern Church is closed, though the doubt about the Apocalypse continues a while longer; at the same time no official decision concerning the Canon resulted, and even the great Trullan Council* (692 A.D.) does not enumerate the Holy Scriptures.

SECTION H.—*The close of the Canon in the West.*

The Western Church was never troubled by doubts concerning the Revelation such as troubled the Eastern Church. In the second half of the third century we find the collection of the *septem aliæ epistolæ* (the Catholic Epistles) regularly recognized in the West. The Epistles to the Hebrews did not so readily gain its place among the Pauline Epistles; but in the fourth century the study of Origen and intimate association with the East made the Western Church gradually accept it as Pauline; both Hilary of Poictiers and Ambrose of Milan use it as such. The Western Church could easily assimilate its Canon to the Eastern since it had never been inclined to exceed the number of Apostolic writings. The Canon of Athanasius was practically the dominant one in the West; and the *absconditæ Scripturæ*, or Apocrypha, were viewed as such because they ought to be read *morum causa a perfectis, non ab omnibus.*

This process of assimilating the Canons of the Eastern and Western Churches was completed at the end of the fourth century by the work of Rufinus and Jerome; the former translated Origen into Latin, the latter gave the learned collections of knowledge made by Eusebius to the West. But each of them read out of these older writers only that which was favourable to a clear corroboration of the ecclesiastical usage. Rufinus had no doubt but that there was a certain number of writings which the *patres intra canonem incluserunt, ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt.*

Jerome is not embarrassed at finding the Greek Church often refusing to accept the Apocalypse, nor because the *consuetudo Latinorum* was not to put Hebrews *inter Scripturas canonicas*; Jerome simply accepts both. Thus both Rufinus and Jerome have the 27 N.T. books of Athanasius. Their views were endowed with the last-needed sanction by the pre-eminent ecclesiastical authority of Augustine. Under Augustine's influence the Council of Carthage, in 397 A.D., decreed *ut præter scripturas canonicas nihil legatur sub*

* The Canons of the Trullan Council are fundamental for the Eastern Church to this day.

nomine divinarum scripturarum, and then the 27 books of the N.T. are enumerated. Under Augustine's influence a later council at Carthage in 419 A.D. renewed this decree and reckons simply 14 Pauline Epistles, with no special mention of the Hebrews, thus implying this Epistle was equally Pauline with the rest.

But as in the East, so in the West no decision binding on the whole Church was made concerning the Canon. It was in vain that the Carthaginian Synods approached the Roman Pontiff for a confirmation of their decrees; we hear nothing of such confirmation being ever given. The Church, as a whole, gave not a sound. It is true that in 405 Innocent I. condemned a number of Apocryphal writings, which had become diffused in Spain, and in so doing had given a list of the canonical books. It is true that in 117 Leo the Great acted in an exactly similar way. But still it was more the authority of Jerome and Augustine than any official statement by the Church, which settled the ecclesiastical view of the Canon in the Western Church.

The Middle Ages possessed no strength to take up an independent position opposed to tradition, nor any means to put that tradition to the test. After the Council of Florence, Pope Eugenius IV., in his bull of the year 1441, repeated again the Canon of Augustine; this is probably the first time that the Roman Throne gave a universally valid decision in the matter of the Canon. The Council of Trent, at its fourth sitting on April 8th, 1546, made a *decretum de canonicis scripturis*, which enumerated the N.T. books according to the Vulgate.

Luther was the first to venture a perfectly free criticism of the traditional Canon; but Luther's criticism was not historical but dogmatic; he objected to the Epistle to the Hebrews, because it rejects a second repentance; to the Epistle of James, because it teaches justification by works; to the Apocalypse, because it deals with incomprehensible visions; and to the Epistle of Jude, because it quotes sayings and stories not found in scripture. Zwingli held that the Apocalypse was "no biblical book," and, like Œcolampadius, claimed the right to make a distinction among the Biblical books. Calvin regards the Hebrews as Apostolical, being from the hand of a pupil of the Apostles, and did not think the objection to 2 Peter necessitated its rejection. Carlstadt was led by a true historical sense when, in his "Libellus de canonicis scripturis" (1520), he divided the scriptures into three ranks, viz., *summa dignitatis*, *secundæ dignitatis*, *tertice (infimce) auctoritatis*. The Magdeburg Centuries reject Hebrews, James, and Jude. Martin Chemnitz calls the seven Antilegomena Apocrypha, and denied that they were to be used for the proving of dogmatic truths. This opinion was generally followed by the Lutheran theologians of the 16th and 17th centuries.

Semler († 1791) really began a proper criticism of the Canon in the Protestant Church. This criterion—holding as canonical that which is of general use—was as much a dogmatic criterion as Luther's. But Semler's historical studies abundantly proved that the collection of N.T. writings was not at all a collection of holy, inspired, apostolical writings, which were always held regulative in

the Church, and so easily demonstrated the falsehood of the traditional view. Our own investigations have amply shewn—first, that the collection of the N.T. writings, which became fixed in the course of the second half of the 4th century more and more as canonical, was not what men then held them to be, a collection of writings everywhere held sacred by the Church; next, that the reception of these separate writings into the Canon does not necessarily imply their apostolic origin, since very various motives led together to the rise of the Canon.

Historical criticism must freely discuss and establish the origin of each of the individual books of the N.T., basing its results on external testimony and internal evidences. The result of this criticism will enable a basis to be laid for an opinion concerning the Canon which tradition has given.

* * * * * * *

The views of Dr. Weiss, as we have given them above, need consideration and weighing in the light of other theories and of the evidence which he himself offers in their favour. This we do not intend to do at present. We shall content ourselves with concluding a paper, already too long, by a few short comments.

Everyone who is at all acquainted with the state of parties in the theological world to-day will be well aware how very well the history given by Dr. Weiss of the rise of the Canon fits into the "Vermittlerungs-theologie" programme, of which he is the chief exponent, and how very strikingly he makes it agree with his critical views. As special examples of this, may be quoted his finding such strong traces of the fourth Gospel in the second century (p. 29 *ff.*), and his interpretation of the famous ἀμφιβάλλεται γαρ quoted by Eusebius (H.E., vi. 25) concerning 2nd Peter as implying no doubt as to its Apostolic origin, but only as to its recognition as "Homologumenon.' These instances, especially the latter, appear to us very special pleading, and more might be found. It must be admitted, however, that they do not necessarily invalidate his general thesis.

Again, as a psychological illumination of a scholar's mind, this position is very remarkable. Dr. Weiss is the least sceptical of all the great critics of Germany when he deals with the claims of the N.T. books to Apostolic authorship. He is perhaps the only great scholar who still holds the Apostolic authorship of the fourth Gospel since Dr. Weizsäcker has gone over to the other side. But in treating the history of the Canon no critic is so sceptical, in that no critic places the real rise of the Canon so late. An illustration of this is found in the date he assigns to the Muratorian Fragment, which Harnack assigns to 170-190 A.D., and which has been put even earlier, but which Weiss sets early in the third century (*cf.*, p. 78).

Again (and this is the last remark we must now make), Dr. Weiss' high and true estimate of the value and place of criticism in theology opens a grand view of the possible advance of theology. While Protestant Conservative theologians are like Prof. Weiss, no one can call theology a retrogressive or stationary science.

A FRANK TALK ABOUT CRITICISM AND CHRISTOLATRY: HOW FAR ARE THEY COMPATIBLE?

THE marked advance of historical criticism during the present century is a fact which all lovers of truth must hail with joy. We have reason to be grateful for the way in which great masses of myth and legend have been removed, and the unity of human development disclosed. On most sides of our life historical science has wrought highly beneficial results. The gains have been solid and substantial, the losses chiefly sentimental. But in one department—and that which we feel to be the most important—the progress of criticism, creates a sense of uneasiness. Every intelligent Christian knows that his religion claims to be a positive religion: the outcome not of a philosopher's dream but of positive historical facts. These fall within the province of the scientific investigator and become subject to his tests and methods. Sacred history equally with the so-called profane is no forbidden field to the critic. The result of his researches we often await with a fear of which we are at heart ashamed, but which is perfectly natural. We cannot, we say, *afford* to lose those stories of holy men of old, those conceptions of the course of ancient history in general which have become bound up with our highest life. Yet we have misgivings that they must be in part, may be in whole, given up: and we shudder at the thought that the highest vision with which mankind ever believed itself favoured may vanish along with satyrs, fairies, elves, and vampires, before the cold grey dawn of science.

The Christian student, more especially the student of theology, who conscientiously pursues the historical studies bound up with his special science, not infrequently wakes up with a start at the revolution which is being wrought in his conception of the old Bible story. As the superstitious prejudices and mechanical notions of early days are dispelled, as he is bound to give up much that once seemed most essential, he is faced with the question, "Is my religious life not thereby seriously affected? Is its old fulness not drained, its energy crippled by what I now learn is the truth of Scripture narrative?" He may have quietly followed the quest after historical reality and for a long time been so absorbed in his study as to overlook its bearings upon his faith; until some day he is fairly startled by the contrast between what he has now accepted as historical fact and the former basis of his religion. The surprise speedily passes into alarm, and the thought arises, How dare I retain my old faith along with my new knowledge of the facts?

The question is a very old one, and a very large one. But it is also new, for the varying aspect of our progressive science puts it in ever fresh forms, and a few words on the way it presents itself on one of its sides to one of its students may give some hint towards a fuller answer.

The revolutions which are going forward in the field of Old Testament history might at first view seem very terrifying; but any Christian who has seriously reflected upon the ground of his faith will soon overcome the tendency to fear. We profess to be participators not in the Old Covenant but in the New. We may at once, and without further ado—so far as our faith is concerned—make a present to the critics of the beautiful stories of Genesis and Judges and Kings which so delighted our childhood; we may allow them to work what havoc they will upon the Pentateuch, to prove Moses no legislator, and David no Psalmist; we may grant that the prophets often predicted what did not occur, and were guilty of much that we would most heartily condemn, and yet not find ourselves much poorer religiously. Nay, the mere form of N. T. writings may not seem to us essential. We may be prepared to deny the authenticity of many of the Epistles, and to question the direct apostolic origin of the Gospels; we may not refuse to class the first half of Acts with the Saga of the Jahvist and Elohist, without feeling the vitals of our faith impaired. As to whether such sweeping admissions are critically justified is another question into which I do not now propose to go.

As Christians we believe in Christ. He is the sum total, the author and finisher, of our faith. We do not believe in the prophets or apostles save in so far as they foreshadow or reflect Him; we may regret the imperfect records we have of Him, we may lament that so much we know of Him is rendered hazy by legend and distorted by misconception. But if by asking for our N. T. writers no more than for any human authors under the influence of a strong personal and religious enthusiasm, we can yet glean from their varying narratives a true picture of one who is none the less our Lord and our God, we may view with equanimity, nay, with a sense of relief, the elimination of certain magical elements which have been the burden more than the stimulus of faith.

But the all important question is, has the Divine Image of Christ been spared in the general iconoclasm? How far can we in face of the results of fearless investigation into the documents of our religion hold to our fathers' faith of "God in Christ?" After all the admissions which Church orthodoxy is or will be compelled to make to modern criticism, can we accept the stupendous thought that God of very God once lived and died a man on earth to save mankind?

The case of the negative critic may seem at first sight very strong. Without entering into particulars of date and authorship of the Christian records, making the present discussion wholly technical, he may rest his argument on grounds broad and palpable to all. His "results" look fearful enough from the old dogmatic standpoint.

Inasmuch as these must receive a fair hearing in the student's mental judgment hall, and inasmuch as I wish to establish a ground for his faith while they are being impartially investigated, let me here state them in full, always with the proviso that I commit myself in no way to regarding them as finally established.

* * * * * *

Proceeding from within, trenching for a time on the old dogmatic territory, the aforesaid negative critic would forthwith strip our Lord of the immense Divine attributes which have been ascribed to Him. They are utterly incompatible with Humanity, and would imply the most fantastic and aimless Docetism on the part of believers. If Jesus had known everything, past, present, and to come; if He had all physical power—of making, enduring, destroying; if He were everywhere present, then His life was the most consummately acted *lie* from beginning to end. He made believe He was ignorant, and professed surprise: He spoke as though He were disappointed: He acted as though His strength were limited: all that is human or precious to us is mere *Schein*. We must, for the sake of preserving the elementary morality of Jesus as well as His simplest human value, discard from our conception of Him the awful predicates of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence.

Our critic is glad, however, to leave the *á priori* dogmatic ground and come to concrete historical facts. These, he declares, indicate that Jesus was ignorant in some most important matters, and not infrequently was led by his ignorance into positive error. He would maintain that in very many things we know better than the man whom we have worshipped as Lord and God.

There is no sign, for instance, that Jesus had any idea of the facts of the material universe as they have been disclosed to us by modern science. We have no sign, that is to say, that He whom His followers glorified as Creator had any clear notion of the way in which His material creation worked. Every factory boy who attends an evening science class may be said to know more about the sun and stars and earth than Jesus Christ.

We have no proof that Jesus knew even the wisdom of the ancients. The knowledge which as man He might have acquired we have no evidence that He possessed. We find no syllable in His recorded utterances which show Him acquainted with Plato, whom as the grandest intellectual product of human culture we might have expected him to know.

In regard to the Old Testament, we naturally look to find Him at home: we would imagine that in regard to it He would show no ignorance and fall into no mistake. But the historical probabilities are—to put it at the mildest—that we have to-day a better knowledge of the Old Testament than Jesus had. We find Him repeating the traditional views respecting the Scriptures, quite unconscious of their error. He is represented as speaking of Moses, and saying, "He wrote you this precept" (of divorce), and it is questionable whether Moses wrote anything; it is certain he did not write the law to which Jesus referred. Here Jesus is wrong, because—we can only suppose—He was ignorant. Again, He says, "David himself said by the Holy Ghost the Lord said unto my Lord," &c. The verdict of modern criticism is that David was not the author of that Psalm, consequently did not say —either with or without the Holy Ghost—what Jesus declared he did say. Here, again, we know better than He. He declares what is erroneous.

We find, moreover, as before remarked, that He is represented as expressing wonder and disappointment. He marvelled at the faith of the centurion. He hoped to find fruit on the fig-tree, and found none. Little incidents like these point to deeper experiences of His life where He entertained erroneous expectations, and was disappointed.

Further, our critic may allege, on closer examination of the earliest record of His public ministry, we detect such changes in His action and teaching as we are bound to attribute to expansion of knowledge, growth of view from less to greater—in a word, *development by experience*. For one large part of His public life, no sign appears that He was aware He must die by violent means. His early teaching lays little emphasis on Himself, much on the kingdom of God. Only by appropriate outward experience is the conviction forced upon Him that He must be martyred by His religious opponents. This discovery costs Him great pain, and occasions great perplexity. Not until He finds out the vicarious nature of His death do joy and triumph return to Him.

His requirements from His followers vary and deepen with His growing apprehension of the end. Repentance is intensified to self-denial, and that to self-sacrifice.

The pressure of events brings His own person to the foreground in His teaching. We have thus the spectacle not of a Teacher whose doctrine is complete before He began his ministry, and who came in calm consciousness of His mission and destiny and end, but of One who only slowly rose in conflict with surroundings, to the consciousness of the means by which His aim was to be realized, and of the supreme importance which was to be attached to His own person.

* * * * * *

Now, if these and similar assertions were to be fully substantiated—and I do not by any means wish to assert that they are—have we right any longer to regard Christ as God? If, on many points, we be now so much superior to Jesus of Nazareth, how can we assume before Him the humility of worship? By the very fact of human development, combined with the other fact (admitted on all hands) that Jesus was at least man, are we not compelled to maintain that in many ways we have got beyond Him? Must not henceforth any talk of the deity of Jesus be abandoned as unscientific, or tolerated merely as the exaggerated tribute of admiration to a good man? Such questions inevitably suggest themselves to the honest Christian thinker, and we must at least attempt to answer if we would avoid that schism of the spirit when the heart has faith and the head has none: when the fulness of moral conviction has not fructified the intellect, nor the firmness of the mind steadied the aspirations of the soul.

I cannot attempt more than one side of this difficult theme. I would leave out of account all that projection of the inner experience of Christians in previous ages, which may be called the objective in theology. I would appeal rather to the subjective aspect of our question. I would do so not so much in the interest

of scientific deliberation as in that of our personal devotional attitude. As students and as investigators we need no less than other men a resting-place for our worship and love: to seek for this amid the controversies involved in my opening remarks is my present concern. To carry out this aim I must begin from some general or universal basis.

We were born to worship somewhat. We need plead for no permission to hold our birthright. One may say, all men are born to worship, as is more than proved by the universality of religion. This innate need demands and finds, or feigns, objects for worship. These objects of worship are called gods. Service of them arises from the correspondence of the subjective need and the objective ideal or reality. What is worshipful to a man, that must be worship. The supreme object of his reverence is Deity. What we bow before with whole soul and life; what most drives us to our knees is to us Divine. This is the point from which I would start: *the most worshipful that we know is our highest God.*

Where, then, is the highest god to be found? What is the most worshipful? What extorts from us—students living in the nineteenth century, heirs of the accumulated moral life of the ages—most readily and reasonably our tribute of reverence?

Power, think you? Can you worship power? It is a grandiose thought as well as a grandiose word—that of omnipotence, the compass and concentration of all the forces of Nature, the might that pervades and upholds the whole material universe. Grandiose, but not worshipful. Who could ever worship a big hydraulic engine, or feel reverence for so many horse-power, even though it be horse-power into the billions of billions! True, Semitic nations, but a few degrees above animalism, called their god El—the strong; yet even they had other notions than mere power (*brute* power as we so naturally say: offering, therefore, no fit object for human worship), and the thought that could terrify a savage may only receive *our* scorn. Power—brute force—expanded into the infinite, can alone never extort our homage: it may compel our fear, our hate, our subjection, but never our reverence. It may crush us; but crushed we can defy it, and know our superiority to it. So Pascal. Our whole soul revolts at the idea of submission or homage extorted by mere power. Our sympathies go out towards the conquered one who will not abase his will to any show of force however overwhelming. Hence it is we admire Milton's Satan more than "Jehovah with the choir of shouting angels." The fallen fiend is greater in his "unconquerable will" than the supreme despot in his infinite might. Even an evil will appeals to our admiration more than colourless or arbitrary force. Of course when power is united with other and estimable qualities, we may respect the composite character; yet the worshipful element lies not in the power, but in its combination with higher traits.

Infinite wisdom is an imposing idea. To conceive of all the knowledge which men have slowly accumulated since human inquiry began as the continual intuition of a single mind, rouses our awe; but the inconceivably grander notion of omniscience

dazzles even the far-seeing eye of wonder. Yet wonder passes not into worship. Absolute knowledge divested of moral or emotional colour, though accompanied by absolute power, may make us stand aloof in cold and distant admiration, but cannot command our reverence. Those amongst our fellow-men whom we revere most are not always found amongst the wisest, most learned, or ablest. Intellectual endowments or acquirements in themselves do not strike us as reverend. As associated with other characteristics or as implying them they may be respected and admired by us. But before blank omnipotent omniscience we refuse to bow the knee. We feel that Job is poorly vanquished in argument when Jahweh flaunts his infinite wisdom and might before the suffering mortal and means thus to silence him.

Sensuous beauty has won from many a poetic soul adoring tribute. Whether in nature, or in nature as idealised by man in art, the beautiful may well seem to be the worshipful. But it is not the mere symmetry of form or the warmth of colour, nor their magic interminglings, that distends the bosom with the sigh of devotion: it is the unity of soul and sense, the synthesis of graces spiritual and physical which bids us worship. When the reverence inspired of beauty breaks forth into speech—and it is almost ever rhythmic speech—the fact is at once made evident that tint and contour are venerable only as blending with them a spiritual import. The sensuous *quâ* sensuous we do not worship.

What, then, are those qualities so worshipful which win beauty her votaries, which lend by their presence a reverend character to knowledge and power? What is that which when found alone exacts our homage in spite of its isolation?

Appealing once more to our ordinary human experience, I would ask, Whom of our friends do we reverence the most? Who rouses a sentiment most nearly approaching to worship?[1] It is not the strong man because he is strong, or the rich man because he is rich. We do not revere the most learned or most beautiful because of these attractions. We revere the upright, honourable man; and because he is upright and honourable. When these high virtues pass over into heroism, self sacrifice, the devotion of love, our reverence tends more and more towards worship. Chivalry at heart is nothing but worship of the gentleness and purity of womanhood; and in spite of all its fantastic extravagance, it is a real cult. Justice and honour and love, a pure and steadfast moral purpose, these are the qualities from which no man save by momentary or habitual violence to his nature can restrain reverence.

And that reverence is not affected by the isolation of such qualities. They are not dependent on combination with other characteristics; their claim on our worshipful regard is irrespective of the presence or absence of riches, of learning, of power, or of æsthetic charm. This is the point on which I would lay the most emphasis. I shall not by our circle be thought too sentimental if I refer in support of it to memories of home. We call to mind—or rather there is ever present unsummoned—that firm and gracious influence

1 Jeremiah ix. 23, 24.

which tabernacled there, and centred in her who was in truth at once the Queen and Priestess of the hearth. She was not perhaps very highly educated; hers were not the days of Newnham and Girton; her mental horizon may have been of the narrowest. We who owed to her a threefold birth, of body, mind, and soul, have now got far beyond the stock of knowledge she so sedulously and lovingly imparted to us; our notions of nature and of history could scarcely find words to match in her vocabulary; our philosophy, our theology would be to her a haze of phrases; our ruthless dealing with the Bible which she loved so well would, may be, have raised her hands in holy horror. But although we now "know far better" than she, is there a man amongst us who would dare to say his reverence for her had decreased with the increase of his knowledge? Has it not rather grown with the years until it has now almost passed into worship? We remember and recognize with growing clearness the sacred character which hallowed our life: the virgin purity of soul whose indignant horror damned for us each tainted tendency; the womanly grace which is the counterpart and creation of chivalry; the sensitive honour which scorned the wrong as mean, and only did homage to the good; the clear woman's insight into what was just and fair; the mother's tenderness; the life of passionate yet delighted self-surrender to her children's weal, the soul as keen to touch or claim of sympathy as finest tempered blade to breath or bend; the effluant self forgetting love; the firm loyalty to truth and right; and the consecration to the Unseen Holiness which brought her many featured moral character to unity. That beautiful blended life has been the growing inspiration of our thought and action; has been a saving power in times when moral purpose was weak, and insight into duty was clouded, has won from us an ever deepening reverence. We may smile as we think of her ill-informed theories of men and things, of her lessons in Scripture history, of her defect in philosophic grasp; but we would even smile in reverence as we think of the holy influence in which the most erroneous notions were steeped. She still remains of all our personal acquaintance most worshipful: the name of Mother stands next the Highest Name.

Pass from the simple woman heart of the home to the great thinker who has made or marred our age. Kant, lost in wonder as the "starry heaven above" pays more genuine obeisance to "the Moral Law within," finds in obedience to this Law the supreme claim to reverence, irrespective of what mental or social deficiencies may attend it; is even disposed to grant that this humble demission of the soul before moral purity is free from empirical taint, is in truth a transcendental passion.

The influence of mother and the testimony of Kant combine to indicate where lies the truly worshipful. It is not in power, in knowledge, or in beauty: it is in the moral and spiritual character: it is in the rightly purposed will. "A good will is the only good thing;" is the only "venerable thing." The most worshipful would therefore be the will which is wholly good: the unity of purity and tenderness; the stedfastness of love; the perfection of moral and spiritual life. It would remain the most worshipful

whether conjoined with or separated from other qualities such as perfect knowledge and power

Now comes the question, Where in the dominion of actual fact do we find our most venerable? Of all that has emerged in history, of all whose positive existence is guaranteed to us, who or what is to us most worshipful? To put the question is to answer it. We turn at once to Jesus of Nazareth. He is the highest that we know. We look through all the noblest souls whom it has been our privilege personally to know; through all the most august and beautiful characters of human history, and find no equal to Jesus. This holds altogether apart from the vulgar "miraculous" powers and acts attributed to Him. We find further that with few exceptions the purest and sublimest natures which have appeared on earth attribute their best life to the influence of Jesus: and the civilizations most worthy of respect are such as have most sedulously sought to approximate to his ideal. In the moral and spiritual realm, Jesus is without a peer. We can thus in a way historically verify that Jesus is relatively the most worshipful.

That He is absolutely the most worshipful, is, I grant, a matter of faith; it can, of course, never be a matter of historical verification: that is precluded by the word absolute.

When the *science* of history, by aid of all its moral standards, leaves us Jesus of Nazareth as comparatively the most worshipful reality, it has ministered its utmost to the *faith* that He is absolutely the most worshipful. John Stuart Mill may seem a strange witness for the absolute worshipfulness of Jesus; but in saying that there was no better way of translating the rule of virtue from the abstract to the concrete than to live so as Christ would approve our life, he makes Christ the model for universal imitation, therefore the absolutely perfect in morals, therefore the absolutely adorable. The deductions are ours not his, but none the less valid. If such be the verdict of a mind trained—not as some we say to an impartial attitude to Christianity, but to a most partial antagonism to it,—what shall be *our* verdict?

Confused and darkened though the accounts may be which we have of the Man of Nazareth, they cannot obscure the main features of His life. Through the mist of legend and the night of superstition, we see limned in light the broad outlines of a figure of Divine proportions, which in its filling in—were we but near enough to see—could not fail of Divine perfection. What we know of Him boldly chalks out the circle of an all-perfect life: our faith can only hold that where the circumference is there is also the centre and the encompassed area. And we have drunk of the influences which He has sent thrilling through His Church: we have tasted of His life, flowing, it may be, through the most imperfect channels, and we have known it to be in deepest sense "the life of the world." The Sacred Records however dissolved and recast in the crucible of modern research, leave upon our hearts the impress of the seal of God: and His spirit is the highest that we know among the holiest of to-day.

Jesus of Nazareth embodies in Himself the Moral Law, before

which our critical philosophers sink in adoring humility. He is the perfect Humanity whose colossal shadow cast across the race wins the worship of our ardent positivists and rules their noblest efforts. His purity and tenderness, His "grace and truth," form the source whence by many variant rills the holiest life of home has gathered. All that is sacred and adorable in the motherhood whose memory is our daily inspiration sprang directly from close copy of His life. The perfection of all moral and spiritual graces emerges into visible history in Him. He therefore is the most worshipful: and man born to worship somewhat and bound to worship the most worthy of worship, rightly adores Jesus as God. Jesus is our supreme Deity.

Yes, Deity: though in all points like as we are, yet without sin. Nay Deity, although in all points (with the same great exception) like the Galilean peasants of His day, and so in many points below the Greeks of that time and the scholars of this.

The true worshipfulness of His character is none the less though he be shown to have had a completely erroneous notion of the courses of the heavenly bodies and altogether mistaken as to the Pentateuch. He may not be all-powerful, and was not, and yet be most worshipful: He may not be all-knowing, and was not, and yet we abate not our reverence. There may be in Him no form nor comeliness that we should desire Him: the merely ascetic part of us may find little in Him to satisfy it: yet to the soul He is still the altogether lovely, the terrible, the adorable.

Nor would the content of His Deity be diminished, but rather increased, were we to find—as there is now much evidence to show—that He passed from less to more: that His thought and knowledge widened with the days, that He did actually, and during His public ministry, develop by experience. For, contrast with the conception of His life the old popular dogmatic notion. Suppose as possible the impossibility of Absolute Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Omniscience, spending some thirty years or even three in a so-called human life. Can we revere the exemplary fortitude and purity and love of such a life, the conscious interlude of eternal power, with anything like the profound emotion with which we adore One who, man as we are men, struggled and suffered in human darkness, who knew not how his path would end, but amid all uncertainty abode steadfast to His holy aim, who felt the pang of vanished illusions, of broken hopes, of trust betrayed, who shrank and quailed as the dark shadow of the Cross first fell across His path, who learned from bitterest experience His inevitable doom, who could even in His sorrow doubt His Father's sympathy, and yet who conquered by love and righteousness and holy constancy—who faced the world, and not in the might of its Creator and Indispensable Sustainer, but in the power of meekness and gentleness and perfect purity overcame the world? We worship not the Son of God that Milton described, who with flaming thunderbolts drove the rebel angels over the battlements of heaven: but the Son of Man the Synoptics reveal to us; the hero Who fought His way step by step through the darkness, and vanquished His opponents by the infinite loveliness and lowliness of His life. The sweet firm readiness with which

Jesus accepted all that a growing experience showed to be bound up in His saving mission, the cheerful resignation with which he opened His heart to the thickening wounds of vicarious pain, the calm triumphant majesty with which at the last he moved forward to meet His death, are more Divine than any of the usual mechanical attributes of Deity—than, for instance, sending a few worlds more or less of so many million tons spinning through space. So the old hymn writer:—

> " 'Twas great to speak a world from naught
> 'Twas greater to redeem."

The sacrifice of Self to the uttermost that so His life might be the resurrection of the race is as it were the focus of His moral and spiritual perfections: there we find the most worshipful, the most Divine disclosure of His Spirit. Such in effect is the testimony of the last stanza in Shelley's " Prometheus Unbound," giving as it does the essence of that marvellous drama: wherein one of the most gifted children of our age turns in horror from the fictitious physical Deity to the real and spiritual, and pays the tribute of his devotion to saving and victorious suffering. It is not impassive, immobile perfection that brings us to our knees: it is the Jesus Who points to nail-print and spear-wound that forces from our lips the cry, " My Lord and my God." He who " became perfect through suffering " wins our supreme adoration.

Jesus is " My Lord and my God." We would worship Him and bestow our fullest life as offering on His altar. We follow Him. He has the highest, the practical adoration of our souls. This perfect Divinity of His gives us also surety as to the nature of the Universe and of its Supreme Ruler. Regarding these we accept His testimony with life-surrendering confidence. If He were to tell us, the sun goes round the world, we would refuse to believe Him: that was the defective knowledge of His day, we would say.

If He were to declare " Moses wrote the Pentateuch," we would still refuse assent; we have got to know better since He lived. Perfection of moral spiritual life is quite possible on both assumptions. But when He assures us that over all and in them all is a spirit of infinite benevolence and absolute purity, a Being whom he calls His Father, in whose power and knowledge all things rest, from the impartial radiance of the sun to the seemingly unnoticed fall of a sparrow, we believe Him with whole heart and soul. Why? Because the certainty of moral insight deepens with its purity, and the perfection of Jesus' morality involves the truth of His verdict as to the moral nature of the universe. A world created and ruled by a power which is immoral or non-moral, or only imperfectly moral, must display the character of that power to a being of perfect moral insight. By such a being the supreme power could only be recognised as perfect if all its works and government were perfect. Gethsemane and Calvary indicate how immorality acted upon the perfectly pure one: yet so sensitive a soul as that of Jesus can detect in our world nothing finally to shake His faith in an all perfect Sovereign of the world.

There are certain acids which when dropped into a solution will

indicate at once by a change in the colour of the liquid the presence of the merest trace of a given alkali. Where no such change occurs, we have a guarantee that the alkali in question is wholly absent. We may, with an apology for its grossness, apply this illustration to the highest things. The spirit of Jesus, poured forth with such loving sympathy upon the works and ways of the Supreme Unity, is certain to defeat and resent even the slightest trace of moral defect: we know what effervescence and revulsion of soul was caused by the sin present in the deeds of man; and the fact that Jesus lived and died in unshaken confidence in the absolute perfection of the source of all is a guarantee to us that it is a Spirit at one with His which wields the might and wisdom of Omnipotent Omniscience. The moral spiritual character, *i.e.*, the regnant controlling Will of the Maker and Master of the Universe, is revealed to us therefore in the Divinity or Deity of Jesus.

But, one may say, the spirit of moral perfection when combined with the attributes of knowledge and force must be more worshipful, more Divine, than the same spirit without these accompaniments, and that Jesus is therefore not the supremely worshipful, is not God. But we cannot play *plus* and *minus* with the Divinity of moral excellence. All these more sounding attributes do not add to the essence of Deity: as moral excellence it is already at infinity.

Even human relations might teach us this. The hero-statesman when he happens to have left office and is no longer within reach of his former power, and no longer in receipt of his former information, is none the less hero. And God, without the all-knowledge and all-power which some deem so essential to His nature is no less God. Nay, if we venture to suppose that He is found divested of these wider attributes in order that He may the more minister to and save the fallen children of His grace, may we not say, God is more God in His divested perfectness of gracious self-surrender that in all the fulness of Omnipotence and Omniscience? "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" is a Diviner object than Jehovah creating the Universe in six days, or the Unknowable evolving the Universe during an immeasurable tract of ages. God is God, not by virtue of these terrific physical attributes: that is the heathen idea: God is God by virtue of His absolute morality. The rest of the attributes are wrappings, clothes, crown, throne, and sceptre: this is the King Himself. So Jesus is the Kernel, the Heart, the Essence of God: He is the Highest, the Most Worshipful. However far we may be carried by the enlightening processes of historical research, we are only brought into fuller knowledge of the truth that in Jesus we see the Divinest of the Divine Nature: Jesus is *Deissimum Dei*.

NOTE.—To avoid misapprehension it may be well to state that in this Frank Talk nothing has been said which is not perfectly compatible with the Kenotic theory of Incarnation—a theory which is embraced by some of our most unimpeachable orthodox theologians. I have said nothing which is out of harmony with the belief that Jesus is the eternal Son of God, consubstantial personality with the Father, who yet on becoming incarnate "emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant," together with all the sinless limitations of our human state.

"WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?"

"WHAT think ye of Christ?" This question is one which must sooner or later be faced by all Christians, of whatever degree or description of Christians they may be. The words and work of the one Prophet of the one God are not more vital to Mohammedism than the person and work of Jesus is to Christianity. It is true that Islam has had fewer doubts and discussions, fewer differences and divisions, about Mohammed than the Christian Church has had concerning Christ; but it would be easier to take Mohammed out of Mohammedanism than to take Christ out of Christianity. Nothing can be more absolutely certain than that a noble and productive Christianity must have a noble and practical belief about Jesus Christ. The Church has always instinctively felt this, and the Christological debates have been always the longest and bitterest, and the Christological heresies the most sternly oppressed and the most prolonged. A historical religion cannot be separated from its historical source, and all who in any way are connected with Christianity should be brought face to face with the question, "What think ye of Christ?" The orthodox Churchman may, like the pious Catholic, say that he believes what the creed confesses, what the Church teaches, or what the parson preaches, but then he is not giving a very good account of the faith that is in him. The liberal theologian and the advanced thinker may discuss historical questions concerning Moses in Egypt or Paul in Rome, the composition of the Pentateuch or the authorship of the fourth gospel, but no such question will make his theology so liberal or his advance so thoughtful as if he formulates an answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ?" The practical philanthropist and ardent reformer may declare that the positive words and the benevolent deeds of Christ when on earth are all that he can accept, and all that he would insist on, but by shirking the question as to the person and work of Christ, he excludes from his reckoning one of the doctrines which has most powerfully influenced history and humanity. The truest Christian and the best preacher will be he who will bring all the light of criticism and history, and the experience of his own Christian consciousness, to bear, and will make these answer for him the question, "What think ye of Christ?"

There are several sides from which the Christological problem may be regarded, but it will be enough here to arrange our thoughts about three aspects or questions, and to ask (1) concerning the nature of the Second Person in the Church doctrine of the Trinity; (2) concerning the work of Christ; (3) concerning the place taken by Jesus Christ in the Christian consciousness.

I.

The inquiry into the nature of the Second Person of the Trinity must be pursued from the point of view of the theologian, and will pave the way for further inquiry; it may therefore be regarded as the negative criticism of the doctrine of Christology.

Theologians and preachers of extreme and traditional orthodoxy have often endeavoured to show that the monotheism of the Old Testament, rigid as it is, yet necessitates the Trinitarian doctrine of Christianity. No reference need be made here to the style of argument, of which Browning, half in sarcasm, gives an example in his "Christmas Eve," where the preacher of "Mount Zion" proves the doctrine of the Trinity from the three baskets of the baker, whose dream was interpreted by Joseph in prison.[1] But there is a suggestion or hint of the Christian doctrine in the O. T. conceptions of the Spirit of God,[2] the Angel of God,[3] the Word of God,[4] and especially in the wisdom of God,[5] which is poetically regarded as a Person, and whose personification was made an article of belief by the Alexandrian school of Judaism.

Between the O. T. and the N. T. stand the Jewish schools, which, while they handed on the traditions of the prophets and writers of the earlier Jewish Church, at the same time transformed or developed them. The Messiah was eagerly expected at the time of Jesus' coming, but was never conceived as a Divine Being. In the book of Daniel (date about 165 B.C.) the Messiah is conceived as like "the Son of Man," as a unique but not as a Divine Being (Dan. vii. 13).

The Messiah expected by the Pharisees was not to be God Himself, but a God-sent servant, sent to conquer and save. Of much more importance for the doctrine of the Trinity is the teaching of the Jewish school of philosophy in Alexandria, of which Philo was the great master. Philo seized on the Jewish Biblical ideas of angel, word, spirit, and wisdom of God, and wedded them to the Platonic "ideas" and the reason or *logos* of the Stoics. This is the genealogy of the Philonian *logos* (λογος), a half-religious, half-philosophical conception, which formed the mediator between a super-terrestrial God and the world of evil and sin. This *logos* was thus the medium of the creation of the world and the revelation of God. Philo wavers in seeming to attribute to this *logos* at times a personal, at times an impersonal existence.

It was the universal conviction of the early Christians that God who had spoken before by prophets had now spoken by His Son, and had fully and finally revealed Himself in Jesus Christ (Heb. i. 1.,*f.*). The earliest speculative form of the belief concerning Jesus Christ is that of Paul, who identifies the principle of the Divine Sonship of man with the person of Jesus, and views the eternal purpose of God to reveal Himself in Christ as the ground for holding that Christ had a pre-existent and ideal life in heaven before his appearance on earth (Gal. iv. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 6, &c.). His own idea of Christ in his relation to God is not systematically or fully stated by Paul, but the ideal and

1 "The Poetical Works of Robert Browning," Vol. v., p. 125.

2 The "Spirit of God" in the Old Testament represents God's imminent being and active movement in nature and man. *cf.* Gen. 1, 2; Isaiah xlviii. 16, and very frequently.

3 The "Angel of the Lord" appears as the bearer of a Divine revelation or judgment, or the form in which God himself appears to man. *cf. inter alia*, 2 Kings xix. 35, Gen. xxxii. 24-30, Judges vi. 21 *ff.*

4 The "Word of God" is frequently spoken of as if personified: the fundamental meaning appears to be that of the will of God as imparted (to man). *cf.* 1 Kings xix. 9, also Genesis i. 6 (Heb).

5 *cf.* Esp. Proverbs viii.

historical elements of Christ's nature are recognised, and if any reconciliation of the two is suggested, it is that Christ is personified spirit or power of God. In fact, it is not until the Johannine writings, the latest layer in the N.T., are reached, that Jesus is regarded as the eternal Divine Logos, the personal creator of the world and channel of all revelation (*c.f.* John i., 1. *ff.*) The eternal Divine sonship of Christ, who is "Logos," is the basis and reason for the Divine sonship of man. But the Divine Presence among the company of the faithful, as it had been during Christ's life the presence of the Logos, was now conceived as the presence of the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, or Comforter, which is likewise personified and more and more reduced to the analogy of the Logos, being viewed at last as a Divine Person, like Christ the Logos. Thus the Christian consciousness, working along the lines natural to it, using the forms of thought belonging to the Philonian philosophy, the noblest and devoutest thinking of its day, came easily and naturally into the possession of a belief in a Divine Father, the Eternal Son, and the personal Holy Spirit. The naturalness and ease of the transition from the rigid Jewish Monotheism to three Divine Persons is attested by the trinitarian expressions found even in Paul's writings, (2 Cor. xiii., 14.; 1 Cor. xii., 4—6), and by the evidence of the earliest extant forms of the baptismal formula (*cf.* Matt. xxviii,. 19, Didache vii., 1 and 3.)

The theological statements of the early Church were influenced by various considerations; there were, in particular, two which must be noticed here. The eternal message and extraordinary nature of Jesus Christ had to be first vindicated, especially against the Jews, and Jesus Christ is accordingly held up as the Logos in personal form, come in His fulness in order to complete the revelation of God, to fulfil the prophecies of the Hebrew prophets, and to answer all the higher longings of man. On the other hand, while the polytheism of Rome and the dualism of the Gnostics denied the unity of God, the supreme and single majesty of God had to be reasserted. The strife of these two tendencies may be seen especially in Justin Martyr, who regards Christ as the Logos, hypostatically separated from the Father before the world, but not eternal: a true object of worship yet not God Himself. He thus wavers between a semi-dualism and Monotheism. The period from Justin Martyr to the Nicene Council sees the great struggle between the doctrine which was to develop into the Trinity of the orthodox Church, and the doctrine of the Monarchians, whose great aim was to assert the undivided supremacy and majesty of the Father. The Monarchians generally rejected the separation of the Logos from God, and while some of them regarded Christ as a man especially inspired with the Holy Spirit (Ebionitism), others regarded Christ as the appearance of the Father Himself, come to suffer for the sins of His human children (Patripassianism), while some (and especially Sabellius), regarded the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as three forms in which the one God was revealed to men, not separated as $\pi\rho o\sigma\omega\pi\alpha$, or persons, but as successive forms of the one Divine Logos.

The Monarchian denial of the impersonal nature of the Logos

was unfortunately pursued to excess in two opposite directions: the Ebonites rejected the true divinity of Christ; others (Docetics) rejected the true humanity of Christ. In order to preserve these two, and as the feeling of the Church clung to both, the relation between God and the Logos was more and more thought of as being such that the Logos was personally distinct from God and subordinated to God, as Son to Father. This subordination theory dominated the Church, appearing in Justin Martyr (as already seen), in Tertullian and Origen, whose Græco-Alexandrine philosophy regards the Son as the Logos, which form the bridge, eternal in idea if not in personal being, between God and the world, until Arius, pressing the theory of subordination to its conclusion, taught that the nature of the Son was neither "eternal in his being nor in his generation, but created in time."

The spread of Arian doctrines synchronizing with the Church passing from its period of persecution to its period of virtual establishment by the Roman Empire, and things being now ready for a more or less final settlement of the doctrine of the relation between Father and Son, the Council of Nicœa (325 A.D.) ordained as orthodox the perfect agreement of nature (Homoousia) of Father and Son, and taught that Jesus Christ was "Son of God, begotten of the Father [God of God], Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down, &c." This creed was reasserted and more closely defined at the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D., when the doctrine of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost was added and stated as it now stands in the "Nicene Creed."[1] The Homoousia of the Nicene Creed was not finally accepted without further difficulty. Gregory and Basil opposed the tri-theism, into which some perverted its doctrine, while Augustine developed its similarity of substance into an identity of substance: this Augustinian doctrine was accepted by the Church in its famous symbol, "Quicuse que vult," known generally as the Athanasian Creed, which came into existence about the year 450 A.D. in the Latin Church.

The Protestant Church has, in the main, simply accepted the doctrine or the Trinity as the Catholic Church developed it, and to this day many Protestants never consider that there is anything inconsistent in rejecting totally the system of priesthood and sacraments which the Church of the first five centuries built up on the same lines and in the same way as it constructed the doctrine of the Trinity which they unhesitatingly accept.

Before leaving this part of our enquiry, we may ask in view of this Doctrine of the Trinity, "What think ye of Christ?" Do we conceive him as a Being of like, or the same, nature as the Father? Or is it as the supreme revealer and chosen vessel of the Father's love, and without any thought of whether or not his Being, Person, and Nature are such as the Trinitarian symbols define? Surely the former question is immaterial, if not impertinent. Surely the later question is most vital, if not absolutely essential. Must not,

1 The additions found in the creed as it stands in the "Book of Common Prayer" were added in 381 A.D. The words God of God were added by the Western Church.

then, the Christian conviction in view of this doctrine return to the religious roots of the doctrines, which have been obscured by a doctrine which insists on metaphysical distinctions as essential, while it neglects the weightier matters of spiritual experience of truth? We are conscious that we have the love of the Father, because the saving life and death of his Son Jesus has revealed it to us, and has given us to live in the sacred fellowship of the Holy Ghost. Does not this mean that the God whose widest and earliest revelation of Himself is in creation and nature, has revealed Himself again in the person of Jesus, and in the Church, which is the bridge of Christ living in His spirit? Does not this mean that God's revelation is in triple form, God revealing Himself as author of Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification? Are we not to think that He created to redeem, and He redeemed in order to sanctify? In this sense the Trinity has a most vital and essential meaning, for it sums up the faith, the salvation and the hope of the Christian. But when this doctrine is made to consist of a rough collection of contradictory statements, culled from systems of strange theology, or when a symbol like the Nicene or Athanasian Creeds, good at certain times and against certain dangers, are made permanently binding on Christian believers, it is time to recur to primitive faiths, and to refuse to give our belief to anything save what is the outcome of our consciousness of God's goodness working in history and in our hearts.

II.

In discussing the question of the work of Christ, we do not consider (as has been done in the former section) the relation of Christ to God, but the place which Christ holds in human history, and the work accomplished by Christ in revealing God to man, or (in other words) not Christ as Son of God, but as Saviour of mankind.

The foreshadowings of the work of Christ in the Old Testament form one of the most marked characteristics of the prophetic preaching. The earlier prophets looked for a Day of Jahve, when God would come and do wondrously for His people, judging the evil and manifesting his salvation for the good (Amos v. 18, Joel i. 15 *ff.*, Micah ii. 3, 4 (?), Isa. ii. 12 *f.*, xiii. 6 *ff.*, &c.) The conception of the golden age soon to appear, when the salvation of Jahve would be manifestly asserted, is an idea common to all the prophets, but while some connect this consummation with no particular human being (so Amos, Hosea), some associate with its completion a theocratic office as that of prophet (so Elijah ?), or of King (so Micah, Zechariah). This is especially the conception, which thrills through much of the finest inspired prophecies of Isaiah, who teaches that a king, of David's line, endued with the Divine spirit, would appear as the victorious and righteous Ruler of the age of peace (Isaiah ix. 5 *ff.*, xi. 1 *ff.*) Indeed, the conception of the Saviour as King is first fully stated and finally established by Isaiah. When the actual kingdom declined and fell, the part attributed by the prophets to the Messianic King is diminished in importance but not entirely wanting (*cf* Jeremiah xxx. 9, xxxiii. 15, 17), and Ezek. xxxiv. 23 *f.*, xxxvii. 24 *f.*) The Exilic author of

Isaiah, chaps. xl.-lxvi., the so-called Second-Isaiah, goes so far as to ascribe the political duties of the Messianic King to Cyrus, the King of Persia (Isaiah xlv. 1.), while the religious duties of the Messiah are placed upon the faithful remnant of the oppressed people, which is idealized and represented as the suffering servant of Jahve. This suffering servant unites the ideas of teacher, prophet, priest, leader, and substituted sufferer. In the Apocalyptic literature, which sustained both the political longings and the religious hopes of the Jewish people during the dark century and a half, which preceded the birth of our Lord, the conception of a personal Messiah plays a most prominent part. In that Apocalypse, known as the Book of Daniel, "a Son of Man," coming from heaven and conceived as an angelic being, is regarded as the inaugurator of the heavenly kingdom. In the extra-canonical Apocalyptic literature are found both the views of the Messiah as a supreme semi-divine being (in the Books of Enoch and Esdras), and the view of the Messiah as pre-eminently the Davidic King (in the Psalms of Solomon). Such was the Messianic hope of the people to whom Jesus came.

Now, it was the fundamental faith and the crucial test of primitive Christianity that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Promised of God (*cf.* Matt. xvi. 15 *f.*, John vi. 69., xx., 30 *f.*) The words of Christ were in the most perfect sense the words of the Spirit of God, which inspired the Messiah; His mighty and marvellous works were a testimony to His Messiahship; His sacrificial death, freely and undeservedly suffered, was the title to Messianic priesthood; His ressurection and ascension to God's right hand were the seal of his Messianic Lordship; and the shortly-expected second coming of Jesus as the Christ of Glory to judge and to reward was eagerly awaited as the Messianic victory over all evil, and the institution of the Messianic Kingdom of Heaven.[1] Thus the whole of the body of beliefs and conceptions, which were crystallized round the Messianic hope of the Jews were transferred to the person of Jesus! It is doubtless the case that Jesus Himself profoundly modified the Messianic belief and made it in His disciples more ethical and spiritual. But that the Messianic belief of many of the early disciples of Christ remained material and anti-ethical cannot be doubted in face of many passages in the New Testament itself, and in face of the early history of the Church, in which Chiliasm and Montanism played no unimportant part.

This danger of falling back into a material conception of the Messiah was, in God's mercy, prevented by the spiritual thought of Paul and the Christian speculation of the fourth Gospel. The spiritual insight and clear understanding of the two greatest writers of the New Testament—perhaps the two most influential writers who ever wrote—have not saved Christianity from being often largely materialized, but have assured to Christianity that it should ever remain a spiritual force and a moral influence in human society.

1 It will be readily seen how the popular and accredited view of the Messiah would add its weight to the memory retained of the actual Jesus, and how inevitably the dogmatic conceptions of the former were united with the facts of Jesus' life. The conception by the Holy Ghost (Matt. i. 18 *ff.*, Luke i. 31 *ff.*) was but the most easy and natural way in which the general Christian consciousness of that day would fulfil such a prophecy as Isaiah vii. 14. But that does not prove it a necessity to the Christian consciousness of to-day.

Jesus Christ is to Paul "the man from heaven," "the image of God," "the Son of God," the "Second Adam," the "First-born of many Brethren." The pre-existent Son of God appeared in the fulness of time on earth in the flesh as Son of David, the Messiah; obedient to God's will He suffered the death of the Cross, and vicariously bore the curse of the law, thus freeing sinners from the power of sin and reconciling man with God; by His resurrection Jesus manifested His Messiahship, and established the new righteousness and freedom of those who live in His Spirit; by His being raised to the right hand of God Christ becomes our intercessor with the Father, and the guarantee of the completion of our salvation. At the visible return of Christ in majesty to earth He shall judge and reward all men and perfect the communion of the Church with Himself and God. Finally, when all things have been subjected to Christ, He shall again be subjected to Himself, that God may be all in all.[1]

Such is the conception of Christ, which is found in the undoubtedly genuine epistles of Paul.[2] The doctrine of Paul in the four great epistles is stated in opposition to Jews and Judaizers of the first generation of the Church, and has suffered misinterpretation in consequence of the use of language which came natural to a student of the Rabbinical schools, but which sounds strange in our ears. The doctrines of the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, on the other hand, opposes to a Gnostic or rather Ebionite worship of angels the worship of Christ, who is exalted over men, especially as possessing the *pleroma*, or fulness, of God.[3] The Pastoral Epistles, undoubtedly *not* the work of Paul himself, anticipate the later doctrine of the Church by asserting against opposing heresies the Divine and humane elements of Christ's natures. The Epistle to the Hebrews, strongly influenced by Alexandrian thought and by old Testament lore, upholds the eternal priesthood of Christ, which completes and abrogates the Jewish priesthood, and the sacrifice of Christ, which renders needless the sacrifice of the temple.

All these New Testament writings are more or less occupied in stating the doctrine of the work of Christ over against incomplete or one-sided counter doctrines. Subsequent to Paul they all more or less rely on the idea of the Logos to interpret the true doctrine of Christ. But the Gospel and Epistles of John, constituting the last stadium of the New Testament, state the doctrine of Christ, independently of, but not without reference to, the heresies of the hour and popular Judaism, and also carry out the Philonian doctrine of the Logos into complete and logical agreement with the Christian doctrine of Christ. In the Johannine Christology, Jesus is the Messiah, because he is the Logos or Word become flesh. The historical Jesus is the same personal subject, which was from the beginning the only begotten Son of God, the Divine means of all creation and revela-

1 References cannot be given for all the points in this paragraph; it will be enough to direct attention to 1 Cor. xv. 28 as bearing on the last sentence.

2 *i.e.*, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians.

3 *cf.* Col. ii. 9. This word *pleroma* is only referred to in the N.T. to God or Christ in the Ephesians, Colossians, and John i. 16.

tion; He is the sole way by which men come to God, the only truth which they can know of God, the one life which they can share with God. Thus Christ is the personification of the means, the truth, and the essence of religion. The work which Christ performs is to reveal the Divine Life of the word become flesh, full of grace and truth (John i. 14.) Christ performs this work by His words, which in the fourth gospel do not, as in the Synoptists, give simple practical teaching of truths concerning the Kingdom of Heaven, but state and define what is his relation to the Father and humanity; also by His works He bore witness to His being sent (John v. 36), and manifested His glory (ii. 11); but above all is Christ revealed in His death, the glory of which is recounted in this Gospel at greater length than by the Synoptists, this being conceived as a return to the Father, as a laying down of life for His friends in order to take it again, and so to bear much fruit, as an overcoming of the world, as an accomplishing of His work, and as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. The permanent existence of the work of Christ on earth is assured by the promise of the paraclete, the comforter, which shall lead men into all truth.

Thus a gradual development of the growth of the idea of Christ's person and work may be traced within the limits of the New Testament, beginning with the simple belief of the first disciples, that Jesus is the Messiah long promised to the Jews, and culminating in the religious philosophy of the Johannine writings, which makes Jesus the eternal Logos, *ratio* and *oratio*, reason and word, made flesh and manifested to man, a view which does not exclude the Jewish national faith, but is independent of it, because it includes it and much more besides.[1] If this be so, the Johannine writings are of most vital importance, showing, as they do, how the last and perhaps the greatest writer of the New Testament viewed the whole of the Creation and man and eternity, and found their eternal reason (Logos) in Jesus Christ, by whom and for whom they were created and exist. No higher nor purer view of Christ and Christianity is possible than this, which makes Christ at once the centre of all history and the comforter of the individual's sorrow.

The secret of the Christological discussions, with which the history of the centuries of Christianity is crowded, is the difficulty which men found (as they always will find) in combining the historical humanity of Jesus with the Divine nature of the Christ, and in explaining how the death on the cross could reconcile the sinful world to God. While, on the one hand, the Monarchians and Ebionites asserted that Christ was a mere man, and insisting on the complete human nature of the Lord, joined to it various degrees of Divine inspiration; and while, on the other hand, the Gnostics and Docetics, insisting on the Divine or superhuman nature of Christ, joined to this various forms of human nature, either the appearance of a body, or the body of an ordinary man, into which the Divine soul entered; the Church held to the for-

[1] The miracles of the fourth Gospel, few in number, seem all to have a dogmatic or symbolical meaning, which generally lies on the very face of them, as in the story of the man born blind (John ix., esp. verses 39 *f.*) and in the raising of Lazarus (chap. xi., esp. verse 25).

mula of the word become flesh, thus asserting the union of Divine and human in Jesus. And while, on the one hand, some, like Arius, held that the human soul of the man Jesus was displaced by the Divine Logos; and, on the other hand, some, like Apollinaris sacrificed the human element to assert the Divine, Athanasius, and with him the Church as a body, defined the Divine Logos as assuming a real and human body, soul, and spirit in Jesus Christ. But the Nicene Council, though it established the doctrine of the Trinity, only began a new series of Christological discussions; and not till a century and a quarter after, at the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), did the Church finally fix its doctrine that in Jesus Christ there are two unmixed natures, human and Divine, and one indivisible person. This doctrine was later authoritatively explained to mean that the human nature of Christ partook of the properties of the Divine nature, but not *vice versâ*. This doctrine of the person of Christ was taken bodily over (it may be said) at the Reformation, and has become the property of the Protestant confessions.

The close connection of this theory of the person of Christ with the theory of the work of Christ must ever be borne in mind. The doctrine of the human nature in Christ was united with a doctrine of His sufferings, by which He paid for the sins of the world. This payment takes at times the form of a debt paid to the devil (this is even stated as a cheating or quibbling payment by some), and at times a debt paid to the justice and truth of God. This connection is most notably seen in Anselm's famous "Cur Deus Homo?" the one great dogmatic work of Scholasticism. In it Anselm explains the incarnation by his theory of atonement. Divine justice dooms all men to punishment, but this would thwart the Divine goodness, so the Divine wisdom devises the plan of uniting the human and the infinite (or Divine) in Christ, to pay the infinite debt due by humanity to Divine Justice, which must be paid by a human being and must be infinite; thus the incarnation of Christ was necessary to the atonement, or satisfaction of the Divine justice.

The patristic and scholastic doctrines of the person and work of Christ formed part of the heritage of Protestantism when it left the bosom of the Catholic Church. It is true that the Arminians partly, and the Socinians entirely, rejected the Church doctrine, and on critical and speculative grounds endeavoured to build up a large or totally new doctrine of redemption. It is true that the mysticism and even the Methodism of last century have often tended to depreciate the old doctrines; it is true that the rationalism of last century urged much against the Church doctrines even when it spared Christianity. But still the Catholic doctrine, in one form or another, has generally held its ground, even where the Reformation has been most complete. The various forms in which the doctrine has been stated by Protestant writers, and the various criticisms and modifications it has received, need not be noted here. It is enough for us to remember that it is still common among Protestants to hear the Nicene or Athanasian creeds quoted as if they were as authoritative as the New Testa-

ment, and that many Protestants consider that the "satisfaction theory" of Anselm is the only basis on which the Gospel can be proclaimed. But the object here in view is not to criticize either modern or antiquated theories, but to consider the question, "What think ye of Christ?" It is time, therefore, to pass to the next point of view, and consider the place which the founder of Christianity holds in the Christian consciousness.

III.

The foregoing statement should have made it clear that the Church doctrine has been an attempt to assert both the superiority and the similarity of Christ to man. The natural striving after an expression of these aspects of the Saviour has given rise to the Church doctrine, and has preserved that doctrine; and how to accomplish this is still the problem to be faced to-day. For when it is declared (as all Christians must declare) that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of mankind, two things are implied (*a*) that Jesus Christ is the historical starting-point of the one highest and truest religion of salvation; (*b*) that He is the permanent example of the true and holy or saved life.

Looking at these elements separately, it is implied in the first of them that Jesus Christ has a position and a nature surpassing that of ordinary man, in that only one being—and that no ordinary man—can be the historical starting-point of the highest and truest religion. But if this superiority of Christ to ordinary mankind be made the ground for attributing to Christ a Divine nature, how can His life remain the type and ideal life for man? Again, that the life of our Lord remains ever the ideal life to which man must approach, implies the close similarity between His nature and that of mankind. But if this similarity of Christ to ordinary men be made the ground for attributing to him a human nature —perfect, yet only human—how can He be considered the starting-point of the one highest and truest religion? On the one hand, Christ can only be the perfect type of humanity, if He is human. On the other hand, if Christ is the fountain-head of the one or absolute religion, His nature is in some way or other unique. The problem, therefore, is to find a statement of the nature and work of Christ which will assert the superiority and similarity of Christ to man without preventing the believer from thinking of him as the fountain-head of the absolute religion and the perfect type of humanity.

Judged by such a standard, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds can scarcely be considered satisfactory. The Nicene Creed makes no assertion that Christ is the permanent ideal and pattern of human life; the Athanasian Creed, by its doctrine of Christ's "assumption of the Manhood into God," prevents the believer really sharing in the humanity of Christ, and by its elaborate fencings over the persons of the Godhead and the substance of Christ, entirely neglects, if it does not preclude, the real and active conception of Christ as the perfect man, into Whose likeness all men must come. Quite reasonably and rightly, therefore, the truly Protestant Churches have dropped the liturgical use of the Nicene

and Athanasian Creeds, and this makes it all the more strange that so many Protestant writers profess such allegiance to these symbols. Regarded as sign-posts along the road of Church history, they are worthy of honour as well as observation, but as expressions of the Christian consciousness of Christ, can anyone who is not a confirmed Catholic say that either is adequate or helpful? Must it then be said that no symbol can express the Christian consciousness? or that the symbols of the Church are unsuited to the needs of the day, and new symbolical statements are required? Surely the latter alternative is the true one; religion implies belief, and belief needs a statement, *i.e.*, doctrine. What can the doctrine of Christ be but the statement of what Christ is to the Christian consciousness? It is the duty of the Christian consciousness to state by the mouthpiece of its religious writers and thinkers what it believes of Christ, and what Christ does for it.

It is strange that, although Protestantism is based on the principle of the authority of the Scriptures, no section of the Protestant Church has ever attempted to state its answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ?" in purely Biblical language. But if it is true that the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century is only being consummated in this generation, it may be now time to ask whether among those Christian communions which have shared the principles of the Reformation for nearly four centuries, there is not some need to formulate in language at once more Biblical and more practical than the creeds of the Church an answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ?"

The value of the Bible never diminishes, but ever increases, and one reason for this is that the expressions of the Bible have always a practical value, *i.e.*, they never lose their force or meaning to the Christian consciousness. How different this is with the formulæ of the Church! It is to the mind of to-day almost inconceivable that the difference on the question of the famous "*filioque*" clause could have resulted in the great schism between the Eastern and Western Churches. It is hard to understand to-day why Luther should have attached such immense importance to the points on which he differed from Zwingli. But where controversies are recorded in Biblical literature, they still seem living to the Christian of to-day; and the struggle of Elijah against Baal-worship, the controversies in which Paul engaged (*e.g.*, in Galatians and 1 Cor. xv.), or the evils exposed by the Epistles of James or John, even if past in time, are present in interest and import. So, too, with the language of Scripture: it is ever fresh and living to men's souls, and states the feelings and beliefs of the nineteenth Christian century as truly as it expressed the feelings and beliefs of the first. If this be so, it would seem reasonable to state what Christ is to the universal Christian consciousness, in the language of the Bible, which has a universal applicability and meaning for Christians. Not in the jargon of decaying classical philosophy, with its terms of *substantia*, *hypostasis*, *prosopon*, *ousia*, nor in the scholastic language of a later day, but in the simple language of the New Testament, which, though doubtless due in part to the philosophies of its own day, has yet so impressed itself

on the history and religion of the world, that it belongs equally to all ages.

John Milton in one of his prose works gives a magnificent picture of what Protestantism might be if bound together with the concord of workers, the singleness of aim and unity of faith, which the Catholic Church possesses. If ever that dream of Milton is to be realised, the faith of the Church must find its symbol in Biblical language, in a creed which will assert the uniqueness and universality of Christ, unite men in their reverence and alliance to Christ and yet allow men of widely different views to dwell and work in the same church.

Believing this is at once the logical outcome and the true ideal of Protestantism, the goal to which the spirit of Paul points, and the end to which the various sects are now blindly but actually struggling, the Christian, whose christianity is the result of faithful appreciation and free criticism of Biblical and ecclesiastical history, not of Catholic tradition and antique dogmatism, may be allowed to answer the question "What think ye of Christ?" in some such a statement as the following: "Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, promised by God through his prophets, the Son of Man, the only-begotten Son of God, the eternal word become flesh, the Great Prophet, the one High Priest for ever, who put away sin by sacrifice of Himself, who rose from the dead, and by whom came also the resurrection of the dead, the King of the Kingdom of Heaven, whose Body is the Church, whose Spirit is the possession of all Christians."

It need hardly be pointed out that such a symbol as this seeks to be, is not so constructed that it may exclude some Christians like the Catholic symbols, but that it may include all. It would be thus truly and really Catholic. It is not constructed so that it may be used to assert that some are orthodox and to condemn others as heterodox, but that all may be orthodox so long as they reverence the Bible more than the theories of theologians. It would be thus truly and really orthodox. It is not constructed so that it may satisfy the refined subtleties of the theologian, but that it may express the devout convictions of the Christian believer. It would be thus truly and really practical. It is not constructed with the words of profound thinkers, as the Athanasian creed was constructed from the treatises of Augustine, but with the simple words of Scripture, as being at once authoritative and clear. It would thus be truly and really biblical.

This essay has already occupied too many sheets, but the writer cannot well conclude even this incomplete study, to which he hopes to return, without illustrating two points in the main conclusion of this present effort. Consider in conclusion then only two of the clauses composing the above suggested answer to the question "What think ye of Christ?"—those which state the truths of Christ, Incarnation and Atonement.

Jesus Christ is "the only-begotten Son of God, the eternal word become flesh" (John i. 14.) This phrase is the most explicit statement of what is called the Incarnation to be found in the New Testament. Of course there may be a world of difference in the

explanations of it; the word may be regarded as a personal eternal substance distinct from God the Father, or as a Divine mode of existence and revelation: the word becoming flesh may mean a Divine person assuming a human nature, or the Divine spirit revealing itself in a unique or extraordinary way in Jesus. So long as the Incarnation is interpreted by men of different views and tendencies, so long will the exact form vary in which it is conceived. But so long as the Bible is accepted as the authoritative canon of doctrine, and so long as men look to Jesus Christ as the living embodiment and particular revelation of the Divine truth, they should rest content to confess one faith in the words of the disciple, who wrote "the word was made flesh."

To say that Jesus is "the one High Priest for ever, who put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," is to assert that by Christ's death sin ceases to have dominion over his disciples. This statement of its Atonement is of course open to most various constructions; it will cover Origen's theory of Christ's death as a cheating the devil of his due, or Anselm's theory of satisfaction, or the less legal and more ethical doctrine of Abelard in the Middle Ages, or Frederick Denison Maurice in later times. But the supreme fact of practical importance, that Christ's death gives to man assurance of a victory over sin, remains asserted in the words of Scripture. So long as the central doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews (from which the phrase of the suggested symbol is quoted, *cf.* Heb. v. 6, vii. 3, 16, 24 *ff.*, ix. 26, &c.), is accepted, so long will the vital and practical fact of the death of Jesus Christ and its importance be asserted, preached, and believed.

Can the Protestant Church consistently with its principle of the finality of Biblical authority make any creed which is not purely Biblical, or any language or formula of later origin, binding on its members? Does not Protestantism resign all its *raison d'etre* when it reasserts in part or in whole any creed like that of Nicene or *Quicunque vult?* And is not this more especially true in its faith and thought of Jesus Christ? No man who is in any degree fair or unbiassed, can believe that the average Roman Catholic of to day, to whom Jesus Christ is first the bread and wine used in the Mass, then the sufferer on the Crucifix, and lastly the terrible judge, who will appear to save his Church and to hurl heretics and sinners to the bottomless pit, has any idea of Christ really shared by Christ's chosen disciples or by Paul. But why should not Protestants really so think themselves into the thought and times of the New Testament that they could join in the language of John or the Epistles to the Hebrews and in the faith of Paul? Why cannot they answer in the words of the New Testament to the question, "What think ye of Christ?"

* * * * * * *

P,S.—The writer of this paper hopes to supplement this essay before long by taking the symbol he has set up and explaining it, as he believes it to be true to himself. Meanwhile he would only beg any who read his pages to pause before they condemn, and to answer to themselves his question before they finally consign these pages and their author to oblivion.

THE CHALDÆAN GENESIS.*

LITERATURE.—*George Smith*, Chaldäische Genesis (German translation with additions by Friedr. Delitzsch); *Lenormant's* Work on Berosus; *Friedr. Delitzsch's* "Wo lag das Paradies?" *Fr. Lenormant*, "Les Origines de l'histoire d'aprés la Bible et les traditions des peuples orientaux" (3 vols. 1880—1884), "Le déluge et l'èpopèe Babylonienne" (in Les prem. civilisations, II) *P. Haupt*, "Der keilinschriftliche Sintfluthbericht" (lectures given in 1881: the same author has an important excursus in the 2nd edition of Schrader's "Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O.T.") The question has been treated in numerous articles and has been considered also from the point of view of O.T. scholarship. Among other writings may be consulted special parts of K. Budde's "Die biblische Urgeschichte" (1883) and the careful article of W. H. Koster "De bijbelsche zontvloedverhalen met de Babylonische vergleken" (Theol. Tydschr. 1885.)

THE peculiar attraction of Assyriology consists for many in its bearing on Old Testament studies. But this very ground of attraction is at the same time also a ground of danger, in that it urges one to seek eagerly after biblical parallels and carry on a kind of sensational science. It cannot be denied that since the remarkable similarity between the narratives of the Deluge given by the cuneiform inscriptions and the Bible were first made known by G. Smith in 1872, this danger has not been always avoided. Here we shall simply state the facts of the case.

The accounts to be compared are, on the one hand, Genesis, chaps. i—xi., and, on the other, the statements about the early history of the world in the Babylonian Assyrian texts (found both in cuneiform inscriptions and in Berosus.) The truth is, that the subject leads into many points of detail. Friedr. Delitzsch, for instance, has endeavoured to prove from the geography of Babylonia that the story of the Garden of Eden may be substantially corroborated, but his position has been disputed by Lenormant and others. With much less show of reason G. Smith discovered an account of the fall in the cuneiform inscriptions. The only basis which supports any such idea, is the very doubtful conjecture that a certain tree, which figures on the Babylonian cylinders, represents one of the trees of Paradise. On the other hand, the connection between the Cherubim of Genesis iii. and of Ezekiel, and the Kirubu of the Babylonians and Assyrians, a sort of genii, which unite the four natures of bull, lion, eagle, and man, is more assured. But the Assyrian origin of the Cherubim, even when firmly established, does not satisfactorily explain their nature. Another important point of comparison is afforded by the numerous ethnographical notices given both by the Assyrian inscriptions and the list of peoples in Genesis x. Lenormant has placed these materials side by side with great fullness. But the parallel to the story of the Tower of Babel, which G. Smith thought he had discovered in a cuneiform inscription, is again entirely untrustworthy; quite as much so as are the linguistic reasons given for the assertion that the tower at Borsippa (now Birs Nimrod, which

*This article is a translation of a section (No. 57) of de la Saussaye's "Religionsgeschichte," recently published by Paul Siebeck, Freiburg i. B. As it sums up a question much canvassed in England, the editor hopes he is justified in placing it here.

seems to be the terrace-built temple of Belus, mentioned by Herodotus) was the same tower, the building of which is recounted in Genesis xi. All these questions may be left aside by us in order that close attention may be given to the two most important parallels, which concern the story of Creation and of the Flood. For the story of Creation we are thrown almost entirely upon later authorities; but, fortunately, we know that Berosus has handed down to us genuine ancient records. There are, indeed, some fragments of Cosmogony in the cuneiform inscriptions, but they are in such a poor condition that they afford no satisfactory view of the whole question. There are only a few notices which are quite clear, *e.g.*, that at the beginning was Chaos, which the text calls Tiamat. Fragments of texts and descriptions of the cylinders tell of a creative war between Tiamat and Maruduk, which is given in another form by the well-known story of Bel and the Dragon. This Tiamat is conceived as a female, and as the sea, which held all things in itself in chaos, while the God (Maruduk or Bel) introduced order and so created the world from it. This Tiamat occurs under the name Tauthe as one of the two cosmogonic principles (the other being called Apason), in Damascius, an author, whose fragment on Babylonian cosmogony is preserved in Greek, and contains various names, among which it is easy to recognize the divinities Anu, Hea, Davkina, Bel. But the fragments of Berosus give the richest results. The fish man, Oannes, who brought to primitive and barbarous mankind the beginnings of civilisation and knowledge, and then plunged by night into the sea again (for "he was amphibious," as Berosus pleasantly remarks) left behind him a writing on cosmogony. In the beginning there was only darkness and water, in which all sorts of monsters were spontaneously generated. A woman, Omoraca or Thanatt, which means "sea" (Tiamat) ruled over this creation. Bel put an end to this state, for he cut the woman into two parts, from which he made earth and heaven. Then Bel cut off his own head, and from his blood, mixed with earth, the gods kneaded mortal men, who are accordingly endowed with divine intelligence. In comparing these cosmogonic notions with those of the book of Genesis, a third branch must be considered at the same time, *viz.*, what is known from the fragments of Philo of Byblos (Sanchoniathon) of the Phœnician story of Creation. When all the accounts parallel to the biblical narrative of Creation are set together as they have been, especially by Lenormant, one sees very clearly that they do not warrant our making any definite conclusions about the origin and development of the various representations. The imperfect condition of the cuneiform inscriptions in particular occasions here a very sensible want. But the following points especially claim our attention:—First, this cosmogony is also a theogony as it is found both in the account of Damascius and in one of the fragments of Philo of Byblos, but *not* in Genesis, where the whole cosmogony is described in a spirit of rigid monotheism. Again, an original and chaotic condition, a primæval water, is found both in the Book of Genesis and in the Babylonian accounts. In the same way, there is an essential agreement in the conception of creation as the ordering of matter already existent in the notion of a separation of heaven from earth, and in the

thought of the mixing of the life of God and the dust of earth, when man is created. But, on the other hand, the connection of the cosmogony with the account of the origin of civilization appears far more prominently in both the Babylonian and Phœnician accounts than in the book of Genesis, where we have much difficulty in reading out of a few expressions, if not in reading into them, any story of the rise of civilisation.

The contents of the accounts of the Deluge are more satisfactory than the accounts of the Creation, for, besides Berosus, a circumstantial and well-preserved cuneiform inscription concerning the Deluge is extant in the 11th table of the Izdubarepos. This account agrees both in general and in important details with the two narratives, which the Redactor of Genesis has united, especially with the older of the two, the so-called Jahvist. The Izdubarepos also gives an account of a great flood, from which the pious Hasisadra was saved, because he built a ship at the Divine command, in order to save himself and the seed of all living things. The drying of the earth is made known in this account also by birds being sent forth (a dove, a swallow, a raven). After being saved Hasisadra made a sacrifice, at the smell of which the gods collected like flies. The list of points of agreement and difference between the Babylonian and the Biblical accounts has been frequently arranged. As for the differences, the most noticeable is the different spirit of the two narratives. In Genesis the Deluge is a judgment, which is sent by God on sinful man. This view of the event is entirely wanting in the Chaldæan story, which regards it rather as due to a serious quarrel among the gods. The Flood is either caused by Divine arbitrariness, for the gods took pleasure in sending the flood, and Bel was especially active in bringing it about; or, again, it was a sort of fated event. Istar prophesied a great plague, but without knowing what it was that was to come to pass. The preservation of Hasisadra was entirely due to Hea, and without the knowledge of Bel, who was even angry that man was saved. Istar complains about the destruction of mankind, which she did not produce, in order to fill the sea with a brood of fishes. After the catastrophe is complete, a serious quarrel between Hea and Bel takes place: Hea reproaches Bel for his having destroyed good and bad without distinction, and announces the decree that the earth shall no more be devastated by a flood. Bel is only with difficulty reconciled to the saving of Hasisadra. This dramatic episode among the gods constitutes the greatest point of difference between the Biblical account and the account of the cuneiform inscriptions. The account of Berosus has again some other features. It emphasizes chiefly the fact that Xisuthrus (Hasisadra) had to bury the sacred writings in the city of Sippara, where they were to be found again after the flood. After the flood Xisuthrus was not allowed to live immortally on earth, as Hasisadra, but was carried off to the gods in heaven, like Enoch in the Bible.

From these and similar considerations we may conclude how we must conceive of the relation between the Babylonian and the Israelite narrative. That, in spite of many differences both in the

spirit in which they are treated and in details (*e.g.*, in the building of the Ark, the duration of the Flood, &c.), they still remain one and the same narrative is just as little to be doubted as that the Chaldæan account is the earlier of the two. But how or when the account was borrowed can no more be determined with certainty. It is most improbable that there was any pre-historic connection between the two, such as that Abraham could have brought this tradition with him from Ur of the Chaldees, or that these accounts could have developed independently among the two races. Against any such assumption there is strong evidence in the fact that a knowledge of the deluge can be proved to be only late in entering the O. T. literature. But, beyond this, with the list of parallel expressions before one, it is only with difficulty that one can think of a connection so far apart as that between the shoots of the same tradition, which has developed independently among two races separated ever since the very earliest period of history. But it is just as doubtful whether one should thrust forward the date when the account was borrowed to the times of the Exile: at this period the Israelites were but little disposed to take over religious traditions from their oppressors. It is more probable to assume that the borrowing took place in the time of the kings, when the relations between the Israelite kingdoms and Assyria and Babylonia were frequent and far from entirely hostile.

Much has still to be investigated in connection with these and kindred questions. When the noise which the first discoveries produced had ceased, Chaldæan Genesis appeared to many only a fraud, because they found in it only difficult problems instead of the promise of brilliant results. But now it is recognised that these problems have a value of their own, and that the labour bestowed upon them is not entirely without reward.

"ANTIQUA MATER."*

THERE is a new school of criticism and of theological enquiry, which has appeared within recent years on the continent, and which has just found a champion in our own land. This school, whose tendency and method have been represented in Germany by Bruno Bauer, and in Holland by Loman, Pierson, and Naber, has found a representative in England in the anonymous author of "Antiqua Mater." He propounds as the question of his work "what may we learn—apart from the books of the New Testament —from the old Christian and the Græco-Roman literature of the second century, in respect to the origin and the earliest development of Christianity?" (p. ix.) The answer which this question receives at his hands is (to put it concisely) that the Gnostics, the eclectic religious philosophers of the second century A.D., whose doctrine included Jewish, Greek, Egyptian, and other elements, were the real founders of Christianity; the New Testament writings and the literary monuments of early Christianity are due to the redactors, interpolators, and literary hacks of this movement; that Jesus and Paul are in no sense historical figures, but only the creations of poetic imagination and dogmatic tradition; consequently the founders of a higher religious faith were not men, who lived and worked and suffered among men but the pedant and scholar, the literary interpolator and the fashioner of popular legends, and the "Antiqua Mater" of the Church and its claims is tradition, that rolling ball, which ever gathers as it goes.

It is not necessary here to go at length into the positions and conclusions of "Antiqua Mater;" a few instances will suffice.

First of all, the documents of the New Testament itself are here treated as quite outside the pale of evidence. If one professes to treat the rise of Christianity as a subject for critical and historical study, one must fairly face the New Testament itself and show how far it contains matter for history. To ignore it altogether is as dogmatic and unscientific as the old dogmatic position which sets it up above and beyond all criticism.

The precarious conclusions of "Antiqua Mater" may be conceived when it is told that the references to the persecution of the Christians under Nero and Trajan in Tacitus and Suetonius are explained as late insertions in the Roman historians, and the famous correspondence between Pliny and Trajan as framed by "a romancer of moderate genius" (p. 30).

From the point of view of this book it is of course very necessary to be able to explain the origin of the names *Christus* and *Christians*. If there was no such person as Jesus, worshipped as the Christ, how did the names *Christ* and *Christian* arise? This is explained through the Greek words το χρηστον, χρηστος, *i.e.*, (the noble, good), which were in the latter half of the second century connected with the *unction* of Christians, or with the Jewish Messiah! (p. 19.) But even after this clever explanation, the author has to admit it is

* *Antiqua Mater: A Study of Christian Origins.* London: Trübner & Co., 1887.

"an enigma why Marcion and the Gnostics should have adopted the name Christus at all" (p. 228).

There is another point in this book which must not be overlooked. "Antiqua Mater" quotes very often and very approvingly from Dr. Harnack's "Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte." The aim of that book is to show that Christianity was a history, a faith, a practical life, long before it became a dogmatic theory. The author of "Antiqua Mater" accepts Dr. Harnack's evidence as to the late rise of dogma, and then proceeds to argue, if the dogma only arose so late, therefore there is very late evidence for the historical basis of the Christian faith. This is at least his general tendency. It is impossible to conceive a worse travesty of Dr. Harnack's position. We advise the author of "Antiqua Mater" to read Dr. Harnack's criticism of Pierson and Naber's "Verisimilia" in the "Theologische Literaturzeitung" (1887, No. 10 s., 218 f.) In leaving this book which though so unsound and unbalanced is yet learned and interesting, we may quote words which Prof. Holtzman, perhaps the foremost of New Testament critics, used not long ago in a conversation with us: talking of the progress of scientific and earnest study of the New Testament, he said, "Though you are very slow and conservative in England, there is more reason to congratulate you than our neighbours the Dutch; you advance slowly but steadily and surely, and you are not likely to be upset by such writings as those of Pierson and Loman in Holland; the look-out is bright for you."

It is to be hoped that English scholars and critics will not follow in the lead of "Antiqua Mater;" it is certain that, if they do, a scientific love of truth, and a liberal view of the Christian history and religion will only be made more difficult and more distant than it was before.

THE CHRIST OF A FREE CHRISTIAN.

[The writer of "What think ye of Christ?" (Selected Papers, No. 3, pp. 72-84) desires in this paper to state what he holds to be the full meaning of the concise statement previously made by him, in Biblical language (p. 83), in answer to the question which he then put to himself and his readers.]

THE Christ of a Free Christian is the Christ, revealed to the faith of one, who strives to come as near as may be to the Christ of history and the Christ of the Apostles, and who, unwilling to submit to the dictation of any Church, council, or creed, believes that the answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ?" must be found (at least, for himself) in the study of the Scriptures, in understanding as much as he can of the whole of Christianity, by patience and prayer, and through the testimony of the Holy Spirit with his own spirit. If Christianity is to produce for this day all the fruits it has produced for a day that is gone, Christ must be in this day as nobly conceived and as truly believed as in the past. If the Christianity that is coming is to do greater things than those which the old Christianity has wrought, Christ must be more nobly conceived and more truly believed than in past times. It is for the present age to decide whether this shall now begin to be or not. The writer of these pages is not ashamed to own his great faith in the determining power of our highest religious and metaphysical thoughts, and he must confess to have speculated on the *close* connection (as it seemed to him) between Church doctrines (even its Christological doctrine) with the failure of the Church to affect certain natures and effect certain ends. He therefore looks upon it as a matter of supreme importance *what* he believes concerning the Saviour, and he is persuaded that he will have obtained something, if he can but induce others to connect their thought and life more closely with their belief concerning Jesus Christ.

"Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ promised by God through the prophets, the Son of Man, the only-begotten Son of God, the eternal Word become flesh, the Great Prophet, the one High Priest for ever, who put away sin by sacrifice of Himself, who rose from the dead, and by whom came also the resurrection of the dead, the King of the Kingdom of Heaven, whose Body is the Church, whose Spirit is the possession of all Christians." (See Selected Papers, No. 3, p. 83). Taking the various members of this statement in order, it will be well to develop what their full and real meaning should be to a Free Christian of the day.

"*Jesus of Nazareth.*" That there was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth is an assertion which only very few have ever attempted to doubt. It is true that a few thinkers and scholars do exist who deny all the historical evidence which declares that Jesus of Nazareth lived and died, and a well-known Dutch theologian seems to hold that Christianity can exist even without the belief that there ever was a Jesus of Nazareth; yet it may be said to be indubitable that Jesus of Nazareth lived, and that He allowed

men—at least, towards the end of His life on earth—to believe that He was the Messiah expected by the Jews.

"*The Christ promised by God through His prophets.*" It is possible to hold, as Jews have always done, that though Jesus came forward as the Messiah, He had no true claim to that title, and was, in fact, an impostor. The Christian belief must ever be that the deepest spiritual and religious longings and desires, especially those expressed by the prophets of Israel, who mark the highest level ever reached by pre-Christian religion, were fulfilled, as the Divine Providence intended them to be, by Jesus of Nazareth. That Jesus believed the God of the Old Testament to be His God, that the Old Testament leads up to the expectation of a more perfect revelation of God, and that Jesus answers this expectation, these are the reasons why the sacred writings of the Jews are sacred also to the Christians. Some may have felt, as the writer formerly did, that Christianity had its own literature, that the Old Testament was not Christian, and could not be as sacred as the New; the Divine mission of Christ, however, is only understood when it is perceived how He fulfils the highest and holiest religion which went before Him: and the sacred literature of the New Testament is only understood when it is compared and illustrated with the Old.

The mode in which God promised a Messiah (or Christ) through His prophets was essentially spiritual, not by revealing supernaturally the manner of His birth, the nature of His person and work, but by preparing the heart of His chosen people to receive the Christian revelation. Isaiah believed that the Messiah would be one of the royal house of David, and would rule as a great earthly King: in the former of these beliefs he was most likely mistaken; in the latter he was most certainly; yet the religious and spiritual element (as distinct from the political and material) in Isaiah's promise was perfectly fulfilled by Jesus as the Christ.

It is of fundamental importance to conceive this position aright, as it explains many others. If Jesus is the Christ promised by God through the prophets, then it is only by a rude break with the prophetic idea of God and His Messiah that the Christ can be conceived as a Divine Person, "equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead." It is strange that two such mutually antagonistic conceptions of God as the one Allah of Islam and the Trinity of Catholicism should be traceable back to the Jewish idea of Deity, and it makes one ask, Is the Theistic idea in Messianic prophecy reconcileable with the ecclesiastical dogma of the Trinity? Is not Islam in respect of its formal statement concerning God nearer the Hebrew prophets than the Catholic Church?

Another question which may be answered in the light of Jesus as the promised Christ is that concerning the sinlessness of the Saviour. To many this question is of profound moment: many earnest seekers after God torture themselves by arguing, "If Jesus was perfectly sinless, my path is clear, but of this I cannot be sure; who will assure me?" The fact is that Jesus is to men the

Christ; and, as far as His history shows, Jesus, in taking to Himself the Messianic hope of His people, purified and deepened it spiritually, overcame all the temptations to which it exposed Him, suffered in perfect obedience the trials and death which it brought upon Him, and left to His disciples a perfect model of holy living. As Messiah, the life of Jesus was free from all error and sin: and it is as Messiah that men must know Him. To enquire whether Jesus of Nazareth ever sinned is a question which there is no evidence for answering either way. It is a question which is (except to Catholic theology) as idle and senseless as the question why Jesus was never married. That Jesus of Nazareth was, as a man, subject to human conditions is certain: that He ever really committed one actual sin there is no means or method to prove or disprove.

It should be noticed here that much of the materialized Christianity which has become popular with superstitious and unspiritual minds, the questions as to the "approaching end of the age," and the "pre-millennial or post-millennial advent," &c., are traceable, like much of ecclesiastical and popular Christology, to the material and passing elements of the Messianic belief of the Jews. When Protestantism is completely free from the bondage of the letter, and true to the spirit of Christ, these questions will be passed out of thought and be remembered only as theological curiosities.

"*The Son of Man.*" In this phrase are summed up two main positions (1) that Jesus was a true man, and (2) that Jesus is the model, type, and original for all mankind. In that Jesus was fully and truly man, His earthly life must be conceived as subject to the same laws and conditions, weaknesses and struggles, modes of learning and growing, both spiritually and physically, as other men: nothing less than a complete human nature is conceivable, if we are to make Him the pattern of our lives. Again, in that Jesus is the type and original for all mankind, He must be held to have perfectly realized the will of God in His own life, and to show to all men for all time the way in which they may in like manner realize the will of God in their lives.

"*The only-begotten Son of God.*" As Son of God, Jesus is recognised as possessing in a supreme degree the confidence of God and trust in God, the filial love and paternal regard, which are proper to the relationship between father and son: as Son of God He is full of that love for man, which is God's own nature: and as Son of God His life is full of mastery over the powers of the world and sin, which might subdue Him physically, but could not alter spiritually His obedience or His love.

As the *only-begotten* Son of God, the Christ must be held to be the only human being who can be called the Son of God, and the divinely-ordained minister of the full and perfect salvation, whose nature and life are only explicable by referring them to a unique and unparalleled act of Providence.

"*The eternal Word become flesh.*" The Word of God has been conceived as a divine existence apart from God, and also as a supreme

act of Divine revelation. But the truth lies between these extremes: the Word is that aspect of the Deity, in which He creates and imparts grace and truth (John i. 17), is (in a word) the Love which is made known to, and shared by, man. This Word is eternal, in that the ultimate ground of all creation and all redemption—the work of the Word—lies in the essential nature of God, and therefore beyond all conditions of time.

But Christ is the eternal Word become flesh; by this is meant that He was not only enlightened by the word in the same way as, but in a more full measure than, all prophets and men of God, but was from everlasting determined by the will and plan of God to reveal to the uttermost that man can comprehend, His love, His grace and truth.

That the Providence, which has ordered and sustained creation, has ordered and brought it to pass that Jesus Christ should, in His own person, reveal the fulness of the Divine Word, this is the whole truth of the Incarnation, or the Word become flesh. Ecclesiastical development, with striking negligence of the real kernel of the truth, and in radical antagonism to the teaching of the Scriptures, has offered, instead of a simple biblical and spiritual truth, a metaphysical and historical absurdity; for its doctrine of the Incarnation, with its teachings concerning the exact kind of individual pre-existence of the Saviour and the Virgin birth, is nothing less than scientifically unwarranted and religiously unsound. To neglect the great fact of Christ's work as the highest fact of a great system of Providence and to offer instead a certain philosophical notion concerning the pre-existence and appearance of Christ, which in reality separates Christ from all Nature and Providence in the world, has been the course adopted, resulting in the conflict between reason and faith.

Here may be alluded to a question which must have troubled many concerning the pre-existence of Christ. The pre-existence attributed to Christ, not only by the later writings of the New Testament but also by the very earliest, the Pauline epistles, was long ago a stumbling-block to the writer, but has now become one of those matters which are complacently acknowledged and historically understood. The pre-existence of Christ is undoubtedly a fact when it is considered that Christ existed from the foundation of the world in the will and plan of God, but when it has to be further defined it is necessary to know what is the origin of human souls, what pre-existence, if any, they have had, and whether Christ's spirit and soul had or needed more or different pre-existence than the souls of other men; when these questions are finally answered then it will be more possible to define the nature of the pre-existence of Christ; till then, that God's eternal Providence was the ground of Christ's pre-existence is all that can be absolutely asserted.

"*The Great Prophet.*" Christ is the great Prophet, because He is the great moral teacher for all time, not only by His actual words and recorded life, but even more by the spirit which flows from Him, and is, with all His followers, leading them into all

truth. The profound and wonderful consciousness of God and will to obey God which was in Christ, may be showed in greater or less degree by His disciples, and the teaching of Jesus is none the less universal in application because it was formulated by Him in antagonism to Judaism and for few and feeble followers; for that spirit which was expressed thus for that time lives on, and must be re-expressed again and again through all time.

An example may show how Christ, in the working of His spirit, is to be considered the Great Prophet: very few—if any at all—of those who take an historical rather than an ecclesiastical view of Christianity hold the words put into Christ's mouth in the Gospel of John to have been ever actually uttered by Him; they represent what Christ had become to the Church of the early second century. But are they less inspired or valuable on this account? Far from it; they show how the consciousness of Christ's union in will and work with God had increased in the Church, and are thus really more valuable than had Christ actually spoken them Himself: they show that their writer had attained a more deeply spiritual and independent position than even Paul had reached before him, and are thus more authoritative for the true development of Christianity than if they had come from the early apostolic age. Just in the same way the spirit of Christ may speak in Christ's disciples to-day, and may reveal more than has ever been revealed before, or may apply what has been revealed so that it appears a new and fresh revelation—new words of Christ, new work which He does for men.

"*The one High Priest, who put away sin by sacrifice of Himself.*" The High Priestly office of Christ is most important for the individual Christian, and especially for the individual Protestant. For if Christ is the one High Priest, no human, or even heavenly, person can claim any priestly position or right to atone man with God. Christ as High Priest made a sacrifice of Himself; He sacrificed Himself to satisfy the will and plan of God. The sacrifice of Christ has been viewed (ever since Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo?*) as a sacrifice to Divine justice, or to Divine wrath. This view is close akin in its gross anthropomorphism to Origen's view that the sacrifice of Christ was a debt paid to the devil! Christ Himself never recognises His death as an offering to appease Divine Justice, but often as a satisfaction to the Father's will. In this sense—as satisfying the will of God—the death of Christ atones for the sins of the whole world, for it both points the way in which all sin must be overcome, by perfect submission to the Divine will, and may be appropriated and made our own according as we put our faith in Christ and make His life ours. It is often discussed whether the sacrifice of Christ was a sacrifice involving substitution; whether Christ suffered instead of man. The answer must be that the *suffering* was substituted. The *punishment* was not. The sins of man compelled Christ to suffer, but they could never compel Christ to be punished. This is strictly in accord with a supreme natural and moral law, by which the race suffers for the sins of the individual, and in the recognition of which lies the only hope of social and moral

progress. The highest instance of this law is in the highest sphere: the regions where Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world, in that, sinless Himself, He felt more than any other mortal the sins of the world and suffered for them, while at the same time fulfilling the Father's will in His own life, He has opened the way by which men, partaking through faith on Him of His righteousness and the sacrifice He made of Himself to God's will, may enter into the perfect salvation of God.

"*Who rose from the dead, and by Whom came also the resurrection of the dead.*" The fact of the resurrection is essential to Christianity, the form of the resurrection is not. Christianity without a hope for the future life must ultimately become a barren Rationalism or an inconsistent Positivism. Historical criticism and a more spiritual understanding of the resurrection have made the religious truth and content of this doctrine more clear and more easy than the old traditionalism could ever do. The form in which Free Christians will hold the doctrine, is that of a spiritual resurrection, which is the form to which Paul in 1 Cor. xv. holds when he speaks of a spiritual body, *i.e.*, the Spirit of Christ rose from the dead and was manifested in visions to His disciples; this is the natural interpretation of the first account of the resurrection, that of Paul. In the Gospels the difficulties, historical and critical, which arise in each account taken separately, and are still stronger when the four Gospels are taken together, can only be explained by supposing that they are the legendary accounts of a later generation giving a partly material, partly poetical form to phenomena, which it did not sufficiently comprehend. Two of the most certain of and unanimous contentions of biblical criticism are that the Gospel of Mark is the earliest of the four Gospels, and that the last 13 verses of Mark are a later addition, dating from well on in the second century. This is a most important admission for understanding the resurrection: for the fact that the earliest of the Gospels now contains no account of the resurrection suggests as an easy explanation that the account it once contained was inconsistent with other narratives, and when the various accounts were brought together this section of Mark was suppressed, and supplanted by another paragraph written for the purpose, with the Gospel of Luke and the Acts and probably the Gospels of Matthew and John serving as literary sources.* Be this view of the critical question right or wrong, there is a stronger reason for believing that the resurrection of Christ was a resurrection not of His flesh but of His spirit; this is, that if the resurrection of Christ be a resurrection of the flesh, the resurrection of the believer must be conceived to be a resurrection of the flesh also. For it cannot be doubted that the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection is that the believer is to share the resurrection of Christ (see especially Rom. vi. 5, and 1 John iii. 2; see also Col. iii. 4, Phil. iii. 20*ff*, &c.) But the resurrection of the believer was not conceived as a resurrection of the flesh, which doctrine appears for the first time in Tertullian († 227 A.D.) though

* See references given in the margin of the Revised Version of Mark xvi. 9*ff*, in support of the view that these verses are dependent for their origin on the other Gospels and the Acts.

it afterwards became an *articulus fidei* in the Catholic Church. The primitive doctrine then was that the believer shared the same resurrection as Christ; and since the believer's resurrection was not originally a resurrection of the flesh, but rather of the spirit, therefore the resurrection of Christ was originally regarded, and must be viewed by the Free Christians to-day, as a resurrection of the spirit only.

By the resurrection of Jesus, and the belief that by Him also came the resurrection from the dead, the Free Christian will believe that Christ died, and His body returned "Dust to dust and ashes to ashes," but the spirit appeared to the disciples as an apparition or in a vision, and that Christ's spirit, *i.e.*, the vital power and strength to will and to do which were in Him, remained with His disciples, was manifested to His earliest disciples in peculiar clearness and certainty, and is ever with the Church or company of Christian believers who call upon His name. This is the witness of the spirit, and assures man *religiously* of a future life. Philosophical arguments in favour of a future state, like the arguments for the existence of God, may be formally perfect, but they only convince and inspire the soul with active zeal, when they are driven home by religious faith, or when they are revealed as religious truths and as having practical importance and enduring authority. In that Christ rose from the dead, and His spirit is with us to this day, Christ assures us of our resurrection, since we may be united with Him in the bonds of our faith.

"*The King of the Kingdom of Heaven.*" The mission of the Messiah was to found the Kingdom of Heaven; and as its Founder, He is its King; but not only as Founder, but as the perfect model of Christian life in showing perfect obedience to the Father's will, He is first in the Kingdom, its King: and yet again, in that the Spirit of Christ is the ruling power and active force in all Christian life, whether social or individual, Christ is the King of the Kingdom of Heaven.

And here a question may be faced, which has to many appeared the one question of Christianity—are we to worship Christ? Now as long as the conception of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of Christ its King, is borne in mind, all glory, praise, and honour must be given to our King. But is this worship? It must be, if all true heart and soul service is worship,—and such service is what we bring to Christ; we must pray to Christ, and invoke God in His name. Scriptural precedent, natural impulse, and speculating reason all demand this. But while we worship Christ as our King and Lord, we must not confound Him with God the Father—this is both un-Scriptural and anti-Scriptural. A most pregnant and oft-forgotten passage seems to show exactly what our worship to Christ must be: "And when all things have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subjected to Him that did subject all things unto Him that God may be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28). Paul here concludes one of his most inspired passages by picturing a time when Christ Himself, the Lord of Glory, shall be subjected and when God shall be all in all! [To reconcile such a passage

with the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity might be taken as the height of impossibility.] Here we see how Paul, though he worshipped Christ, did not worship Him as God, but as the revelation of God and the great servant of God. Let us also worship Christ in this way.

"*Whose Body is the Church, Whose Spirit is the possession of all Christians.*" The risen "Lord is that Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 17) which inspires all believers, the Church, the whole company of Christians, throughout all time, and who individually must possess His Spirit and its witness, or they are none of His (Rom. viii. 9). Perhaps there is no point in which the doctrine and faith of the primitive Church is more distant from the generally accepted view of later Christianity than this: for the early Christians were conscious of each possessing the Spirit, while the Catholic Church confines the Spirit's working to the sacraments or the clergy, and Protestantism has gone perilously near confining it to the inspiration of Scripture. No Christian can live and walk in Christ's footsteps except he has the consciousness of possessing Christ's spirit working in it. It is this possession which brings him at once into fellowship with the Saviour and into the Holy of Holies of God's presence. The present day is one which has asserted and proved the reign of law in all (or nearly all) the regions where thought can enter, and the long series of cause and effect thus opened makes man feel a mere link in a long chain, far away both from God, his origin, and God, his end; but the consciousness of possessing the Spirit of Christ, of working with that power, which is not ourselves, and yet within us, which is within us and yet more without us, which was perfectly manifested in Jesus Christ, and may one day be perfectly manifested in us, which is inspiring all believers in this world and the world where time and space are exchanged for eternity and infinity—it is the consciousness of having this spirit, which, though it work through the natural means which Providence has ordered, still ever bears with it the conviction of Divine presence and Divine power. It is this which is the inalienable birthright of every Christian, and which should, and eventually shall, unite all mankind together in the Kingdom of Christ the King. This is Christ's spirit, and if we live ever with it as ours, we know Christ as our Saviour.

NOTES ON PFLEIDERER'S SYNOPTIK.*

MARK, or Urmarcus, is the original Gospel. Its author used the logia collected probably by the Apostle Matthew. [As to when it was written, Pfleiderer made no distinct statement.] It was written by a Paulinist, who repeatedly insists on the want of intelligence in the *Urapostel*, and interprets the tradition of Jesus in in the interest and spirit of Paul.

The second in the order of time is the third Gospel, the author of which wrote the Acts of the Apostles, using for the latter the travelling record of a companion of Paul, who might be Luke. This Gospel belongs to the time of Justin Martyr († 166 A.D.) It is also Pauline; and while more unreservedly in favour of Gentile Christianity is marked by a mediating tendency. Elements offensive to Jewish Christians, *e.g.*, Christ's denunciation of Peter with Ὑπαγε Σατανᾶ are omitted.

At the close of the second century—(at another time Pfleiderer said in the third or fourth decade of the second century)—about the time of the rise of the Montanists was written our first canonical Gospel, from Mark, certain sources of Luke, and other sources. Its tendency is Jewish Christian; it upholds the validity of the Law, but throws the emphasis on its moral requirements. It wages a polemic protest against the anti-legalists (ἀνομοι ἀνομια), and while not excluding Paul from the Kingdom of Heaven, distinctly assigns him the lowest place (Matt. v. 19). The doom, "he shall be called ἐλαχιστος in the Kingdom of Heaven," has unmistakable reference to the title Paul gave himself—1 Cor. xv. 9—ὁ ἐλαχιστος των ἀποστολων. This author alone gives the glorification of Peter, who is made foundation-stone of the Church, and endowed with binding and loosing power.

STORIES OF BIRTH AND GENEALOGY.

The stories in Luke and Matthew respecting the birth and childhood of Jesus are not historical: cannot be combined: have their source in Old Testament prophecies: are the product of the poetic and mythic faculty, and have only ideal worth.

The story of the birth in Bethlehem is explained by the dogmatic desire to prove that Jesus was not born in Nazareth. Κυρηνιος was not Governor until six or seven years after Jesus' birth, which occurred in the time of Herod the Great. Under the early emperors census was taken only of provinces, and not of the whole empire. Furthermore, Roman law, unlike the Jewish law, did not require the presence of the wife at the census.

* Selections from the note-book of a student who attended Prof. Pfleiderer's *Erklärung der synoptischen Evangelien* at Berlin University, Summer Session, 1886. The *Passionsgeschichte*, his treatment of which the Professor regarded as the most important part of the course, was dealt with after the student's departure.

[It is hoped that these notes of Lectures by Dr. Pfleiderer will prove interesting; they mark the union of the *tendenz-kritik* of F. C. Baur with the purely literary criticism of Holtzmann, Weiss, and Abbott. Whether this union will be productive of permanent results may be doubted by some; but most will admit that it can solve some considerable difficulties. It must be remembered by readers that this paper is only a summary of bare results.—EDITOR.]

That mother and brethren later thought Jesus was beside Himself (Mark iii. 21) proves that Mary had received no annunciation from the Angel.

The genealogy in Matthew is built up on the dogmatic theory that between Abraham and David, David and the Exile, the Exile and Jesus fourteen (7×2) generations found place.

Luke's genealogy is universalistic, going back to Adam, as Matthew's is Jewish Christian, going back only to Abraham; in both the sacred number seven plays a part. Both are constructed on the supposition that Jesus was son of Joseph.

The original tradition of both Luke and Matthew's birth-story may be the statement that Jesus was blessed from His mother's womb by the Holy Spirit (*cf.* Jer. i. 3 and 4). The same story of a Divine fatherhood is told of Plato, Alexander, Pythagoras, and Buddha, although it did not arise so early in their case as in Christ's.

If a prophecy could be found which could explain a report, that report was forthwith accepted as fact.

The Star in Matthew cannot be explained astronomically: has its source in Balaam's prophecy. The Messiah was expected to furnish a sign from heaven; and Matthew furnishes it for Him. Hosea's "Out of Egypt have I called My Son," was probably referred to the Messiah by the Rabbis: Jesus not being in Egypt in later life is sent there by the Evangelist in His infancy.

The narrative of the Slaughter of the Innocents is probably due to the prophecy in Jeremiah xxxi. 50. The grave of Rachel is said to be near Bethlehem: whence the localization of the prophecy and narrative.

"He shall be called a Nazarene" refers not to Nazar*ite*, but to נצר (Isa. ix. 1), the rod out of the stem of Jesse.

The Vision at the Baptism, as recorded in Mark, is quite conceivable as a subjective vision; in Luke becomes quite objective, excepting the voice, which is for Jesus alone; in Matthew John is made to recognise Jesus' greatness—an idea quite incompatible with his later embassy, "Art thou He that should come?"—and to hesitate in administering to Him baptism. So the narrative grows with the Christology.

The temptations in the Wilderness have their parallel in stories of Buddha, and are purely Saga of the Church. They represent in gross picture form the spiritual allurements which must have beset Jesus.

Luke v. 1-11 is simply a symbolical expansion of the metaphor "fishers of men." The "Launch out into the deep" is an authorization in symbol of the Mission to the Gentiles.

"MIRACLES" OF HEALING.

The demoniacs were persons suffering from a disease of the nerves. In such cases there frequently occurs a disruption of consciousness, which leads the patient to imagine himself two persons. This was set down in the popular psychology as possession by a

demon ; and Jesus accepted the ordinary view. The influence of a commanding personality upon such patients is very great and very observable. Consequently the narratives of healing these "demoniacs" are quite historical. The course in such cases, as verified by frequent modern experience, is: the impression of the words and look of the healing person ; a crisis in the condition of the patient ; cramp ; an inarticulate cry ; quiet and restoration.

The story of the healing of Peter's wife's mother bears all the marks of historicity. Healing by physical contact is very common with men who are specially endowed.

The narrative of the healing of the sick of the palsy (Mark ii., 1-12) "has every sign of historicity." On such diseases a commanding personality has great influence. It is a question whether the power which Jesus possessed was not also magnetic.

In cases where healing is said to have taken place by a mere word and without physical contact, we must be very cautious. There are many instances proved of healing in certain diseases by magnetic power carried some distance. We cannot doubt the possibility of such cures as that of the Syrophenician's daughter.

The case of healing through power proceeding from Jesus (Luke vi. 19 ; Mark v. 30) is undoubtedly a historical fact. This power proceeding from the nerves is not yet investigated by science, but it is a fact of experience. There is a magnetic or hidden power, possessed only by extraordinary men, a material power which hangs together with the spiritual power of personality—which goes out and heals.

It is quite possible and non-magical for the healing power to be transferred (as in Mark vii. 31-37) in the spittle.

"SON OF MAN."

Pfleiderer gave no distinct definition of the meaning of the "Son of Man." We first turn, he said, to Ezekiel, where the word is very frequently used : there it signifies the human instrument of God's word of punishment or salvation. In Daniel vii. 13, "Son of Man" symbolised the Kingdom of God in contrast to the beast-like empires which preceded it. The phrase has Messianic import in the book of Henoch, but perhaps that book is post-Christian. It is uncertain whether it was used as term for the Messiah in the time of Jesus. He used it regularly, yet would not allow His Messianity to be announced. Perhaps Jesus used it in the sense of Ezekiel, as meaning the prophet, the human instrument of God. Perhaps after the prediction of His sufferings He used it to denote the Heavenly Ruler of Daniel. The phrase (Son of Man) occurs in Mark only twice before the prediction of passion : and these instances may be a reading back of the usage that first followed the prediction. Subsequently where the title has a Messianic meaning, it always relates to the exalted Jesus. The disciples have made it the chief title of Jesus for Himself, especially Matthew and John, the latest Gospels.

THE PARABLES.

In dealing with the parables Pfleiderer lays down as canon : that

the original parables of Jesus illustrate *one* truth, which is the *point* of the parable; all else in the parable belongs to the picture as distinguished from the principle; and wherever the parable has passed into the allegory, there we see the manipulation of later hands. To state his account of the parable more fully:—The παραβολη discovers in a process of natural life a spiritual meaning. It is an expansion of the metaphor. A metaphor is the expression of a single *Begriff* by an image: a parable deals not only with one *Begriff*, but with a complete *Gedanke: ein Vorgang oder Gesetz des geistlichen Lebens.* The story as a whole is to be taken quite literally and naturally; and in its unity is the expression of *ein einheitlicher Gedanke.* When the details are taken figuratively the parable becomes an allegory: the clear direct thought of Jesus becomes veiled in the interpretation of the early Church.

With Weiss and Keim, Pfleiderer holds that in Jesus' early ministry, while He was still enjoying the applause of the people and the approval of God, there was no thought in Him of the tragic end. Hence the reference to the removal of the Bridegroom in Mark ii. 20, is not from Jesus.

The new cloth upon the old is either the later rigorism of the Pharisee upon the earlier simplicity of Israelitish religion; or the new customs of Jesus' disciples upon the old-fashioned texture of the Baptist's disciples' life.

The parable of new wine in old bottles gives a deep glimpse into the heart of Jesus; reveals the consciousness that He brought a new spirit which could not be put into the old religious forms.

"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," is a saying which, because neither dogmatic like Paul, nor ritualistic like the Jewish Christians, but an appeal to natural moral feeling, are genuine words of Jesus. Paul never argued from the natural moral feeling of man for the removal of the law.

The prophecy in Isaiah xlii. 1*ff.*, referred to the ideal Israel, not directly to the Messiah, nor to a single person; but it rightly applied to Jesus in Matt. xii. 17, for Jesus was the ideal Israel in personal form. He did not work like a demagogue nor like an agitator among the people. He gains universal empire through His care for individuals, for the broken and the suffering.

THE "TWELVE" APOSTLES.

Judas Iscariot (man of Kerioth), was the only Jew amongst them; the rest were all Galileans. Perhaps Philip in the Acts of the Apostles is the same as the Apostle of that name: perhaps his work as deacon and evangelist led him to be put amongst the Apostles. Schleiermacher and Volkmar have held that the number 12 was not chosen by Christ, but by the later Church; yet perhaps this is too bold. Still, it is singular that the passage in 1 Cor. xv. 15, in which Paul speaks of "the Twelve" is not free from suspicion: for Paul goes on later to speak of "all the apostles," as though he had not mentioned "the Twelve."

Immediately after the election of the Apostles, Mark, and Mark alone (thus indicating his priority) recounts Jesus' breach with His

family, as well as with the authorities of His people. The later evangelists omit the family breach as being inconsistent with the stories of His birth. In reporting Jesus' words as to the unpardonable sin, Mark makes no distinction as Matthew does, between the Holy Spirit and the Son of Man. The blasphemy was to identify the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Son of Man as diabolical. This showed the final hardening of heart.

When Jesus refused to heed the call of His mother and brethren and declared that His only kinship was with those who did His father's will, He overthrew the whole distinction between Jew and Gentile. Though not yet explicit, the truth was there: that the society which He founded was spiritual and not based on natural or particularistic basis.

The argument in Matt. xii. 27, and Luke xi. 19, is not cogent. That Jewish exorcists were not diabolic agents was no proof that Jesus was not. This want of cogency, and the fact that Mark has not this argument, reveal an interpolation and no genuine saying of Jesus. That Matthew used here the phrase "Kingdom of God" instead of his customary "Kingdom of Heaven," shows that he follows Luke.

PROGRAMME SPEECHES OF JESUS.

The three synoptists agree in putting a programme speech (manifesto) in the mouth of Jesus. Mark's is a Sermon on the Boat (Mark iv.); Luke's is a Sermon on the Plain (Luke vi. 17); both after calling His disciples; Matthew's is a Sermon on the Mount.

Matthew gives what is, in this place, quite improbable as a discourse of Jesus.

The simpler form of Luke vi. 20 *ff.*, is nearer the original.

The fourfold beatitude and the fourfold denunciation, reported in Luke, are to be taken literally, as referring to the really poor, the really hungry, not the spiritually so. Jesus addresses His disciples (in second person) as the bearers of poverty, the O.T. עני. Matthew changing the person into the third is bound to limit the application to the spiritually poor and hungry. But not so in the original words of Jesus. He denounced the really rich and the really pleasure loving, not the spiritually so, and sought to comfort the poor. Here we see Jesus' benevolence to the poor.

Jesus held the view of the Baptist that there was a new order coming in with the Kingdom of God. There should be a community of men, in which the hungry should hunger no more, and the half-clad be clothed. This was a standing thought of the old prophets. It was a cardinal idea of Jesus regarding the Kingdom of God: so he said, "Seek first the Kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you." He laid great emphasis on this social reform and amenity. Jesus was no establisher of a *Social-Democratie* it is true, but He was a friend of the poor, a People's Friend in the best sense. He aimed to realise all that was noblest in the social-democratic ideal. He sought to prepare men in their inner life for the coming of the Kingdom of God: then there would be a Divine interposition, a new order let down from Heaven, in which

all should come to their rights. This view of Jesus' mission has been overlooked by the Germans in their transcendent theology, but has been laid hold of by the French—notably Renan.

The fourth beatitude is not original but added later, because of the persecutions of the Church. It reveals the hope—no longer earthly but heavenly—of the Paulinists in the beginning of the second century.

The principle of the hyperbolical commands (Luke vi. 29, 30) is given in Rom. xii. 21. "Overcome evil with good." Treat every wrong-doer as though he had wronged another and not you. Exclude all personal passion. Cultivate a serene objectivity.

εἶναι υἱοι Ὑψιστου means *Gottähnlichkeit in Sittlichkeit*; moral likeness to God.

Between vv. 36 and 37 in Luke vi., Matthew inserts chap. vi. But Matt. vii. follows rightly on Matt. v. Upon benevolence in action comes benevolence in judgment.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

found in Matthew is, as even Calvin recognised, the Evangelist's own compilation of many different speeches of Jesus.

The time was not that of Matthew. For the disciples were not called until chap. x. Jesus spoke of Himself as Messiah, as He did not (according to Mark) until much later. He defended Himself against misunderstanding impossible until later. He spoke of false prophets—a saying without pretext until later.

Nor was the place. Nor order.

Here, as in Thucydides and Livy, as also in the great speeches of the 4th Gospel and in the Acts, the speech is the work of the author. Why should the general literary custom not be followed in Holy Writ? The sources of the Sermon were the *Logia*.

The mountain is deliberately chosen in contrast to Moses' Mount of Legislation. Luke tells us it was a plain.

The beatitudes in Matthew are said generally to be seven. If "Blessed are" are the decisive words, there are nine, three times three; and the three original beatitudes of Luke and Matthew expand to nine. Some try to make out ten beatitudes, to answer the Ten Commandments.

Matt. v. 17-20, contains the key to Matthew's general position. It is hard to understand these words as words of Jesus. Whence could have come the suspicion that He disregarded the law? Most probably here the Jewish Christian author puts into the mouth of Jesus his own objection to Paul. The antithesis is twofold against Paul who would hold only to the inner meaning of the law, and against the Pharisees who emphasised the external alone. So Matt. xxiii. 23 insists that the inner requirements ought to be done, and yet the other (outer) ought not to be left undone.

As a fact Jesus observed the Jewish law, and out of this *practice* the Jewish Christians deduce a binding prescript for the Church; just as Paul deduces freedom in regard to the Law from the *spirit* of Jesus. But Jesus never did insist on the fulfilment of the Law to jot and tittle (this phrase denotes literal and not ideal fulfilment), else He had condemned beforehand the whole development of

Christianity. Matthew's Jewish Christian standpoint appears again very clearly in vii. 21-23, wherein the hyper-Pauline, or Antinomians (ἀνομοι) are denounced.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

The shorter and simpler, and probably the more original form of the Lord's Prayer, occurs in Luke. Matthew expands and amplifies. Luke has five petitions; Matthew seven, of which the third is identical with the second, and the last was probably added as a comprehensive conclusory formula. "Father" was never found in prayer in the O.T. By the later Jews it was frequently used, as in Matthew, "Our Father who art in heaven." The liturgy of the Jewish Service, in part of the Introitus, ran "Glorified and sanctified be the name of the Lord in the world which He hath created for His good pleasure. His kingdom rule in us and in the house of Israel throughout the world." Paul and the Apocalypse know nothing of the Lord's prayer. It is evident that at first it was not in common use in the church.

In the last clause of the prayer there was no necessity to think of the Devil, but only of Moral Evil (*das Böse*).

The eye, which is the light of the body, denotes the inner voice of God, the rational sense (Vernunftsinn). Jesus held (in opposition to the Ritschlian and Socinian schools) that there was a Divine organ inborn in man, an organ for Divine revelation, which alone rendered possible the reception of an outward revelation. To exalt the Church and the spiritual revelation from the outside by denying the inner organ for it is like putting one's eye out in order to say we owe all the light to the outer world.

In Jesus' view of the world *ora* was more than *labora*.

THE PROGRAMME PARABLES.

Mark's programme speech consists (iv. 1-25) of a series of parables. The 4th Gospel is remarkable because it contains no παραβολη: it contains παροιμιαι, but the parable which is the chief form of teaching adopted by the synoptic Jesus is entirely wanting.

The statement of the purpose of the parables, given in Mark iv. 11 *ff.*, is totally incorrect. Jesus did not use these parables of His, so transparent, so suited to make known His proclamation of God, in order that the people might not understand them. Could anyone believe that Jesus, who loved the people, would use a form of teaching precisely in order to prevent their conversion? The τοις ἐξω indicates a late idea, sprung into existence when the Church was fully constituted and opposed to the world. The statement of the Evangelist arose out of the pessimistic temper which sprang up in the Church because of the Jews' rejection of the Gospel of Christ. Paul, in Rom. xi., declared that God had intended it in order to promote the spread of the Gospel. Mark took up the view of Paul and reads it into the thought of Christ. Generally Mark is right, but here he becomes quite unhistorical. Mark sympathised with Paul, and wished to explain the Jews' rejection of him. Further, the parables were no longer intelligible to the Evangelist. He regards them as a mystery, a secret doc-

trine which required a key and was open only to the initiated. But Jesus was no esoteric teacher of mysteries, nor was He an enemy to the people. He was a teacher of the people, who made vivid and real and intelligible the highest truth to all. In Mark iv. 33 we have the real purpose of the parables stated.

The disciples are represented over and over again as misunderstanding Jesus in the most impossible way. Not only the Jews but the Jewish Christians were objects of the Paulinistic pessimism. The explanation of the parable, Mark iv. 13*ff.*, is the Evangelist's and not Jesus'. The minute allegorization is a sign of later interpretation. All that Jesus meant was, the word of God is for all yet fructifies only in few, because the power of the word was hindered by the nonreceptivity of men's hearts.

The parable of the tares (Matt. xiii. 24-30) is a later expansion of the parable in Mark iv. 26-29, and contains a warning against rigoristic Church discipline. The servants who would clear the field are the Montanists. The sharp distinction between the children of the Kingdom of God and of the Devil accords with the dualistic conceptions of the second century, and of the Johannine writings. But there is much that is bad in the good and good in the bad. Jesus recognised there was soil even among thorns and stones; there was a possibility of good in all.

The three parables in Mark's programme supplement each other: (1) The various reception of the word; (2) The gradual growth of the Kingdom; (3) The unexpectedly great result of the process of development.

Matthew, in xiii., adds to these three and to the parable of the leaven from Luke three new ones, the treasure trove, the pearl of great price, and the net, thus making up his beloved number seven.

Matt. xiii. 52 is no word of Jesus, who never compared Himself to the Scribes—His opponents—but is a *Selbstapologie* of the evangelist, who knows that he adds here new parables which are not in the old tradition, but in other sources.

A SERIES OF "MIRACLES."

In regard to the stilling of the storm, and the healing of the man with the legion, there are historical reminiscences: the narrative is too vivid to be invented. The connection between the words of Jesus and the stilling of the storm as cause and effect is only subjective. Perhaps it was a *post hoc* which came to be *propter hoc*. The subjective illusion of possession by a legion of evil spirits was only an exaggerated instance of the ordinary self-diremption and dual consciousness of the mentally diseased. The picture of the demoniac is quite historical. Perhaps it was the shrieking of the man at the crisis of healing which drove the herd of swine in flight down into the sea. The number 2,000 corresponds to the number of the Roman legion on peace footing. But it is hard to say what were the events which really occurred.

The bloody flux of the woman in the crowd was due to a nervous disorder, and was quite naturally healed by the magnetic stream (accompanied by her faith) flowing from Jesus' garment. Την τουτο

ποιησασαν (Mark v. 32), shows that Jesus already knew the sex: a very fine trait in the narrator.

Mark's narrative of the raising of Jairus' daughter is perfectly natural. Matthew has exaggerated the story until it becomes impossible. But in Mark, the story gives us every reason to believe that the girl was in a swoon (Scheintod) or in a cataleptic fit (Starrkrampf). The girl was *in extremis* when the father came to Jesus. Mark has ἐσχατως ἐχει. Luke gives this a stronger turn, ἀπεθνησκεν. Matthew exaggerates to the extent that ἀρτι ἐτελευτησεν. The later news of her (supposed) death found in Mark and Luke, Matthew must omit. Matthew brings in flute players (αὐλητας) contrary to the custom of the East and the possibilities of the case, where the child was, say, only a quarter of an hour dead.

[Pfleiderer forgets that, according to Matthew, she was dead when the ruler left the house to seek Jesus.]

Jesus' words, ταλειθα κουμ, which were reported by Mark as having probably deeply impressed the witnesses, are left out in Luke and Matthew, being no longer intelligible. Mark says nothing about the spirit returning to the child: that is Luke's amplification. Mark adds the girl was 12 years old, not perhaps to show how she could walk, but to show that it was at a period of her physical development (Eastern women developing early) when the nerves are so affected as to produce such apparent death. In ordering her food, and commanding that no one should be told about the case, Jesus acted as any good physician would act in recommending food and quiet.

The story of raising the widow's son at the gate of Nain is of very questionable historicity. There is no mention of it in the other evangelists, and the inner improbability of a dead man rising from his bier is against it. On Jesus' visit to Nazareth Luke puts a reference to Elijah's visit to Zarepta, and to the healing of Naaman. As a parallel to the latter, Luke gives us the story of the healing of the centurion's servant; as parallel to the former he now makes Jesus raise a widow's son. This is an imitation of the prophet-narrative.

The softening of the distinctly human elements, and the emphasis on the divine observable in Matthew as compared with Mark, appears in Matt. xiii. 54-58. Mark says, Is not this the carpenter? Matthew, Is not this the *son* of the carpenter? Mark says Jesus *could* not do *any* mighty works. Matthew says, He *did* not do *many* mighty works.

Luke's account of Jesus' visit to Nazareth (Luke iv. 10*f.*) is an unhistorical reconstruction of the original story. It is put early in Jesus' life, although His miraculous fame implies that it must have been later. Jesus is made to enter on an unprovoked controversy. He uses arguments which are quite out of place in Jesus' time. Luke here moulds the passage in Jesus' life to suit the later rejection of the Jews, and the Pauline mission to the Gentiles.

MISSION OF THE "TWELVE," AND THE "SEVENTY."

In the account of sending out the twelve, Mark and Luke exag-

gerate the smallness of the luggage they were to take. Mark allows them staff and sandals. Mark mentions that they were to anoint the sick with oil—showing that the cures were not purely spiritual—but Luke and Matthew omit all notice of the oil.

Luke's account of the sending of the seventy is not historical. According to Genesis x. the number of the Gentile peoples is 70. Hence the Greek version of the Hebrew Scripture was said to be made by Seventy.

Matthew adopts much of Luke's instructions, but enters a protest against Gentile missionary activity. So in Matt. x. 5 and 6, he puts into Jesus' mouth a command which never could have been there. The thought of going to the Gentiles had never in Jesus' time been mooted. In the discussion about Gentile evangelisation we never hear this passage—so decisive—quoted on the other side, or the concluding words of Matthew's gospel, "Preach the gospel to every creature." So we cannot believe there was such a word from the Lord. Only when Paul extended the missionary circle of the Church, the Jewish Christians evolved this command out of the practice of Jesus.

The Kingdom of Heaven suffering violence, and the violent taking it by storm, refers most probably to the Pauline Gentile mission. To the Jewish Christians it was a forcible and violent measure.

The feeding of the five thousand is either a purely ideal narrative—the prototype in the history of the Gospels of the Lord's Supper—or it has some such historical kernel as this: Jesus may have given the hungry people the bread He had, and the disciples and other friends follow suit. The magical miracle which the Evangelist would describe is not after the manner of Jesus.

Mark vi. 45-52 is a doublette of Mark iv. 35-41, and a mythical exaggeration. Matthew further exaggerated by making Peter walk on the waters. But this story is a very beautiful allegory. Peter is the Church of Christ, which walks triumphantly upon the waves of opposition, so long as she remains true to the faith, and if she lost her faith she could only be saved by grasping the hand of her Lord. This was the meaning of the legend which Matthew has taken up as literal truth. This pretty myth is opposed to the teaching of Jesus in His "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

The words in which Jesus "made all meats clean" implicitly repealed the Levitical law. Either Jesus accommodated Himself in His legal observance to the law, the value of which He in His words had disparaged and essentially denied, or He was not concious of the full import of the principles He laid down, and Paul first drew the logical inference. Between those who make Jesus a Paulinist and Antinomist, and those who, like Weiss, make Him an out-and-out believer in the Jewish particularistic religion, I take up a middle position: Jesus observed, but did not advocate or command observance of, the law. Like every reformer, Jesus had a healthy, pure heart and a healthy, clear head, which enabled Him to see through all rules and laws to God's eternal order.

In regard to Jesus' treatment of the Syrophenician woman, it must be borne in mind that to call the Gentiles dogs was the universal Jewish custom. Jesus recognised that His mission was in the first instance limited to the house of Israel; in the heathen world there was no ground prepared for Him.

The narratives of the Pharisees seeking a sign from heaven form a good illustration of the growth of the idea in the hands of successive narrators. Mark (x. 12) says no sign shall be given to this generation. Luke (xi. 29, 30) says the only sign given shall be that of Jonah, referring to the power of Jonah in preaching. Matthew (xii. 40) makes the sign of Jonah refer to his imprisonment in the belly of the whale and the correspondent rest of the Son of Man in the heart of the earth.

JESUS PROCLAIMED CHRIST.

The Petrine proclamation of Jesus as Christ must be historical, because reported by the Pauline Mark. Luke's mediating tendency leads him to omit Peter's subsequent rebuke. Matthew inserts the remarkable blessing on Peter to counterbalance the following rebuke, and claims for Peter the revelation not by flesh and blood which Paul had maintained for himself in Galatians i. 16.

The development from Paulinism to Catholicism may be traced in the following stages: (1) Paul, in 1 Corinthians iii. 11, and the Paulinist, in Mark xii. 10, say Jesus Christ is the foundation-stone: the Apostles are only architects who build upon it. (2) The Deutero-Pauline Eph. ii. 20 of the second century speaks of the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being only the chief corner-stone. (3) In 1 Timothy iii. 15 the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth. In the pastoral epistles the ground of salvation is the Church, not Christ. (4) Matthew xvi. 18, 19 says Peter is the foundation of the Church.

Εκκλησια never occurs in the mouth of Jesus. Matthew xviii. 17 is taken from a later source. The word first appears in Paul, and meant not the Church but the congregation or popular assembly. Paul thought only of specific Churches. The idea of the Church as a unity appears in the Deutero-Pauline Ephesians of the second century. Jesus did not intend to found a Church. He meant to bring in the Kingdom of God under the form of the Israelitish commonwealth (Gemeinwesen). The bestowment of the power of the keys is a piece of Catholic ecclesiasticism which has no connection with Jesus' thought. Jesus Himself gave no legislation for His followers; how much less would He have given this monstrous charge to Peter as His plenipotentiary? This Petrine prominence is the hinge-point of Matthew's Gospel, and proves its late origin.

That Jesus gave some indication of His faith that He would rise again is historically certain, but not that He predicted the precise interval between His death and resurrection.

The requirement, "Let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me," and the following verses in Mark viii. are full of Pauline reminiscences. The use of the word "cross"

implies that it was written after the death of Jesus. That we share in the crucifixion of Jesus is a Pauline thought.

Mark ix. 1, which is often thought to fix the limit of the date of the Gospel, is explained by the Evangelist thinking rather of his own contemporaries and not reflecting that the words were not verbally fulfilled.

It is a question whether Jesus ever spoke about His second coming, whether He ever used Daniel's prophecy, whether this belief did not spring out of the Apocalyptic and Pauline and general views of the Church.

The story of the Transfiguration is an ideal allegory, built up from the O.T. (Ex. xxiv. 9, Dan. vii. 13 *ff.*), the Apocalypse (i. 13 *ff.* xiv. 14), and Paul. The dogmatic thought of 2 Cor. iii. 4-6 is presented here in the form of a narrative. The original apostles are charged with wishing to put the new dispensation on a level with the old. The Transfiguration was not heard of until after the Resurrection of Jesus. The original apostles did not, as Paul did, understand that by the resurrection of Jesus into the Spirit the old covenant was put an end to.

In the warning against uncharitable treatment of the man casting out devils in Jesus' name (Mark ix. 38-40) Jesus is made to refer to Paul and Paulinists.

Matt. xviii. 15-20 cannot be from Jesus, but springs from the later needs of Church discipline.

The parable of the 1,000 talents and 100 pence implies that if we are to forgive without payment being received God does not require payment (*quid pro quo*) before He will forgive.

Jesus' attitude to the Law, as shown in regard to Divorce and Sabbath, was never that of being bound by the letter of it, but always had reference to the ideal which the Law tried to express. This corresponds in effect to Paul's interpretation of the Law.

The great interpolation of Luke (ix. 51—xviii. 14) contains all that he did not find in Mark, and springs from sources other than *Urmatthæus*.

The "babes" to whom God has revealed His truth are the Gentiles, the "wise and understanding" are the Law-proud Jews. Hence these are not words of Jesus.

The "Come unto Me, all ye that labour," &c., is peculiar to Matthew, and has remarkable kinship to Wisdom of Sirach li. 23 *ff.* It may have been adapted by Jesus to Himself, or by the Evangelist.

We cannot accept as historical that Jesus was guest of Pharisees (as in Luke xi. 37, vii. 36.)

Luke xi. 49 *ff.*, which appears here in the mouth of Jesus, is probably a quotation from some Jewish Christian Apocalypse of the time of the siege of Jerusalem, and Zachariah, the son of Barachiah (Matt. xxiii. 35) is the Zachariah son of Baruch, who, according to Josephus, was killed by the Sanhedrim A.D. 68.

The man without the marriage garment in Matt. xxii. 11 *ff.*, is the Paulinist who is not clothed with the works of the law δικαιωματα των ἁγιων (Apoc. xix. 8). This is the Evangelist's own addition to the parable in Luke xiv. 15 *ff.*

The parable of the prodigal son is undoubtedly from Jesus, but is worked up in the first part as a paraphrase of Rom. cc. 3-8, the second part as paraphrase of Rom. cc. 9-11.

The parable of the dishonest steward must be interpreted as giving only one point—not as an allegory; and the one point is, Use earthly riches here so as to secure by them entrance into heaven.

Luke more than once makes Jesus go through Samaria, while Matthew and Mark send Him through Peræa or elsewhere. Samaria served as type of the Gentile world.

In saying the Publican went down to his house *justified*, Luke uses a distinctly Pauline term never used by Jesus, but borrowed from Jewish schools by Paul.

"Of such is the Kingdom of God" refers to actual children as well as to the childlike. Here we see into the heart of Jesus' *Heilsgedanke*, very simple, very deep, that God's requirement is childlike trustfulness and devotion.

On "Why callest thou me good?" &c., note that Jesus is only in contrast with us *i.e.*, relatively, sinless. Only of God can absolute goodness be predicated. God *is* good, the finite being can only *become* good. Matthew omits this self-depreciation of Jesus, because it was not in accord with his Christology.

Matthew's enlargement on Mark x. 28 *ff.*, promising the apostles twelve thrones to judge the Twelve Tribes, is borrowed from the Apocalypse, is a specifically Jewish Christian idea, and is, on every ground, not to be attributed to Jesus.

In the steady amplification and deepening observed in the three predictions of the Passion, we see a certain literary purpose in Mark and a free literary handling.

Peter finding a fish with the stater in its mouth to pay the temple tax may be an allegory of the Apostles finding in the Gentile world converts to make up for the deficit of Jewish Christians.

In discussing the future life, Jesus seizes the nerve of the matter—the continuance of life after death—and leaves untouched the particulars. That "they are as the angels" shows that Jesus, like Paul, did not expect a resurrection of the flesh.

"How say the Scribes that the Christ is the Son of David?" shows that Jesus was no son of David, so far as He knew. The dogmatic postulate was that the Messiah must be son of David. Jesus was the Messiah, therefore Jesus was son of David.

Matthew xxiii. 8-12 can never have been uttered by Jesus, but only by the later teachers of the Church. Καθηγητης equals presbyter or episcopos—titles which offend our Evangelist.

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

(Mark xiii.), is probably a small Jewish Christian Apocalypse, worked up with traditional sayings of Jesus, the whole being a free compilation of the Evangelist.

Matthew, from the narrow standpoint of legal observance, adds, "Pray ye that your flight be not *on the Sabbath*," and

predicts the growth of *ἀνομια*, Pauline and hyper-Pauline disregard of the law.

Mark xiii. 30, this generation may mean the time between one generation and another—30 to 40 years—or the lifetime of one generation—70 years. The latter calculation lands the date of authorship into the second century.

Matthew leaves the phrase unaltered because the tradition was fixed in the Church, although the time stated was now passed.

Mark xiii. 32, puts the Son above the angels, but below the Father. This is Pauline Christology, but is omitted by Matthew, who represents the later and loftier Christology.

Matt. xxv. 31-46 may have had a parable at base, but as it now is, is from the evangelist, and reveals the later standpoint of humane tolerance in judging of the Gentile world.

The story in Luke vii. 36-50, of the woman who is a sinner is the same as that in Mark xiv. 3-9; Matt. xxvi. 2-13; and John xii. 1-8.

ISAIAH AND ZION; OR,

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THOUGHT IN ISAIAH.

A STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF HEBREW RELIGION.

OUTLINE OF ESSAY.

CONTENTS.

Introduction, Perspective, The Supernatural and the Natural in History.

I.

The Sanctuary Faith of Isaiah's Forerunners.

A.—Amos. 1, Expectations. 2, 'Seek not Sanctuaries, but Jahweh. 3, Origin of God-idea, conscience, not ghosts. 4, No forgiveness.

B.—Hosea. 1, Knowledge of forgiveness craved. 2, Isaiah saved his forerunners's writings. 3, Jahweh "Devoted." 4, Sanctuaries needed. 5, Hosea of the North, higher; Amos and Isaiah of the South, poorer.

II.

Isaiah's Early Story.

1, Birth and Boyhood by Zion. 2, The Vision. 3, The Commission; (*a*) When? (*b*) either "twice in a life;" or (*c*) once and amid his toil; (*d*) other theories; (*e*) *Momenta* of the vision; *α*, Judgment; *β*, Grace; *γ*, Zion. 4, Zion's Story: (*a*) Not old, (*b*) Shiloh, (*c*) Solomon's Pantheon, (*d*) the Revolt, (*e*) Judah's many sanctuaries.

III.

The Early Period and Discourses.

(cc. ii. to v. 24; ix. 8-21; v. 25 to end. 740 to 736 B.C.)

1, Date, Silence, Struggle of Influences. 2, Outbreak. 3, The Torrent of Indignation. 4, Thought of "Holiness" avoided. 5, Theory of Conversion and Revival.

IV.

The Hour of Change. (cc. vi.—xi. 736—5 B.C.)

1, Danger and Demand. 2, Vision, God in Isaiah. 3, Incarnation, "Immanuel." 4 Grace the new Theophany. 5, Meaning of Holiness, Philological (*a*) Result of the Theophany, (*b*) Levitical Holiness, (*c*) Jesus' Holiness, All Devotion, (*d*) Stem Q D Sh. and Derivatives — *α*, Qadhosh; *β*, Qaddish *γ*, Qadhesh; *δ*, Qodhsh; *ε*, Classification; (*e*) Æsthetic sense and faulty current use. 5, Sum.

V.

The Changed Prophecy; or the new Gospel of Grace in Zion. 736-700 B.C.

A.—Safety (736-722, cc. vi.-ix., xvii., xiv., xxviii.) 1, The Record of the Vision. 2, The Cento on Ahaz. 3, No altars, Transition. 4, Jahweh is founding Zion, Ahaz's death, Samaria's Vintage and Fall.

B.—Danger (722-721, cc. x-xii.) 1, Assyria too bold. 2, The Golden Age. 3, The true Persuasive. 4, Date and the period of Silence; Hezekiah's reforms.

C.—Grace amid Invasion (708-700, cc. xxix. xxxi., xxxvii., xxxiii.) 1, Arief; Egypt's shame; Jahweh's exultation. 2, God's hovering. 3, Isaiah wavers; laughter. 4, All forgiven.

VI.

The Sequel.

1, Zion the theme of the Old Testament Canon. 2, Reaction, Manasseh. 3, The Revolution of Isaiah. 4, Jeremiah's opposition. 5, Zion's failure. 6, She rose again. Prophetic demand; Jesus; Immanuel.

POPULAR attention has lately been turned to the beauty and meaning of the Book of Isaiah. A gifted student of English

literature has told of the wealth of beauty hidden in our old English version, and he has bidden us to a feast he has found in visions of Isaiah's life. My purpose is to tell how the beauty of reality grows fairer far, if we will but look on the events of the Prophet's life in their real perspective.

For there is a perspective in life, where event ranks after event, and thought speeds after thought. Here, perhaps, a conception is drawing near until, gathering all brightness in its true forms, it bursts on the glad vision, now as never else; or perchance yonder it is withdrawing, receding, mellowing into a dream of the past, fair still, but real only as it prophesies its followers, pointing from then to now.

In such a study of Isaiah it is not necessary that we portray all the rich detail of thought that made Isaiah what he was. It is enough here to single out one bright ray, and follow the movement of that beam. We shall see the hands of men before him who reached down to kindle in him the one bright gleam, handing on to him what God had given them. We shall watch his own ever-deepening grasp of one great Faith, we shall hear his mighty voice printing that Faith into the very traditions of the people. Then we may understand the great waves of like faith that rolled on into century after century later, and we shall know better than we have known the meaning of "The Coming of Christ." The Christian theologian must study the history of the Hebrew religious teachers; for on the one hand the Divine newness of the great new revelation in Jesus marks the method of ever new revelations, that is, of "Progress" or "Development" as the Divine method, and compels us to study history if we would know God. On the other hand, Christianity, the greatest movement of man's history, cannot be known as something utterly apart from all the rest of man's history. Christ is to be known as a movement of history. In other words, our faith in the advent of the supernatural in Christ means on the one hand that the supernatural must be God's method, and therefore must be ever as present as God is, and so all history is sacred; while, on the other hand, the supernatural, which stands amid the natural and in certain relations to it, can be known only by knowledge of these relations, and therefore the supernatural is to be investigated by the strict methods of history of nature. The natural is always supernatural, and the supernatural must be truly natural.

Now to our theme. We enter upon a study of the development of Isaiah's thought concerning Zion: and, in the first place, we shall look what his forerunners had left as their testament concerning the Sanctuary, and its manifestation of God.

I.—Amos and Hosea: Their Sanctuary Faith.

A. 1. The prophecies are autographic monuments. The student of the Old Testament turns to the prophets for self-recorded utterance of the faith and mind of definite individuals. But, as we read these men, we feel our souls ever asking for something more: the writers beget this by their very words of outlook, of need, and of promise. The "Mosheh" (Deliverer) who delivers

to-day looks ever for another Mosheh who shall deliver when he has passed away. Waiting still for the consolation of Israel, the people turned from the grave of Samuel, from the vanishing Elijah, from Elisha's disciples, to listen for another who should speak Peace. The prophets gave voice to the people's highest yearning when they pointed to the "Far-Off" (Elohim) more than to the Divine answer already given. So it must be, for the "Far-Off" ones are "Far-Reaching" ones, whose very gift of their own life must be a gift of yearning like their own. This people that could give birth to prophets and bring forth souls that knew God's mind, and voices to speak His oracle, turned from these prophets, forgot their graves, and lost their words; for the prophets were not enough for souls that wanted God. There was a remarkable, if not severe, disregard of forms in the religion of those early days, and when the era of regard for the Zion symbol was coming, it had to be preceded by an era of regard for the written words of the prophets of the past. When the first century of written prophecy dawned its first great voice was a denunciation of sanctuaries and a demand that men seek not God's house, but God Himself.

2. Turn for a moment to those words of Amos of Tekoa, written perhaps about 780 B.C., a generation before Isaiah's first recorded inspiration in 760. We are searching for men's ideas of where God loves to dwell, and where He may be found. Now Amos has no thought of God as loving certain forms and places without regard for the moral condition of those forms and places. He has, we may say, a true Divine instinct that shrinks away in very fear from anything that is wrong. If wrong is in a place then the joy-giving God cannot be there. The test of what was wrong might be very sensuous, and very little spiritual; but given the sin, then the absence of God was certain. Amos's prophecy is almost wholly a denunciation of wrong-doing. I have said that we shall find severe disregard of sanctuaries; but if we expect that therefore Amos's idea of sin is very purely spiritual, we shall be mistaken. What he condemns is the cruelties and indecencies and ingratitude which he sees about him; what he demands is justice in the law courts for all men, firmness of commercial conduct, decent regard for the dignity of men and of Jahweh; what he fears is death, exile to other lands which are not clean because they are not Hebrew; and what he hopes for is agricultural prosperity under a Davidic chieftain. He certainly thinks in very concrete fashion; surely we cannot expect him to have a very abstract or spiritual or transcendental idea of God. Yet the central glory of the book is the semi-dialogue of ch. 5, where, to save men from death he exhorts to no forms but simply to seek for Jahweh, the Life Giver. When men ask where Jahweh is to be found, he utterly condemns the quest for God in Bethel, in Beersheba, or in Gilgal, sanctuaries of both south and north, while of Zion he says not one word. He knows Zion, for he speaks of it once as a place whence Jahweh's voice has sounded; but when he would bring men to Jahweh that they may find life, Zion is not the sanctuary of safety. "Seek good, and ye shall live," he cries, "and so

Jahweh, God of Hosts, shall be with you, as ye say." He can dwell here in Bethel, or anywhere; He does dwell wherever good is.

3. It was a sublime doctrine, and it seems to point directly to the gospel which Jesus has brought; but it was not to be the gospel then, for men were to cling to sanctuaries for many a long century to come. Yet it tells of a Conscience in that far off day that lay working in prophet and hearers down underneath all efforts to find God. Wonderings about spirits that had left men's bodies, or about ghosts that seemed to flit in the shadows may have helped men to shape their fancies and theories of God's whereabouts, His presence in this sanctuary or that; but these words of Amos were not born of ghosts. This man's primary sensitiveness toward God was a moral sense. Amos felt that something right was before him, or something wrong, and accordingly he felt at once present with him a great authoritative approval or condemnation imparted to him. It was this impartation that made him feel that there was a Being beside him, unseen but almighty, and absolutely at one with goodness. Here is sufficient origin for the belief in an invisible great spirit. When a noted naturalist recently supposed that the idea of a God arose from the idea that the disembodied spirits of men must exist somewhere, he certainly pointed to a neglected fact: for there is abundant evidence that the Hebrews as well as other peoples believed in the continued existence of disembodied spirits. But the naturalist drew his induction from only one class of facts, and that a minor class, and an insufficient class. Amos' authoritative Spirit imparting at once approval of righteousness and condemnation of wrongdoing is a far more powerful, important Being than the disembodied spirit of a feeble man who has to be conjured up from a distance with difficulty to utter a few doubtful words. I need not pursue the argument save to point out that while the record of Amos' thinking dates certainly from before 750 B.C., the record of the witch of Endor and the ghost she raises, on whom the noted naturalist bases his induction, is of very uncertain date, and probably of some late day when the house of David and the kingdom of Judah were failing and needing support from such a story.

4. Another feature of Amos' preaching must be noted. His plan of salvation has no mercy in it. The only way of life is to do good: to do evil is to ensure death. "Seek good and ye shall live:" for it is by the sword that "all the sinners of my people shall die." Thus the character of Jahweh, while it is at one with goodness, does not include in that goodness favour to the fallen or wooing for the wanderer. It is true that if he who has left off doing righteousness shall now seek good he shall live; but this does not imply in Amos any thought of a forgiveness for the past sin. Rather is it the childlike simplicity of Amos' thinking that forgets or fails to think out all the consequences of his counsel. And yet how near together are childlike simplicity and profoundest truth. If a man do sin grievously now, and do righteously choose good at the next moment of his life, this latter choice is in itself an

utter condemnation of his former evil choice, and a submission to all the righteous consequences or penalties of that sin. Aye more, the sinner thus choosing good must have had given to him of God the possibility of a new choice, and has thus been already forgiven of God. God has placed him back again at the parting of the ways where choice is made: He has "given" the sinner back the position that was lost. He has "for-given" him the sin. In the simplicity of Amos the profound truth was at hand. God does forgive the sinner at once; the difficulty is that so often the sinner does not recognise the forgiveness. Here then is the place for a history. What has been the progress of men's recognition of God's forgiveness? We have reached, by our glance at Amos, a beginning in the long road men's souls have travelled: we are at a gate into the history of Hebrew religion. We are to trace what part of the long road Isaiah searched out and built up, and we are to estimate his influence in leading that long road across Mount Zion.

B. But now what of Hosea, the Israelite contemporary of the Judæan Amos?

1. Amos is a picture of the naïve mind of the godly Hebrew in the beginning of Isaiah's century; and we have seen that he has no theory of forgiveness, or rather that he never questions whether God forgives, for to him God will always be present with the man who is doing good. But many a man is more anxious; and, looking back to the past sin, fears that God looks back too, and will not forget the past sinner in the present saint. Certainly this is a more thoughtful position; and a higher rank and culture seems to have belonged to its first great exponent Hosea.

2. We shall find presently how Isaiah rises above the level of both these forerunners, and combines the stern and tender strength of both in his own power and beauty. It is probably true that Isaiah's influence has saved for us the writings of Amos and Hosea through the love he creates for thoughtful words, and through his own reverence for the two men who were his masters. But doubtless Isaiah was likewise made for us largely by those two men.

Amos had proclaimed the stern righteousness of Jahweh that abides only where good is, and destroys awfully all that is evil. Hosea's truer if tenderer soul finds in Jahweh the husband's love, the lover's yearning, the patriot's devotion, the father's and the mother's fondness, the Grace that is even more long-suffering and healing than man has dreamed. "I am God and not man. I am Israel's Devoted One. I return to the loved city, but 'tis not that I may destroy" (Hosea xi. 9.) We shall find Isaiah weaving together both faiths in his own. He rises from the dark severity of the former up to the glad trust of the latter, and then makes this trust the burden of his ever-swelling life-song.

4. But the contrast between Amos and Hosea appears farther, and again furnishes another occasion for Isaiah's higher synthesis. Amos had pushed aside all thought of sanctuaries as God's abode,

in his eager exhortation to seek God himself, and let no symbols mislead the seeker. But Hosea from the first dreads the day when there shall be no symbols, no sacrifice, no sacred pillar, no ephod, no teraphim (iii. 4.) True he points to the calf that "men have made," and says, "therefore it cannot be a God" (viii. 6.) "Altars shall be smitten, and sacred pillars spoiled" (x. 2.) But these exposures of the false use of symbols rather illustrate and prove the prophet's faith in their real use.

As before, so here is evidence of Hosea's deeper insight, which we to-day can well appreciate who believe that God must be manifest in the flesh ere He can be truly known. The Word must become flesh, and we must handle Him with our hands. It was a childlike cry of Amos, seek God and not sanctuaries. Seek good and God shall be where good is; but the quest for good fails until we lay hold on some deed or person in whom good is concretely present. Amos did not look so deeply into human nature as did Hosea. Hosea saw the true need; he preached a higher truth; his words pointed more truly to the needed and coming God-man.

And Isaiah's great doctrine bound together this faith in material revelations, and that of the gracious love of God: for his faith in Zion was a faith that in this Rock and Temple was a symbol of the Devoted Love of Jahweh.

5. Ere we pass on now to Isaiah himself, it ought to be noted that Amos and Isaiah were south countrymen, that is, Judæans, while Hosea was an Israelite of the north. The simple Judæan herdsman carried the simple earnestness and sternness of his soul and of his native wild bare hills away north to the rich vine country, to the plains of Jezreel, God's own seed-land, and to the fair Samaria, crown of the fat valley of Ephraim, the doubly fruitful land. The richer Samarians or Israelites were evidently the more cultured people. Their government was wider, their sanctuaries were older, their early prophets, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, were far greater. They were a richer and easier prey for the foreign invaders, and therefore they fell 100 years sooner than fell Judah, the rocky, bare, mountainous region of the hotter south. Jerusalem was not early chosen as a centre: it has never been one of the sunny spots of earth. The gloom of Calvary is its truly natural air, and its glory has been the inner triumph of trusting souls over the outer world's pain and death. Our reverence for Jerusalem, and the growth of that reverence are illustrations of this, for when the rich and gay and cultured Samaria fell away into oblivion, the city of stern rock remained to be the centre of life and story. The fairest on earth fades away, and still love clings to the feeble and unlovely life that is left. Salvation comes to life when life is feeblest.

So Hosea's home and his companions passed away, and we read of no later northern prophet. But it was when Hosea had heard stern Amos in the Samarian market-place and quietly answered with truer words, that then Isaiah, in Amos' southern home, at first echoed Amos' judgment: then listening to the wise correction, and rising above both, proclaimed a sublime faith that exalted

Zion and saved Judah, aye and made his countrymen wise enough to save his own writings and those of Amos and Hosea too. And it is truth to say that yonder in that far-off century, when Greece and Rome were first born these three Hebrew men were laying foundations for the faith that saves the world.

II.

We turn to Isaiah's early story.

1. He was born probably about 770 or 760 B.C. That was a time of manifold importance in the world's history, for the two great peoples of the West were then just awaking into consciousness, while the old nations of the Euphrates' regions were recalling and recording their ancient and their more modern story to be read by us on buried slabs to-day. But perhaps the greatest, far the most subtle, of all the factors for later history was the wondering about God that was moving the heart of the young Jew Isaiah in Jerusalem. We can almost fancy his boyhood amid the houses and lanes of the rocky capital, while as he played he watched his tribe's chief, named Uzziah, "Fortress of Jahweh," building his new fortresses about the city. Perhaps the boy scarcely dreamed that this loved Zion had ever been aught but the sacred centre of the whole world's strength. Did he play beneath the shadows of the venerable sanctuary; did he not step beside his "firm-treading" father, Amoz, along those aisles and toward those altars that had stood now three hundred years? Did he not gaze in wonder at the grandeur and splendour a wise Solomon had founded, and the follies of many an unwise successor had scarcely marred? Surely to the young poet-soul that sanctuary was the very abode of the God of the Ages, the glorious earthly throne of Jahweh's glory.

Doubtless the lad heard often in these wide courts the rapt utterances of strangely-clad seers from southern ravine and rock, or from more northern fruitful vale. Surely he strayed after these men of God, as through dark lane they threaded out to market square, crying aloud of sin and for the right. Certainly the lad loved to hasten home and, in some quiet corner of the housetop, to pore over and ponder the written words of the old prophets who had been, and to store in memory their burdened cries and their wondrous faiths. So surely he learned those old words that others learned as well as he, so full of high and happy hope, and that he was to set for the text of his first sad lament over his country. The words prophesied that light should flow out of Zion, but it was Isaiah himself who should fill the prophecy with truth. His words and his faith should be the light to save and bless home and all men. In his later years he should compel the brilliant beams of all the past into one bright focus, because they were heaven's own rays: then that form's brightness should illumine the very past itself, and should shine on through all coming ages to lighten men on their way to God, and to lighten the very face of God Himself.

2. In those early years came at length a great strange experience. The great chieftain Uzziah lay a-dying; aye, it may be, that already his cold form lay hidden in the rocky tombs, and his

spirit had returned to God from its long and busy toil. Had this failing of the "strength of men" sent the young Isaiah away to the sanctuary to sit silent, shaken to the soul by this strange thing, a king's death? Such a thing as a king's death the boy had never known before, and scarcely even had his father known it, for the like had not been in Judah for nearly half a century. Did the trembling soul by instinct draw toward God for help? He should tremble yet more awfully ere he should find God's rest. Bowed and covered he sat, buried in his thought. Then God shook the earth. The venerable pile's mightiest foundation-stones shook, the boy's heart quivered, bright flashes flew across the darkened halls, a light that was not of earth filled the boy's soul. He saw God. He saw and lived, and while he lay stricken to the earth with awe, God talked with Him and he with God. The high theme of converse amid the heavenly ministrants there seemed to the lad to be the holy care of Jahweh for His own. And yet that care was troubled, for God could not speak all His will to men. God was suppliant, and sought man's helping voice to speak for Him to Judah. The invitation was a command, a gift of voice and life, and the young man arose filled with a sense of Divine commission.

3. What was his commission?

(*a*). The question becomes complicated at once when we reflect on the familiar position of the story of the vision in the course of the book. Why does it not stand at the beginning? Does its position in chapter vi. mean that the vision came in this relative position in the prophet's life? Had he already prophesied in the spirit of the earlier chapters, and did this vision come as a new revelation to introduce a new period and, perhaps, a new sort of utterance? Or was this theophany the occasion of the lad's first dedication of himself to the prophet's work? Was here his first call and ordaining, as are commonly supposed?

(*b*). Dates do not help us much. If Uzziah's death fell, not about 760, as the old-fashioned chronology supposed, but as late as 750, as the newer and juster calculations say, and if Isaiah's death fell about 700, when his prophecies cease, then to take chapter vi. as the story of the initial vision would be to count the prophet as a lad of some 15 to 20 years in 750, and a man of 65 to 70 at his final words and death. This seems a reasonable theory, and it agrees with the tenor of the story of the vision, for that would seem an unnatural picture, if the man receiving the summons and obeying it had already been the stern, keen, mighty prophet of the early chapters. And yet if the vision came to the young heart as the first call to speak, there must be some reason why it is not placed at the beginning, but only here at the close of those first terrible chapters (chapters 2-5). Our wonder over the vision grows intense as we think that perhaps Isaiah himself wrote down or told the tale long years after he had obeyed the call. The man in his searching after God seems to look back across the vista of years, full of hopes and toils and failures; he seems to wonder whether he had in his first young eagerness taken in all the deep meaning of the revelation. And now in the light of the experience

God has given him, that vision that comes to every man and is the divinest theophany of all, he recalls the early scene, justifying indeed the work he has already done, for the impulse to it was all given in that sacred hour, but feeling now that far more was given then that he did not comprehend, truth far higher, far Diviner, that was then, perhaps, too big for his soul, but that now he will lift up before men and proclaim to the end ever more and more fully. This seems the natural theory.

(*c*). But perhaps the vision came after his first period of prophesying. In this case the year 750, when Uzziah died, must have found him already a man of strength and skill, a man of some 25 to 30 years, and his death would fall in his 75th to 80th year. The theory is certainly possible, but it does not agree with the tenor of the call and the response. And, if it did, the vision would still be the introduction to a new period, whose prophesying is remarkably different from that of the early years and chapters. It is this difference which is so remarkable in the course of Isaiah's work.

(*d*). There is possible of course the farther theory, that not Isaiah, but compilers arranged the order of the chapters. This would only signify that the progress in Isaiah's thought and aim had been seen long ago by the compilers, who placed the story of the vision where it is. To suppose that the compilers invented a progress, and arranged and moulded the passages to illustrate it, would simply be to make the compiler into the Isaiah whose advance in thought we are recording; for the fitness of the passages to the theory is very remarkable as we shall see. We may perhaps leave untouched the remaining theory, that the position of passages in the book is due to haphazard collection. To discuss that theory would be fruitless toil; better assume any of the others.

(*e*). Let us enumerate, then, the various *momenta* of the vision as worded in c. 6, and leave the estimate of each one's influence on Isaiah to be calculated when the particular influence comes into play.

α. Clearly the Amosian doctrine of stern judgment, and a remnant only spared, is prominent. Isaiah proclaimed the faith, "A remnant shall return," as Mr. Matthew Arnold has said, and the prophet stamped the faith on a living monument when he gave the name "Shear-Yashubh" ("When a remnant remaineth") to his boy; but Isaiah had learned that faith from Amos.

β. In the vision the prominent character of Jahweh was Holiness (Qodhesh). This "Holiness" meant "Devotion," as the words of Hosea have already suggested; and here again we find Isaiah reflecting the prominent faith of the second great master of the past. We shall look at the meaning of this word more closely later on, meantime we can see that it is the Devotion or Grace of Jahweh that fills the thoughts of the heavenly ministrants in the vision, and it is that Grace which moves the God who spares the prophet, who seeks man's help to serve man, and who, amid judgment, will yet remember mercy. This is evident, although the commission seems to end in dark severity, barely touched with light.

(*To be continued.*)

ISAIAH AND ZION; Or,

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THOUGHT IN ISAIAH.

A Study in the History of Hebrew Religion.

(Continued).

γ. But there is a third element in the vision. The revelation is in the Zion sanctuary. The importance of this fact will shine out when we read presently the almost scornful taunt at Zion's hopes in cc. 2-5, and then the central significance of Zion in all the later period.

4. To prepare for a true estimate of this importance, let us look back on the story of Zion hitherto.

(*a*). Few students are unaware that only three and a half centuries before Isaiah's day Jerusalem was not a Hebrew town at all, but alien from both Judah and Israel. While David was reigning in Hebron, the future seat of his long dynasty was the stronghold of his bitter enemies, the Jebusites. David reduced their fortress, and both his military skill and his statesmanlike tact were made notable for ever by his choice of that spot of neutral ground as the seat of his government over the united north and south.

(*b*). In David's day, and long before, Shiloh seems to have held pre-eminent rank as chief sanctuary among the many sacred places where David and Samuel, the judges and the patriarchs had worshipped. For many a generation after David, the abandonment of Shiloh was reckoned not as a joyful honour for Zion, but as a disgrace and sad descent from Shiloh. No Zion had been, if Shiloh had not sinned.

(*c*). David built an altar to Jahweh in Jerusalem, but his sanctuary there was of the simplest nomadic order. Where he met God, there, like Jacob, he sacrificed. Solomon built a magnificent temple where his father had prayed, and lavished upon it his own rich skill and the immense wealth and strength his greater father had won and left. Solomon dazzled the sight of his austere people with this sanctuary, glorious like the splendid piles and glittering symbols of Tyre and her rich orient sisters. The great family, too, of the Gods must all lodge in this grand home, for power over all peoples from Egypt to Euphrates must be symbolised by the assembly of all the heavenly lords in this one central abode. The simple worshippers of Jahweh must wander through a pantheon to find their own loved God, if haply they still prefer him over all other glorious members of that host.

(*d*). There is an undercurrent of connection, not obscurely expressed, between that Solomonic luxuriance and religious eclecticism and the speedy revolt of the northern tribes from the house of David. Thereafter those northern tribes never worshipped at

Jerusalem so long as the kingdom of the north existed; and for the unhappy division of the kingdoms Solomon's religious unwisdom seems to have been much to blame. The division was a heavy blow to Judah and to David's throne, but it was a heavier blow to Zion. Zion had been largely the occasion of division, and of injury to kings and people; the fulfilment of the prediction that she would be a centre of light and love for all nations seemed impossible.

(*e*). For ages even Judah herself did not consent to worship in Mount Zion; the temple's grandeur did not overcome the popular preference for the many local shrines. Certainly there seem to have been few shrines in the bare, poor south, as compared with the rich Ephraim's many sacred spots; yet a hundred years after Isaiah's day there were plenty of outside altars to be destroyed by Josiah. Jeremiah himself was one of the Anathoth priests, and hence perhaps his condemnation of Zion. The inhabitants of the capital city must have learnt to honour her temple as the best of all; yet Isaiah quotes as his opening text the old prophetic hope for Zion only to turn away in scornful taunt and bitter condemnation of her unworthiness. To Isaiah in an hour more bitter still, and more desolate, a new vision of the Devotion of Jahweh in that very temple was to be given that should change and re-cast his estimate of God and men, and even of earth itself.

We open then the prophet's book to read the words of his first period, knowing somewhat of the influences from men and things that had played upon his soul to make the words we read. God had spoken in all these: we listen to the inspired words.

III.—The Early Period and Discourses.

c.c. ii. to v. 24; ix. 8-21; v. 25-end. c. 740 to 736 B.C.

1. These passages seem to date from about 740 B.C., when the glory of Uzziah's reign had passed away, and Jotham's regency and reign had altered the State but little, for either worse or better. Ahaz was on the throne. He was gifted, but surely graceless; thoughtful and studious, but without grasp; religious and even superstitious, but without faith; fond of beauty, but the prey of effeminacy; David's son, but a waster and no saviour of David's people.

It may be that the prophet had been utterly silent in the long years between the vision of 750, and these discourses in 740. Perhaps the Hosean influence was breathed upon him then like a fragrant breeze wooing him to longsuffering; while he, strong, high-souled, stern young man that he was, leaned hard toward the sterner doctrine of Amos. It may be that the long silence is a mark of hidden but hard wrestling between judgment and mercy. It may be that while he was all uncertain whether he ought to follow the one great leader or the other, the noble soul severely controlled his own severity and forbore to speak. It is worthy of note

again, that doubtless in these years was born to him that son whom he named "Shear Jashubh" ("it is a remnant that shall return.)" He bade, as it were, his child carry ever in his very name such echo of the stern Tekoan's voice, that the father calling to his son might ever speak with reverence the very oracle given by the Great Preacher of Righteousness.

2. But he, who so sternly forbore to speak, could at length forbear no longer. The times were rotten. Not the little lad's name alone must cry a warning: the father's soul, full to breaking with God's indignation, must break out into awful prophecy. Now if ever must Amos' loud condemnations be sounded aloud again: now there shall burst from Isaiah's soul the most terrible oracle of sin and judgment that the literature of the world contains.

The fierce cry of scorned love heaps scorn upon the scorners. Scorn is the theme and substance of all these prophecies from the second chapter through the fifth.

3. They open as we have seen with quotation of a well-known hope in words of a prophet of older time (ii. 2-5.) But Isaiah turns from the hope for a light from Zion that shall lighten all the tribes, to picture the sad present, all superstition, all folly, all evil. He knows the hope, he has surely shared it; but he scorns the hollow claim that Jahweh is now manifest in that sanctuary. A torrent of awful eloquence bursts forth and rolls on; until, as if in sheer exhaustion, the bitter scorn that forbids a present boast rests in a hope which itself is mixed with bitterness. "If Jahweh shall ever send a burning wind to clean away by awful fire the filth of Zion's best—even her daughters—then at the last there may float over every home in David's city the smoky sign of reverential, joyful feasting" (iv. 4-5.) May we not pause to wonder over this high estimate, written so long ago, of woman's significance for weal or woe! How fine this faith that a pure home is God's pure sanctuary, and a homely hearth His altar. Who will not often kiss the page where such words stand saying, "Surely God was in this man." At every turn of the old leaves the reader shall see God. Blest are the readers; surely the vision of God shall save them from pain and sin.

But the people who heard this voice from God were far away from God; they were revelling in deadly folly. The fire must burn on to burn away the death. Biting sarcasm heaped on Judah's teachers, sharp satire levelled at her gay harems, scorn that beats in thunderous hail on men who scorn God—these are the prophet's only hope, but they are all uttered in the saddest tone. In the "Song of the Outstretched Arm" (v. 25, &c.), the sadness swells into a ceaseless sigh of woe, and a wild knell of despair. The young prophet has again taken from old Amos (Amos iv.) the very form of his dirge; but he has grown sterner and far sadder than his master. The swift ravening lions from afar roar to our very ears; they crouch; they leap before our eyes upon poor Judah. The shriek dies away into a low moan like the moaning of the cold sea. On earth all is black; heaven is palled over by the smoke of earth. The prophecy is all dark: the prophet's own soul is in

darkness, for the prophet of judgment must dwell in the gloom he brings.

4. Observe one feature of his language. He seems to press aside all thought of the "holiness" (Qodhesh) or "special devotion" of Jahweh, as a jewel too precious for the touch of heartless men. Perhaps rather it is that he exalts that "love" as the great Divine dignity that has been despised, but which shall be vindicated in fierce destructions and awful righteousness. For only twice in all this set of discourses does he use the words "Israel's Holy One"; and only twice more in all the period do we find the word "holy" used. Like Amos, Isaiah avoids the words; and in each case when the words are used it is certainly in the way in which Amos would have used them. In iv. 3, after the sentence of certain death on all who sin, comes the uncertain hope that all who are left alive in Jerusalem may be called "holy," *i.e.*, devoted to their God. In v. 16, the prophet declares his dread faith that when proud men are all laid low then Jahweh's own holiness, His "devotion," shall be recognised in the unwavering firmness of His awful judgments. In v. 19 Isaiah quotes the blasphemous sneer of the debauchee over the name "the Holy One." "Let this devoted God use more speed in His devoted work" they cry, not knowing that the long-suffering of God is their life. The prophet cries in answer "Woe! woe! for the hot wickedness is itself a hot fire burning as the tongue of flame devoureth the dry grass." With word and indignation that together wax white hot he calls down quick destruction on those "who have despised the Holy One of Israel."

5. Psychologically, or shall we say religio-psychologically, Isaiah's story is typical. It is an excellent clinical study for the theory of conversion and revival in religious experience. See first, how the gifted lad is full of reverence. The sacred city of his fathers and his king is the honoured altar of his own enthusiasm. A higher reverence still he has: the father-prophets' thoughts of God fill his soul, and hold his unconscious trust. As the boy grows into youth his heart is heavy with wonderings, but there is not yet the quick bright flash of purpose. It comes. A startling scene throws out in front one path resultant of many. That commands the young man's whole will: it is to him the path of God. The converging lines that make that path were all there before, but tangled: now they are woven into one, that is also regulated by the age and disposition of the man. To this young strong heart and hand a strong devotion answering the devotion of Jahweh seems easy. But when his enthusiasm is mocked, then reverence turns to the hot indignation over the godless. For reverence and indignation are nearly akin, and in youth the change is quick and easy.

But the hottest fire burns low, and the hardest blows weary the striker. Aye more, blows do not persuade, and the law that falls like a rod arouses in the unloving heart resistance angrier than before.

The law speaks forth "Thou shalt"; the bitter soul cries out calm and unflinching, "I will not." Then sinks the young enthu-

siast's soul. When the demand breeds more refusal, the failure fills the spirit with despair. Many a fresh devoted toiler goes forth in the morning with hands full of good seed to return at night broken-hearted. Then we need revival. So was it with Isaiah: his young preaching ended in failure and gloom.

But the dawn was drawing near; for man's extremity is God's opportunity. God's great revelations have always come in the hour of man's great need; and when other helpers fail, then men think of the power of the unseen God.

IV.—The Hour of Change. (736 B.C., cc. 6-9.)

1. It was about the year 736 B.C. that the weakling, harem-guided Ahaz was threatened by two strong and allied tribes. Samaria and Syria were in league to harry Judah and depose its chief. The people of Jerusalem trembled as the leaves of the forest tremble in the wind.

Isaiah was ever tender to his fellows when trouble fell. The man who thundered threatenings against wrong done in sunny days sprang to the defence against a foreign foe, for the same strength was strong against every enemy, whether from within or from without. Therefore on a day when Ahaz examined his defences, Isaiah went out to meet him with counsel and with cheer. It was a heavy task to inspire this heartless Prince; it was all the heavier that the prophet came leading by the hand his boy, Shear-Jashubh ("If a Remnant return"), the symbol of the stern Amosian judgment. His words, too, were the stern Amosian demand. "Believe, and live. Seek Jahweh. Lay hold in confidence on Him who causeth all things, and He will cause thee to conquer. Demand thou that God do even change His own laws for thee. As I demand of thee, demand thou now from Him."

Was it strange that Isaiah should expect such strength in one who was named Ahaz ("strong to grasp"), who sought to grasp the stars, and to mark their moving on his famous sun-dial. This man sought even to lay hold on Gods, and bring their power with their altars from afar. And yet was it altogether strange that just this man turned coldly away from belief in Divine interpositions. Grasp of a law of Nature is not always grasp of Nature's heart; and devotion to altar forms may not be faith in God's love. Ahaz stood withered like a rootless reed before the life-breathing wind of Isaiah's inspiration. He would not put Jahweh to the test, but stood cold, strengthless, beside the prophet's fire, and amid his people's danger.

2. Isaiah's hope of help from Judah through this man died. Then in pale agony of indignation, of pity, of utter need, the seer's soul sank, he fell; but he fell upon the breast of God. He had seemed alone, alone his loved people; but he beholds God with him and with them. He cries, "Immanuel."

Ahaz had refused to ask a sign, but here God had given His own sign, a kindling faith in His own presence. God is the sign. Is He not here in this inspiration of trust and joy; is He not at hand in the very tokens of His presence in the past, in the faithful

words that seers of old wrote, in that sanctuary where many a time His presence has blessed the fathers and Isaiah too? The king may not see God, but He may see the prophet rise filled with glad remembrance, touched with great solemnity, thrilled into intensest consciousness of God-Present.

3. Is this vision something too spiritual for the cold-souled king? It shall become incarnate. Man's hunger for the food of sense may never go hungry away; for that hunger is ordained of God, and God will surely feed it. The Immanuel-Gospel shall not be preached in fleeting words alone, but a child's life shall come from God to bear the glad sound, and in the name to echo the prophet's great faith. As the older lad has born the sad name, Shear-Jashubh, and by his very presence has recalled Amos's dread sentence: so now a babe shall come to take upon his life this new name and Gospel.

4. Here, then, is the daybreak o'er Isaiah's soul. The word "Immanuel" is the testimony and symbol that he sees Jahweh's character now as never before. "God, Jahweh, can—does abide with even sinful Judah, to bless us." Here Isaiah soars away beyond Amos and Hosea; he has searched far deeper "what manner of things the spirit of God in them and him doth signify." Amos knew Jahweh's Love, Devotion, "Qodhesh," but counted that its range covered good souls only. Hosea knew more, for to him Jahweh could never come to destroy; yet this Hosean Love was scarcely the grace which is "Favour to the Fallen," for he thought all his people were really good at heart, and the nature not bad at all. They had only gone astray through sensual excitement, and were sure to turn to good when shut away from temptations. But Isaiah sees God beaming grace upon the evil doer. God has come to these; He is among them. Has He not chosen Zion, the abode of this Ahaz, for His place of manifestation? Has not Isaiah beheld Him there? The old faith abides: "Wheresoever I reveal My face, and record My name, thither will I ever come again and bless thee." Zion is therefore surely the sanctuary of this God of Grace, and evermore shall be the place of Grace, the mercy-seat for sinful Judah. This new Gospel shall be henceforth Isaiah's whole prophecy.

As he goes out on the new glad career he gazes back over the vista of years on the vision of old. There Jahweh had told him all, but he had not understood it. There he had seen Jahweh, and from His own face there had beamed Life that did not slay, from the heart of each ministrant had come reflected the Love, the Faith, the Cry, Qadhosh:—Qadhosh, Qadhosh, Holy Devoted; ever, ever Devoted. That Love had begotten the Prophet's first love, it was true Divine Love; and now it inspires the new, glad, mighty Gospel for the ages to come.

I think I might say "Here was the Christ."

5. A brief word is due on the real meaning of Q-D-Sh., and its various forms, which we have seen, or may see. I will put first one or two more general arguments.

(*a*). The consequences of theophany must suggest something

of its nature; but, of course, we have to look at the vision as it was seen and estimated by the prophet the second time, not as he looked on it the first time, for of that experience we have not really a record.

Observe, then, that the vision of the holy Jahweh wrought, first, a sense of sin; then a sense of forgiveness, and, finally, a sense of commission and power. Such holiness must have been that utter moral goodness which is perfect love. Its consequences would never have been wrought by an attitude or an attribute of separation from men: this holiness must have been an approach to men.

(*b*). If we trace the Hebrew idea of holiness through the ceremonial age after the Exile, we shall see that the Levitical argument, "Be ye holy, because Jahweh is holy," means "Jahweh is devoted to you, caring for you only among all nations; therefore care ye likewise for Him only among all deities. Bear ye His ensigns, for He has adopted you as His followers." The essential feature in the holiness is the mutual devotion of master and follower. Of course, the followers of one chieftain are *separate* from another chieftain's flag and provisions; but the *devotion*, and not the *separation*, is the essential matter. Men who are essentially "separated" men are essentially followers of nobody.

(*c*). Clearer still is the devotion that fills and makes up all the Holiness that we read of in Jesus. Probably it is a true echo of His own words, and certainly it is of His thoughts, that speaks in the verses, "Sanctify them in Thy truth," "For their sakes I sanctify Myself." He spoke thus on the eve of His crucifixion. Perhaps he knew not all that He should accomplish, but of this there is no doubt that He was filled with devotion unto death. His was not a holiness of separation from sinful men, but He came unto His own, even when they received Him not. Holiness is here that love that clasps souls to the heart, though the souls be foul and the clasp cost death.

(*d*). Philological argument need not be extensive, for the matter is simple, if but simply handled. The meaning of the stem Q-D-Sh. can be discovered only through its actual use in its various derivations. Of these observe first:—

(*a*). Qâdhosh. Jahweh is called Israel's Qâdhosh. Note that the form is infinitive, the *nomen actionis*; and moreover the form is not "stative," but distinctly active. Therefore Jahweh is one great act toward Israel. He is not passive, set apart by Israel; He is essentially active. Certainly He is not viewed by the Hebrew as a Being hedged away by Israel from touch of Israel's life, but rather as the great Actor Himself. He is not set apart from Israel, else why should He not be set apart from other men as well? He is not the Qadhosh of all men. He bears a relation of ceaseless—not repeated, but ceaseless—activity toward Israel. Duhm has suggested this, holding that while Jahweh is "Exalted" toward all the earth, He is "Holy," or Qadhosh, toward His own people Israel. The word thus seems to express the peculiar relation a God bears to the people of His choice.

The student of the Old Testament needs no reminder that some such relation is constantly in the mind of the Hebrew writers ("Ye shall be My people; I will be your God") and the technical term for this relation is Qadhosh. Therefore to us the expression "appropriated" is almost equivalent, but devoted is "better," because it connotes Jahweh's own action in the appropriation. Jahweh, the Qadhosh of Israel, is that God who has appropriated Himself to Israel. Professor Robertson Smith has reminded us that the other Semitic nations use the term Qadhosh or its parallels as Divine titles, each nation applying them to its own national God. We find evidence of this in our Old Testament literature itself.

(β). For Qaddishin is the term applied to the gods by the Babylonian queen in Daniel v. 11 (Aramaic). The difference in form is partly due to the difference of the Aramaic mode of thought from the Hebrew; but this certainly suggests also the difference in religious character in the different lands and at the different periods of time. The Hebrew word (a Qal) spoke of Jahweh as *one* act or character; the Aramaic (in a Piel form) thinks of the gods as putting forth frequently repeated acts of devotion. The latter devotion is intermittent, not so great and peaceful as the former. Compare the difference between Çadoq and Çaddiq.

But note further that the Aramaic story attributes to the Babylonian people the same estimate of their own God's feeling toward Babel which the Hebrews had of Jahweh's relation to Israel. Each Semitic people regarded its own god as its own "holy one." "Holy" means "devoted unto."

(γ). The notion of purity or cleanness, in the modern sense, was not implied in the word, for the devotion of the "devoted one" may take a very questionable form. The Qadeshim and Qadheshoth were prostitutes, sacrificing body, honour, and life to the supposed pleasure of the Deity. It is important to observe that in these two words it is not a passive form that is used, but the stative form is chosen as exactly fitted to the case. The devotees are not yielded by another's act: they stand in a condition that is neither passive nor strictly active.

(δ). The remaining term is "Qudhsh," or "Qodhesh," the term applied to a "holy thing," and often translated "holiness," as in "my holy hill" (literally, "hill of holiness, mine"). This word is a strict passive, as its vowel indicates, and as the nature of the case requires. It evidently signifies "some appropriated thing." We have set it last in order, whereas it comes first in derivation; but it may serve now to lead us back to the actual root-signification.

(ε). Arranging, then, all the terms in derivative order we have:—

(i.) Q. Dh. Sh. = Appropriate, or Devote.

(ii.) Qodesh = A thing appropriated or devoted.

(iii.) Qadhosh = "*Nomen actionis*," a great act of Devotion; or, used as "adjective" concerning a person, it means "One who is all devoted to someone else, and is all in all to them."

(iv.) Qadhesh = A motionless devotee.
(v.) Qaddish (Aramaic) = One ever devoting himself, a *numen proprium*.
(vi). Then may follow the commonly-used Qaddesh, correctly translated "sanctify," or "devote," "show devotion." Equivalent is the causative "Hiqdish. Other words have easily consequent significations.

(*e*). Finally, the suggestion of Duhm, that the idea is an æsthetic one, springs from the same mistake whence grows the current notion that "to be holy" is essentially "to be separate from something." Of course such "separation from this or that" would be undertaken by the self-separator for the supposed honour of the Deity: and there might be a badge of separation, a symbol, a befitting robe, and in all cases an æsthetic mark. But the generalisation fails when it touches the chief member of the genus. Jahweh, too, is holy, and in Him the essential quality is not "separation from," but "devotion to." Isaiah's faith was that Jahweh was thrice holy in that He descended upon Zion and dwelt there, amid Judah, although Judah and its king were evil. Moreover, He came to the end that He might save. His holiness was His essential forgiving, no mere æsthetic garb, but grace.

5. Here, then, is the work of this hour of change. The prophet in despair through the very judgment himself had uttered, finds "Jahweh is not man but a God, the Holy One of Israel, Who comes not to destroy," but to bless the sinner. Hosea's faith is fulfilled, and Amos's quest for good and for Jahweh is in some sense answered. Zion, the sanctuary, the mere place of sacrifice, cannot save; but Zion, the symbol of declaration of Jahweh's forgiving love, does speak peace to the weary Hebrew soul. That peace fills Isaiah, and flows from his heart in all the prophecies of his remaining days. The demonstration of this by a rapid sketch of these prophecies will be the conclusion of our argument.

V.—The Changed Prophecy, or, The New Gospel of Grace in Zion. (736-700 B.C.)

A.—Safety. (736-722. cc. vi.—ix., xvii., xiv., xxviii.)

1. The firstfruit of the change is manifest in the record of the first vision, recorded long years after, as we have seen. The new faith lifts the prophet amid great darkness to declare his comfortable hope (c. vi. 13), that although desolation may cover Judah's homes, yet the holy, devoted seed shall never be cut off. "As when an oak tree is cut down its stump still lives and sprouts;" so in Judah there shall ever abide, not "a remnant" merely, but "a true remnant, the certain seed of a devoted nation." We read the Iliad and wonder at the great store of figure that flows ever from old Homer's pen to adorn the majestic verse; but here in the Hebrew's sublimer, because truer, epic of Righteousness and Grace Isaiah's pen too can trace abundant graceful figure, for beauty is always the garb of life.

2. Prof. de Lagarde has pointed out that cc. vii. to ix. are a cento of genuine Isaian utterances, arranged by a later hand. The inspiring theme of the prophet had then become the grand traditional faith of the redactor's day; the thread that strings and carries the jewels of the cento is woven of the very substance of the jewels. Zion, Jahweh's abode, is the grand strain, rolling through all the symphony. The great talisman, "Immanuel," sounds again and again to enforce the argument or to kindle cheer (vii. 15, viii. 8, 11); and the ground of all joy is the faith that Jahweh dwells in Zion. The people that once were in darkness have seen a great light: for light has shone from Zion, that lightens up the far off coasts of Zebulun and Naphtali (viii. 18, ix. 1). That light is to be incarnate, and manifest in the life, and name, and deeds of one who is now an infant, a prince of the Davidic line, a prince of the house of Zion.

3. A striking sequel to these words is a passage in c. xvii, dating from about 735, where Isaiah predicts a final catastrophe for the Syro-Samarian league. "In that day," he writes, with a skill of style and figure which no translation can reproduce, "men shall trust no altars nor any other symbols; but all shall look with faith to Him whose name and whose nature are 'The Maker.' For the God of all things is the Holy One of Israel, Israel's Saving God." (xvii. 7-10).

It is notable that this prophecy against all altars does not even pause to except Zion. The utterance comes from the transition period, like a momentary self assertion of the old Amosian austerity, while the prophet's soul is all-absorbed in exquisite meditation on Jahweh's gracious love.

4. Ten years sped away, and in 727 Ahaz lay a dying (c. xiv. 28.) Then Isaiah wrote an oracle of great significance, which he repeated five years later still, in 722, when Salman-Assur's and Sargon's blows were shaking Samaria to its fall (c. xxviii.) When Judah's royal seat was hung about with the blackness and danger that marked a Prince's death, and when perhaps the boy-king sent to his prophet-friend for counsel as he took up the reigns of government, then the brave prophet sent back this message:

> "Fear not, for Jahweh is founding Zion;
> And there is the safe sanctuary for His fearful folk." c. xix. 32.

Our English versions write here, "Jahweh hath founded Zion," but we gain the true meaning from the repetition of the oracle in unquestioned form five years *later* in c. xxviii., 16. Then the Assyrian besiegers were enclosing hard on the hills about Samaria, yet within the doomed capital whirled the mad carouse of the vintage feast. The wine wagons rolled in from fat vale and sunny slope about the fair hilltop city; and reckless riot drowned every anxious voice, dimmed the vision, and dazed the sense of people and priests, prophets and princes.

Isaiah was witnessing like rioting in Jerusalem. He was imploring his countrymen to learn wisdom from Samaria's madness, for her danger was a foreboding of what might be their own. But over their cups the very seers flung filthy sneers at their gloomy

compassion, while the priests of Zion staggered to their task of sacrificial prayer. They are quite safe, they cry, for are not here in their bacchanalian march and dance the grim wild figures of ghouls and ogres, princes and gods of Night and of all hidden things, the Underworld and Death itself? These masked devils would deceive Jahweh Himself: "Under falsehood we have hid ourselves. When the scourger comes it shall not come to us." The prophet's only hope is to speak the people's own speech, to cry aloud the well-known proverb, "A decree and an accomplishing," that awful utterance of their old, common fear of Fate. They believe Jahweh Creator of all and Lord of all hosts is the Lord of Fate. They will give heed to that dread cry. But Isaiah's word of grace flows now. He has gained a hearing for an oracle for Jahweh; and that oracle is not death, but "He *is founding Zion*" as a house of refuge where the trusting souls may rest calm whatever awful storms fate may bring."

"Jahweh is founding Zion," he cries. To Isaiah these years were the foundation days of this Sanctuary. In the year when Ahaz died, 727, he thinks of Jahweh as just laying there the sure foundation; and still in 722 the precious corner stone is just being set upon its base. The meaning must be that now Isaiah is steadily entering upon this faith and grasping it as his great central gospel; he is setting it in brightest, winsome elegance before his fellows for them to clasp and hold it for the centuries to come. And may we not say that the day when a soul plants the foot firmly on a foundation faith is truly the day when God lays that faith as a foundation for that man! Here then is Isaiah's own formulation of the theme of these pages: Jahweh reveals through Isaiah the hope in Zion. He declares His gracious name and founds His token thereof by the word of Isaiah.

B.—Danger. (722, 721 B.C., cc. x.-xii.)

1. The later prophecies grow constantly more rich in this faith in Zion. There may seem to be scarcely ground enough for making a division between the prophecies last described dating from 722 B.C., just before Samaria's fall, and those of 721 B.C., uttered close after that catastrophe. All circle about that event, either foreseeing its coming or dreading its immediate consequences. [N.B. Unless Prof. Guthe's theory quoted below be correct. In that case the central point is still 722, although the radius to c. x. and its scenes be 10 years longer than we thought.] But the terrible ruin of the capital of the north seems to have deepened the prophet's faith in the safety of the southern city and sanctuary. And the utterances of that faith multiply so remarkably after the Fall that for our present purpose the event does divide the prophecies of almost the same date into two well distinguished classes.

When Sargon had levelled Samaria, all Judah and the prophet too believed that the victorious Assyrian would at once march

south to desolate Judah and destroy Jerusalem. The unsated wolf would rush down upon the sacred fold. But over fear the prophet's faith rose grandly. The fearfully expected danger and the proudly expected triumph are both pictured in the high rhapsody that closes c. x. "The host of death may speed on (x. 29-34) until on yonder near heights of the village sanctuary of Anathoth the many thousand spears seem like the forests upon Lebanon; but there shall Jahweh, the mighty forester, hew every proud stem to earth. All shall fall." And why? What are the keen points of Assyria's offence, and of Isaiah's indignation? This it is, that "Assyria hath shaken the spear against the beloved Zion. But the people that dwell in Zion are safe, who stay themselves firmly on Jahweh, Israel's Holy, Devoted One."

2. Then bursts forth from the raptured seer that grand vision of Incarnation that has been a weary world's wondering dream and waiting song (cc. xi., xii.) "When Jahweh's spirit shall reign incarnate in David's heir, then there shall be no hurt nor destruction in all the loved hill of Zion." The "Hosean" doctrine of man's need for symbols of God's presence is now thoroughly honoured. Isaiah pours out promise of a perfect wealth of symbols, not the Zion altar only, not only a Davidic Prince full of Jahweh's spirit, but the earth and beasts and sea shall all be symbols too. If need be the very nature of the ravenous beasts is to be changed, the land and the sea shall change their form, men shall forget to be unkind, to the end that nothing may prevent God's dwelling on earth to bless Judah.

It has been well noted that this vision of a coming golden age is not introduced immediately by the formula, "Thus hath said Jahweh," or by an equivalent form. But to reason from this absence that Isaiah is here conscious of promising developments for which he has no actual Divine warrant, and which he does not quite absolutely expect, whereas he does absolutely expect as infallibly certain all that he predicts with the introductory authorizing oracle-formula, is to conceive of the seer as speaking with a cool calculation quite out of keeping with the exalted excitement of these passages. Moreover, these very passages before us on such a theory would prove that the Prophet made as great mistakes in expectation when he used the formula as when he did not. His cool calculation would be a worthless support to any theory of infallible predictions. The simple, evident fact is that so absorbed is Isaiah by his own grand faith in the certain safety of Zion, and so does the consequent enthusiasm grow upon him, that he loses more and more the sense of being at all different in himself from the very voice of God. In this latter part of the prophecy (c. xi.) his faith is at its highest; he is more than ever one with God; his words are more truly the Divine oracle. Indeed, they are more certain of actual fulfilment than were the predictions respecting Assyria. The Prophet's enthusiasm is not too high, his expectations are not too optimistic, save when occasionally they become entirely materialistic. The enthusiasm, and its perfectly sufficient foundation, are uttered together in the grand final chords of the whole passage

"Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion, for great is Israel's Holy One in the midst of thee." Comment is not needed where the words so richly speak out the argument we have been presenting.

3. There is one feature we may not pass unnoticed. It lies partly hidden in c. xii., which has been thought by some scholars to be a product of exilic hands like those which fashioned Deutero-Isaiah, (cc. xl.-lxvi). The fitness to its present place is seen at once in the words of v. 6; and the exuberant tone is not more like any later age than it is Isaian. It is in v. 2 that perhaps there lies an allusion to Isaiah's original vision and call, and to the later recollection of it in the day when the new gospel and grace dawned upon the prophet. He writes "Behold! God is my salvation! I trust and tremble not!" It was a disclosure of God that first won his soul to the prophetic calling; it was a deeper disclosure of God's character that turned his darkness into day, and gave him the power to save by Divine grace, where he had only failed by preaching Divine judgment. Again in another dark day it is the face of God, disclosed to the eyes that look on Zion, which awakens faith, restores calmness, and kindles joy. Isaiah had learnt the true persuasive, when he cried "Behold! God is my salvation. I trust, and tremble not!" The disclosure of God's heart wins men and saves them, to-day as then.

4. Prof. Guthe has shown strong reason, in his recent work "Zukunftsbild des Iesaia," for assigning this "Oration against Assyria" to 710 B.C., ten years later than the date which had become currently accepted, and which is assigned above to the passage. Guthe's assignment is likely to prove correct; but it does not alter the bearing of these chapters on the present argument. Yet it does alter the appearance of the long interval between the year 720, just after Samaria's fall, and the year 705, when probably Sennacherib's Assyrian invasions drew forth Isaiah's final series of prophesies. If there be no utterances, or only a few probable words from all that period of fifteen years, then we must suppose Isaiah to have been quietly busy as counsellor of King Hezekiah in the reforms of public religious observance recorded in 2 Chronicles, cc. xxix.-xxxi. If we can rely upon the Chronicler's narrative, then Isaiah's eloquence bore early public fruit; and the Reformation under Josiah in 622, which established Zion as the only legal sanctuary, was the second, and not the first royal effort to establish Isaiah's faith as the doctrine of the state. If, on the other hand, we cannot rely upon the Chronicler as giving us here a record of actual events, but must suppose him to be reading into Hezekiah's reign that state establishment of Zion which took place a hundred years later under Josiah, then it is at least remarkable that the chronicler himself has felt how appropriate such an establishment would have been in the days when the prophet Isaiah was closing his lifework. Evidently the chronicler and his fellows felt that Isaiah was the prophet of Zion. They seem to have known that Zion was not exalted exclusively and her feasts honoured above all others in the days of the kings Jotham, Uzziah, Jehoshaphat, and many

another before Isaiah's day; but under Hezekiah, Isaiah saw and said "Jahweh is founding Zion," and then men listened, and began to believe. This fitness of the Chronicler's opinion to our theory of Isaiah's prophecy lends strength to both. Quite probably the chronicler's elaborate record of Hezekiah's reforms and solemnities is largely correct. If then the prophet was busy in practical guidance of the king's plans for worship, the people did not need special admonition to think of Zion, and the prophet was already sufficiently occupied. His silence is thus easily explained. The few utterances from this long period need not detain us.

C.—Grace in Zion in the Period of Invasion.

(cc. xxix., xxx., xxxi,, xxxvii., xxxiii. 705-700).

Amid the terrors of Sennacherib's invasions, the prophet's voice rang out clear and cheerful. His brave, strong alarum sounding in all the passages from this period is ever a note of faith that Zion shall be delivered from all ill. The central thought urged upon the people's heart is that the Zion sanctuary cannot be hurt. The place beloved and guarded of Jahweh as His abode on earth is Judah's pledge and place of safety.

1. In c. 28, Isaiah sings of Ariel, God's altar-hearth, and David's city. Her halls where Judah's families meet for sacred feasting are in distress: but distress more bitter shall come on those who so distress Mt. Zion (v. 8). "The meek shall joy in Jahweh, the poor in Him Who is Israel's Devoted One. Jacob's face shall not wax pale; but he shall sanctify the Holy One of Jacob," he shall count as indeed his own Devoted One, Him Who is called the Devoted God of Israel.

In c. 30, they who flee away to Egypt in their terror from Jerusalem's siege and danger are warned that they are flying into shame, while those who return and rest in quietness and confidence, in this besieged but Divinely guarded sanctuary, shall be saved with strength. There is a striking, touching contrast between the promise of v. 18, and a warning of the Amosian days that stands in c. ii. v. 10, written in closely parallel words. "Hide thee," wrote the fierce young prophet of judgment, "hide thee in the dust, for fear of Jahweh. Jahweh shall be exalted when thou art abased." But now the preacher of Jahweh's gracious heart wites: "He longs to bless, He patient waits, and watches that He may have compassion. But at last, impatient grown, He will arise—but not to slay — no, rather to display the sweet beauty of His yearning face, that this may woo and win sin-sick hearts to rest upon His breast. When Jahweh is exalted, then shalt thou be saved."

2. Amid all the prophecies during the Invasion years, perhaps the most beautifully gracious words are in c. xxxi. 4-5: few, indeed, of all Isaiah's sayings have so exquisite a grace. He has just been declaring that Egypt is no place of refuge. "The Holy One of Israel is the Creator of all things, and He alone can save, as He can also confound all plans of men." Then, with majestic strength

of figure as of faith, he writes: "Like as a lion sallies forth against a band of shepherds and knows no fear, so shall Jahweh, Creator of All Hosts, came down to fight for Mount Zion against all the Assyrians." But now the prophet seems to fear that his figure and his tone are too fierce to soothe the timid folk he loves, and he writes on: "Like parent birds that flutter to and fro above their nest and young with sharp cries and strange courage when some enemy comes near, so doth the Omnipotent God hover over Jerusalem, defending and delivering. Let Asshur's princes behold the smoke arising from Zion's altar fires, for that is the ensign of Jahweh waving high over His home to mark His present power and Judah's safety. Then let Asshur fear and fail."

The passage is truly Isaian; for its beauty is that beauty of nature which God weaves for His own garment, and wherein the men of God must clothe their divinest faiths when they speak for God to men.

3. The story of the hottest day of siege is in c. xxxvii. Then, for one short space, even Isaiah feared that Jerusalem must fall; but soon again, out of the very fear, the old faith rose, again triumphant. Jerusalem may be taken, but Zion may not fail. Even out of the broken city shall go forth a remnant, and out of Mount Zion they that shall escape; these shall take root again and fill the land with rich fruit, with life, with men. Zion shall again be peopled and beloved; Jahweh's burning desire to have His people will perform this. He cannot live or be the God of Hosts unless He have a people of His own; for His own sake, therefore, He will do this. Here is the old Amosian doctrine exalted and filled with a new depth of grace.

But the prophet will rise to higher faith. The fight waxes hotter, so does the seer's excited courage rise, until he cries, Thus hath said Jahweh: "I will defend this city and save it, for Mine own sake, and for My servant David's sake." Isaiah had shouted in his first strong scorn of Sennacherib, "O Assyrian prince, the virgin Zion-daughter, Jahweh's fairest beloved one, hath despised thee. Stay thy battle noise and listen to her merry taunt as she skakes her head at thee." Then the peril grew, and the prophet's heart sank. But the crushed faith re-bounding, rose again, and the final song is a laugh of gladness in the prophet's soul, and of scorn against the hand that had dared to injure the abode of God in Zion.

Verily, that sanctuary has become to Isaiah the pledge and visible sign of God's immanent purpose. For His own character's sake, Zion must be safe. That Will is the token of God's need for man's fellowship. Men need God in Zion, and God needs men and Zion also.

4. Jerusalem was saved then. The siege was raised and fears all forgotten. Then Isaiah seems to have sung the final poem that we read in c. xxxiii. Its burden is the same theme that we have followed all along: "Jahweh hath satisfied Zion with justice and firmness, and therein is He Himself exalted. They who had done wrong trembled in Zion. But now look upon this city: behold how all our sacred joys now centre here. Here is quiet safety, royal

majesty, divine rule and righteousness. Are any feeble, are any conscience-stricken? No, no more forever! For the inhabitants shall not say 'I am sick.' The people who dwell in Zion are forgiven their iniquity." These are the last words of Isaiah. They speak at once the holiest hope of a man, and the holiest purpose of a God—Forgiveness. God comes, touches men's earthly life; then men may start anew on the path of life, when they begin from the abode of God. Isaiah rose to this height of faith; God raised him to it. The seer saw men's weary hungering for a sound of God's voice, a vision of His face, a token of His care. He saw the heart of God that created this yearning and that purposed to satisfy it. He grasped the thought that here in Zion he and many another had been conscious of Jahweh's presence; and that presence was singularly manifested to him when he thought it least possible because of the sin that was present. God came even to sinful men in Zion. That faith Isaiah clasped to his soul, and thenceforth pointed it out to men from his full heart with all that sublime eloquence that has scarcely ever been equalled. Men heard and were moved. Many believed, all wondered: a century later all agreed Isaiah's doctrine should be the national law.

VI.—The Sequel.

1. Here may not be told the long tale of Judah's interest in Zion through all the centuries that followed. The Jewish people are simply an ever unfolding record and monument of the mighty faith of that one man Isaiah, and the Old Testament is a portion of that monument. The study of the Zion Faith is the study of the whole Canon, and above is only the introductory chapter telling the central theme of the whole. There is indeed a strange fitness in the toilsome care of the late narrators when they read into earliest story the interest in Zion as the guiding thread that must lead and colour all their tale. It is true that we have seen no one of the great Hebrew thinkers before Isaiah making salvation in Zion his great theme. This was not the gospel of Moses or of Samuel or Elijah, of Amos or Hosea, and scarcely of Micah, Isaiah's contemporary and follower. But we know also how this Isaiah revelation was truly the child of influences working long before. Moreover, the Hebrew narrators only follow the strong Semitic tendency to belief in Divine Purpose, in other words, "Predestination" or even "Fate," when they find God's purposes manifest long before they are fulfilled. The Zion faith becomes the keystone of all their later life, they could not dream of its absence from all the early stages of their history. This explains many a passage in the Books of Samuel and Kings, and even in the Pentateuch and Joshua. These very passages are the reflex marks of the importance that Zion held in the minds of later men.

2. But when that faith first rose on the winged words of Isaiah it found strong opposition. Isaiah's eloquence and political skill were too great to be unmarked of jealousy; and the traditions

which his faith was certain to attack were both venerable and beloved. We have read of Hezekiah's reforms: then followed sharp reaction in the next reign, and the King Manasseh was its leader. It was the natural, fierce struggle of conservatism against inevitable advance; it was also the fight for freedom and honoured worship in all the local sanctuaries, and for governmental freedom too for the widespread homes and hamlets as against centralized religious observances, and the power that grows where these are. Manasseh must have been an able man, and perhaps was a better man than we have counted him; for bad men or weaklings do not rule so long as he ruled, and they who fight hard for religious ways have not bad motives only.

3. But the wave rolled on. Under Josiah, the great grandson of Isaiah's king, the whole people, with prince and elders, united in the revolution that established Zion as the one and only sanctuary of Jahweh. Only 78 years after Isaiah's voice had ceased his faith became the popular doctrine and national law. All Judah was ready to profess public faith in Jahweh's jealous protection of Zion.

One is moved to ask, what secondary motives there might be for for this action? Were there dangers multiplying that made some men hope for protection very grateful and even necessary? Certainly the struggles for world-empire betwixt the various powers of the Nile, Euphrates, and Tigris valleys, and the Iran plains, were threatening all small peoples with injury if not with absorption. But a more terrible scourge had just swept across all the Orient in the ravaging hordes of Scythians. These were now indeed retreating away back to their trans-Caucasian homes; but might they not soon burst forth again? Would not this new faith give new strength for resistance or at least for enduring the scourge?

Again, was the little kingdom really shrinking in geographical area so that the towns and country without Jerusalem were of less and less importance? Perhaps those Scythian ravages and other fears had driven the people of the land to count Jerusalem as their real home and refuge, although they did sally forth to cultivate the plains, and even to lodge upon them in periods of peace. So did the mediæval feudal dependents count the old baronial castles their refuge, and even their home; and thus may Jerusalem have become virtually the whole of the State as well as its centre. There were many influences at play to produce the Revolution; yet the Faith of Isaiah gave it both its mainspring and its outward form.

4. But opposition rose again, and this time from a far stronger voice than Manasseh's. Jeremiah saw that Isaiah's sublime faith, when caught up by the multitude, was quickly turning to a mere fashion and a loveless custom. The new prophet stood alone at his watch and toil for personal godliness, and saw men caring only for security, whatsoever they might be or do. It was easy to point to Zion, to Isaiah's oracle concerning Jahweh's devotion, and to the new law as their own acceptance of Jahweh's pledge. But real security, and the joy of it, are nothing more than the joy of trust in a Great Friend, who will ensure the greatest blessing, whatever that may be. Such trust is one with love and utter devotion; and

where love is not, there the truth is not, and then the joy of trust cannot be. The real security is therefore present only where love is; but on the other hand, even external insecurity grows where love does not knit life to life and interest to interest in a common bond of strength. Jeremiah saw that real security was wanting in many a soul in Judah, and that outward danger was also growing greater through men's selfishness. Therefore he cried, timid man as he was: "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, 'The temple of the Lord is this;' for Shiloh, Jahweh's older temple was destroyed, and so shall be Jerusalem." To the formalist the words were sacrilege, as well as insult. Was not Isaiah charged with lies, was not Judah's God taunted with unfaithfulness? Jeremiah nearly lost his life: and his whole story is one of suffering. Even when his prediction of Egypt's overthrow was fulfilled in 609, and his reputation as a seer was established, he was still hated and abused by the selfish court. Indeed, in later centuries Jeremiah's stroke at the sanctuary of Zion was bitterly reckoned against him; for it is remarkable that in all the chronicles of the people we have no reference to this man, noble and faithful though he was, save one brief hint that he was a man of lamentations (2 Chron. xxxv., 25.) Isaiah's faith was law and grew more sacred with the ages: Woe to him who had ever gainsaid it. Jeremiah's own cry against Zion tells indeed of the heartlessness of the popular faith, but all the more certainly does it tell of the universal hold which Isaiah's doctrine had gained.

5. Jeremiah also loved Zion. He only would that Isaiah's own great personal devotion should live again. He saw how sorely it should be needed in the darkness that was gathering. For Zion was not to save Jerusalem, the beloved city was to be destroyed and her temple ruined. Zion did not save the men of Judah from sin; sadder still, her princes, the very sons of Josiah the Reformer, were bad, cruel, false. All were driven away from Zion and from Judah, away out to slavery beyond the far desert, in the fields on the streams of Babel.

6. Yet when the Exiles returned, the returning remnant built Zion again first of all. Had not the great seers of the Exile, Ezekiel, and he who, Unnamed, was greater still, pointed across the deserts to the ruined heaps where Zion had been, and declared "Zion should be built again"? Is not that Unnamed prophet often coupled with Isaiah himself as almost the same man, for the love of each for Zion was the same?

So the great souls in the Persian days, in the Ptolemean, and the Maccabean ages, were devotees of Zion. Round that hill, crowned with a second Temple, they gathered, stern patriots, to draw sword and strike for Zion's safe integrity. Round Zion they gathered with bowed heads and strangely patient hands, crying, "Lord, what wilt Thou have us to do"? The sad sigh of yonder lad, "Master, what good thing must I do that I may inherit eternal life?" was the aching fear of a soul that Zion had not been truly honoured. It was more: it was the vision of a deeper need. That lad needed some manifest token of God's love. Love from

God like love for God must be manifested if it be true. The Hebrews needed their sanctuary, their prophets, their history to be signs of God's devotion to them; they read that devotion into all their history, for without a sign they would not rest or live. Was not that very hunger in themselves a sign of God's love? Was not the young man already in eternal life when he was truly eager to have it? It is true that we must have manifestations of God in visible, audible, tangible, perceptible forms. We must have historical facts, scenes, voices, story: yet since these are all perishable, not they can be the spiritual reality for us, or the essential manifestation of God to us. What is the true sanctuary that is itself a sign of the present God? Is it the sacred house, where we bow, quiet and at rest? Is it any spot where, mingling the voice in sacred song and prayer, we seem to feel the breathing of God's answer? Is it the lone chamber, where, pondering o'er the sacred story of men, good and glad, or wayward and unhappy, we seem to see God's finger guiding all? Which of all these things is the very raiment that clothes God? What veils Him and yet marks His moving presence? It is not the material house, or word, or story, but it is our own relation to these. There is God present with us.

The soul that cares only for the outward sanctuary and sacred things soon grows hungry; for the bread of life is not eaten. Then that hunger becomes a very monitor, the stone that was not bread becomes a sermon pointing away from itself. The sacred places and words and history become prophetic. They cry "Arise, haste thee onward, for this is not thy rest." So Isaiah's symbol and the Josian law preached answers to men's cry for God, but the answers were "Know ye what ye ask?" Men were to try these ways to see whether they were the way of life. Then at last should they learn how near God they had always been, while they had been seeking Him. Jesus came, and men began to learn that God was in man. Now no building, form or story, but a human life was infinitely precious. God abode there: that life was all one with God. Men can gaze on this sanctuary and know there is no farther quest, for here is the revelation that in no abode of man, but in man himself, is God's chosen home. God manifests Himself in Jesus, in man, in me. Does there seem still to remain a little gulf that must be bridged? For God dwells in Jesus and is manifest in Him, but not therefore necessarily in me. Nay, here is no gulf but a bond between Jesus and me. He loves me and wins my love, and we are one. In that love which is Him and me, God dwells. In that heart, that life of His that is all love for me, I am all bound. My heart is one with His, and in that bond, unity, love encompassing all, God is present with us. Isaiah's Immanuel is here fulfilled. Zion's prophecy is satisfied. The devotion of God that Isaiah saw in Zion, is manifest now as then. "God is Immanuel."

WANTED: A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS.

THE close of the Eighteenth Century witnessed a stupendous revolution in the world of politics. Are we to see at the close of the Nineteenth Century a revolution on no smaller scale in the world of economics? There are many things which point to such an issue, which indicate no less the need than the certainty of it.

The present distribution of property in European society is fully as anomalous as was the distribution of political power in France under the Bourbon regime. The accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few has reached a height to-day which was only surpassed by the concentration of government expressed in *L'Etat c'est moi*. The material goods which fall to the possession of the human race are shared round on "principles" which are scarcely distinguishable from open theft. The common conscience of mankind is revolted by the existing inequalities, and is only quiet because as yet no practical method of redress has been presented. The facts are patent to any observer. I need not repeat them here. Let me only point to two. At the present moment England is richer per head of population than she has ever been. Yet we know the poverty and distress which prevails among large numbers of honest working men. And one of our wealthiest Dukes is deriving a fabulous and ever-increasing revenue from land which he has done little or nothing to enhance in value, which has been made what it is largely by the labour of those classes, which to-day in London are at all but starvation point. These two contrasts—the contrast between the total of wealth available and the number among whom it is distributed, and the contrast between the deserts and the remuneration of the various classes of society—may serve as sample of the products of our present economic "system."

This anomalous condition of things is doomed. It cannot last—for two reasons. It contains in itself the elements of decay, and the attention of the masses, in whose hands lies now the power of the State, has been most forcibly drawn to it. Inherent decay within, and vigorous moral assault from without, not merely render the doom inevitable, but considering the slow pace at which such immense changes move, also bring it near with alarming rapidity. The working classes of Europe are as keenly alive to the causes of their economic oppression as they are to the pain of it. The recent outbursts in the British Metropolis, which is at the same time the capital of property all over the world,—the Labour Riots in America, the land where the greatest *political* liberty has prevailed for generations,—the Socialistic propaganda in Germany,—the Plan of Campaign in Ireland,—the Crofter revolt in the Highlands,—are palpable indications of what one may call economic unrest: portents that the people will have as little mercy for unjust inequality in property as for unjust inequality in political power. There is something rotten in the state of Denmark—that conviction is rightly spreading: the present "system," which sanctions such

fearful anomalies, has become as a permanency absolutely intolerable: what tolerance it finds is only grudgingly and with increasing impatience awarded to it as a makeshift. There must be, and there will be, a drastic change.

But how will it be effected? That is the all-important question.

It will be effected in one of two ways. Either things will be allowed to drift—perhaps through indolence, perhaps through ignorance of any feasible reform,—until the blind destructive rage of the impoverished masses involve the whole fabric of society in common ruin,—an economic counterpart to the political chaos of the French Terror; or a carefully acquired knowledge of the sources of present economic ills, as also of the true economic ideal, combined with a wise and fearless practical progress towards that ideal, will avoid the lasting misery and injustice of a general social shipwreck.

Of course until it comes to the practical realization of it, all parties will agree that the second course, if possible, is that which ought to be pursued. No one would approve of indolence or of ignorance which can be removed: when these lead to social ruin, every one would condemn them with emphasis.

Is, then, the second course possible? Can so enormous a change as is now demanded in our economic chaos be introduced by such doctrinaire methods? Must it not fight itself into reality by the clash of unconscious and unregulated social forces?

The French Revolution is the best answer to this question. It was in one sense the work of doctrinaires. It was the product of ideas. That it resulted so disastrously was not due to lack of doctrine or idea, but to the fact that the doctrines and ideas it followed were so false or inadequate. Rousseau speculates that the savage is the norm of the race; we have his dreams turned into terrible reality by the savagery of the Reign of Terror. Ideas, theories, are the most powerful and practical of things, and nowhere are they more decisively practical, or more irresistibly powerful than in a period of revolution. If we can get the governing idea, the regulative principle which is needed, there is no doubt that it will govern and regulate.

But is it possible to acquire the true theory, the true knowledge of causes and of cure? Can we lay our finger on the spot or spots whence the disease has spread through our whole economic frame? can we get a correct idea of what the body economic ought to be? and can we physic the old into the new and ideal constitution?

These three questions resolve themselves into one, and that the second of the three: can we find the true norm of our economic relationships? given that, we can soon discover by contrast, the disease and seat of it; and if we are not pessimists, we may hope to bring about the normal state.

The true norm of our economic relationships is given in, is bound up with the true norm—if such there be—of our ethical relationships. This is frequently denied, but can consistently be denied only by the most thorough going materialist. The distribu-

tion of wealth, the maintenance of property-distinctions or the modifications of them, are all included under the head of human activity, and all that can be included under the head of human activity, lies under the rule of Duty. Economics, practically considered, are a branch of Ethic, of the Science of conduct. Men who talk, as I have heard leading ministers talk, about laws of supply and demand being as inevitable and inexorable as the law of gravitation, indicate at once their ignorance and their immorality: their ignorance, because as any primer of political economy would teach them, these inevitable and inexorable laws, are continually modified and rendered inoperative by custom, which is simply the resultant of a great many human wills: their immorality, because they would place one half the activity of man at the mercy of selfishness tricked out as necessity.

If then we can find the true *moral* ideal of Society, we have found implicit the true economic ideal. To find a law or standard of human action in general, is to have found the law and standard by which men individually and collectively shall obtain, possess, or part with wealth.

Have we then a true Social ideal?

For a Christian to put this question is to answer it. He owes his very existence as a Christian to the proclamation some eighteen centuries ago of the perfect Society, the Kingdom of God, revealed and embodied in the person and life of the Proclaimer, and to his adhesion to the same. And the Christian not only believes that in the Gospel he has the presentation of what Society *ought to be*, but he believes that there is given what Society *shall be*. The kingdom of God, the Ideal Society of Jesus, is that which the world was created, and humanity born to realize. Behind it is Omnipotence, before it is Eternity. All the courses of history, however complex, and at times apparently contrary, are making for it as their last and certain goal. In short, the Christian has in the Gospel the ideal of the *perfect* and *ultimate* society.

It follows from the general observations which have preceded, that in the Revelation given in Christ, the Christian has the ultimate and perfect ideal of economic relationships. Because the Gospel is an Idea of Life, it contains an Idea of Property: and that Idea is one which God means to realize in history. Woe be to us if we ignore or oppose its realization.

In face, then, of pressing social dangers, it is of the utmost importance to develop the Christian Idea of Property historically and practically. The age is clamouring for guidance: guidance of some sort it will have, if not towards social safety, then towards social ruin; and we, as Christians, believe and know that in our Gospel, in our faith, is given the guidance, the goal towards which the race ought to move. If we keep the key in our bosom unused, if we do not point out the true path to the bewildered masses, then we are criminally responsible for the ruin which will follow. Fancy this great European Society of ours, voyaging down the rapids of modern progress, with only one channel where safety lies, and only one pilot on board who knows where that channel is—fancy that

sole pilot lazily amusing himself with watching the prisms in the spray, or with inspecting the log of the ship and its numerous past adventures, heedless of the shock which will, ere long, tumble him and all his fellow passengers into social perdition.—Yet is not that just what the Church is doing?

Is the Church making any distinct effort to learn its Founder's will on this momentous subject? Does it not rather shrink back from investigation, because application is so "dangerous?" Is it not too generally taking up an attitude similar to that which it took before the French Revolution, identifying itself with the privileged and propertied classes, and destined with them to common ruin?

I have now attended or visited a great many theological schools and have mingled with many of those who claim to lead the foremost ranks of theological advance. Yet I have not heard once of anything like systematic study of the Christian Idea of Property, any attempt to build from the foundation upwards a theory of Christian economics. We have chairs and teachers for tracing out the most minute questions of Israelitish history and polity, for unravelling the intricacies of Gnostic heresy, for describing the "immanent development" of the vowels and diphthongs of obsolete creeds; and yet nowhere have I heard of a chair, or fraction of a chair, being devoted to these practical Christian questions,—How are the poor to be fed and clothed, and the rich made to contribute their share to the social weal, how the pursuit of wealth, or the possession of wealth is, in accordance with the Highest Will, to be ruled and directed. Yet these are the questions which are agitating society, and may end in bursting it up from below. Of course, individual Christians, writers, and pastors, may have done their little to contribute to the discussion of these problems; but in these days when Science must be studied co-operatively, if it is to be studied aright, a poor parson here or there can do little or nothing. Further, in lectures on Theological Ethic, professors may have dropped a hint or two on the subject of economics; but ordinarily Christian economics in Ethic lectures are—snakes in Iceland. Is this right? And while theologians and Churches are calmly closing their eyes to the needs of the age, forgetful of the physical needs of the poor, of whom their putative Master was so specially careful; is it not touching to hear that the Atheistic Socialists of Berlin maintain that the true solution of the economic problem is to be found in the teachings of Jesus?

It is deplorable to see with what equanimity even earnest Christian thinkers have left the subject of the production, distribution, and exchange of wealth, which is in one form or other, the occupation of the whole human race, to system-builders who make naked human selfishness the foundation stone of all their theorizings. Instructive contrast, is it not? Rev. J. G. Rogers, B.A., on platform of the Congregational Union, declaring, amid cheers, such laws founded on selfishness to be inevitable and inexorable as laws of planetary motion; and the poor Berlin Atheist pointing to Christ as the solution of modern economic difficulties.

Of course I would not abandon any of the lines of study which

are now being pursued in our theological faculties. Let us have all the critical and philosophical and historical knowledge possible; but let us not overlook the weightier matters of the Law.

Now that the application of true historical methods has enabled us to see the Son of Man more truly, and to get a clearer grasp of His ideals, we may hope that we are at the dawn of a new era, when the truth so painfully sought and found shall be applied; and with the elimination of Judaic and Hellenic "elements" from our faith, we shall devote a larger proportion of our academic energies to the human ideals of our Lord. Shall not the Christ's Idea of the State and of the Family; of the Church and of the World; of Nature and of Art; and of Economics also be articulated with greater clearness than at present? We have been pulling down the old preternatural "high doctrine"-al Christianity of our fathers; surely we may hope we have at last got to the rock, to a clear level whence we can erect our new practical Christianity. Is it too much to hope that, ere long, the Church may be found to resemble her Founder, feeding the hungry, healing the sick, providing for the physical as well as the spiritual renovation of man?

I believe, however, that most of my readers, if not all, are at one with me here. They all, I trust, feel the need of a truly scientific system of Christian Economics. My aim in circulating this paper is not merely to call attention to the need which exists of some such discipline, but in the roughest of all sketches, to present an outline of study, from which friends may choose the special department of reading and research which most suits their special temperament or capacity.

The science which has for its object

The Idea of Property

must contemplate first—

Exposition.—*A.* The primitive economic condition of the race, so far as known to us.

The patriarchal, or clan system: in early Indo-European society: traced through the several branches, especially Roman and German. The "common" system.

One might call this undifferentiated Socialism.

It would next be necessary to trace as for striking example in Roman history the gradual development (through tribe property and State property) into

B. The modern, or individualistic, conception.

The Stoic philosophy, born amid the wreck of ancient social life, and so knowing only *persona et res.*

The Roman law, codified by Justinian, by Stoic lawyers.

The gradual dissemination through European States of this individualistic Roman law.

Its contact with German individualism and feudalism, and consequent modification.

The rise of political economy and methodic application of (Pagan) individualistic principles, from Adam Smith downwards. The "Manchester School." Reaction, in many authors, notably Ruskin.

Germs of a higher than individualistic theory appearing in many modern (German) economists (*e.g.*, Wagner in Berlin), and witnessing to the influence of

C. The Christian Idea.

I.—The Old Testament pre-suppositions.

1. The pre-Canaanitish or nomadic life; traces found in later times, *e.g.*, sons of Rechab.
2. The agricultural period.
3. Rise of commerce; agrarian crisis; attitude of the
   (a) Prophets, notably Amos and Isaiah;
   (b) legislative ideals,
   the Deuteronomic, the year of release (every 7 years),
   the Levitical, the year of jubilee, &c., &c.

The Old Testament pre-supposition that the poor are the good and the rich the wicked (from which, by-the-bye, Prof. Ritschl says Jesus never freed Himself): how far a continual truth.

II.—The Idea of Jesus.

The Kingdom of God,
As anticipated in the Old Testament,
As proclaimed by Jesus,
Not merely a spiritual renovation of human society, but
A social and economic reform. "Blessed are hungry, poor," &c. "Woe to the full, the rich," &c.
As reflected by the Apostles.
Meaning of the Lord's Supper.

III.—The endeavours of the Church;

The continual hankering after a Socialistic ideal, attempts more or less blind and spasmodic to apply Christian principle to property.
The ideal picture of Acts iv. 32 *ff.*
The hermits. The monks and brotherhoods.
Wave after wave of socialistic or poverty-seeking enthusiasm passing over the Church and leaving sediment in form of new orders.

These are most frequent in the Catholic Church, which emphasises the idea of the *Society*; less frequent in the Protestant, which emphasises the idea of the *Individual*.

Nineteenth Century Socialisms.

IV.—Systematic construction of the Christian Idea, from

Old Testament pre-suppositions,
New Testament deliverances,
Church endeavours and impulses, elucidated by side lights from the primitive condition of human society, and results of individualistic theories.

Having finished the Exposition of the Idea, the science must now treat of, second—

The Application.—

A. Negative: how *not* to do it.

Non-Christian ways of realising the Christian ideal:
Insurrection,
Act of Parliament,
Erratic spasmodic individual action or action of small societies, which breaks in on the continuity of human social development.

B.—Positive: How to do it. Christian ways of realising Christian ideal

I.—For the individual;

Christian stewardship, trusteeship for the Kingdom of God,
Due regard for the existing and transitional state,
Duties of rich and poor,
Duty of saving,
Luxury, how far right—and wrong?
Duty of simplicity and reality,
Re-productive investment and non-productive,
Voluntary graduated income-tax for purposes directly touching the Kingdom of God.

II.—For Society:

1. Points of attachment:
   (a) Poor law, all shall have bread for body in common;
   (b) Education Act, all shall have food for mind in common;
   (c) Public parks, gymnasiums, public subscriptions, co-operation, &c.
2. Further development, general encouragement of all points of attachment.

Not having gone through the course of study I have sketched I cannot, with the confidence which historical generalization can alone impart, give many hints under the last head (Second, B. 11, 2). But I think I have jotted down the chief points through which such a line of investigation must pass. Readers will have no difficulty in filling in from more extended knowledge and closer application this meagre sketch.

I need hardly add how glad I should be if a certain number of likeminded men would undertake the work between them, arranging each to devote himself to a different part. Only so can the rudiments of the Science be thoroughly ascertained and made use of.

Nor do I need to remind readers of their influence as constituents of Colleges in urging the appointment of men who would give themselves to such study, men of great mathematical, economistic, and historical abilities; or of encouraging those who venture to direct their students along such routes of research.

I commend these suggestions with special pleasure, and confidence of response, to such of my readers as are pastors. Pastors are bound by continual meeting with real life to feel the need of a readjustment of our economic relationships.

If the Church, in its pastors and teachers, is not deterred from its duty by the scare of "Property in Danger!" but conscientiously endeavours to know its Lord's will regarding the wealth of men and of nations, and as well endeavours fearlessly to do His will, then the economic revolution which is impending will be carried out in wise and temperate method, and the Church, may, in some measure, regain what its unfaithfulness lost it in the great political revolution of last century.

CAN THERE BE A SCIENCE OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE?

The progress of physical science during the last half century, and the criticism by wider views and drier lights, which has simultaneously played upon our religious convictions, have acted with the general advance of education and of liberalism in making theological opinions far less prominently important than they used to be. Fifty years ago a Congregational minister was cut off from the communion of his denomination by his hetrodoxy upon one peculiar point. Lately he has filled the chair of the Congregational Union, although his life-long energies have been devoted to preaching that peculiarity of doctrine for which he was accounted a heretic. This was not because he had converted the Congregational Union to his views, but because of the real advance in liberal feeling and charity which the Congregational Union has made. Its liberality, indeed, is now so marked that it attracted absolutely no notice that one year its chairman had just published a treatise asserting the absolute literal truth of the early records of the Book of Genesis, while the next year its chairman had just published some lectures in which he regarded the same early records as merely legendary. This liberal spirit has not been confined to any one sect or section of the Christian Church, but has even leavened at least the outside of the mass of the Catholic Church, both in its Roman and Anglican branches, and even is even seen in the Eastern Church also! In the Anglican Church not one, but at least several clergymen have been allowed to deny the physical fact of the resurrection of Jesus, while in the Roman Church voices have been openly raised in assenting to the naturalistic theories of German critics concerning the Old Testament literature and history.

But amid this growth of tolerance, and the general intellectual activity with which it is necessarily associated, one department of theological study, and that one the highest of all, has been neglected. Christian Doctrine, *Dogmatik*, or Constructive Theology, has been like a field which has gone out of cultivation; the best land, which should go out of cultivation last of all, has here disappeared from fertility before any other. This is because Christian Doctrine, which aims at showing the Christian Faith in its systematic relation to man and his place in the universe, had necessarily to be constructed *de novo*, or at least remodelled, when the old theories of man and his place in the universe passed away, and new theories took their place. Now that these new theories have won for themselves such a majority of adherents among Christian thinkers, it is to be hoped that Christian Doctrine will no longer remain a barren field. It is of course true that thinkers have not ceased to think and speak and write upon subjects of Christian Doctrine, and in certain sub-divisions of the science the brain and the pen have

been especially active: works on the eschatological problem have crowded with peculiar rapidity from the Press. It is of course true also that those indefatigable Germans have not been idle or reticent, while others have been silent or reserved; and the generation which has produced the works of Biedermann, Ritschl, and Dorner, cannot be called entirely fruitless in systematic theology. It is, of course, true that every one who thinks at all deeply and continuously on the problems of Christian faith and life must form for himself a sort of system of Christian doctrine. But this fact remains—that no great critical and constructive mind in our own country has in these years built up a system of theology which is at once abreast of modern thought and also avowedly and essentially Christian. Is this science of Christian Doctrine to arise again and be a living power in the land? Or is it to become a mere antiquarian study?

This question has been asked and shall be briefly answered by one who believes in the power and duty of theological thinkers to construct such a system of the articles of the Christian faith as may make the Christian religion better understood, more earnestly believed, and more purely preached.

If this theology is to be really a science it must be founded and carried forward in those logical processes and ultimate principles which are common to all sciences. The school men of three hundred years ago silenced arguments concerning physics or anatomy based on new experiment and discovery by quoting the authority of Aristotle; Theologians, at least those of the Catholic Church, silence the arguments of modern thought by appealing to the authority of Father, Council, or Pope. If Christian doctrine then is to become a science of to-day, it must construct its positions by reasoning out the truth, not by quoting authorities.

But the authorities and great names of olden day must not be abruptly thrown aside, for *Christian doctrine is primarily a historical study*. The Christian faith of to-day springs from the Christian revelation working in history; the Christian Church forms a great historical stream which has brought down (not without modifying it) the doctrine and faith of primitive Christianity. To understand the fulness, and to view the many aspects of Christian belief, it is necessary to know the history of Christian thought. A Christian Doctrine might be evolved out of the reason or pious emotions of a Christian believer, but if he is ignorant of all Christian speculation save his own, his system will stand apart from the great current of the Universal Church. Doctrinal Theology must examine Christian doctrines in their genesis and germ in the Bible, must trace this growth and decay in the History of Doctrines, and in "*Symbolik*, or the comparative study of creeds and confessions, must understand those forms into which the doctrines of Christianity have been crystalised. Only after having examined these materials and basing upon the results they yield when fairly criticised, can the science of Christian doctrine proceed to its positive constructive efforts.

Christian Doctrine must be therefore a critical study. The Christian

faith has been given us in earthen vessels, and it has often grown so cold that it has been frozen in fixed forms, and men have then been unable to tell what was mere form and what was living water. The criticism of Theology must be directed to distinguish the letter from the spirit. How much of modern religion still is hampered by phrases and forms of ancient philosophy, and even of heathen lore! The pure and spiritual, broad and elastic nature of the Christian faith will not be fully realized, till the criticism of more perfect science is brought to bear upon it.

Christian Doctrine will thus have also an apologetic duty to perform. Both by clearing the faith from the fungus growths that have fastened upon it till its original form has disappeared, and by establishing, on philosophical and historical principles, the reality of spiritual truth, this science will materially defend and advance the Christian faith. By showing the falsehood implied in superstition on the one hand, and in unbelief on the other, and by exposing the wrong ideas, which underlie both fanaticism and indifference, this Christian science of systematic Theology will render a true service to religion—a service indeed, which must be rendered ere the highest intellects and fullest culture can be brought over as true converts to Christianity.

Christian Doctrine must be, above all, a constructive science. Man needs his knowledge and understanding of the deep things of God built up and advanced. This is what Constructive Theology has to do. Of course it will be always true that man's mortal eye cannot fathom the secrets of the Divine. There will always be mysteries remaining for man to marvel at. But it is idle, nay almost blasphemous, to say that because man's knowledge of himself and the universe is of late so vastly increased he now has no more need of systematic reasoning concerning the ultimate being and the tendency and end of the human race. It were truer for to say that never before in man's history has there been the same chance for him to make his thought so true, so deep, or so devout.

When will our English religious thinkers cease to look upon their broken vessels with adoring but unavailing laments, and arise to construct something more spiritual, with stronger hope and truer knowledge? It is the mind which directs the body. The religious mind of to-day will better direct and stimulate the modern religious body, if it can consistently and completely formulate the Christian faith in the light of modern thought and discovery. When it does this on the lines this paper has attempted to sketch, will not it also be paying a duty owed to the most vigorously intellectual age that Christianity has ever experienced?

DAVID.*

With Moses Israel began to be a people. He founded the religion, and so founded the nation. But his work, just because it was foundation work, remained for a long time underground. Only slowly and gradually was it built up into a compact national edifice. The thought of God which he had brought, and the life which he had breathed into those poor nomads of the desert, contained no more than the germ of political unity, but it was a germ of such vitality and vigour as to develop under the most unfavourable conditions into a united organized State. The influence of that first great soul was indeed a Divine elastic cord girdling round the roving tribes, admitting of wide and prolonged tension, but slowly tightening and narrowing its grasp, until all were bound together in the one close bundle of national life. Let us briefly trace this process that we may better know the meaning of the Great Soul in whom it culminated and was crowned.

The tribes released from Egypt, with the worship of Yahweh burnt into them by the fires of Sinai, passed northward, a straggling horde, into the high table lands lying east of the Jordan. There they remained for some indefinite space of time upon the soil which they had won by conquest. Their numbers increased, and their strength improved by settlement upon this generous pasture land, the tribes began to aim at further conquest. They cast longing looks across the great gorge which from Lebanon to the Dead Sea cleaves Palestine in twain: they would cross the Jordan.

The settlement of the tribes upon the lands to the west of this river was not effected by any one great battle, nor even by any one organised campaign. Only very slowly and gradually did the tribes creep over the country, and absorb or exterminate the original inhabitants. So we have the words of Yahweh (Ex. xxiii. 29), respecting Hivite, Canaanite, and Hittite: "I will not drive them out from before thee in one year . . . By little and little I will drive them out from before thee until thou be increased and inherit the land."

Scarcely any other method appears possible or natural. In all points but one the Canaanites were a people vastly superior to the invading Israelites. They were far beyond them in the arts of civilization. The tribes whom Moses had judged were rude pasturers of the wilderness. The people west of the Jordan were devoted to agriculture, were engaged in the production of corn and oil and wine, dwelt in "great and goodly cities," which were "fenced up to heaven," and in settled "houses full of all good things." They had better military appliances than the fighters from the desert. Besides their high-walled towns they had "chariots of iron," which

* Intended to follow up the constructive study of Moses, which appeared in Selected Papers, p. 31, *ff.*

were long a terror to the Israelites, while an ancient poetess assures us that at one time "there was neither shield nor spear seen among the 40,000 of Israel." No wonder the invading tribes crept along the mountainous districts keeping to the woods and hills, looking down with envy and with dread upon the "Cities of the Plain," only gradually endeavouring to subdue the rich and warlike Canaanites. Indeed, the wonder is that the sons of the wilderness did finally subdue the husbandmen and burghers of Palestine. The law seems to be that the people of higher civilization absorb the people of the lower. Even granting that the Israelites had a military advantage over the Canaanites, what was to prevent them being as completely absorbed into the native population as the Normans were absorbed into the English?

There was only one thing which saved Israel, now as again and again in later ages: and that was his religion. In that alone he was superior to the natives he sought to dispossess; but that gave him the supremacy. The Canaanites had no strong religious unity round which to rally for inner development or outer defence. They had many sanctuaries and many local gods, but no one national God. The voluptuous and immoral worship of the Canaanites might be a standing peril to the baser souls in Israel, but they could never destroy the consciousness of supreme allegiance to Yahweh. Israel existed for Him: and they too often imagined that He existed for them. Whatever might be the tribal differences and local severances, all the children of Israel had in their one worship of Yahweh a sense of unity which made them strong to overcome the superior powers of the nations. It is this which made their conquest of Canaan a wonder-march, a veritable triumphal progress of Yahweh.

As the tribes were slowly pushing their way forward, as they were assimilating to themselves the peoples and manners of Canaan, as they gradually left the pastoral habits of the desert and turned to the cultivation of corn, of the olive, and of the vine, their religious life, though beset by many perils, was deepening and strengthening with their other life. Although at times apparently slumbering, it was wakened into self-consciousness and vigour by the rude shock of assault from without. The religious and national unity asserted itself in defiance of outward foes.

Let me point to the three great unifying epochs which preceded the final unification.

The scene of the first lay to the north in the fertile and far-famed Valley of Jezreel. Sisera, the Canaanite, with his 900 chariots of iron, has sought to subdue the several tribes to his sway. But a woman raises the standard of revolt and invokes a common resistance to the common oppressor. Deborah, with Barak for her lieutenant, sends round the fiery cross to the tribes of Israel, musters in Jezreel all who hurry to the help of Yahweh against the mighty, and there meets the foe. We have the story of the encounter in her own majestic verse. We read how in thunder-pomp Yahweh marched north from Sinai—for He still dwelt in Sinai: and wielding the combined powers of earth and heaven,

of cloud and mountain, of flooded stream and fighting stars, scattered the enemies of His people. Through the stress of struggle, and through the enthusiasm of victory the nation rose to unity in its consciousness of Yahweh.

Issachar was the tribe which had taken the lead in this crisis. The next centres in the tribe of Manasseh. The incursion of the Midianites, a desert horde, which sought to press as Israel had done into the wealth and fertility of the west, called to the front a man of Ophrah, Gideon or Jerubbaal by name. In the hour of national danger he appealed to the national God for deliverance, and in the name of Yahweh united the tribes and repelled the invader. His kingdom, however, perished in the hands of his usurping son Abimelech.

These passing perils on the north and east were succeeded by a permanent peril to the south and west, and the union which had been so lightly dropped must become permanent too, if Israel was to live. A strong military people had come from Caphtor (under which we may perhaps understand Crete) and had settled on the low-lying coasts of southern Palestine. Their compact organization and warlike abilities had already made the name of Philistine a name of terror. They pushed along the coast, turned inland, crushed the weak resistance of the Israelites, and brought them completely under their yoke. Shiloh—the central sanctuary of Israel, where the ark of Yahweh had resided—was destroyed for ever.

The pain of oppression stung the tribesmen to a sense of the need of united appeal to Yahweh. Under the shadow of great national disaster arose a great religious revival. A wild ecstatic spirit of prophecy seized upon the people, overcoming even the most sedate and high placed, driving them together in revivalistic crowds. And there was at the time, a man fitly called a seer, Samuel, who saw how to direct the religious feeling and how to restore the national life. The people must be organised into a permanent unity; the one increasing State must express the one worship of Yahweh, if either people or worship were to be preserved. Such a unity—not to be evanescent like the tribal gatherings under Deborah and Gideon—must be—could only in those days be—a duly-established kingdom. The inspired genius of Samuel impressed this idea upon the minds of the tribesmen and selected the man to realise it.

This man was a chieftain of Benjamin, already noted for his prowess and power, with a son of almost equal influence with himself. Saul, son of Kish, justified his title of King by a victory over the Amorites in the east, and made the tribes rally round him as he prepared for the death grapple with the Philistine. It was a long and wavering struggle. The heroic feats of Jonathan, and the generous valour of the King would have left the issue uncertain, but at their Court appeared one who was to turn the scale for ever in favour of Israel. The successive attempts to realise the national unity and liberty which had been made by Issachar, by Manasseh,

and now by Benjamin were to be crowned with success by Judah. Southward "the march of empire took its way."

The heir and author of empire was introduced to the royal court as one that was "cunning in playing, and a mighty man of valour, and a man of war and skilled in speech, and a comely person," and it was added: "Yahweh was with him." He came as a man of high family, of personal beauty, of approved valour and piety and—a characteristic more unusual and strangely blending with the rest—a player skilled in the rude music of that day. From his first presentation, David's rise was swift and steady. First he was armour-bearer and musician to the King. Then he became the most intimate brother-friend of Jonathan. At last the coarse trophies of his valour in the field won him the hand of the Princess Royal. His military genius gave him continued victory over the Philistines, and a growing popularity among the Israelites. The youthful hero lived in a dawn of unwonted brilliance.

But clouds soon gathered. David had proved himself too great a general not to be dangerous to the King, whose power as yet was wholly military. The natural jealousy of the monarch was heightened by the fears of the hypochondriac. Saul discovered, or affected to discover, a plot between David, Jonathan, and the priests of Yahweh at Nob. He charged them with aiming to deprive him of his throne. David was forced to flee for his life. Jonathan was sternly rebuked. The priests of Nob were massacred.

Quite naturally, though it seems to us somewhat unpatriotically, David went over to the enemies of his king and country. He sheltered himself more or less openly under the friendship of the Philistines. In doing so we can scarcely accuse him of infidelity to Israel's God; for the priests of Yahweh had sided with him, and the sole survivor of the massacre at Nob was his constant attendant.

Now follows the period in David's life which appeals more to our boyish love of adventure than to our moral admiration, when he led the life of an outlaw. He gathered about him in Adullam a band of desperadoes and malcontents and supported himself and them pretty much after the fashion of the Border Mosstroopers. He made inroads on unprotected districts, and levied black-mail on those which his free corps protected. His adventure with Nabal at Carmel is a suggestive instance of the way in which he lived. The stories of his wanderings, and of his hair-breadth escapes from his pursuers, are some of the most thrilling chapters in the romance of Scripture. But however interesting they may be to read, they were not pleasant to experience, and we can hardly wonder at David settling down as recognised vassal of the Philistines. He received Ziklag as his fief; and he who had been leader of the hosts of Yahweh was prepared to march in battle array against his countrymen.

The apostacy of David united with the melancholia of Saul to make Israel a comparatively easy prey to his hostile neighbours. The lords of the Philistines assembled their forces, pressed northward to Jezreel, and turning southward met the enfeebled array of

Israel on the mountains of Gilboa. In the battle which ensued the Israelites were hopelessly defeated, Saul and Jonathan were slain, and the land west of the Jordan passed under the yoke of the uncircumcised.

This was sad news for David, Philistine vassal though he was, and his feelings found vent in that fine outburst of personal and patriotic grief—his elegy on Saul and Jonathan.

But however sincere his sorrow, David was too good a statesman to overlook the opportunity which presented itself. The house of Saul had been driven beyond Jordan. There was its new capital Mahanaim, there were the only realms which owned its sway. The Philistines were supreme in Northern Israel. As their vassal, David now secured a feudatory kingdom in the south. He was a Bethlehemite and had probably never lost hold of his local connections. However it came about, the elders of Judah anointed him King in Hebron. There for many years he reigned, under the ægis of Philistine power, employed in fighting its battles and his own against the kingdom of Israel and the house of Saul. He was cautiously and skilfully consolidating his power, he was biding his time, until he could satisfactorily accomplish the mission which was ever growing clearer to his mind.

Nor had he long to wait. A palace intrigue drove Abner, the chief supporter of the house of Saul, into the arms of David, and another soon ended the sad career of Ishbaal. David's gracious reception of Abner had opened the way to negociation with Israel; his generous and politic repudiation of Abner's assassination had kept it open, and when the throne was vacant, the thoughts of the Northerners naturally turned to the brave and generous and powerful monarch of the South, who had before led them so often to victory, and who was now only waiting for their adhesion to proclaim himself once more their champion. The representatives of the tribes met together in Hebron and anointed David king over all Israel.

The new monarch was in a very different position from that Saul occupied at coronation. The son of Kish had been elected by the tumultuary enthusiasm of the tribes, and his power seems to have too much depended on similar passing gusts of popular excitement. David on the other hand was a king of several years standing, a general of still longer and more honourable record. He had around him a devoted body-guard, an army ready for his most daring will. He had added to his own the strategy of the Philistines. His power—small though it was—for the kingdom of Judah would not exceed in size the county of Cambridge, was compact and thoroughly in hand. And he soon showed that he intended to apply similar measures of consolidation to his larger realm.

His first step was perhaps the most important. He took Jerusalem and made it his capital. Up to that moment it had been in possession of the Jebusites, a section of the original Canaanitish population: so incomplete even in David's day had been the subjugation of the land. The new monarch displayed

rare wisdom in the selection of this city as the seat of his government. For military purposes it was admirably situated. It was naturally a very strong hold, and when fortified by art became well nigh impregnable. It was furthermore near enough the Philistine frontier to be a terror to invaders, yet not so near as to expose the heart of the nation to fatal surprise or severance. The political advantages of the new capital were even greater than the military. David knew full well the fissiparous nature of the Israelitish organism. Common danger might unite the tribes in war, but local jealousy was ever operating to part them during peace. The antipathy between South and North had been embittered by several years of civil war, and to retain Hebron as seat of government would be continually and painfully to remind the other tribes of the ascendancy of Judah. But the capital he chose belonged to no tribe—it was the prize of the common valour of all. It lay midway between the kingdom of Judah that had been and the kingdom of Israel that had been. It thus became the new and impartial centre of the national life. David soon sought to consecrate the military and political uses of his capital by the highest religious sanctions. The ark of Yahweh which had had no fixed abode since the destruction of Shiloh was at last housed in Jerusalem amid great national festivities. The city which during the earlier age of Israel's history had been nothing more than a fortress of the Canaanites was turned by the wisdom of David into a point round which should cluster the most sacred associations of Jewish and Christian centuries. The ardent patriotism of later Jewish patriotism—"If I forget thee oh Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning!"—the Christian loyalty to his Church as "our hill of Zion," the glowing anticipations of the New Jerusalem, can all be traced back to that sagacious choice of the freebooter king.

But David was not long left to pursue in peace the task of consolidating his new powers. For him to be proclaimed King of all Israel in succession to the house of Saul was to throw off his allegiance to the Philistine lords, and to have deserted to their hereditary enemy. So "when the Philistines heard that they had anointed David King over Israel, all the Philistines went up to seek David." They found him to their cost. The monarch of united Israel entered upon a career of all but unbroken victory. By a series of brilliant campaigns he shattered the might of the Philistines, captured their metropolis, and subdued them to his sway. Israel had at last risen superior to his most formidable and persistent foe. The struggle had been terrible, but the chosen people emerged from it united and free.

Nor was the soldier-king slow to avail himself of the new national enthusiasm. He embarked on a course of conquest which wins for him a place among the great generals of antiquity. He turned his victorious arms from the South-West to the South-East, and massacred the Moabites into tributary submission. The Ammonites, the Amalekites, the Syrians of Damascus, the Syrians of Zobah, felt in turn the weight of his hand, and after ineffectual insurrections purchased peace by tribute. These campaigns were

cruel and more like wholesale butchery than war, but they were after the fashion of the age; and Israel gave but what he had too often had to take. The news of this unbroken series of victories smote terror into the hearts of neighbouring nations, and states like those of Tyre and Hamath sought by friendly alliances to secure the suzerainty or benevolent protection of David.

Thus it was by dexterous diplomacy, by wise large-hearted statesmanship, by marvellous ability in war, that David built up what we have a right to call, in distinction from the petty kingdoms around it and within it, the Empire of Israel. His sway extended over tributary or protected peoples from the Euphrates to Egypt, and from Mount Lebanon to the head of the Elanitic Gulf. As we measure empires now-a-days it may seem diminutive; it was at most about the size of England, but to the small ideas of those ancient times it was a realm of extent immense.

Yet this had all been done by one who at first was but an outlaw chief, a leader of desperate men, one who had been hunted for his very life. Step by step, with a caution and a sureness which evokes our special admiration, he won the suffrages and the throne of Judah, and by careful and magnanimous action secured the adhesion of the northern tribes. To gain the unanimous loyalty of the tribes was one thing, to keep was another and much more difficult. Yet amid the continual waste of war, through the terrible schism of Absalom's revolt, and through the no less trying insurrection of the Northern tribes under Sheba the Son of Bichri, David succeeded in keeping the nation together and in maintaining its hold over the heterogeneous mass of peoples within the Empire. So firm yet so gentle had been his grasp that even after a long and decrepit old age, he bequeathed to his son Solomon an unimpaired dominion. How was he enabled to do this?

After making all allowance for the marvellous genius of the man we find the secret of his success to have lain in the fact that he apprehended and applied the central principle of the Israelitish religion. He recognised that the religious unity, the unity of worship, required and facilitated the national unity. He took up the great thought of Moses that Israel was the people of Yahweh and Yahweh the sole God of Israel, and saw that monarchy was the political corollary to monolatry. So he sought to act in all things as the agent and vicegerent of Yahweh. The courtier introduced him to Saul by saying "Yahweh is with him." He signalised himself under Saul by the way in which he fought the battles of Yahweh. The priests of Yahweh were suspected of being fellow conspirators with him. One of them, Abiathar, accompanied him always, and bore with him the sacred ephod or image of Yahweh, from which he sought and obtained the Divine oracle. He consulted Yahweh before every undertaking of moment. He had no sooner chosen a capital than he transferred thither with great pomp and rejoicing the ark of Yahweh. It is said he meditated building a temple for its accommodation. His sons were priests. He honoured the prophets of Yahweh as few monarchs would

have done. Nor was this exceptional regard to Yahweh, his worship and his servants, a mere cloak assumed for political purposes. It expressed the inner life and ruling principle of the man. Every great man is dominated by a great idea. With some it is unconscious, with others it is explicit and intelligently applied. In David's case, his great idea came from his religion. Just as Bismarck has acted as executor of the German aspiration for the unity of the Fatherland, just as Cavour was the minister appointed to carry out the movement in favour of Italian unity, so David felt himself called to realise the Divine idea of the unity and liberty of Israel. He completed the political movement which Moses had set a-going. We have the secret of his mission and power in the words, "David perceived that Yahweh had established him king over Israel, and that He had exalted his kingdom for His people Israel's sake." I do not deny that there were present selfish motives, love of fame, and the craving for power which belongs to all noble minds; but I do maintain that even in his worldly ambition David believed he was achieving the ends of Yahweh. He lived to carry out Yahweh's plan, and he was "the man after Yahweh's own heart." He had made the worshippers of Yahweh a united, an organised society: he had founded the visible kingdom of God on earth.

This great work had been done by a great soul. The large outlines of what he achieved form the picture of a large and noble personality. David's was an intense and a many-sided nature; too generous, too turbulent to be prisoned within the limits of ordinary morality. He was no saint after modern notions. All his actions cannot be fitted into the New Testament mould, nor made models for our imitation. How could they be? When we remember the early and barbarous age in which he lived, we cannot wonder at his faults. He was undoubtedly fierce and cruel. He was a man of Blood and Iron. We cannot condone his massacre of two-thirds of the Moabites. His treatment of the people of Rabbath Ammon, putting them "under saws and harrows of iron and axes of iron and making them pass through the brick-kilns" was, if our Hebrew text be correct, inhuman and detestable. We shrink from the thought of his stringing up the seven sons of Saul as sacrifices to Yahweh in Gibeah; it is hard to think of human victims being offered to the God of David, but nevertheless it is true. Nor was he free from the dark vice that so often attends as shadow of an impulsive and a generous nature. But those blemishes, for which partly his time and partly himself were responsible, cannot hide the nobleness and comprehensiveness of the man's character. He was a valiant soldier, noted and chidden for his personal daring. His brilliant genius as a general, his consummate ability as statesman and diplomatist we have already seen. His services as judge, his conduct of his court, seem to have specially endeared him to his people. But those public virtues only bring out into stronger relief his private character. His poetic gifts, his skill as a musician, impart to his nature a tinge of art, the glow of a sentiment which is rare in Hebrew life. They

prepare us for the ideal beauty of his loyalty to the King who hated him, and of his love to the brother of his soul.

> "Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives,
> And in their death they were not divided."

What a glimpse that couplet gives us into the deep heart of the man. And again—

> "I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan,
> Very pleasant hast thou been unto me;
> Thy love to me was wonderful,
> Passing the love of women."

We have never got beyond the wonder and intensity that throb in these two last lines. They make us understand how the great soldier and statesman could yet be the passionate lover, whirled along by the very torrent of his emotion. The man who could love so profoundly could generously forgive. In the magnaminity with which David could overlook even the most mortal offences against himself we seem to see a man far before his time. His contemporaries, and notably the grim Joab, could not understand his forgiving Abner and Amnon and Absalom and Amasa and Shimei as he did. It appeared to them, perhaps it really was, an unwise softness. With our immensely higher code of honour and morals we are still surprised by the chivalry and lofty generosity of David's deeds. His character of father cannot be commended for its wisdom nor outdone in its tenderness. What can surpass the intense self-sacrificing pathos of that cry, "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom. Would God that I had died for thee, O Absalom my son, my son!"

Even when he had fallen to his lowest, when he had wrought the deed of shame, the revulsion of remorse and the open avowal of his crime only revealed more plainly the nobleness of his nature. It was a deed of splendid daring in the prophet Nathan to confront the King with that damning sentence: Thou art the man. Yet it is perhaps a not less splendid tribute to the moral grandeur of that absolute monarch, so wild and turbulent, whose lightest word could have hurried the prophet to instant death, that he replied in humble contrition: "I have sinned against Yahweh."

David's was a large, a mighty soul, capable of vast purpose, of heroic fortitude and yet of most patient and painstaking attention to the next thing: full of tumultuous and overmastering passions, able to do fierce, cruel, and dastardly things, yet with great depths of tenderness welling up within him; never above tears: the massive rugged outlines of his character mellowed and rounded with the beauty of poetry and chivalry,—a grand man, a true hero, a King of men. His ardour for Yahweh was no mere political or ceremonial zeal: it was a true moral passion. He owned a higher purer Will than his own, and bowed before it in profound reverence. He abased himself with all his fame and power and owned with noble shame his sin against Yahweh. That csene between the prophet and the King, the "Thou art the man," and the "I have sinned against Yahweh" stamped a new and higher conception alike of King and God upon the heart of Israel.

The great work he did, and the great soul with which he did it combined to make him the Ideal King of Israel. He had made real in outward form, and to some extent in inward life, the Kingdom of God on earth. His reign became to the devoutest imagination of succeeding generations the golden age of Israel's past, and so the type of Israel's brighter future.

David had raised his people from a group of quarrelling tribes into a compact world-power. He had given a wide horizon to their thoughts, had made them possess in some measure a world consciousness. That experience of national greatness, short lived as it was, and never renewed, inspired the Israelites with a noble ambition, an ambition which they never even in their darkest and meanest days wholly abandoned. And at the heart of that ambition he had left the memory of his personal nobleness to give it a moral and a human meaning. For many generations the highest hope the heart of poet and prophet could frame was simply the restoration of the Davidic empire. Even when a fuller faith expanded the Messianic realm to the confines of the world, it was still a Prince of David's line should rule. They foretold either that David himself would be brought back to them, as the German peasant folk looked for Frederick Barbarossa rising from his sleep to save the Fatherland, or that some scion of the House of David, some King of David's dynasty and spirit, should re-unite his scattered people, and introduce the world-wide sway of righteousness and humanity and truth. "Of the increase of His government and of peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David." The realm which David created became the visible type of the Kingdom of God as he of its King; and the development of the religious life in Israel clustered round these types an ever deeper and diviner meaning, until Jesus came, a son of David, to bring in the universal eternal Kingdom of God.

Moses laid the foundation and David completed the edifice of the material State which was to foreshadow and cradle the Divine Society of earth. And the faith and life of both—of Moses and David—supplied the means whereby the sensuous was sublimed into the spiritual; whereby the nation of Israel fructified in the Church of Christ.

THE PROTESTANT IDEA OF THE CHURCH.

Dr. Paton, the able and energetic principal of the Congregational Institute at Nottingham, well-known (among other things) as the founder of the Recreative Evening Classes movement, has lately printed—for private circulation only, we believe—a little book, which he calls "The Inner Mission." The name is, of course, borrowed from Germany, and the book states very clearly and eloquently the idea, which is really the dominant one in Dr. Paton's life and work, the idea that the Church has not only to convert to the faith, and confirm in the faith, all men of all nations, but has, as its duty, to educate, enlighten, and ennoble all departments of human life. The meaning of the phrase "Inner Mission" is explained in Dr. Paton's own words (*Preface*, vii.):—"in a general sense" it denotes "the social redemptive work of the Church of Christ, by the diffusion of those regenerative influences, which the living spirit of Christ, in His grace and truth, imparts to it for the well-being of society;—and, in a more specific sense, a union of Christian Churches, the object of which is to give consistency, higher intelligence, and mightier effort to their separate and conjoint labours for the good of the people." The meaning and scope of this "Inner Mission" of the Church is developed in the four addresses, which are here printed, "the Inner Mission of Germany, and its lessons to us," "the Inner Mission of the Church," "the present state of Europe in relation to the spread of the Gospel," "Woman's great work in the Church.

The chief reason why this booklet should be noticed here is that it contains, and indeed is, a protest against the orthodox Protestant conception of the Church. Dr. Paton is orthodox among the orthordox on most points of Christian Doctrine, but he writes (p. 97) "the Church is not, as most of our Protestant symbols teach, an institution which exists only for the faithful preaching of God's word and the right administration of the sacraments, but it is a living and life-giving organization, which, if it be compacted of living members and be thus living in Christ, its abiding spirit, does impart grace and healing to men, of which its sacraments are but the signs" (*cf.* p. 52).

Leaving aside now Dr. Paton's book, which may be heartily recommended as suggestive to all interested in the usefulness of the Church, we may ask the question which is left before the reader as he lays down the book, have Protestants generally a sufficiently clear and consistent idea of the Church? The Roman Catholic conception of the Church may be very false and contrary to the true spirit of Christianity, but it almost atones for its falsity by its clearness and the severe consistency with which it is carried out in practice. When will the Protestant communities learn to think more clearly upon, and hence to act more directly from, their idea of their larger and better Church?

But first to enquire how our present conception—or rather variety of conceptions—of the Church came into being. In the Old Testament dispensation the political and religious rule and power are in the same hands, and the people of Jehovah form a theocracy pure and simple. Even the prophets, who appear to contradict this, at least when they oppose the priests or kings, really fall under the same principal; for the seeming opposition is only the friction caused by parallel offices; the prophets, the priest, and the kings all exercised their functions as the Lord's anointed, and as deputies of God. Under New Testament dispensation these three offices are united in Christ, who is the eternal Prophet, eternal Priest, and eternal King of His Church. Of course, this principle was not recognised from the first in the Christian Church. For Jewish Christianity, while practising baptism in the name of Jesus and celebrating the memorial act of the Lord's Supper, continued to hold to the Jewish forms of worship and polity. It was first the Pauline theology, and afterwards the Alexandrian theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the fourth Gospel which asserted the complete freedom of Christianity from the trammels of Jewish custom and constitution.

In the New Testament there are three elements which constitute the distinctive character of the Christian Church, one element social, another universal, and the third the element of holiness. The first of these elements shows the Church as a social organism, which is to be compared to a temple, whose corner stone and foundation is Christ (1 Cor. iii. 16, Eph. ii. 20), or to a body with members whose soul and whose head is Christ (1 Cor. xii. 12 *ff.*, Eph. i. 22 *f.* iv. 12, Rom. xii. 5), or to a vine with branches whose stem and stock is Christ (John xv. 1 *f.*), or to a bride whose husband is Christ (2 Cor. xi. 2, *cf.* Eph. v. 27); in all these metaphors there is asserted the close connection of the various members of the Church and their submission to Christ alone. The second attribute of the Church is its universal character, "Ye are all one in Christ" (Gal. iii. 28), and "We are all baptized in one body, and all made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 13, *cf.* whole chapter), are words which strike the key-note of unity—that all Christian believers are essentially united in one spiritual union (see also John xvii. 20 *f.*, Eph. iv. 3-6). The attribute of holiness in the Church is made to depend on or follow from the possession of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. vi. 11 &c.), and is connected with the life of communion with Christ which His disciples necessarily live (John xv. 2 *ff.*).

The growth of the Catholic conception of the Church, from this New Testament idea, went parallel to the growth of the ecclesiastical doctrine of the person of Christ. In fact, as they grew up together, they must ultimately stand or fall together. The Christological doctrine grew to its orthodox form by identifying the Divine Logos with the person of Christ; the doctrine of the Church grew up by identifying the dwelling of the Holy Ghost with the external organisation of the Church, or rather of its dominant orthodox section. The maxim "*ubi episcopus, ibi ecclesia*" expresses the germ of the

whole theory, and it was only natural that the attributes of the N. T. Church, its social character, its universal nature, and its moral holiness should be perverted as they were; the social character becoming that of an exclusive oligarchy or monarchy rather than that of a free republic; the universal aspect of the Church being hardly upheld by excommunicating all who denied the doctrine or the authority of the dominant rulers; and the moral holiness of the Church being exchanged for a certain purity of doctrine and adherence to a legal set of regulations, and being re-enforced by a claim to infallibility, which, though all indefinite and inconsistent in itself, was the logical consequence of the sacerdotalizing of the Christian ministry.

It is the great misfortune of the Protestant Church that it was originally so largely guided and, has been subsequently, so greatly influenced by its opposition to the Catholic Church, its doctrine of the Church has accordingly been too much a denial of the Catholic conception of the Church, and too little a development of the N. T. data in the light of modern conditions. This may be seen in several ways. The distinction between the Church visible and the Church invisible is common to Catholic and Protestant theology; both admit the invisible Church to be the congregation or sum of all believing souls, but their definitions agree no longer when they try to explain whom they conceive to be believing souls. The Church visible is, according to the Catholic Church, the hierarchy and its adherents and no others; in fact, the Catholic Church says "I am the Church visible." Protestant theology, on the other hand, regards the Church visible in two lights, as the universal Church, or "the whole multitude of those who are called in every part of the world," and as formed by many "particular churches," the various branches of the one universal Church.

With the universal Church on earth we have nothing here to do, save to insist that all members of it should be ready to recognise the one Spirit that reigns in and inspires them all in equal reality though in unequal degree. No hindrance to the understanding of the truths of the universal Fatherhood of God, and of the universal Brotherhood of man, and therefore to true piety, is so strong and so much within the power of the individual to overcome as the feeling that says what can I, the free Protestant, feel in common with the superstitious Catholic? or how can I, the critical student of Christianity, believe as the ignorant and credulous enthusiast? It is just because the truth of Christ makes all his followers one before God, and makes all their differences of shade and hue fade in the brightness of the Divine Fatherhood that true Christianity is the most powerful means in teaching men how to progress in all that is good and noble.

But the question of the nature of a particular Church is more immediately practical. The notes of a true Church, according to the general consensus of Protestant opinion, are (1) preaching the Word of God, (2) adherence to the Holy Scriptures, (3) due administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and (4) the power of the keys. Under preaching the Word of God has been

understood the public ministry of preaching in its narrow sense of pulpit preaching, and the power of the keys has been limited to the proclamation of remission of sins by the ministers of the Church. But thus to define and limit these notes of the Church's activity is to take from the Church the characteristic feature of being a healthy organization or organism. If the church is still to be as the New Testament defines it, a temple, whose foundation is Christ, a body with members, whose head is Christ, a vine with branches, whose stem is Christ, &c., it is necessary (1) to insist on the personal connection of each member with the Saviour, and (2) to emphasize the union of the various members together through a common religious and spiritual bond. Now Protestant theology has never, to our thinking—neither in its historic symbols nor in the writings of its greatest doctrinal teachers—sufficiently insisted on these obligations of the Church, to provide a loyal army for the Saviour of men, and to afford an air or a sphere in which might flourish the highest spiritual and moral life. From either of these duties would flow immediately the duty to prosecute what Dr. Paton calls "the Inner Mission of the Church," for to raise a loyal army for the Saviour and to create a high spiritual and moral life in men is seen directly to necessitate "the diffusion of those regenerative influences which the Living Spirit imparts for the well-being of society." The reason why these most important aspects of the true character of the Church have been so overlooked is of course that Protestantism has had to build up itself in direct opposition to the Church of Rome; this appears in the phrase "power of the keys," a term and a conception common to Protestant theology, but which would certainly never have been adopted into Protestant theology except to protest against the meaning which Catholic theologians gave to the term. In the same way the notes of adherence to the Holy Scriptures and of due administration of the sacraments are entirely absent from the New Testament conception of the Church and were adopted from Catholicism.

What Christianity must have in order to realize its promise is a Church which shall strike the "notes" not of Catholic tradition nor Protestant Reformation, but of the classic age of Christianity, of the New Testament. Those notes are (as we have seen) that the church should be *a social*, *a universal*, and *a hallowing* power: as a social power, it must bind men together by binding them all to Christ; as a universal force, it must have its hold on all men and have an answer to all cries and needs of mankind: as hallowing influence, it must make us see the things of this world by the light of an ideal and heavenly world, and must make all men and all things pure and holy. The Church of the future may find that these ends may be attained without a public (*i.e.*, pulpit) ministry, by a different observance of the sacraments to that which now obtains, and by what we to-day would call slight adherence to Holy Scripture; but if the Church of the Future can display itself as a social, a universal, and a hallowing power more strongly and more faithfully in the Spirit of Christ than we can to-day, it will not be an unworthy successor to the Church of the Past.

THE PASTOR OF HERMAS AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

THE Pastor of Hermas occupies an unique place in Christian literature and for the light it throws upon Christian life and faith about one hundred years after Christ died it is most valuable. It takes its title from the fact that the author calls himself Hermas, while the angel at whose instance and instruction he writes is in the form of a shepherd (Pastor). The work has been the ground of various discussions and conjectures, and the history of all its various fortunes at the hands of theologians, translators, critics, and commentators would certainly be voluminous and possibly entertaining. The date of this treatise, for instance, has been placed as early as before the year 79 A.D., but there is little reason to doubt that it was written in Rome in or about the year 138 A.D., *i.e.*, at the end of the reign of Hadrian or in the early days of Antoninus Pius. The "Pastor" gives a glimpse into the faults and dangers of the Church in that day; it is not only a protest against the failings then too common, but a sort of devotional and practical manual, with three divisions: (1) four visions (*visiones*), in which the need of repentance is enforced, (2) twelve commands (*mandata*) which are delivered to Hermas by an angel in shepherd's attire, (3) ten parables (*similitudines*), in which the Church is represented in various forms and always enforcing moral and religious truths.

This treatise, though entirely of a devotional and practical tendency, and the work of a layman in the Church, contains a certain doctrine concerning Christ and the Holy Ghost, which is none the less clear and important for being unsystematic. The "Pastor" is none the less an authoritative witness to the belief of its own day, because its author was a layman and a visionary; for the Canon of Muratori gives it a high but not a canonical value, and Origen, though he knew it was not universally regarded as "Scripture," regarded it as such himself and often quotes from it, as he does from other inspired authorities.

The most important questions from a doctrinal point of view which it suggests are "What is the conception of Christ's person held by the writer?" and "What is the relation of Christ to the Holy Spirit?" These questions are closely connected, if they are not really one, since in several passages Hermas seems to show—if he does not actually declare—that in his view the Son of God (Christ) and the Spirit of God are identical. The answer to the question whether in the mind of Hermas the two are identified has given rise to an important controversy. F. C. Baur, in his "Trinitätslehre[1]" asserted that Hermas held that the Son of God and the Holy Ghost were ultimately and essentially identical; he has been answered by Dorner,[2] who in his "Person of Christ"

1. F. C. Baur, "Trinitätslehre," i. p. 132*ff*.
2. J. A. Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. i. vol. i. p. 123*ff*.

comes to a conclusion the very reverse of Baur's. Many subsequent writers have engaged in the controversy, Zahn may be mentioned in particular as having taken up the position of Dorner, and as having been answered by Dr. Harnack, who says "Hermas knew of a single son of God who was before the foundation of the world, the chief of the angels, and whom he held to be the same as the Holy Spirit."[1]

The question is of real importance, for if it is to be held that, as Baur and Harnack state, Hermas did not distinguish between the ultimate nature of the Christ and the Holy Spirit, then it follows that the Church doctrine of the two separate hypostases in Son and Spirit is contradicted by a writer, who is very characteristic of primitive Christianity. As the issue is one of great interest it is worth while to review it again.

The first point to notice is that the Spirit-world plays a large part in this scheme of the pastor. Hermas imagines the universe as peopled with a multitude of Spirits, bad and good, which enter into man, and pervert or direct, injure or improve him. In this Hermas shares a feature or the later Jewish and also of Catholic theology. The angel of repentance commanded him to write his visions (vis. v. 7); the archangel Michael is the guardian and preserver of all the just (Sim. viii. 3 3); the ninth similitude has a great deal about certain virgins, who are explained to be "holy spirits," and unless these virgins have clad a man in their garments he cannot be found in the kingdom of God; for these virgins are powers of the Son of God" (Sim. ix. 13, 2), reprobate men are viewed as "handed over to evil spirits and cast out" (Sim. ix. 18, 3); many evil spirits may enter into a man and drive out the holy spirit; where Hermas says this he speaks of evil spirits (plural), then in the next breath of the evil spirit (singular), then again of evil spirits (plural) (Mand v. 5-7); but whether this is due to careless expression or an indistinct conception of the spirit-world is doubtful. Of this, however, there can be no doubt that Hermas views each individual as a spiritual being, or as possessed of a spirit; he speaks of "an all-holy and approved spirit" (Vis. i 2, 4), and the "renewing of the spirit" is a constant phrase with him (Vis. iii. 8, 9, Sim. viii. 6, 3, ix. 14, 3, &c.) Hermas conceives the Holy Spirit of God to be in frequent relation to the spirit of man,[2] constantly moving and guiding him: the following passage[3] representing well the place of the *Mandata* of Hermas, shows how man is the dwelling-style of spiritual forces:—"Be noble-minded and prudent and thou shalt have power over all evil works and shalt work all righteousness, for if thou wilt be noble-minded the Holy Spirit dwelling in thee will be pure, not darkened by any other evil spirit, but dwelling in a broad place will rejoice and be glad with the vessel, in which he dwells, and will serve God in gladness, having plenty within himself. But if any wrath enter in, the Holy Spirit,

1. Harnack and Gebhardt, Patr. Apost. Op., fasc iii., p. 157.
2. *cf.* besides passages quoted Mand. xi. 2, 8., Sim. v. 7 *ff.*, ix. 25, 2 & 4, ix. 25 2.
3. The translation is given mainly from the Greek text, but occasionally from the Latin. The two versions vary very considerably at times. What is the relation of the two versions and how they arose is a matter of doubt and uncertainty.

being tender, is straitened for room, having no clean place, and seeketh to retire from the place: for he is choked by the evil spirit, not having place to serve the Lord as he wishes, and being defiled by the wrath, for the Lord dwells in noble-mindedness, but the devil in wrath. When both spirits, therefore, dwell together it is unprofitable and evil for that man in whom they dwell" (Mand. v. 1-4.)[1] This passage, which is a thoroughly characteristic one, shows how large a part the doctrine of spirits plays with Hermas; how undefined is the conception of the Holy Spirit will be noticed from the transition from speaking of *the Spirit* in the man, to *the Lord* dwelling in noble-mindedness, and then back to *the Spirit* in the man. The devil is often mentioned in the "Commandments," and is closely connected with "the earthly spirit," but these are generally set in contrast over against the Divine Spirit: "Every spirit given of God questioneth not, but having the power of divinity of itself speaketh all things, because it is from above from the power of the Divine Spirit; but the spirit which questioneth and speaketh according to the desires of men is earthly and light and hath no power" (Mand. xi. 5*f*, and Mand. ix. 11, and Mand. xi. 17-21.) An instance of the action of the Holy Spirit as viewed by Hermas may be found in what he says of the Spirit taking him and bearing him away to a place where he beheld his visions (Vis. i. 1-3; and he adds elsewhere that this revealing spirit is the son of God (Sim. ix. 1. 1.)

From this it will be already apparent that Hermas used language crude (if not confused), concerning the Holy Ghost: he seems to have taken no pains to distinguish the nature, and work of the Spirit from that of the Son of God: indeed he calls the Spirit the Son of God. This language is corroborated by the most doctrinal passage in his book. This passage is worth looking at more closely. The fifth parable speaks of a certain man, who had an estate and many slaves; he made a vineyard, and entrusted it to a faithful slave, promising him his liberty if the vines were well trained to the stakes; the master went a journey, and returned to find, not only the vines trained to the stakes but the vineyard dug and weeded; the master called his son and heir and his friends, and because the slave had done for the vineyard better even than he had required, he tells them that he will make the slave the fellow-heir of his son; this determination approved by son and friends, the master made a feast, and sent what was over to the slave, who distributed it among his fellow-slaves; they in turn are glad, and wish that he may receive greater honour from the master; when the master heard of this, he again called together his son and his friends, who more than ever request him to make the slave co-heir with his son. (Sim. v. 2). The angel, who tells this parable to Hermas, after admonishing him, and telling him that he is over-eager to hear the explanation of it, explains it as follows:—"The estate is this world, and the Lord of the estate is He who created all things, and ordered and blessed them; his son is the Holy Spirit; the slave is the Son

1. This earthly spirit seems connected with the words of James iii. 15. There is a strong affinity in both cast of thought and diction between Hermas and the Epistle of James.

of God; the vines are this people whom He planted; the stakes are the Holy Angels of the Lord, who have charge of His people; the weeds rooted up from the vineyard are the sins of the servants of God; the good things which he sent from the supper are the commands which God gave to His people through His Son; the friends and counsellors are the Holy Angels who are first of created things; the absence of the master is the time which remains until his advent." (Sim. v. 2*f*). Hermas then enquires why in this parable the Son of God should be conceived under the figure of a slave? he receives as answer that "the Son of God is really placed in no servile condition, but in great power and majesty, because God planted the vineyard, that is, created His people, and gave them over to His Son, and the Son set angels over them to guard them, and He purified them from their sins by much toil and bearing many labours: for no vine can be dug about without toil and labour. When therefore He had cleansed the sins of the people, he showed them the paths of life, giving to them a law which He received from His Father. Thou seest that He is Lord of His people, having received all power from His Father. And listen wherefore He took His Son and the glorious angels into counsel concerning the inheritance of the slave: God caused the Holy Spirit, that was from the first, that created all creation, to dwell in flesh as he wished. This flesh therefore, in which the Holy Spirit dwelt, served the spirit well in holiness and walked in purity, defiling not the Spirit with any spot of uncleanness. When then it (this flesh) had served well and in holiness and had toiled and laboured with the spirit in everything, and had walked in strength and courage, God received it into fellowship with His Holy Spirit: for the walk of this flesh pleased God, because it was not defiled by the earth and had the Holy Spirit. So he took His Son and the glorious angels into counsel that this flesh, having served the spirit blamelessly, might have some place of abode, and might not appear to have lost the reward of its service: for all flesh which is found unpolluted and unspotted, and in which the Holy Spirit has dwelt, shall receive a reward" (Sim. v. 6).

What can be concluded from these passages concerning the belief of Hermas in the Holy Ghost? The judgment of Baur gives this answer: "The Son of God spoken of here is directly called the Holy Spirit, as we find also in the ninth parable[1], where it is directly said of the Spirit, who speaks with Hermas in the form of the Church, the Spirit is the Son of God. . . . . The higher element, that makes Christ the Son of God and works in Him as Divine principle, is here only the spirit, the Holy Spirit; and indeed the Holy Spirit, who first exists as Son, as subject distinct from the Holy Ghost, in the humanity of Christ, is in respect of His pre-existence, the Son Himself. It is of course curious that the Son in His pre-mundane existence should be immediately identified with the Holy Ghost, especially since the Holy Ghost can be conceived only as the immanent power of God, but the Son only as a

1. Hermas, Sim. ix. 1. 1.

self-conscious subject. But in order to gain the right stand-point for this conception, we must start from the appearance of the Son of God in human form, and regard this title ('Son of God') as originally put on the Holy Spirit after the appearance in human form. Consequently, as the union of the Spirit with a human body constitutes Christ, the Son of God, the Holy Ghost is termed Son of God before this union, inasmuch as he was destined from the beginning to appear Son of God in a human body."[1] Dorner argues against this conclusion on the ground that this similitude (the fifth) cannot give a satisfactory answer "to the question how the Holy Ghost is related to the Son" . . . . "because the similitude has to do not with the pre-existent Son of God, but with His state of humiliation, and with the sonship of Christ only as it was a reward conferred on the suffering humanity of Christ."[2] Later on however he admits practically what he labours to deny;" one might mark it as a defect here, that a moment seems to be supposed in which "the body of Christ existed, and was consecrated by the inpouring of the Holy Ghost, while as yet the indwelling of the Son had not taken place."[3]

It is pertinent to quote here the words of one whose sympathy with orthodox ecclesiastical doctrine cannot be questioned, and who says in reference to the question at issue: "In two passages Hermas identifies the Spirit with the Son, and it is difficult to determine to which of the Persons (*sic*) his language applies. Dorner maintains the reference to the Son; Bishops Bull and Hefele take the opposite view."[4] When it is possible to sum up the position thus, when the writers, to whom the orthodoxy of Hermas is a matter of concern, disagree between themselves as to whether he is speaking of the Son or the Spirit, surely this is virtually an admission that in the view of Hermas there is no distinction between that which is divine in Christ and that which is divine in the Holy Spirit, but only identification of the essence of the two. This conclusion is the more inevitable since the doctrine of the Spirit is so prominent in the Pastor: if Hermas referred only seldom or casually to the Holy Spirit, ambiguity might not imply much, but when the Holy Spirit plays so great a part in his doctrine, there is no alternative but to take this identification of Son and Spirit admitted in his language to be indicative of his thought and belief.

But looking back to the passage above quoted in the 5th Similitude, in which the parable is explained (Sim. v. 6), it will be noticed at once that the writer is at some pains to carry out to its full issue the parable's allegory: he does not gloss over its meaning (possible or apparent), but explains it in a detailed and straightforward way: "When the flesh had laboured with the Spirit, God received it into fellowship with His Holy Spirit: . . . all flesh in which the

1. F. C. Baur, "Trinitätslehre," i. p. 135, *f.*
2. J. A. Dorner, "Person of Christ," I. i. p. 128.
3. Ibid., p. 134.
4. H. B. Sweete, in article "Holy Ghost," in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. The question "which of the *Persons*" Hermas refers to seems rather an anachronism, especially after the admission that Hermas identifies the two.

Holy Spirit has dwelt, shall receive a reward," &c. Such language reminds us of Paul's doctrine that "the Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 17), and of his words concerning "the first-born among many brethren" (Rom. viii. 29), and indeed there can be little doubt in those who study Hermas carefully, that so far from giving ground to the statement that the Early Church always recognised a distinct hypostasis of Son and another of Spirit, he affords direct evidence to the contrary. This is all the more remarkable since Hermas, though a layman, was, if the Canon of Muratori may be trusted, a brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome, and so most probably he was not uninfluenced by the official views of the leading churchmen of his day. Be this as it may, it is certainly an important fact in the history of doctrine that Hermas saw no ultimate distinction between the Holy Spirit which dwelt in Jesus, and the Holy Spirit which sanctifies the hearts of men.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MARRIAGE.

CHRISTIANITY to be all-powerful and to teach men their duties in all spheres and situations in life needs a doctrine reaching to things practical and social as well as to matters of heart and head. Foremost among social and practical relations comes the family: it is in the family that Christian faith and life can be best sown, raised, and made beautiful. The basis of the family is the married state; hence enquiry into the Christian doctrine of marriage is not mis-spent if it help to form a truer opinion and set things in a truer light.

Systems of Christian ethics always devote a certain section to marriage and the family; but this section always appears extremely inadequate, for it gives no distinct principles on which to decide the difficulties, moral, social, and religious, which are connected with the satisfaction or restraint of animal instincts, the procreation of children, or even the general ethical significance of married life. What will be here attempted will be to give in outline the history of the doctrine of marriage relations as it has been variously conceived at various periods, and then to add some criticisms with the view of showing what must be altered or added to render that doctrine more effective and complete.

The Christian Church entered on the inheritance of the Old Testament and the traditions of the Jewish Church. In the Old Testament there had been already sounded one distinctive note, remarkable indeed when heard along with the teachings of Greece and Rome, but more in harmony with the best traditions of Eastern religion: the obligation of purity and the sanctity of the family. Alike in the legal, prophetic, and historical literature of the Old Testament constant references to the need of purity in family life occur. Among the Jews this teaching had produced the feeling that the state of matrimony was higher and more honourable than celibacy.

The sayings of Jesus which bear on the subject show that without sanctioning the Jewish feeling concerning the higher value of marriage he honoured it and insisted on its pure and holy nature. This is implied in the utter condemnation of divorce (Matt. v. 31*f.*, xix. 4*ff.* and parallels). There is little doubt that the saying that there is no marrying or giving in marriage in the resurrection is a genuine saying of Jesus, for it occurs in all three Synoptists (Mark xii. 25, and parallels), but this saying and the words concerning the "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake" (Matt. xix. 12) do not directly bear on the sex relationships: they only assert in striking language that the claims of the spiritual life are supreme even over those of family life and family instincts; they tell us nothing of our duty towards wife or children, save that

we must obey the law of God, even when love of family seems to bid us disobey. Though the marriage in Cana (John ii. 1*ff.*) cannot be accepted as history, it is worth remembering here as it proves that the Christ of early tradition, among those who best entered into His spirit, blessed marriage with peculiar blessing.

The teaching of the Apostle Paul on the question of marriage is much more full and decided than that of his Master, Christ. The seventh chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians is the *locus classicus* of his teaching.[1] Here the underlying principle of his teaching on the relations of the sexes is that celibacy and virginity are distinctly preferable to the state of matrimony; indeed, if men universally were to act up to Paul's doctrine the human race would soon cease to exist. It is, however, true that Paul's teaching is rather special than general, and takes the form of a plea rather than a dogma; thus he admits that he speaks his own belief, not the authoritative word of God on these matters, and holds that the question is one for each individual, who should be guided in this matter by the indwelling Spirit (1 Cor. vii. 7, 24, 40, &c.) Paul's teaching is no doubt largely due to his mistaken conviction that the end of the age was close at hand (1 Cor. vii. 29), and allowance should be made for this in estimating the Pauline doctrine of marriage, which is, in brief, that marriage is ordained as the refuge from fornication for those who are not strong enough to live the higher life of purity and celibacy. While this is the leading thought of Paul's teaching concerning marriage, it must not be forgotten that he also recognised the higher spiritual element in wedlock. He is the first Christian to hail the Church as the Bride of Christ (2 Cor. xi. 2), and to liken the relation of man to Christ to the relation of a woman to her husband (1 Cor. xi. 3). Indeed, this higher element of Paul's spiritual teaching became too strong for the ascetic element of his practical doctrine: at least in the development of the Pauline doctrine as found in those canonical epistles, which bear Paul's name, but are the product of the generation that inherited his tradition.

Thus it will be found that in these epistles the Master's own spiritual teaching had overcome his own ascetic view that marriage is on a distinctly lower level than celibacy. In the epistle to the Ephesians, a beautiful passage (2 Eph. v. 22-33) gives the most elevated and spiritual teaching concerning marriage in all sacred scripture. In the Pastoral Epistles, which are written in opposition to the dualistic Gnosticism, which especially forbade marriage (*cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 3), marriage is strongly recommended both for men (1 Tim. iii., 2, 4, 12) and for women (1 Tim. v. 14, Titus ii. 4); nay more, it is said here that a woman "shall be saved through the child-bearing" (1 Tim. ii. 15, διὰ with instrumental genitive). Thus the words attributed to Paul by tradition contradicted and overcame the words of the Apostle; and the voice of tradition will probably ever be the more obeyed.

It was not without opposition nor yet without modification that

1 One may compare on this question F. W. Robertson "Sermons," 3rd series, sermon on "marriage"; also C. Weizsäcker "das Apostolische Zeitalter" p. 687 *ff.*

the teaching of the Church of the second century as reflected in the Pastoral Epistles (especially in 1 Timothy) passed into the doctrine of the Catholic Church. On the one hand, many sects and heresies either condemned marriage or countenanced sexual antinomianism. Chief of these were the Montanists, who, headed by the great Tertullian, regarded marriage as a thing to be tolerated merely; but some went the length of utterly prohibiting the union of men and women in wedlock.[1] On the other hand, the growing asceticism of the age, or rather of the Christian Church, as it was drawn towards Eastern ideas and repelled by Western licence, tended to make marriage less highly honoured than celibacy. The chief modification, however, which distinguishes later from earlier regard for matrimony, sprung out of the growing ecclesiastical control of the clergy. There is absolutely not one word in the whole of the New Testament to favour the view that marriage needs the permission or sanction of the ministers of the church. Paul indeed has advice to give, but he insists (as already noted) on the matter being a personal one for the individual themselves to decide, whether the marriage is right and lawful. It is in the latter half of the second century, in the Ignatian epistles, that the first claim is modestly made that it is fitting that "those who marry should be united with the sanction of the bishop" (Ignatius, ad Polycarp. v. 2). Henceforth with the encroaching powers of the clerical office, there were restrictions placed on certain unions, and at the same time marriage gradually became illegal or null unless authorised by the clergy and celebrated with a priestly rite.

The progress of the doctrine of marriage therefore from the Primitive Church of Paul's day to the Catholic Church of a thousand years later, was slowly and surely leading to this conclusion, that celibacy was regarded as a higher state religiously and ecclesiastically than wedlock, while at the same time marriage was constituted one of the seven sacraments of the Church. Ingenuity was of course needed to reconcile a doctrine, which made marriage a means of grace, with the necessarily celibate life of the priesthood; but that ingenuity was forthcoming, and where it was not, the inconsistency was not a cause of offence. With this development in the way of regarding marriage, there necessarily went a legalizing and unspiritualizing tendency in the moral view taken of matrimony. While the protests against the growth of worldly spirit and immoral practices were united either with heresies, which were condemned and rooted out, or with the false ascetic feeling of monasticism, a free and healthy spirit, which would reverence and elevate the natural and lawful relations of the sexes, was impossible.

One great sign of this is the growth of the worship of "the virgin-mother of God." Many of those in this day, whose eyes are not opened by historical criticism to recognize the utter incredibility of the legend of the first and third Gospels of the virgin birth of Jesus, must still feel it a great stumbling block to have to believe

1 See Bingham's "Origenes Ecclesiastical," Bk. 22, chap. i.

that the Saviour could not be born as all the other children of men, whom he came to save. "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common," might have been applied to marriage, if Christ had been thought of as the son of a wedded pair. But "what God hath despised that seek thou to do without," was the natural though unexpressed feeling, as Jesus was conceived the son of a virgin mother. In any case, this devotion to the virgin mother is only part of the whole Catholic doctrine, which at the Council of Trent declared celibacy "better and more blessed" than marriage.

Another fact to be remembered is that the middle ages of European history are marked by the rise of the great monastic orders; these with the celibate clergy played the protagonist part in the social history of the Church; it is due to this fact, no doubt, that low views of the dignity and solemnity of marriage are so common still in modern society. The great sign and perhaps (in a measure) the cause of this in our own land, is that the marriage service of the Church of England is still in use, while no voice is ever heard in protest against its low and material view of matrimony. Some of our Church divines, even some of the most liberal, claim for the Prayer-book a sort of secondary inspiration; it might be curious to ask if they hold the inspiration of the marriage service to be as high as that of other portions. In the opening address of the priest, we are told that the reason why marriage was ordained:—(1) For the procreation of children, &c. . . (2) For a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication; that such persons as have not the gift of continency might marry, &c. . . (3) For the mutual society, help and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, &c. Of these three reasons, the first makes the getting of children the prime object of marriage, while a subsequent prayer of the service makes it appear that an unlimited offspring is desirable; the continual use of this prayer is surely somewhat of a mockery, in face of the notorious fact, that many married couples do not desire to have children at all. The second of these reasons implies that continency is a gift which the majority do not possess, and so denies that it is a duty equally binding on all men, whether married or unmarried. The third reason, which ought surely to be put first as the most important, fails to insist on the higher purity and spiritual life, to which so many, who cannot reach it in single life, attain in wedlock. In a word, though this opening address of the marriage service just refers to the "mystical union, that is betwixt Christ and His Church," there is nothing else in the service of a tone higher or nobler than the Catholic and ascetic idea of matrimony.

But how far did the Reformation affect the mediæval ideas of the sexes and of marriage? This is no doubt an important and a difficult question. A recent writer, who has given some attention to this question, at least as far as Luther and Germany are concerned, holds that the influence of the Reformation upon the moral condition of the German people "was not in favour of progress."[1]

1 Karl Pearson, "Ethic of Freethought," p. 261.

It is true that in Mediæval Europe there existed even in the sixteenth century convents, in which many women lived lives of purity, usefulness and culture; if the sisters were not all pure, these convents afforded a distinct sphere for women such as Protestant countries no longer possess; these were abolished by the Reformation. It is true also that Luther, and to a less extent other reformers were so vigorous in their denunciation of the ascetic celibacy of the Church, that they went to the other extreme and taught that marriage is natural and necessary in a way that was coarse as well as false. It is strange that Luther, whose doctrine was nothing if not a revival of Paulinism, should have gone so counter to Paul's high estimate of the unmarried life; he did so in his reaction against the monastic discipline, which he knew so well. Though Luther well insisted on the purity of the family, yet in preaching that boys should marry at twenty and girls at eighteen at latest, and teaching that continence in sexual matters was impossible and undesirable, he cannot be said to have furthered the higher view of marriage.[1] Fortunately this preaching of Luther was modified by his own beautiful married life, and must have soon shewn to those who listened to it, how false it was. Neither was it frequently (if at all), seriously taken up by followers of Luther.

While both Lutheran and Reformed sections of the Protestant Church agreed in rejecting the Catholic doctrine of marriage as a sacrament, and took their stand on the biblical revelation, they differed in this, that the Reformed Church subordinated the physical basis of marriage to the spiritual aspect in a way the Lutheran Church did not. Zwingli wrote "let no man suppose that the dignity of marriage is thereby diminished that I count it not a sacrament," and the system of marriage law, which was established in Zürich and read every quarter from the church pulpits, insists as strongly on the sanctity of marriage as Zwingli's own preaching did on its religious significance.[2] The teaching of Calvin is again on a distinctly higher level than that of Luther. He most emphatically asserts that marriage is not only to be a refuge from fornication, but that a married man ought to be "ad omnia pietatis officia promptior,"[3] and he goes on to solemnly warn those who are married that they should admit nothing "indignum honestate ac temperantia matrimonia."

Since the Reformation Protestant countries have recognised the State rather than the Church as the judge and arbiter of marriages with powers to sanction and to annul: in England, where the Reformation was only partial, the change has come, though more slowly. Indeed it has also come in the Catholic countries as well, where the liberalizing tendency has insisted on the State ceremonial being alone valid in the eyes of the law.

During the present century the laws of most European countries

1 See Karl Pearson, "Ethic of Freethought," pp. 256*ff*. Pearson gives information, but his judgment is as strongly biassed against Luther, as that of others in favour of Luther, who in silence condone him.

2 *cf*. R. Christoffell, "Zwingli," p. 154*ff*.

3 Calvin, "Institutio," 2 viii. 43.

and the feeling of the times have altered with respect to divorce: the granting of legalized divorces has become universally more simple and generally easier. From the Clerical and Catholic point of view this is taken to be significant of a lower tone and estimation of marriage. It is more truly to be regarded as the general recognition of the fact that marriages, entered into in a worldly spirit and by persons who are free from the sanctions of the Christian faith, may be better dissolved than perpetuated in misery and sin.

At the present day the Christian doctrine of marriage exists in two forms—in the Catholic form, identical with the mediæval doctrine in spirit and authoritatively expressed once for all by the Council of Trent—and in the Protestant form. In the Protestant form it exists without authoritative expression and often ignored in practice and in teaching by professing Christians. Yet, to thoughtful and earnest Protestants marriage means the natural and spiritual union of man and woman, who having become one flesh, are ever becoming more and more nearly one in spirit. This ideal may be often forgotten and often found hard to attain, yet it must ever be implied in marriage to those whose religion is based on the New Testament, and so long as the New Testament refers to the mystical union between Christ and His Church under the metaphor of a marriage.

But in modern times conditions have brought the very idea of marriage into debate. The free conditions of thought have allowed men to conceive of a desirable state, in which marriage in its present form should no longer exist. The economic conditions of modern life also have made the procreation of children a serious practical question. The quickened conscience and wider outlook of the enlightened Christian should make him face marriage from three points of view—individual, marital, and social. As an individual, he must ask "is it my duty to marry or to abstain from marriage?" As a husband, there is the difficult question of sexual relations. As a member of society, there is the question for him, whether he should become a father. Now it is just the failing of our present Christian doctrine—or rather frame of mind, for it is not definite enough to be called a doctrine—that to none of these questions does it help the individual to an answer.

Take the individual question, "should I marry?" How seldom we hear a word spoken or written to guide a man in this matter! Hegel held that it was a moral duty to marry if possible, and perhaps it was from a sense of duty that the learned philosopher married a gay young *belle*. But to most men it is a question primarily of inclination or of passion, and if duty comes in, it comes in as a secondary concern. What is needed is a stronger feeling and teaching that a man ought to marry if he believes he will thereby become, as Calvin says, "ad omnis pietatis officia promptior," but unless he does feel this, it is his duty not to marry.

The marital question stands on delicate ground. It is largely due to the feverish reticence as to sex-relationships, and partly due to a lack of physiological knowledge, that there is not feeling enough

to call forth a healthier tone on this matter. To-day a man may be the chief or helping party to a course which enfeebles himself by undue, though accounted lawful, gratification of his passions, and not a word is ever said as a protest, nor is he held culpable, though he suffers the results of letting the flesh have dominion over him. In the same way a man is often the cause or helping party to a course, of which the result is that his wife is so weakened by frequent or numerous pregnancies that her health is broken and life becomes a burden: yet one hears no condemnation and one is inclined to think that as most people *seem* to view the woman as suffering inevitably, one must do the same oneself. What is needed here is a stronger teaching on the limits of gratification, and the universal duty of continence.

The social question is the most difficult to answer. Ever since Malthus drew attention to the tendency of population to outstrip the means of subsistence, there has been a population question: and since the modern development of machinery, and the great increase of late years in the amount of the world's capital, the fact has become pressing to every true Christian, that constituted as our society now is there are too many children brought into the world to allow sufficient work and sufficient ease to all. A man ought to face this fact in producing children. It may of course be said, what is true enough, that economic relations stand apart from personal duties, that the population question is an economic question, and the procreation of children a personal concern. This is true in a sense, but not true in the sense that a man's private and public duties can never touch or clash. A man has no moral right to have a family while he "trusts to providence" (or to improvidence) for their support. A man has no moral right to lead a useless life, nor has he the moral right to produce a useless life. Of course it may be said that it is impossible to act in this matter with a view to the uncertain contingencies of future years. But the truth remains that sooner or later the present increase of population if continued will absolutely necessitate some restraint or restriction in the procreation of children. If the Church is to lead the world in moral questions, it must face this fact and answer it.

In conclusion, no excuse need be made for treating this subject a full treatment of it is needed and must eventually come; it is enough here to have suggested periods in the history, and points for the criticism, of the Christian doctrine of marriage.

PHILO JUDŒUS.[1]

THOSE who know anything of the teaching work or writings of Professor Drummond, the successor of Dr. Martineau as Principal of Manchester New College, London, will welcome his work on Philo. It is the most thorough and elaborate work which Dr. Drummond has attempted, and his attempt is surely a great success. Whoever has read Dr. Drummond's articles and reviews, especially his articles in the *Theological Review*, will be prepared to find in him a scholar of singularly patient and careful judgment; and this book is a calm and full judgment on Philo's place in Greek philosophy.

The contents of the work are thus arranged:—After an introduction on Philo and the general principles of the Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, in which the life of Philo and the school of Alexandria is sketched, the First Book, entitled "Greek Philosophy," contains a discussion of the thinking of Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, in as far as these thinkers were the progenitors of the Philonian system: the Second Book, which is headed "Blending of Hellenism Judaism till the time of Philo," contains chapters on the preparations for the doctrine of the Logos in the Old Testament, Ecclesiasticus, the Septuagint, Jewish-Alexandrian Literature, Sibylline Oracles, and the Wisdom of Solomon: the Third Book deals with Philo, in which book the synthesis of Greek with Jewish thought, which Philo represents, can be understood the more fully after the preparation afforded by the two previous books. The chapters in this book are upon the following subjects:—The origin and nature of Philosophy, the Universe and the problems it suggests, Anthropology, the existence and nature of God, the Divine Powers, the Logos, the higher Anthropology. The most important and the longest of these chapters is that on the Logos. As to the question whether the Logos was held by Philo to be a personal being or not, the author not only examines the chief passages in Philo and the chief criticisms of his commentators but shows that "the separate personality of the Logos would be a purely disturbing element and introduce a quite needless perplexity into an otherwise coherent system." If Dr. Drummond's conclusion that the Logos of Philo was not conceived as a distinct person, generally commends itself, a conclusion is reached, which has important consequences in the history of doctrine.

Up to the time of the publication of these volumes, the best accounts of Philo in English have been translations from the German of Zeller and Schürer. We now have an original work, which though not intended to be a complete introduction to the study of Philo" (so says the Preface) certainly gives a picture of Philo's thought as complete and as fair as any German work. In particular the spiritual or religious element, and the logical consistency of Philo's thought are brought into prominence; the book

1 Philo Judœus, or, the Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion. By James Drummond, L.L.D. Williams and Norgate, London, 1888. 2 Vols.

is therefore a real contribution to theological literature. For this work will enable the student better to understand the connection of Greek thought with Christian doctrine.

The attention which is now being directed to this connection is evidenced by Dr. Harnack's "Dogmengeschichte," and by Dr. Bigg's Bampton Lectures for 1886 on the "Christian Platonists of Alexandria." Dr. Harnack's brilliant work has not satisfied, though it may have aroused, very many. Dr. Bigg's lectures are more descriptive than analytical: more a contribution to, than a conclusion of, the questions with which they deal. By this book of Dr. Drummond, and by the Hibbert Lectures of Dr. Hatch, on the History of the Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Ideas and Usages of Early Christianity (when they are published and can be considered fairly), the problem of the rise of Christian Doctrine will be carried into a further stage than it has hitherto reached. Careful and cautious historical criticism is becoming more possible and more authoritative, and therefore more effectual in its influence in forming the belief and dissolving the prejudices of men. This is one of those books which will contribute to that end.

TWO SONNETS.

—:—

1.—After-Failure.

God called a sleeping son, and he awoke
  And wept that he so long had slept in sin,
  Being of such an heavenly birth and kin;
Then like a sudden flame that cleaves the smoke,
He cast afar the death-defiléd cloak,
  That cramped the bright eternity within,
  And stood aright, all eager to begin
The life of freedom 'neath the Father's yoke.

The death that can alone immortalise,
  The painful footway to the sun-crowned height
    Dawned dread-inevitable: on the slope
He faltered, sought some path of compromise
  Then chose again the darkness, knowing light—
    And after that, Oh God! what hope, what hope?

—:—

2.—Outside.

Am I without the Church, oh Lord! of those,
  Thy faithful souls united in endeavour
  To keep Thy Spirit in their midst for ever
And win away Thy kingdom from Thy foes?
To-night I strove to join the prayers that rose
  In sweet springs running in one God-ward river,
  But some blind power still bade our spirits sever,
And held me, coldly listening, to the close.

I saw Thy people waiting faithfully,
  And that strange radiance dawning in each face,
    A deeper union with thyself confessing,
And mutely wondering what it all could be,
  So left them—just the one in all that place,
    That needing most, had somehow missed a blessing.

ELIJAH.*

THE great epochs of sacred history express themselves in great souls. Moses embodied the Foundation-Epoch. His thought of Yahweh along with his personal influence formed a new religion and so became the germ of a new nation. David realised the political unity which was implied in the unity of Mosaic worship. He completed the material edifice of the Kingdom of God and handed down to posterity a sensuous figure of the spiritual reign. His empire and his ideal kinghood formed the visible alphabet by means of which later generations could write down their hopes of the invisible sway of God on earth and of the coming Divine King. As Moses stands for the Foundation, David stands for the Consolidation of the Sacred Society.

The next great stage, which is also summed up in a mighty soul, is the period of Preservation, during which the life of the Divine Commonwealth is preserved from foreign corruption.

It is a singular fact that this process of preservation was only achieved by *un*doing the work of consolidation. The disintegration of the political was the means appointed for the defence of the spiritual life of the people. We now begin to trace the marvellous series of national disasters which indicated and were occasioned by the religious progress of the nation. From the fall of the Davidic empire right on to the destruction of Jerusalem at the commencement of our era we notice a succession of political convulsions, generally deepening in tragedy, but each marking a new stage of advance in the religion of Israel; until the rudimentary cult of David blossoms into the faith of Christ. The removal of inward as well as outward defect was only accomplished by the remorseless destruction of the national fabric. The object of our present study is to observe the way in which political dissension and schism warded off dangers from without.

It must be evident to the most superficial reader that the religion of Israel was exposed to many external perils. That religion in insisting that Israel should have only one God was absolutely unique. The other religions of the world and notably those which girt in the Israelites were quite prepared and accustomed to admit of inferior or rival deities beside their national god. Now when Israel by way of conquest, commerce or alliance, came into relations with other nations, the temptation was inevitable to accompany political with religious civilities and to do some honour to foreign gods. To resist this temptation became the duty of the

* These three sketches—of Moses (pp. 31 *ff.*), of David (pp. 151 *ff.*), and of Elijah—have the design of furnishing suggestions for the constructive treatment of that period in Israelitish history which is not yet illumined by the contemporary evidence of the prophets' writings. The author is fully aware of the many crudities which must characterise any attempt of this kind in the present state of Old Testament criticism, but he ventures to believe that he has marked the chief points of survey to be taken in making a roadway of positive history from Moses to Amos.

faithful worshippers of Yahweh, who were ready to sacrifice both alliance and commerce and conquest in order to maintain the purity of their religion. Hence arose the fact that preservation of the religion meant disintegration of the nation. Let us glance at a few scenes in this drama of national self-denial.

The first to tempt Israel from his sole allegiance to Yahweh was Solomon. Born after most of his father's victories had been achieved he naturally thought more of the empire than of the people of Israel. His accession to the throne was due to a palace intrigue and not to the votes of the tribes, and his policy was a gorgeous but mistaken imperialism. His aim was to convert his father's sway into a great imperial absolutism. This ambition seduced him into a most unwise disregard of the temper and traditions of his Israelitish subjects. He parcelled out his empire into provinces irrespective of the old tribal boundaries (1 Kings, iv., 7 *ff*). He reduced Israel and the nations which Israel had conquered to a common level of oppression. He sought to centralise all power in his own imperial court, and spared no expense to make Jerusalem a worthy centre of so wide a despotism. He fortified it and beautified it; and by his palaces and temple made it architecturally the most imposing city in his dominions. But to get the treasure and labour necessary to carry on his numerous public works he was obliged to exact the most galling tribute not merely from the subject races, but from the freeborn Israelites (1 Kings, v., 13 *ff*). The hardy sturdy tribesmen groaned under his "grievous yoke," and bitterly resented the prospect of being merged in a mass of inferior peoples by the impartial severity of an absolute monarch. And they soon found that their religion was in danger. Solomon would be a religious as well as a political imperialist. He wished to exalt the brand-new temple at Jerusalem above the most ancient and hallowed sanctuaries of the popular worship; above Beersheba where Yahweh had appeared to Abraham and to Isaac; above Bethel, where the father of the race had seen the ladder leading up to Heaven; above Dan, where served priests of the line of Moses, the great founder of the faith; and as though to insult the austere simplicity of Israelitish high places, he had tricked out his temple with the gorgeous art of Tyre. Had not Yahweh declared "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me . . . and if thou make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it thou hast polluted it"? Yet here was a temple containing the most elaborate sculpture; with carvings of lions and oxen, and palm trees, and cherubim, with chapiters of lily work on the pillars of brass, with curiously engraved molten sea, with a brazen altar, set up before Yahweh! Whatever may have been the reverence which later associations caused to gather round it, the temple of Jerusalem must at first have greatly offended the simple religious habits of the Northern Israelite. He had seen nothing like it except the polluted temples of the Phœnician. And Solomon finally showed

that as he had not shrunk from introducing foreign art and foreign commerce he no less shrank from introducing the abominations of foreign worship. His empire contained many nations and therefore many religions; and every religion as well as every nation should be represented in the capital. The imperialist wisdom of Solomon made him feel after the religious policy which centuries later set up the Pantheon in Rome. His numerous wives represented an extensive alliance, and he seems to have acted on the principle that the gods of allied as well as of subject powers should have hospitable reception in Jerusalem. So "Solomon went after Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites." He built "a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Molech the abomination of the children of Ammon. And so did he for all his strange wives which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods."

A dull or tame people would have ensured the success and so have vindicated the wisdom of Solomon's imperial policy. They would have meekly surrendered at his bidding their political liberties and their religious convictions. But the people of Israel were neither tame nor dull. Their necks would never bow to any tyranny however splendid. Their simple faith should never be sacrificed even to the most magnificent ritual and architecture — no, nor should it so much as tolerate a rival, though the prize of compliance were to be the most extensive empire. The cry of "Our religion in danger" made the prophets the successful opponents of the new Absolutism and gave a Divine sanction to the popular discontent. Disaffection deepened into conspiracy and revolt; a divided nation could not retain its former conquests; and one after another of the peoples which David had subdued threw off the yoke of Solomon. At last the splendid but misguided monarch died, and the people seized their opportunity. When Rehoboam came to receive the homage of the tribes at Shechem, and insolently refused to consider their temperate statement of grievances, there arose the old cry of rebellion, "What portion have we in David. . . To your tents, O Israel!" The royal officer was stoned to death; the young prince forced to flee; and the vision of Imperialism was for ever dissipated. The Empire of David was no more.

The dominions which had extended from the Euphrates to Egypt had shrunk to the patrimony of a single tribe. David had ruled a realm as large as England. His grandson was king of a district about the size of a small English county. The new kingdom of Ephraim or Northern Israel far surpassed the kingdom of Judah in wealth extent and power. Thus the Divine Commonwealth which David had consolidated had lost its dependencies, had split up into two hostile kingdoms, and was henceforth steadily weakened by foreign aggression and internecine strife. But the religion of the Commonwealth had been saved. Northern Israel reverted to the simple worship of Yahweh in Bethel and in Dan; and foreign cults seem to have vanished from Judah. The

jealousy of Yahweh had been appeased by the exclusion of rival gods; and for this end the Empire had been destroyed. It was from Ahijah, the prophet of Yahweh, that, we are told, Jeroboam received his commission to set up the insurrectionary kingdom of Northern Israel.

The first great danger which threatened from without had been repelled. The second was much more acute, but arose in a not unsimilar way. The occasion of both was an ambition for political aggrandizement.

For many generations, indeed, there seemed little scope in Israel for national ambition of any kind. Egypt ravened and ravaged on the South; Syria on the North East. Ephraim was at war with Judah and even more seriously at war with himself. The chosen people seemed only too likely to sink beneath the double burden of foreign and civil war. But at last out of the welter of bloodshed emerged an able man who held up the falling fortunes of Israel and revived something of the glories of David. Omri, called to the throne by the voice of the army, put a stop to the long rage of civil strife, and founded the first great dynasty of Northern Israel. He fixed his capital in Samaria, as David had fixed his in Jerusalem, and made it the centre of a vigorous and far-felt sway. He brought back Moab under an Israelitish yoke. He is the first monarch of Israel who won for himself a name in the Assyrian inscriptions. The nation is thenceforward known to Assyrian historians as the House of Omri. His son Ahab still further augmented the powers and fame of Israel. In league with his hereditary foe, the king of Damascus, he fought the rising world-power of the East, and carved with his sword on its mysterious monuments the renown of the new dynasty. By his diplomacy and his military fame he re-united the northern and southern kingdoms; Jehoshaphat, King of Judah, seems to have been little better than his vassal. Under Ahab, as under David, though not quite so compactly, Israel is one.

But Ahab was not satisfied with consolidating his own kingdom, and exacting the support of Judah; his ambition, perhaps his necessities, drove him to seek a wider connection. Syria, for ever encroaching from the North-East, was the common foe of all Western States. Ahab sought help against her, not merely from the Jews of the South, but from the Phœnicians of the North-West. He repeated the policy of Solomon in establishing a Phœnician alliance. He married Jezebel, daughter of the Zidonian king, and entered into the closest relations with the great mercantile people of the Coast. The throne of Samaria was now highly exalted. Ahab not only ruled over Israel and Moab, he also held in close and compliant league the kingdoms of Judah and Zidon. Though much inferior to the empire of David, the associated realms formed a most formidable power.

Yet the brilliance of the Omri dynasty was not attained without casting a shadow over the popular religion. Religious purity was once more being sacrificed to political greatness. The people had

no objection to the league with Jehoshaphat or to the subjugation of Moab, but the truest among them regarded the Phœnician alliance with unmixed aversion. They beheld in it the channel by which the abominations of Phœnicia would flood the land. Nor were their fears groundless. For the alliance with Zidon to be more than merely nominal, Zidonian visitors and residents in Samaria must have conceded to them their own quarter of the city, as well as the right to observe their own customs and their own religion. A temple to the Phœnician Baal was accordingly built by royal order in the capital of Northern Israel.

We are not to go to the length of imagining that Ahab was a complete apostate from the worship of Yahweh. Such a thing was scarcely possible. To substitute the religion of Phœnicia for the national religion of Israel would have been to make Israel a subject province of Phœnicia: for in the East, State and Church were not separable. Ahab was bound to be an upholder of the worship of Yahweh, and there are many signs of his piety. He gave his sons names in which the name Yahweh occurred—a custom which was not yet common. He followed the directions of Yahweh in his wars with Syria. He was continually receiving messages from the prophets of Yahweh. Nay, when he was meditating his last fatal expedition to Ramoth Gilead, the prophets, four hundred strong, bade him go up, for Yahweh would deliver it into his hands. And when he was rebuked for his sin, he humbled himself before Yahweh.

But though Ahab had not repudiated the religion of Israel, he had violated one of its most fundamental requirements. The Spirit of the ancient faith had declared, right down from the days of the wilderness, "Thou shalt have no gods beside Me." Yahweh was to be the alone god in Israel; whatever political advantages might be gained by toleration, no other religion than His was to be tolerated among His people. Yet here was the King of Israel establishing a foreign cult in the heart of his capital!

At first it might seem an innocent enough matter to allow religious recognition of a political alliance. But the best of the Israelites felt the danger of the foreign poison spreading. The fair white robe of Israel's faith was gradually being tinged with the foul Tyrian dye. The change from the worship of Yahweh to the worship of the Zidonian Baal was all too-easily made. Up to the days of Hosea, the name of Baal was frequently applied to Yahweh, and where the name was the same, the worshipper might readily pass from the Baal of Israel to the Baal of Zidon. Even where this did not occur, the rites paid to the foreign deity might be transferred to the worship of the native deity.

The loathsome nature of these rites might well rouse all that there was of conscience in Israel. They were rightly called abominations. The very vilest of all vile vices—too foul to be named in decent hearing—were practised as a regular part of Phœnician worship. Wherever Phœnician mariners traded or settled, they left the trail of their debasing cult. The beautiful

religion of Greece and the stern faith of Rome were polluted by vileness borrowed from the temples of Tyre and Zidon. These nameless horrors were now imported into Israel. They were set up in the royal city and under royal patronage. They were spreading, by aid of kindred speech and under cover of the same Divine name, to the sanctuaries of Yahweh.

Against this peril so terrible and imminent, the spirit of the people was roused by the PROPHETS. Since the time of Samuel these religionaries had been playing a growingly important rôle in Israel. At first they had strolled through the land in wild ecstatic groups somewhat after the manner of the frantic dervishes who accompanied the Soudanese Mahdi; but they came to be regarded as spokesmen and leaders of the popular faith. They had gathered together in certain prophetic guilds or schools of the prophets, congregations akin to the simpler forms of our monastic orders. Their habits were very frugal and austere; their devotion to the ancient simplicity of Yahweh's worship had grown into a passion. When therefore they beheld the immoral worship of another god established in their midst and saw its debasing influences permeating the people, they lifted up their voices in fierce vehement protest. Ahab, they declared, had abandoned the pure worship of his fathers: he had gone after Baal: and great would be the wrath of the jealous Yahweh. Their following was numerous and vigorous; but they and their followers were alike dwarfed into insignificance by the gigantic figure of their leader. The rising indignation of the masses, the passionate resentment of the prophetic schools, nay, the very wrath of God Himself burst in words of fire from the lips of ELIJAH.

A man of the lightning, the storm-cloud, and the whirlwind, he flashes upon our notice as sudden and terrible as any bolt of heaven; and at the end of a career crowded with marvels disappears from view in a tornado of flame. But through the blaze of miracle which envelopes him, we catch glimpses of a veritable man; sublime and awful indeed, but still human. The rough hair mantle, tucked in with the leathern thong, of which the messengers spoke to their king (2 Kings i. 8), enclosed no spectre of pious superstition, but a real man. When fully possessed by the spirit of Yahweh, his will became well-nigh superhuman, and controlled the wavering multitudes with despotic force; but when the higher consciousness had gone from him, and apparent failure settled down on his work, the strength of his great nature sank into a weakness which, were it not so human, would be contemptible. One of the mightiest personalities of all time, he yet could cry, "It is enough, O Yahweh, take away my life!" But from those moments of dejection the prophet went forth with renewed strength to fight a harder battle than before, and to gain more signal victory. Such was the eminence of power which he attained that the wondering faith of later ages saw in him the wielder of every elemental force, the very embodiment of the terrors of Mount Sinai.

This was the mighty soul whom Yahweh sent to keep intact from foreign stain the faith which Moses founded. Of the opposition to the Zidonian alliance he became the leader and the life. Naturally enough he brought down on his head the fiercest enmity of the Court. For a great part of his time he was compelled to seek the precarious safety of an exile's lot. But ever and anon he issued from his retreat and delivered his message with tempestuous daring to the king's own face. Finding the Court obdurate. he appealed to the people. Elijah and his party might indeed be easily made to appear to the ordinary Israelite men of extreme and fanatical purpose. The moderate and conservative mind could not find anything very serious in allowing, for political reasons, the worship of the Phœnician Baal to be maintained alongside of the national worship of Yahweh. We hear of only one temple to Baal. That, surely, might be tolerated without grave insult to the ancient faith of Israel, especially when it ensured the important Phœnician alliance. All such considerations as these, Elijah burned up with a noble intolerance. He absolutely refused to allow that two religions could exist together in Israel. He entrenched himself behind the great thought of Moses that Yahweh was to be the solitary object of Israelitish worship, and declared that any tolerance of a second was apostacy from Yahweh. The man who offered sacrifices to Yahweh and yet suffered a temple of Baal to stand had forsworn the national faith. He might call himself a worshipper of Yahweh, but his tolerance belied his profession. Either there must be absolute acceptance of the religion of Yahweh (with consequent exclusion of every other cult), or there was rejection of it. There was no third alternative. So Elijah appears before the thousands of Israel with the memorable words, "How long halt ye between two opinions? If Yahweh be God, follow Him, but if Baal, then follow Him." Two opinions, two religions, was really acceptance of Baal. He admitted of companion deities, but Yahweh knew no peer. So that if the people meant to have two religions they had better decide to make Baal the national god. That was Elijah's great principle: tolerance of Baal is repudiation of Yahweh. He knew that the people as a whole would never consent to the complete abandonment of the national worship, for that would have meant in those days the surrender of national independence. His only fear was of their allowing both forms of faith, their halting between two opinions. Once let him get his principle engraved on the people's heart, and Israel was saved. It was when he had burnt it into their consciousness by his heavenly fire, that Israel was in fact saved and the multitude owned that Yahweh was the alone God. We know how even in this cynical critical age one man fiercely in earnest can sway a nation to his will. We can form some idea, therefore, of the way in which the transcendent personality of Elijah would dominate the will of Israel.

Yet that will could not at once express itself. The Court was strong: next to David, Ahab was the most able and powerful king of Israel; and he did not scruple to subject to fierce persecution those

who had dared to oppose his fondly cherished foreign policy. The prophets of Yahweh who were of Elijah's way of thinking were hunted and slain. The great hero himself was driven into despairing exile.

But the gathering popular discontent was startled into sudden power by a foolish and criminal act on the part of the king. His judicial murder of Naboth, and his appropriation of the murdered man's estate, lay heavy on the national conscience. The bands of loyalty were seriously loosened; and Elijah was to the fore once more, as zealous a defender of the public morality as of the national faith. He hurried down to the stolen vineyard where Ahab was rolling through in his chariot. He confronted the monarch, dared his wrath, told him to his face of the sin he had committed, and of the terrible doom which awaited him. The dynasty of Omri, strong as it was, and at the height of its power, should perish "hated and abhorred."

Elijah was but the one man standing there before the chariot of the king, yet he embodied the rising indignation of the people, and echoed the voice of Ahab's conscience. It was the repetition, on a grander scale, of the scene between Nathan and David. Nathan had addressed a friend, Elijah bearded an embittered foe who had repeatedly sought his life. And the doom he spoke out was by far the more awful. His boldness won his cause the most signal success. The king had put himself in the wrong in the eyes of his people; Elijah had nobly championed the right, and the king was bound to succumb. He did public penance for his sin, and the prophet declared that Yahweh had accepted it. It is difficult to estimate the effect of this triumph for the prophetic party. The dynasty of Omri had humiliated itself before the persecuted advocate of Yahweh's exclusive worship. It showed that the nation was siding with Elijah, and that the foreign cult was doomed.

Nevertheless the sentence of doom was not at once carried out. Elijah was swept from the scene of his earthly struggle before its consummation was achieved. Elisha was his great continuator, and by more temperate and sustained measures slowly won the people to his side. But the last extermination of the Baal-cult took place only after the overthrow of the Omri dynasty.

That dread scene in the vineyard of the murdered man, where Elijah met the guilty monarch and foretold his tragic fate, was witnessed by at least two other spectators who are not unknown to us. They were driving behind Ahab; a chieftain and his charioteer. The chieftain could never forget the awful burden of the oracle of doom; it lived in his memory in letters of fire, mingled with his ambitious dreams, stimulated his fierce, impetuous energy, until the day came when he was called to execute the awful sentence he had heard. The party of Elijah and Elisha waxed strong enough to meditate revolution, and Jehu, son of Nimshi, that chieftain of the chariot (1 Kings ix. 25), was chosen for the work of victory and of vengeance. The dynasty of Omri was overthrown; its last issue was slain, and the new monarch entered on his reign

the sworn foe of Phœnician innovations. But the fierce fire which Elijah had kindled was not to be quenched by the blood of the offending dynasty; a yet more terrible carnage was demanded. By the most unjustifiable treachery, Jehu gathered all the worshippers of Baal from all the coasts of Israel into the Samaritan temple of their god—"there was not a man left that came not"—surrounded the doors with his guards, and massacred the whole multitude. "Thus Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel." The work of Elijah was done.

But done only at great cost to the nation. The most powerful dynasty which Northern Israel had seen was sacrificed to the jealousy of Yahweh, and the people were much weakened by the long religious struggle. The next consequence was that the Syrians always a formidable foe, but now doubly formidable under the merciless Hazael, could work havoc at their will upon the feeble tribes. Israel east of Jordan was brought under their yoke, and even the Jordan was no effective barrier to their inroads. The nation suffered bitterly for its devotion to Yahweh.

Yet the spiritual gain more than outweighed the political loss. The religion of Israel henceforth escaped any serious corruption from without. That which was to become the purest faith of the world was saved from the stains of the foulest. Without doubt much that was impure remained *inside* the worship of Israel; but that could and would be thrown off by the process of inner development. What had been decided in this great era of preservation was that these inner processes should not be interrupted by violent innovation from the outside.

The great idea which Moses brought, and which enabled David to build up his empire, has now shown itself stronger than the empire it founded. It has shown that political—even imperial—schemes are allowed to exist only so far as they subserve it; are destroyed so soon as they thwart or threaten it. We are already beginning to see—what had not yet dawned on Israel—that the nation only existed for the religion, and not the religion for the nation. As regards rival faiths, this truth had been demonstrated by Ahijah and Jeroboam in the ruins of the Davidic empire, by Elijah and Jehu in the overthrow of the dynasty of Omri. The same great principle was now to be verified in the inner development of the people's life. The era of preservation from without gives place to the era of purification from within.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

It has been said that the Lord's Prayer is the one œcumenical symbol of Christendom. Certainly, though there are no two churches on the earth but find some differences between them, there can hardly be two Christians in the world who should not be able to kneel and say the prayer of Christ together.

Now, although the Christian Church is unanimous on this point —and on this point almost alone—that it uses this prayer as given by the Lord himself, yet there seems some doubt and difficulty in determining the exact occasion, form, or even aim of the prayer. For, when looked at in the light of historical criticism, it presents some interesting, obscure, but important problems.

First, it is to be noted that the prayer is given in two gospels, Matthew vi. 9-13 and Luke xi, 2-4. The latter account is shorter but otherwise almost verbally identical. The contrast between the two occasions, as related by Matthew and Luke, is much more striking. Matthew introducing it into that collection of the sayings of Christ, which is known as the Sermon on the Mount, makes the Lord's Prayer stand in contrast with the vain repetitions of the Gentiles, which are condemned in the two preceding verses (Matt. vi. 7, 8). Luke makes the prayer stand as that taught by Jesus to his disciples, when "It came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples" (Luke xi. 1). The so-called Harmonists, those to whom the literal accuracy of every account is to be retained, even at the cost of consistency, and in the face of historical truth, give as a reason for this, that Jesus first taught the prayer generally to all the people, and then again, more specifically, 18 months after to his disciples. The true explanation is, of course, that both the authors of Matthew's gospel and of Luke's found the prayer in the *Logia* or collection of sayings of Jesus, which they both alike used in composing their gospels. Luke's gospel, whether the earlier (as is probably the case), or the later of the two, gives the prayer in a short, and therefore probably more original, form. The author of Matthew's gospel quotes the prayer in an ampler form. It is hard to say at once which form is the original; for that in Matthew's gospel it may be urged that it is unlikely that the original was shorter than that here given since it is preceded by the warning against vain repetitions; for the originality of the form of Luke it may be said that the shorter form is naturally the more original, that if the phrases, "Thy will be done," and "deliver us from evil," &c., had been in the *Logia* they would not have been omitted by the Pauline author (or compiler) of the third gospel, whose gospel is the fullest and longest of the three synoptists. The answer to such a question does not lie on the surface, and is only to be found after thorough examination.

To proceed then, it is necessary to observe the differences in the two forms of the Lord's Prayer. This may be done by comparing them side by side:—

MATTHEW *vi.* 9-13.	LUKE *xi.* 2-4.
Our *Father* which art in heaven,	*Father*
Hallowed be thy name.	*Hallowed be thy name,*
Thy kingdom come.	*Thy kingdom come.*
Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.	
Give us this day our daily bread.	*Give us day by day our daily bread.*
And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.	*And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us.*
And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil (one).	*And bring us not into temptation.*

In this parallel arrangement, taken of course from the Revised Version, one sees at a glance that the version of Matthew's gospel contains two phrases or petitions which that of St. Luke's gospel omits; these two petitions however, though not "vain repetitions" of the preceding clauses, are still nothing but amplications of them; for if God's kingdom had come (at least in the sense in which its coming was understood in the time of Jesus) God's will would be done, as in heaven, so on earth, and if we were never brought into temptation, we should be ever delivered from the evil (one); these additional petitions of Matthew's version may be viewed as applications or explications of their preceding clauses, and on the face of it it is obvious that they are either dropped by the writer of Luke, because they only express in another way what has been expressed before, or added by the writer of Matthew, because they express in a clearer, fuller manner what has already been implied before.

The form and arrangement of the prayer is carefully and designedly balanced and concise, and so this prayer has been a "most exact summary of all prayers."[1] It was the custom of the Jewish Rabbis to compose short prayers for their disciples and to use such forms as the summary and conclusion of their petitions to God.[2] The Christian's prayer to his Divine Father must vary according to the temper of the times, the needs and circumstances of the day, and faith of the man who prays; it would be absurd to say that his prayer must always be in the fashion or the language of the Lord's Prayer, but the whole of the Christian's desires are summed up in the prayer, which Jesus taught his disciples, which must be viewed as the *summary* of all devout aspirations. If this prayer is not only to be now regarded as a summary, but was also given as such by our Lord, and to do so would only have been in strict accord with the relations of Jewish teachers to their scholars, then it seems much more probable that the shorter and more compendious form, that of Luke's gospel, is the truly original one.

1. Lightfoot on Matt. vi. 9 (vol. II. p. 158, works, ed. 1684).

2. Lightfoot, loc. cit. see also p. 1139. "The Jews' daily prayers, when Christ gave this, were eighteen. They reduced all these to a brief epitome. Rabbi Akibah saith, if he have promptness in prayer pray the eighteen, if not the short epitome."

This analogy with the Jewish prayers of the time is all the more cogent when it is observed that, as Lightfoot pointed out over two centuries ago, "the whole Lord's Prayer might almost be picked out of their (the Rabbis') works."[1] It is of course obvious that if Jesus wanted at once to answer the aspirations of his people for a Saviour, and to lead them naturally to a true, and spiritual devotion, he would teach them to pray in a way both natural and easy for them, and in a way which would assert that he was a true Rabbi and a religious teacher. It is therefore quite natural to find Jesus used the expressions of the Jewish prayers in giving his summary of prayer. This may be seen if the several clauses of the prayer be examined in detail.

"*Our Father, which art in Heaven*" (Matt. vi. 9), has the single word "*Father*" to correspond with it in Luke (xi. 2). It appears that "Our Father which art in heaven" is a not uncommon title in the Hebrew prayers.[2] The fatherhood of God, at least in relation to the nation if not to the individual soul, was a part of the faith of the old covenant (see Deut. xxxii. 6, Isaiah lxiii. 16, lxvi. 8, &c.) The gospel of Jesus consisted in making that belief in the Divine Fatherhood a truth for the individual soul. This truth is seized and enforced pre-eminently in Luke's gospel, which alone has the parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv. 4*ff.*) It is therefore strange that the term Heavenly Father, or Father in Heaven, which occurs in Jesus' mouth twenty-two times in the gospel of Matthew, and ten times in the Sermon on the Mount, is never once used in the gospel of Luke,[3] either in Jesus' words or elsewhere. The reason for this is of course easy to find, the writer of Matthew's gospel wrote for Jewish Christians and he used a Jewish phraseology with freedom and force, the author of Luke's gospel wrote for Gentile Christians and therefore he eschews Jewish terms and forms of speech. But is the shorter form of the third gospel simply due to the avoidance of Hebrew forms and nothing more? May it not be due to the fact that Jesus taught his disciples in the first instance to say, not "Our Father, which art in Heaven," but simply, "Father?" The only place in the New Testament, outside the first gospel, where the term "your Father, which is in Heaven" is used is Mark xi. 25 (parallel to Matthew vi. 14 *f.*) It is not used in the Pauline epistles, nor in any of the other gospels, not even in the semi-Jewish book of Revelation. Now if Jesus had taught the people on the Mount, and his disciples also, to address God as their Father in Heaven, might we not expect to find some of the apostles and other writers of the New Testament using the term? But as we do not find it used elsewhere (save in a single passage) outside of the first gospel, we must conclude that it is not the term Jesus used and taught. I hold therefore that the probability is exceedingly strong that the simple word "Father" was the word of address to God taught by Jesus to his disciples, and that "Our Father, which art in Heaven" was

1. Lightfoot, works, i. 1003.
2. Lightfoot, works, i. 159.
3. The "Heavenly Father" of Luke xi., 13, is an altogether different expression in the Greek.

the Jewish phrase substituted for the more simple "Father" by the writer of the first gospel and subsequently by the Church generally.

This conclusion gains weight by noticing how at the most solemn moments Jesus used "Father" simply in addressing God, especially in those sayings which one cannot think could ever be either altered or forgotten, "Father, if thou wilt, take this cup from me" (Luke xxii. 42), "Father, forgive them" (Luke xxiii. 34, Mk. xiv. 36), and "Father, into thy hands" (Luke xxiii. 46, Luke x. 21, Mark xiii. 32, &c.)

"*Hallowed be Thy name.*" These words occur letter for letter the same in both accounts. This reference to the 'name' and to the holiness of God is particularly Jewish. For the Jews "held no prayer to be right where there was no mention of God's name and kingdom. This is a plain canon, &c.[1]" And as Weiss pointed out, this phrase is closely connected with the idea of Jehovah, God of Israel, whose name was held in such holiness that it was left unspoken,[2] "the holy awe with which the being of the Holy One was recognised in Israel, which made people fear to offend Him, was to be the fundamental presupposition for the coming of the kingdom of God." [As is well known the names of Deities were used as charms and in incantations, and the name of God and of Christ was held in especial reverence in the early Church, and the usage in the Acts of the word "name" is very remarkable; see Acts v. 41, ix. 21, and often.]

"*Thy Kingdom come.*" In this petition again the words of Matthew and of Luke are identical. This was a purely Jewish desire, to see the Messianic kingdom come upon earth. As long as Christ is the Messiah, and as long as the Christian hope is in its spiritual contents and essence the same Messianic hope of peace on earth and righteousness among all men, so long will this prayer "Thy kingdom come," be lifted up to God. There can be no doubt that this as the preceding petition was part of the original prayer taught by Jesus, and was the outcome of Jewish thought and language.

[The alteration, which Marcion made or used in this position is worth remembering. Marcion (about 150 A.D.), used instead of these words the form, "Let Thy Holy Spirit come upon us." This form was once held by the Tübingen school to have been the original form of the prayer: as a matter of fact it contains an idea in a form belonging to the second century. The idea is not Jewish but purely Christian, and would have sounded strange to the earliest disciples of Jesus.]

"*Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.*" These words are found only in the longer edition of Matthew's gospel. As already pointed out, they develop and define the pregnant thought of the preceding "Thy kingdom come." In their first four words they

1. Lightfoot, works ii. p. 1,130.
2. Weiss' "Life of Christ," ii. 349*f*.

are literally identical with the words uttered by Jesus in His agony in the garden (Matt. xxvi. 42, parallel to Luke xxii. 42). The idea of the will of God being realised on earth as in heaven is found throughout the New Testament, and supposing this petition to have been added to the originally shorter form of the prayer, it was at least a very easy, natural, and appropriate addition to make.

"*Give us this day our daily bread*" is in Luke's version given with only a slight difference, "Give us *day by day* our daily bread." The difference, though slight, is more than verbal. Matthew's version asks for bread for *to-day*. Luke's version asks for bread for *each day*. The difference is readily explained in two ways: either it may be held that the form in the first gospel is original, and its meaning has been widened and generalised by the third gospel, or it may be held that the form in the third gospel is original, and its wording has been slightly altered in the first gospel. The latter alternative seems much the more probable, both because on other accounts the version in Luke seems the more original, and also because this phrase "Give us *day by day*" would not have agreed quite with the injunction "Take no thought for the morrow," which appears in the same chapter in Matthew (vi. 34), but which has no parallel in Luke. Possibly the writer of Matthew's gospel altered the phrase to avoid a real or seeming inconsistency; possibly, too, the writer of Luke's gospel omitted to incorporate this saying from the *Logia*, because he saw the inconsistency, and was unwilling to alter the Lord's prayer. Unfortunately this is a point in which the decision must remain as choice between two conjectures, and cannot pass into absolute proof. There is, however, one fact which seems again to point to the probability that Luke's version is again the more original. The adjective or participle translated "daily" and found in both versions is more strictly to be translated "coming" or "advancing," a word more general and indefinite than our word "daily," and, therefore, a word which seems to suit better the form of Luke's gospel, "day by day," which is more general and indefinite than "this day," the form of Matthew's gospel.

"*And forgive us our debts as we also have forgiven our debtors.*" This is Matthew's version, and Luke's is distinguished from it by several important divergences. Luke gives it thus: "And forgive us our *sins*, *for* we ourselves also *forgive everyone that is indebted to us.*" This latter version obviously loses the fine antithesis and balance which is possessed by Matthew's version, and though in the original Greek the balance and arrangement is not so unhappy as it perforce becomes in the English translation, yet the use of *sins* (Luke), instead of *debts* (Matthew), is a rude break in the symmetry of the whole prayer, which is otherwise symmetrical and balanced. Hitherto probability has seemed to point to Matthew's version being further from the original: here Luke's seems obviously more free and less original. Why is this? There is no

doubt as to the reason: the compiler of Luke's gospel was a disciple of Paul, and his phraseology and point of view is often visibly coloured by those of Paul. He wrote his gospel also for Gentile Christians, to whom Paul was better known than among the Jewish Christians, for whom Matthew's gospel was written. Now if there was one characteristic term in the Pauline preaching and epistles it was the term *sin* (ἁμαρτια); this is the word which the compiler of the third gospel uses in places of *debts*, and though it cannot be doubted that the beauty and balance of this position is lost by the change, was it not justified by making the petition more intelligible to the Gentile Christians, and thus uniting the preaching of Paul to the prayer of Jesus Christ? This conclusion may be made with practical certainty as it is quite in accord with several other cases in which the record of Luke has been moulded into verbal agreement with Pauline doctrine. Perhaps the most notable other instance is in the account of the institution of the last supper (*cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 24 with Luke xxii. 9), in which Paul and Luke's gospel alone record the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me." It is to be noted also that in the second clause of this petition, Luke's account retains the idea of *debt* in the words "Every one that is indebted."

The relation of the two clauses differs in the two versions; Matthew's version asks for a forgiveness *like that* already given by the asker. Luke's version asks for a forgiveness *because* of the forgiving nature of the asker.[1] Now which of these is likely to be the original true form? The former version is strictly consonant with the passage immediately succeeding the prayer, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (Matt. vi. 14*f.*) This passage cannot be considered a mere scholium on the Lord's Prayer, as it contains the new term "trespass" (παραπτωμα) for "debt" (οφειλημα): besides it has a parallel passage in Mark (xi. 25, above quoted), which, however, agrees better with the turn of the petition as found in Luke's gospel. The difference in meaning between the two versions is here very small, and if that in Matthew's gospel agrees better with the notion of God's power to forgive freely whom he will, that in Luke's is more consonant with the idea of man's right to claim forgiveness if he does righteousness, an idea most un-Pauline, but recognised as one of the religious ideas among which Jesus lived.

"*And lead us not into temptation.*" This, the concluding petition in Luke's account, is word for word the same as the petition given in Matthew's gospel. Lightfoot[2] gives the petition as existing with *me* instead of "us" in Jewish prayers. That this was an original clause in the prayer taught by Jesus, there seems little reason to doubt. The wording is closely parallel to a saying

1. Weiss' "Life of Christ," ii. 351.
2. Works, i. p. 1,003.

undoubtedly uttered by Jesus, the injunction to the sleeping disciples to "pray lest ye enter into temptation" (Mark xiv. 38, Matt. xxvi. 41, Luke xxii. 46); this saying is given in practically identical words by all three synoptists, and appears to have a reference to the words of their prayer, taught by Jesus to His disciples.

[Some have felt a difficulty in reconciling with this petition the opening of the epistle of James, "Count it all joy when ye fall into manifold temptations" (James i. 2.) But there is no real difficulty in the matter, and it cannot be admitted as any evidence on the question as to how much the Lord's prayer was in constant use at the time when the epistle of James was written.]

"*But deliver us from the evil (one.)*" This clause is wholly wanting in Luke's version. It is, as it stands in Matthew's version, a development and definition of the preceding clause. As it appears most probable that the words "Thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth" were added by the compiler of Matthew's gospel, so it is probable that here again he has added these words to define and enforce the preceding petition. Perhaps also he may have felt that the balance of the whole prayer was less injured by adding two phrases, an explanatory one near the beginning and an explanatory one at the end, than by adding one phrase towards the beginning only.

The phrase added in the Jewish Christians' gospel appears to be one which was in use among the Jew.[1] There is only one really similar expression[2] to it in all the New Testament, viz., "The Lord will deliver me from every evil work" (2 Tim. iv. 18), which passage has been held to constitute "an unmistakable reference" to the Lord's prayer. But surely if this is the only "unmistakable reference" to the Lord's Prayer in the New Testament, it is a very distant one, and the fact that there is none more unmistakable goes some way to show the petition was not an original part of the Lord's Prayer.

[As to the famous question whether *του πονηρου* should be translated "evil" or "the evil one," it may be observed that the latter translation is more consonant with the spirit of Judaism or Jewish Christianity, which the first gospel so often reflects, and the personality of the evil being or principle was not doubted among the Jews, and is implied in many passages of the New Testament. That "The evil one" was a person to the first men who used this form does not hinder us from using it, even if we no longer believe in the personal being and activity of the devil.]

An examination of the various clauses of the Lord's Prayer confirms the view that the shorter form of it given by Luke is closer to the original than the longer form given by Matthew, except in one clause, viz., "forgive us our debts," where Luke's

1. Lightfoot, works, ii. p. 160.
2. 2 Cor. i. 10, 2 Thes. iii. 2, 2 Tim. iii. 11 are not sufficiently close to merit serious attention.

gospel has substituted "sins" from the dogmatic motive, to associate it more closely with the teaching of Paul. As far as we can see, therefore, the original form of the Lord's Prayer was approximately as follows:

Father,
Hallowed be Thy Name.
Thy kingdom come.
Give us day by day our daily bread.
And forgive us our debts,
For we ourselves also forgive everyone that is indebted to us.
And lead us not into temptation.

Perhaps long and holy associations or other reasons may incline us to think this form short and meagre, and certainly though perhaps quite perfect in itself, it cannot be desired that we should go back to this primitive form, however much we may long to return to Christ's Christianity.

The doxology, which traditional usage has indissolubly united with the Lord's Prayer, and which is allowed by scholars of all schools, both orthodox and critical, to have had no place in the original form, has a place in our religious consciousness and devotions, and however lacking in originality, will not cease to be upon our tongues. The words, "For Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen," are not found in the earliest MSS or versions, and are not given in the Revised Version either in Matthew or in Luke's gospel. There is no doubt that the doxology is as the rest of the prayer, indeed more so than most of the petitions, eminently Jewish in feeling and expression. Very similar phrases occur in the Jewish liturgies; and the public (or synagogue) prayers of the Jews were largely "benedictory or doxological."[1] Similarly, their prayers ended with the word with which we end all our prayers—Amen. The use of the word "Amen" was doubtless very early adopted, in Paul's time, to judge from 1 Cor. xiv. 16. The word was used as a response in public worship; its universal use (public and private) has crept in through its liturgical use.[2] Such facts and discoveries need not lead us to discard a certain form or alter the language of our prayers, but they should teach us to turn with fresh reverence to the spirit of Him, who taught us thus to pray.

---

1. Lightfoot, works, ii. p. 427 . . . *cf.* ii. 160*f.*
2. Lightfoot, works, ii. 160.

THE RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE OF ANGELS AND DEVILS.

Those who are tempted to be sceptical about the progress and purification of popular belief may well be reminded that it is not fifty years ago that the Congregational Union lecture by the Rev. Walter Scott, was delivered and published; it was entitled "The Existence of Evil Spirits proved, and their Agency, particularly in relation to the human race, explained and illustrated." The title of the book sufficiently explains its contents, and for the spirit in which it is written, suffice it to quote from the Preface. "Those who disbelieve the existence of fallen evil spirits, deny some of the peculiar doctrines of revelation, and, not unfrequently, almost all of them." It is impossible to imagine the chosen spokesman of the Congregational Union of to-day adopting such language or such a point of view. In fact, the change of mind, which has been generally brought about by the increasing enlightenment of the age acting upon religious belief, has in this respect been a silent revolution. We no more boast our belief in a host of angels and devils, nor in the Devil as the personal cause of all the evil in the world; philosophic speculation and historical truth have permeated the popular mind and changed the popular belief. There still remains the question of the religious significance of angels and devils, since the words remain as 'current coin,' even though the dynasties, whose image and superscription they bear, have passed away. In the scriptures, in Christian art, and in Christian literature these terms find an abiding place. It is therefore worth while to consider the real content of the idea of which Angels and devils have formed a part.

It is first to be noted that the belief in higher spiritual powers, good or evil, comes sometimes as an advance upon a lower form of religion; to primitive naturalism, which deifies natural forces, or to animism, which imagines spirits in inanimate objects, or to a materialism, which recognizes no spiritual or non-material powers, a belief in angels or demons means an advance, because it is a step towards the recognition of the one and the great spiritual power—God. If not an actual advance, the entrance of such a belief may prepare the way for religious progress; this was the case when in the Roman Empire the old Stoic naturalism gave way before the theory of demons, for the latter was a point on which Christianity could agreee with the ancient world and from which it could lead it on to higher ground.

But again, when the tendency to exalt God so above the world as to relieve him of close connection with it is accompanied with growing faith in angels and devils, this belief acts as a gulf between man and God by making God distant (if not unnecessary), and in relegating the powers of the Deity to subordinate yet superhuman beings; in such a state of feeling, the general tendency will be to attach more importance to the powers of good or evil spirits.

The scriptures of both Old and New Testaments illustrate these principles. In the Old Testament religion, previous to the captivity in Babylon, the angels appear as the servants and messengers of the Divine commands, and even as personifications of God's power or presence; their abode is in heaven and they are thought of in connection with the host of stars, if we may judge from the meaning of the term Jehovah Sabaoth, Lord of Hosts. This belief seems to have been modified in and after the captivity, by the influence of the Persian religion: names of angels now appear and the angels are now considered first of the works of creation. A similar change in the the demonology of the Old Testament is to be found in comparing the early and the post-exilic periods; in the earlier period the spirits of plague or death, possibly remnants of an earlier nature worship,[2] come as the workers of the divine anger (2 Sam. xxiv. 16; 1 Kings, xxii. 22), but in the writings of the later Hebrew Church the personified power of evil has become the author of moral wrong, and the name of Satan carries with it a distinct idea. A good iliustration of this is that the late book of Chronicles makes Satan the cause of David's numbering Israel (1 Chron. xxi., 1), while the earlier account of the Book of Samuel makes Jehovah incite David to do this (2 Samuel xxiv. 1). Thus the belief both concerning good, and concerning evil spirits becomes more prominent as the idea of the transcendence of Jehovah is more grasped; for the idea of the immanence of Jehovah in the world grew weaker and was compensated by the growth of a doctrine of good and evil spirits.

In the New Testament less development of opinion is to be found—naturally, since the New Testament literature covers a century at the most. But here it is important to observe how the popular Jewish belief of the day is assumed rather than asserted, and referred to rather than taught. Angels appear in stories of our Lord's birth, passion, and resurrection; in the words he used they are mentioned, and the idea of guardian angels appears in the book of Revelation and elsewhere (Rev. i. 20, Matt. xviii. 10, Acts xii. 15), but Christ as the mediator between God and man, and the Holy Spirit as the possession of every believer—these fundamental thoughts of the Gospel rendered the angels devoid of all doctrinal importance or even of any vital religious significance. The doctrine of the evil spirit is more prominent in the New Tes-

1. cf. A. P. Stanley, "Jewish Church," iii. p. 145. (Lect. 45).
2. cf. B. Stade, "Geschichte des Volk. Israel," i. 503 ff.
3. cf. B. Duhm "Theologia der Propheten," p. 317.

tament than the doctrine of angels; for the kingdom of the Prince (or God) of this world is contrasted with Christ's Kingdom of God (2 Cor. iv. 4, Matt. xii. 26, John xii. 31, xiv. 30), and many forms of moral evil are thus attributed to the devil (John viii. 44, Luke viii. 12, 2 Cor. ii. 11, &c.); besides this some forms of disease were then popularly attributed to demons within the bodies of the sufferers, and among these were the frequent class of those 'possessed with a devil.' It is however most remarkable that the New Testament doctrine of Sin does not admit of the Devil being of any real vital importance, at least in a doctrinal point of view; for if it is the essence of sin that "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh" (Gal. v. 17, cf., Rom. vii. 14, viii. 7) then sin is explained as quite apart from the Evil Spirit or Devil, and if this explanation of sin is to be *rigorously* carried through, it would imply the rejection of some common biblical phrases (e.g. 1 Pet. v. 8, 2 Tim. ii. 26), at least as doctrinally incorrect.

Though there is nothing to which serious objection can be taken in the language of the New Testament personifying the powers of good and of evil, the development of this idea by the Church led to unfortunate results. The belief in good and evil spirits became more and more prominent among Christians, and exerted great influence, because it was a proof on which the Christians trusted to effect the conversion of the heathen, that the Christians had such power to cast out devils. "Tertullian, writing to the Pagans in a time of persecution, in language of the most deliberate earnestness, challenges his opponents to bring forth any person who is possessed by a demon, or any of those virgins or prophets who are supposed to be inspired by a divinity; he asserts that, in reply to the interrogation of any Christian, the demons will be compelled to confess their diabolical character."[1] It was in fact because the early church could occupy common ground like this belief concerning exorcism with the heathendom of the Roman Empire that it both made the world become Christian, and in doing so made also Christianity become worldly. In the development of the Catholic or Orthodox faith, the doctrine of angels came in place of the worship of the many minor deities of the Græco-Roman Pantheon. In the speculations concerning the time of the angels' creation, whether before or after the creation of the world, or concerning the nature of the fall of the evil spirits, and later in the writings so falsely attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, which arranged with such exactness the heavenly hierarchy of angels, one may trace the rising importance of a theory of superhuman beings, which made the stupendous fact that man is face to face with God, and may ever come direct to him in prayer and devotion less and less realized. Then came in the practice of canonizing saints, who became the special guardian angels as it were, of particular nations, towns, or families, and who were prayed to as being powerful to hear and aid. In

1. W. E. H. Lecky, "Hist. Eur. Morals," 1.382*f.* (7th Edit.)

like manner the doctrine of evil spirits was elaborated, and though more and more stress was laid on the power of the devil, the church was saved from the appearance of dualism, by holding that he and his friends had been created good and had rebelled. The firm conviction in the personal being, qualities and activities of the devil did not fail to deeply impress the doctrine as well as the language, liturgies, and art of the Catholic Church. Indeed the impression has been so great that it may be well doubted whether if Christianity is to remain a religion in historic continuity through the ages with its early days it must not continue to keep much of its old language, though it accepts that language in a new sense. One result, which must not be forgotten here, was that the growing demonology of the middle-ages assimilated to itself the popular belief of the Teuton nations concerning witches ; thus through centuries was continued a terrible persecution of men and women, whose only fault was that they were accused of a crime and had never a chance of disproving the charge ; the belief in the criminality of witches was retained amongst Protestants even when the demonology of the Catholic Church of which it was a part had been at last largely curtailed ; it is well too to remember that Luther, Francis Bacon, and Richard Baxter were all strong believers in witchcraft, and that it is not a century since witches were executed in our own land ; verily the heritage of error is grievous !

The Reformation movement effected a real return to earlier and truer faith in rejecting the worship of angels and saints ; Calvin especially in his grand desire to honour only the majesty of God would not go beyond the language of Scripture in speaking of the angels, though the Lutheran Church was more free in speaking in a poetic and symbolical way of saints and angels. On the other hand, to the church of the Reformation generally the personal devil was a familiar idea, and especially so to Luther, who believed he had seen the devil face to face, and who wrote " A Christian must know that he sits in the midst of devils, and that the devil is nearer him than his coat or his shirt, or his own skin ; that he is all round about us, and that we are constantly at grips with him, and bound to fight against him ";[1] at the same time the Protestant divines made no doctrinal use of the belief in the personal devil. " There are two special points where a doctrinal use might be made of this notion of the devil, first if the evil in man were referred back to, and derived from, the prior evil in Satan, and secondly if the devil were produced as effecting the punishment of the wicked But our Protestant confessions of faith are too prudent to base any of their doctrine on these points on so hazardous a notion." [2]

The belief in the personality and activity of the devil no doubt still continued, but in Protestant theology he occupied a forensic and popular, rather than a a real doctrinal, position ; no doubt the early preaching and poetry of Protestanism were full of the devil,

1. cf. G. G. Roskoff, " Geschichte des Teufels," ii. 368 ff.
2. Schleiermacher, " d. Christliche Glaube," i. 211, § 44.

and the belief that men could be and actually were possessed by the devil had considerably influence, especially in the continuance of persecutions for witchcraft, which in Protestant and Catholic countries were equally common. The history of the arguments and criticism which have disposed of the belief in the devil belong therefore rather to the story of popular Christianity than to the history of doctrine proper. The first to question the universally dominant belief in the devil was the Dutch pastor Balthasar Bekker[1] (about 1690), who, in his work "die betorerde Weereld," attacked principally the popular belief of his day and indirectly menaced the generally accepted tenet of the theologians; he paid for his temerity by the loss of his office; this work of Bekker is particularly to be remembered as an application of the philosophy of Descartes to theology, according to which he argued that immaterial spirits cannot act on material bodies, for God alone is the origin of the connection of the soul or spirit and the body; so that if the evil spirits could act on human bodies, it must be through their intentions being aided by God, a thought which is absurd and unholy. Bekker had, besides, a Biblical argument against the belief in the devil, and many Biblical expressions, which seemed to favour an opposite view, he explained as the outcome of rhetorical modes of expression. The general tendency of this work was to insist, surely very truly, that with regard to angels and devils, the Scripture gives no dogmatic teaching and only refers to them in so far as they enable men to understand, not the truths of metaphysic or science, but man's duty to God and the way in which man may become holy. But Bekker was before his times, and one must pass over seventy years and come to the great critic and theologian Semler to find another defendant of the same point of view. In 1760 Semler published a work, which, though occasioned by a notorious case of supposed possession in a woman who lived in the neighbourhood of Wittenberg, struck at the belief in witches and "possessions" as contrary to the doctrine of the Scriptures; unlike Bekker, who had denied that the Gospel accounts of those possessed with devils had historic accuracy, Semler admitted that such "possessions" had really occurred, but argued that these manifestations were only permitted by God for the time, and had since passed away; Semler, however, modified his view after the publication of Hugo Farmer's "Letters on the Demoniacs" in 1775, which book Semler brought out in German, and in 1777 he answers the question, why did Jesus and his disciples speak of demoniacs in the same way as the Jews, by laying down (1) they necessarily used the method of speaking adopted by their co-temporaries; (2) the evangelists may well have been of the same opinion as the Jews, and thought that many sick persons were really plagued by evil spirits; and (3) they show very clearly that the demoniacs were only persons sick of a peculiarly dangerous kind of sickness; (4) the Evangelists and Apostles so frequently

1 See Herzog's "Real-Encyclopædie," vol. ii., s. 231 *f*, 2te Auflage.

call any enemy or opposer of truth and every opponent of what is good by the terms Satan, devil, that they cannot be blamed for having used Jewish ideas and ascribed to the devil that power of evil of which the Jews stood in fear; and Jesus, while using the forms of speech of the Jews had united with them quite different ideas to those of the Jews.[1] From this time onwards writings on the subject increased in number and effect, and sermons were preached against the rising "adœmonism," as a movement sure to be followed by Atheism; deeper insight into historical truth and wider philosopical speculation gradually did the solvent work of reducing the belief to more reasonable form and import. It is true that the Kantian philosophy endeavoured a reconstruction of the idea of the evil one from its idea of moral evil, and re-asserted his existence as the personification of the evil principle in the world; but still the belief in the devil and his angels has steadily receded. At the same time, and in the same way, the belief in angels or good spirits has also retreated into the background of religious ideas; the somewhat imaginative theory that some of the stars may be inhabited by higher spiritual beings than man, and that these are the angels of Scripture and of theology, is a speculation quite irrevalent and valueless as an object of faith or devotion.

To trace the history and literature of this question of the existence of good and evil spirits since the historical criticism of our religion was inaugurated by Semler, and since Kant was followed by the great speculators of Germany, whose influence has so largely stimulated the thought of Europe into its present state, would be an interesting and a lengthy task. One feature of that history alone is too important for our present purpose to be allowed to pass unnoticed. The modern doctrine of evolution, which had found partial expression in many thinkers before Darwin, has become, since the great English naturalist's "Origin of Species," and "Descent of Man," a commonplace among thinking and educated people. Probably the bearing of the evolution theory on religion has been in no point more influential than in modifying the idea of evil. It has shewn how the struggle for existence results in a higher type, and this truth has been applied morally and spiritually, and the suffering and evil of the world now seems to us not less hideous but less unbearable, because by analogy we infer that if directed aright it may induce to a higher moral and spiritual development both in the individual and in the race. This, and similar reasoning with which all educated persons are now quite familiar, has had an enormous influence in forcing upon thoughtful, religious minds the conviction that what before seemed inexplicable without a belief in a personal devil is now clear and the devil is no longer necessary.

But this influence of the doctrine of evolution has acted in another way—and here much more unfortunately—it has greatly weakened the sense of sin as an essential part of the religious con-

1 F. C. Baur "Vorlesungen u. Dogmengeschichte," iii. 474.

sciousness. Evolution insists that the suffering and pain of life are a necessity of existence, and it may call them undesirable, but it cannot say that they are quite avoidable or always morally wrong, while insisting on the developing power of struggle and pain, it seems almost to invite us to taste these as means to a higher development. Thus the sense of sin as something not inevitable, something that can be, and must be, struggled against has been lessened, and no one can doubt that this is a most serious danger for the Christian faith. It is to be hoped that when we become more accustomed to the new aspects of nature and man, we may come to see more clearly that though man has his place in nature he has also his place above it, and can rise above the power of the forces around and within him, and can assert the freedom of his determining will.

This general relaxation in the rigid idea of sin and the theory of evolution have come upon us together, and may possibly be followed by a reaction, which will re-assert the existence of some power apart from God which causes the evil. This idea seemed reasonable to John Stuart Mill as he wrote his last thoughts on religion. This view has been also upheld by a very advanced thinker, the author of the "Kernel and the Husk."[1] The writer of this work in a very suggestive but paradoxical chapter, admits indeed that an examination of the belief in Satan furnishes "a sufficiently amusing exhibition of inconsistency and ignorance," but holds that it is easier to explain the sin and suffering of the world by believing that, not God, but "an enemy hath done this," and claims that this theory is indeed the only workable one, as apart from a belief in Satan men will not believe in the goodness of the Almighty God. His argument is briefly this, that in so far as evolution has taught that good has resulted from death, destruction, waste, conflict, and sin, it has helped to strengthen our faith, but we must learn to think, not of "Evolution by itself," but of "Evolution with Satan." "Evolution without Satan" would appal us by the seeming wastefulness and ubiquity of conflict, and the indirectnes of its benefits; but "Evolution with Satan" enables us to realize God as our refuge and strength amid the utmost storms and tempests of destruction. Such an argument however only throws the difficulty one step farther back; it assumes the existence or Satan as an excuse for the ubiquity of conflict and the indirectness of its benefits, but this by no means makes the belief a more satisfactory solution of evil: evil exists and there is still ubiquity of conflict and indirectness of its benefits, and these are and must remain to human knowledge irreconcileable with a belief in the Divine Power as Almighty. Only two explanations are in any way possible: either we may believe in a Dualism, a divided rule and authority in the universe; or we may believe that what seems so evil and awfully revolting to us now, will some day appear no more evil and awful, but necessary

1 "The Kernel and the Husk," by the author of "Philochristus," and "Onesimus." London, 1886. Pages 80-96.

and even a cause for rejoicing. The latter view is the one to which evolution more readily, even if not entirely, lends itself, and will probably be accepted more and more as the true solution, as men learn to seek more and more, not the earthly and temporal, but the heavenly and eternal truth. This latter is, moreover, a view which most effectually renders unnecessary the belief in an actual personal devil.

Thus it is that to-day, though many names of Christian thinkers are ranged on the side of those who still hold to the belief in the existence of Satan and fallen spirits, they are chiefly the names of men of known conservative tendency; while the day is gone by when belief in the devil could be treated in any Protestant Church as an article of faith: perhaps the best sign of this tendency is seen in the half apologetic way in which Dorner says that the Church holds still to the belief, "although it does not place the doctrine in the rank of one of the fundamental articles."[1] It would certainly be difficult to find people now, who would share the opinion of the pious old Scotchwoman, who on being told about certain persons who were Atheists replied "A weel, it is dreadful to think o', but na so bad as if they didna believe in the devil." In fact there is at least freedom universally permitted and recognized on this subject, and even those who still believe in a personal Satan, admit with Schleiermacher that "the belief in Satan cannot in any way be taken as a condition of the belief in God and in Christ."[2] This fact is certainly of prime significance, for it means that upon a point, which was once esteemed a matter of orthodoxy or heterodoxy and sufficiently vital to subject the heretic to complete excommunication, there is now such freedom that although differences of belief may exist among Christians they are not made occasions for schism or grounds of offence. Why should not this be the case with all our religious beliefs? Why should some Christians refuse to associate with others who differ on certain points, while they never heed any difference about other points?

The decreasing prominence of Satan in theological discussion would be unaccountable were it not for the increasing realization that the whole idea of Satan as a fallen angel is impossible and absurd; this has been very clearly shewn by Schleiermacher,[3] who has well pointed out that the idea of the possibility of the fall of an angel endowed with the noblest gifts and created to praise God eternally is a self-contradiction, and that the notion of Satan, gifted with the gift of superhuman wisdom and perfect insight, knowing that his revolt against God is certain to end in utter failure, yet persevering in it with unabated confidence and energy, is just as absurd. Besides this intellectual difficulty (not to say absurdity) there is the moral difficulty against the belief in Satan, that Satan has been often made the scapegoat of human sin; men

1 Dorner: "System of Christian Doctrine," iii. 97, § 86.
2 Schleiermacher, "d. Christliche Glaube," § 45.
3 Ibid, § 44.

have said this evil in us and that wrong in others is due to Satan's working, while as a matter of fact it is man's fault, and as such can be corrected: besides this, the statement that "there is nothing bad in the world but a bad will" is in itself an indictment of the belief in Satan, and modern preaching which as a rule bases on this statement its encouragement to withstand evil thus tends to discount the belief in a personal author of evil.

Again, in an age particularly alive to superstition as our age is, it has been doubtless perceived that the belief in angels and demons is one of the most fruitful sources of superstition, and one of the points concerning which unprofitable speculations and theories are most apt to arise. Indeed, it is a matter of common experience that it is the uncultured and illiterate that believe in angels and demons, and whose religion is largely fraught with material and unspiritual elements.[1] This feeling has no doubt done much to set the popular mind against the old demonology.

Another aspect of the belief in spirits superior to us and yet working in the world must be noticed. It has been said[2] that "God is not confined within a law of nature, once for all ordained and for ever immutable, but His will is accomplished through the free agency of those living and personal powers, the angels, without whom there can be no God of miracles." This is no doubt true in as far as the belief in miracles and the belief in those personal powers, the angels, must stand or fall together: miracles, angels, devils, are different but connected aspects of a certain theory of Christianity, which may be styled the supernatural or exceptional theory, the theory which has generally been assumed to be essential to the idea of a revealed religion, and which is only gradually being superseded by the conception that Christianity is essentially a natural and reasonable growth. So long as the Christian religion is viewed as originated and founded by a series of divine interpositions in the course of history, so long will the belief in miracles as special interferences with the laws of nature, in angels and in devils, be found. As the wider aspects of nature and history become plain, the belief in these will fade away: it is the latter process which we see going on around us to-day.

The true place of angels and demons in religion is not in the co-ordinated and reasoned faith or dogmatic, but in the rhetorical or artistic expression of the faith. As symbols of the attributes of God or of His manifestations and working in the world angels may be not only admissible, but even welcomed. Just as the Wisdom of the Hebrew Proverbs was personified into a being, and just as the message to Elijah was considered to have been delivered by a messenger or angel, so the poetry and pictorial art of our religion may well use these words and forms, though they cannot use them as logical, accurate, and scientifically exact, but only as poetical and pictorial. Similarly, the words "Satan," "devil," "demon,"

1 For a strange illustration of this see Jessop's "Arcady, for better or worse," p. 78*f*.
2 By Hofmann, quoted in Biedermann's "Dogmatik," 2te. Auf., ii. 511.

have a value; they appeal to the imagination and suggest trains of associations and connections, which make the spiritual truth more clear. Nothing is more certain that if we are to retain religious continuity with the past, it must not be by cutting ourselves adrift from all the ideas and forms which have been degrading or objectionable; it must be by purifying the old notions, retaining the spiritual essence of a doctrine while we reject its accretions, and by giving to the old imagery a new and truer import. If to speak of angels helps us to view all the benign forces and happy occurrences of life as connected with Divine providence and rule, by all means let us speak of angels. If to speak of the devil helps us to realize that all the dark and terrible powers of nature and deeds of man are manifestations of a will and existence in antithesis to God, by all means let us not scruple to speak of the devil. Milton's Satan in "Paradise Lost," and Dante's *Imperador del doloroso regno* in the "Inferno," can never be mere remembrances of a bye-gone belief, nor can they ever seem grotesque or unreal; they must ever remain living figures—but the living figures of imagination and poetical insight, not of historical reality or actual existence; the same is true of the angels of Fra Angelico and the Michael of Guido Reni; these images tell the horror of sin and the glory of being on the Lord's side in language equally clear and true to all believers; and in this alone is contained the religious significance of angels and devils; they are the personifications or symbols of true ideas, not names of actual existences.

THE BROAD-CHURCH PARTY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND BISHOP COLENSO.[1]

Sir George W. Cox, the disciple and champion of Bishop Colenso, brought out some months ago his life of the famous and unfortunate Bishop of Natal. He has followed up the life by a pamphlet entitled "The Church of England and the teaching of Bishop Colenso."

Of the life of the Bishop little need be said. It is avowedly written as "a full and complete vindication" of one who has been perhaps more roundly abused and more unjustly condemned than any other latter-day "heretic." These two long volumes, containing 1,400 pages altogether, trace in great detail the history of his famous works on the Epistles to the Romans, and on the Pentateuch; and the so-called "trial," "condemnation," and "larger excommunication" by the Bishop of Capetown. They show how complete was Colenso's victory in retaining his see even after the excommunication. They give an account of the Bishop in his diocese and tell the story of Colenso's action in the Langalibalele and Cetshwayo affairs. It should not be forgotten that the Bishop Colenso was at once the brave critic and the brave politician: the unpopularity and abuse which he received from churchmen for his criticism of the Pentateuch he received again from statesmen for his defence of the Zulus: the same heroic love of truth and right urged him on in both matters: and for his action on each of these great questions John William Colenso must be remembered and honoured. The life of Bishop Colenso can teach two great lessons: first, that fearless statement of religious convictions is good and honourable, and secondly, that the duty of Britain to the native-races she rules must be utterly just and generous. We must now leave the life of the Bishop with the wish that Sir George Cox (or someone else) will publish a shorter life, or an abridged edition of this life—say in about 200 pages—for few will read these heavy tomes, and Bishop Colenso's memory and life is too precious to be allowed to lie buried in 1,400 pages.

The pamphlet, with which the author of the Bishop's life has followed up the account of his master, needs notice here because it is more or less of a *manifesto*. It consists of a preface of four pages, a number of propositions occupying fourteen pages, and then an explanation of "the real meaning of the language of the Eucharistic Office in the Book of Common Prayer" contained in eleven pages, and printing side by side with the words of the office the explanation of the sense in which the writer thinks they should be taken.

1 "The Life of John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal." By the Rev, Sir George W Cox, Bart. In 2 vols. London, 1888. 8vo. "The Church of England and the Teaching of Bishop of Colenso." By the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox. London, 1888. 8vo.

This pamphlet is important as it raises the whole question of the position of the Broad Church party in the Church of England. For the preface claims that the propositions, which contain "all that is of any importance in the theological, religious and critical opinions and method of the Bishop of Natal," "represent with a fair measure of exactness the thoughts and conclusions of all so-called Broad-Churchmen, and of all liberal theologians and unprejudiced thinkers generally." What then are these propositions? They are 154 numbers, each short and clear, and they are arranged under five heads. The first 60 may be termed theological, christological, or soteriological; the next 30 deny the infallibility of any church or book, and explain the Latin and Greek theological terms, which are so familiar to the ear but "are of little use to average Englishmen:" the next six propositions explain the nature of the Catholic Church and of the Church of England; then propositions 97 to 144 assert certain positions of Old Testament criticism; and the last 10 propositions assert a few positions of New Testament criticism, and vindicate the spiritual truth and grandeur of the Bible. These propositions, it must be borne in mind, do not touch on all the chief points of theological belief, nor on many crucial and controversial problems; they are simply propositions on which Bishop Colenso expressed himself in the course of his writings, and of most of which mention is made in the "Life" of the Bishop, cross references to volume and page of which are given in support of most of the propositions. Thus it happens that though the propositions which deal with the work and mediation of Christ and the Pentateuch are ample, these subjects having been treated by the Bishop in his Commentary on Romans and his work on the Pentateuch, there are no propositions which deal with such questions as the anthropological bearings of evolution, or the ecclesiastical theory known as the Incarnation. It happens also that the propositions vary greatly in importance and in the amount of assent they can command; those concerning the resurrection, especially No. 38, "the resurrection, spoken of by St. Paul, has no reference to any supposed revival of dead bodies so-called," are both more vital and more certain than such a sweeping and hazardous a statement that "the whole eschatology of the New Testament is drawn from the book of Enoch" (No. 147).

But leaving aside the theological and historical questions which these propositions suggest, there is still a serious consideration which this pamphlet forces into prominence—What is the position of the Broad Church party in the Church of England? Now, the highest courts of the Church of England have decided that these views can be held by a Church of England clergyman; on the other hand, the bishops have unanimously condemned them and their author has been excommunicated: the consequence is, that to-day there is no Bishop of Natal, no successor to Bishop Colenso, not because one has not been appointed, nor yet because the See

is no longer a See, but because on a successor having been chosen, no bishops could be found to consecrate him. This deadlock in the case of the bishopric of Natal is typical of the position of the party to which Colenso belonged. In the Church of England to-day there are some clergymen who deny the physical fact, but affirm the spiritual truth, of the Resurrection of the Lord: yet no Bishop on the Bench "would knowingly ordain, or if already ordained, license to a Curacy or institute to a Benefice any man who denied the physical fact of our Lord's Resurrection." (We quote here a letter lately addressed by the Bishop's chaplain in answer to a letter sent to the Bishop of London by one who wanted an answer on this very point). We know as a fact that many Church of England clergymen—all the Broad Church men, if we may believe Sir George Cox—do deny this very thing; at least, Dr. Abbott has emphatically denied it, and Sir George Cox does so here. What we want to ask is, what *moral* right (for we say nothing here of their legal right which is indisputable), these Broad Churchmen have to get ordained or to hold benefices in a Church of which they defy the *ecclesiastical* authority in so flagrant a fashion? Having got into Orders or Benefices through the ignorance or neglect of the Bishops—for we refuse to think it can have been by their own misrepresentations of themselves—they hold to their Orders and Benefices in spite of the Bishops and Church in general being wholly pledged to have nought to do with those who hold such positions. They meanwhile shelter themselves by the Law Courts and trust to the Erastianism of the State Church. We desire here to protest against this practice, and to urge that the result is to throw general discredit on the movement which these very men desire, or pretend to promote. For they lay themselves open to the charge that they prefer their position and benefits as clergymen to suffering aught for the cause of the truth as they have received it. As a matter of fact, the cause of spiritualizing and purifying the faith of Christendom has nothing to hope from a State Church, which, though it permits freedom of faith according to its law, is in the persons of its highest officials and its general tone the stronghold of Conservatism and even of Reaction.

In conclusion, we desire in saying this not to cast any reproach upon the memory of Bishop Colenso. His position, and the position of things in his day was entirely distinct from the position of those to-day who hold benefices to which they know that no Bishop would license them, if he knew their opinions. It is one thing for a Bishop to explain his views and another thing for a clergyman to give a false account of himself by concealing his opinions. The former should be praised and had in honour: for the latter we have only contempt.

SIR GEORGE W. COX AND THE NATAL BISHOPRIC.

In the last number of these "Papers" a reference was made to Sir George Cox's "Life of Bishop Colenso." Two circumstances have since arisen to call for further remark. The first is that Sir George Cox has written to the writer of the article to protest against what he considered an implication that he was in the Church of England on false pretences, and against the idea that he has ever been guilty of cloaking his true opinions. Now it was never said nor intended by the writer that Sir George Cox has ever been anything but a most outspoken advocate of his own views and beliefs. The thought in the mind of the writer when writing the last lines of his review of Sir George J. Cox's book was nothing but this: Bishop Colenso was cut off from the Anglican communion for his opinions; he was excommunicated for adhering to them, and his disciples in Natal have not found a single Bishop at the Lambeth Conference to sympathise with their appeal; how is it, then, that the Broad Church party of the Church of England, which (says Sir George Cox) is in substantial agreement with the views of Bishop Colenso, does not suffer for those views the same punishment which Bishop Colenso suffered for them? Two answers to this question seemed possible: The first was that they do not press those opinions so boldly or so clearly as the Bishop of Natal did; the second was that the temper of the parties who excommunicated Bishop Colenso has become less intolerant and more generous: as the second supposition seemed to him at variance with many facts, the writer was obliged to accept the former view, and to conclude that the Broad Church party as a whole were not confessing their faith with the same boldness which characterised Bishop Colenso.

The second circumstance is of more importance. In August last was printed and presented to both Houses of Parliament a correspondence concerning the Bishopric of Natal. As the importance of this correspondence has been unfortunately much overlooked, and as it has an especial importance at this time, when the question of Church Reform is in the air, and when both within and without the Anglican Church a cry is raised that the Church of England should be made more comprehensive, it is worth while to refer to this story of an attempt—unfortunately only too successful—to make the Church of England less liberal and less comprehensive. The story of the Church of England in Natal is a sad one. The Bishopric of Natal was created in 1853 by Royal Letters Patent "a corporation sole with perpetual succession," by which it was provided that in case of a vacancy occurring in the See the

Crown was to appoint a successor. Bishop Colenso was the first Bishop. After the publication of his famous work on the Pentateuch he was formally deposed and then excommunicated by his metropolitan Bishop, Gray, of Capetown. Bishop Colenso appealed to the courts in England, and his position as Bishop of Natal was by them asserted, and it was further declared that he could not be deprived of the temporalities nor the spiritualities of the See. It was also decided by the courts that "the Church of the Province of South Africa," a Society started with the approval of some of the Bishops to take over the See of the Bishop of Natal, was "root and branch" separate and distinct from the Church of England, and therefore schismatic. When Bishop Colenso died in 1883, the members of the Church of England in Natal wrote at once to the Archbishop of Canterbury requesting him to choose some one and send him out as their Bishop. The selection was left entirely in the hands of the Archishop, and some of the Bishops whom it was requested should act with the Archbishop. The answer to this request was a point-blank refusal. In 1886 the churchmen of Natal proceeded to elect a bishop, and chose Sir George Cox, but as neither the Crown nor the Archbishop issued a mandate for his consecration, the election has not much profited the church of Natal. Meanwhile the Archbishop and Bishops in England are doing all they can to push into the place of the Church of England in Natal the so-called "Church of the Province of South Africa" under its Bishop, the Bishop of Maritzburg, although this society has been judged by the Courts to be wholly separated from the Church of England. The object of the Archbishop and those who act with him (among whom unfortunately must be reckoned the Colonial Secretary, Lord Knutsford, who has tarnished an otherwise honourable career by grossly unfair, if not unconstitutional, conduct in this case), is plainly enough to destroy what the law of the realm proclaims a true branch of the Church of England in order to put in its place a schismatic Church whose only claims to their support are that it was founded to be a thorn in the side of a man whom they hated, and that its narrower interpretation of the same creed coincides with their own private opinions. It is a melancholy reflection that, nineteen centuries after Christ's coming, the head of the Church which can call itself the Church of England can show such an animus against any section of that Church. Men may pray and work for a more tolerant and earnest Christian Church. But this episode will probably only strengthen the fast-growing opinion of many that truly national religion can never be gained by asking for a comprehensive Church of England, but must be reached along a road of many stages, and the first of those stages must be the disestablishment of the Church of England.

PROF. PFLEIDERER'S 'URCHRISTENTHUM."*

AMONG the more liberal of the theologians of Germany perhaps no one is better known in England than Prof. Pfleiderer of Berlin. He has not been so prolific an author of theories or of books as some German theologians, but whenever a book by him has appeared it has been noted and read by not a few thoughtful and earnest spirits. His "Paulinismus" was translated and published in 1877, and his Hibbert Lectures, delivered and published in 1885, "On the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity," covered the same ground, and gave the same view of Paul in a more mature, and also more concise and popular form. His "Philosophy of Religion," the second edition of which has lately been translated and now appears in its English dress in four volumes, is worthy to be studied alongside Dr. Martineau's "Study of Religion." Its last volume especially deserves to be very widely read, as it is an attempt to lay the foundations of a permanent peace between the conflicting parties of the Protestant Church.

Dr. Pfleiderer's latest work on "Primitive Christianity" is like his preceding works, evidently the result of earnest thought and study. Its grace and ease of style—for Prof. Pfleiderer writes a style remarkable clear and flowing, especially for a German theologian—ought to find the book many readers. It might be described as a history of the literature of primitive Christianity; it is indeed the history of the rise of the early Christian Church, but this story, told often before from various points of view, is here told again from a new point of view, viz., from that of the literary historian; the history of the development of doctrines and of the rise of the Church organisation are thus gathered round the history of the literature of the New Testament, the so-called Apostolic Fathers, and the few other early Christian documents. The main divisions of the book are five and deal with Paul, the Apocalyptic writings, the Historical books of the New Testament, Christian Hellenism, and Antignostic Catholicism; and the chapters or sections into which these divisions are divided deal, in most cases, with some particular book of the New Testament, or some other early Christian writing. The work therefore forms a handbook, introductory to the New Testament and the history of the Christian Church, though differing much in style and scope from the ordinary "Introduction"; and in avoiding with few exceptions all

* Otto Pfleiderer, "Das Urchristenthum, seine Schriften und Lehren, in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang beschrieben." Berlin, Reimer, 1887. Price 14 marks. 891 pages.

quotations from, references to, and refutation of other authors who have traversed the same field, it gains in vividness and in interest, and will, on this account, be found very acceptable to the student who is first entering on the study of this field and to the general reader who is serious enough to take up and read a heavy volume but not able to master all the various points of view of other scholars.

As for the theological standpoint of this book, it differs little if at all from the already well-known position of its author. It is, however, important to scholars as a criticism of Prof. Harnack, recently Professor at Marburg, but now just called to be Dr. Pfleiderer's colleague at Berlin. The main point of the criticism made by Dr. Pfleiderer on Prof. Harnack is, that the latter's view of the rise of the Catholic Church pre-supposes the existence of an ideal primitive Christianity which never existed, and is forced, if logically carried out, to discount the value of, if not to disregard, the later books of the New Testament itself. This is a question at least worth considering, and those who desire to find the true answer to the problem of early Christianity cannot afford to disregard Prof. Pfleiderer's solution.

Finally, it may be noted that the student who has read the "Notes on Pfleiderer's Synoptik" (Selected Papers, No. 4, pp. 99-112), will be glad to find here the question of the relation of the Synoptic Gospels treated with great clearness and detail (Urchristenthum, pp. 359-543).

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.*

I.—The Jerusalem Church. Events to the beginning of the epoch-making activity of Paul.

It is difficult to say how much is certain about this time, but there are certain fixed points.

(*a*).—*The Resurrection of Christ.* In the first form of the Gospel tradition there is no appearance of Christ on the morning of the resurrection. It is not in the Gospel in the narrower sense of that word. A few days after the death the disciples had a conviction that Christ had arisen. Even Baur and Strauss admit this.

Paul connects our resurrection with Christ's. We shall live because Christ lives. Paul is certain death is vanquished. No Christian may surrender this position. Outside Christ there is no certainty of our immortality.

At the end of the first century it is thought there is a better belief in resurrection than that depending on sight (*Cf.* "Thomas" John xx. 29). The conviction was got from experience of Christ. It went beyond what phenomena could assure them of. They believed Christ lived and was *Lord* of *Heaven*. We too can experience what they experienced. He Who, not in what He said but in what He was, brought the gospel, is not a part of nature simply.

(1). Paul's account. (1 Cor. xv.) Christ is not revealed to enemies. He is not there continually. (*a*). Appearance to Cephas incidentally confirmed Luke xxiv. 34. Peter's importance perhaps here, that he was first witness of the resurrection. (*b*). To the Twelve. He makes a distinction between the Twelve and the Apostles. Judas is gone, but the usual form of speech is adhered to. The group is meant. (*c*). To 500 brethren. At one moment. Shall 500 have a vision!!! The idea of appearance in vision does not fit here. (*d*). To James. Confirmed in the Apocryphal Gospel according to Hebrews. They wished James to be regarded as the first witness. (*e*). To all the Apostles. (*f*). To Paul himself. This follows in order, without distinction from the other appearances, yet it is several years after the resurrection. The others cannot well be all brought within the few days following the resurrection. Gal. i. says "to reveal His Son *in me*." This is said of the Damascus journey. Those with him neither saw nor heard; they are not Christians. In 1 Cor. xv. he says, not that the grave is empty, but that we have seen the Lord. Flesh and blood too cannot inherit the kingdom of God.

(2). The disciples' account. Notwithstanding that He eats and drinks with them, He is a person with relations to more than three

* Notes of Lectures by Prof. A. Harnack in Marburg University, Summer, 1888. Introductory Lectures not included.

dimensions of space. With all their realism, they give Him a glorified body. These accounts are not in Mark at all. They are the latest parts of the other Gospels. Why should Paul omit the appearance to Magdalene, that in Galilee, &c.? We cannot contradict those who say these accounts are from the early part of the second century. Harnack holds to Paul's account (belonging to 56 or 57 A.D), where differences appear.

What then happened? The historian can only say that the vision-explanation is difficult—not impossible but very improbable. Further, Paul was one of the greatest of the Pharisees: an event arose which suddenly changed his whole life. His experience was not a construction of his own mind. We can only say God so worked as to assure the disciples concerning the life and preaching of His Son. Criticism cannot upset or establish the Confession of the Church; it is a matter of faith. [N.B.—Meaning of "faith" here is evidently direct assurance of spiritual reality.]

In reference to the *Ascension*, the case stands very differently. There is no gap in the appearances recorded by Paul: they continue to his own time. In Luke xxiv. 51, "And was carried up into heaven," is omitted in the most modern text (W. and H.) It is only in Acts (1₋₉) the statement is made. There are other witnesses. The Epistle of Barnabas says Christ went to heaven on Easter Sunday. Paul's view is that the quickening includes the setting of Jesus at God's right hand. An account existing in the early part of the second century (a sect thence originated) says Christ remained on earth 545 days. The Coptics say 11 years. These are the materials for criticism. The kernel of the belief is that Christ rules the world.

(*b*).—*The choice of one in place of Judas.* The casting of the lot is without analogy among the Jews. Matthias is quite obscure in the Church literature. So he cannot have been brought in here because of later celebrity. Paul would have been more easily the twelfth. The Gnostic Basilidians have a Matthia.

(*c*).—*The Whitsuntide Account.* This is a new version of the Babel story. Neither Paul nor any Apostolic Father knows anything of this. The writer had not experienced the peculiar gift of the Spirit—the gift of tongues. He interprets glossalalia as a speaking in new languages. In Apostolic times (*Cf.* Cors.) it was a speaking of something not understandable—expressions of praise, etc., were understood without the words being known. The unheard of number is also to be questioned, 3,000! 5,000 is also spoken of; still they are daily in the temple in the hall of Solomon. Only so many hundred could get in. They met in houses too. They had goods in common, and none were in need. Paul speaks of so many poor at Jerusalem, and they are called Ebionites—"the poor." The kernel of truth here again is, that a brotherly love and service was conspicuous. The idea of the community of goods is Hellenic. The Apostles are represented as another Sanhedrim. Note the union is called Μαθηταί; Paul uses Ἐκκλησία.

Chaps. I-V contain an ideal presentation of the facts: in chap.

VI. we are on firmer ground. Note the distinction of Hebrew and Hellenist Christians (transition to the Gentile world), and distinction of "deacons of the word" and those who "serve tables." The *Hellenists* were Jews of the Diaspora, who returned late in life to their native land like Chinese to-day. They differed in view from home-Jews and spoke Greek. They had formed groups, Cyrenians, &c. For the *seven deacons* we have the witness of the "we"-passages (*Cf.* Acts xxi. 8.) One is a proselyte: the account connected with another *Stephen* is of great importance for the increase of the Church. The seven are Hellenists. Stephen comes into conflict with his own class. He asserts that Jesus will make an end of temple and cultus. The *speech* as in old writers is not trustworthy. Cf. Lucian on writing history—speeches are to be adapted. They had no means of reporting. The speech contains no more than many a pious Jew said. Temple and cultus are allegorical. For Jews of the Diaspora separation from them had become fact. Stephen is the first to discover the inner *universalism* of the Gospel. The persecution which arose sent many back to their places in the Diaspora.

Section VIII.$_{5}$-XI.$_{18}$ is inserted between 8_4 and 11_{19} which fall together. Here we have $8_{5\text{-}40}$ activity of Philip and conversion of the Chamberlain (Eunuch); $9_{1\text{-}30}$, conversion of Paul; 9_{31}-11_{18}, missioning of Peter on the Philistine coast and conversion of the Centurion. Note the crescendo. Philip converts a *Samaritan*, then a King of the East—a *Proselyte*, then Peter converts a complete *heathen*. As confirmation of the conversion of the heathen there is the vision, the out-pouring of the Spirit at baptism, and the assent of the Jerusalem Church. The latter and Peter are represented as beginning the mission to the heathen. This seems to contradict Gal. ii. Could there be such a back-sliding as to need a new start? That Philip exercised mission activity is testified to by the "we"-sources, and by the report in the second century that he came to Asia Minor with his four daughters. *Simon Magus* is now admitted to be a real person, a Samaritan Messiah, active 30-40 A.D., between whose movement and the Christian a conflict arose. Baur said he was only a disguised Paul, and the money offered was the money Paul collected for the poor at Jerusalem to win him favour with the Apostles. It is not accidental that the Chamberlain converted by Philip was a Proselyte; but a true account may have been put by the author into this, the most effective position. Of Peter's activity among the Philistines we know from other sources—a Jewish of the third century, founding on Clemens; also from Paul. At the convention in 51 A.D., at Jerusalem, the conclusion was that Peter was chief missioner to the Jews. Scattered Hellenists preach to Jews, but some come to Antioch and speak to Gentiles also. Paul never asserts that he was the first to preach the gospel to the heathen. Proselytism was known already among Jews, and the further step to Christianity was natural. The rub was as to whether to become Christians they must first become Proselytes and recognise the law. The question must have become

acute before 51 A.D., Paul simply got the principle of freedom recognised as *law*.

Inserted Section XII.$_{1-24}$ (12$_{25}$ follows 11$_{30}$ directly and the source of Ch. VI. continues.) James is slain by Herod. Peter is rescued miraculously from prison. This James is not heard of afterwards, and James the brother of the Lord is named without distinction as at the head of the Jerusalem Church. Peter only comes forward again, in Acts, at the Council. In the first 20 years the only opposition manifested has been that between Hebraists and Hellenists.

II.—Common Christian Faith among Branches of the Jewish People: The Oldest Mission Preaching.

The common faith is discoverable from Paul. He speaks of Peter, of Apollos, and of Jewish opponents: and we can compare him with the Synoptists and Hebrews. "The Revelation," too, is not theological and not influenced by Paul, but is from a Greek-speaking Jew. The one announcement of the Gospel was, *Jesus of Nazareth is Messiah*. Original Christianity was Judaism under the domination of this. Many points arose: (1). The believer must confess the person and power of Christ, and convince himself that O.T. prophecies apply to Him. (2). He must call Messias King and wait in expectancy His coming again. (3). He must be convinced he had salvation which bound to God and His Son. (4). In place of previous conditions of participation in Messiah's kingdom came trust or faith in Jesus. The proof from prophecy is most important for them. O.T. revelation was fixed, and Christ said He was this Messiah. Outwardly He agrees but little with prophecy, still they held to Him as Christ and read the O.T. after Him. In spirit he was the right conclusion to their history. The suffering Messiah was here and there expected. If Messiah had come, they were the more bound to obey the law. But this work of Christ is only introduction. He will bring the end and it is very near. They are pilgrims. Only so could they endure privation and death. It was a religious faith, not a mere hope, that Jesus lived in heavenly glory. Here is the significance of the faith in the resurrection. It is the bridge to an eschatology. Apocalypses of Christ's second coming were frequent in the early church, and were received as Scripture. One part of prophecy remained to be fulfilled, and He would come to fulfil it. The popular view was, the land would be theirs, enemies would be subdued, the vine be fruitful, &c. Papias quotes one of these Apocalypses as Scripture, and the Gospels have been much influenced by them.

But in the present they had an exceptional possession of Christian life. (1). They were governed by the Spirit of God and Christ (*Cf.* Acts, the Revelation and Shepherd of Hermas). That individuals should possess the spirit constantly was new to a Jew. (2). They had forgiveness of sin. This is fundamental with Paul. Christ died for sins according to the Scripture (1 Cor. xv.) He pre-supposes (1 Cor. i.) that there was a common basis of confession, and that all were baptized into Christ's death. (3). Every

Christian was priest and king. It is a ground-conviction this of the old Church (*Cf.* 1 Pet., from a very old writer). They were in place of old kings and priests who were sporadic. This is the source of their joyful hope. (4). They were saved by faith. Here emerges the controversy Faith v. Law. All remembered "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." The new revelation made obedience more binding. James, the brother of the Lord, and others were very careful about fulfilling the law. *Where does the friction arise?* (*a*). Faith in Christ is added to obedience to the law. Wherever thing and person compete, the thing fails in attraction. (*b*). Christ regarded the law from within, and an inner relation to it was necessary. All emphasis is laid on motive. Love God and thy neighbour, and so fulfil law and prophets. The Sadducees and Herodians were too far off for Christ to deal much with them. With the Pharisees, however, there was a "corruptio optimi." He had been in their school Himself.

Hold the law and trust in Messiah were the two conditions of becoming Christian. There were *three ways out* of the difficulty. (1). Law to be observed, but as national form—not as necessary to salvation. (2). The whole law to be observed, but as spiritualised: "Circumcision is of the heart." (3). Christ is the end of the law: it is done away. All these proceed on the idea that ceremonial is not necessary to salvation.

III.—Freeing of the Gospel from National Bonds.

A.—The earlier History and Conversion of Paul.

Paul is not the only one to free the Gospel from national bonds. He has only taken one of the three possible ways.

Paul was born in Tarsus, of Cilicia, which in the time of Augustus was a great city chiefly inhabited by Syrians and Greeks, but Jews were numerous. It is important that Paul was a man of a great city. Jesus and His disciples were country folk. It is probable that, as was usual, he had both names—Saul, Paul, and used Paul in the Diaspora. The theory that the change of name in Acts connects it with the conversion of Sergius Paulus, is not substantial. Perhaps another source is used where the name Paul comes in. He was born not later than 9 A.D., *Cf.* Acts 7.58, a "young man" in 34 A.D., and Philemon—an "old man" 62 A.D. He was a thorough Jew and most zealous Pharisee. His writings show him a Pharisee in good points—acuteness, dialectic, elevated thought, care for God and His word. The chief Apostle came out of the circle of Christ's particular enemies. The Gospel freed him from national limitations. Though much under Greek influences, there is no proof that he knew the learning of Greek schools professionally. He was an educated Jew, trained in the Scripture and Targums. He knows the O.T. in Hebrew and the Septuagint. Inspiration in both is believed to be verbal. He argues from "the *seed* of Abraham" being singular. Scripture was allegorical (*Cf.* ox treading corn, Hagar and Sarah), and typical (*Cf.* rock in the

wilderness is Christ). But it is strange he did not allegorize about circumcision The Targums are used as of half-canonical worth. Compare points cited from the Targum and not in O.T.: angels gave the law, Gal. iii.; double creation, 1 Cor. xv.; persecution of Jacob by Esau, Gal. iv. 29. He accepted the later demon and angel doctrine. He loved dialectic and legal treatment. The Greeks of the second and third centuries did not understand this style: Augustine was the first to understand it again.

Paul's father had the right of Roman citizenship, so was not a small citizen. Perhaps Paul was married, and early became a widower (1 Cor. vii. 8), before his mission activity. He was small of stature. Barnabas and he were taken for gods, but Barnabas was the Zeus. He had great bodily suffering. Some say epilepsy. All we know is it was chronic, and at times broke out very painfully. He was very sensitive in temperament. Note his gift of tongues; the anacolutha, and frequent changes of tone in his letters. Harmoniousness of nature had to be obtained in covenant with Christ and his God. He is well depicted in his own words (2 Cor. vi.)

At 25 he is taking part in persecution with exceptional glee. This is confirmed by Gal. i., 1 Cor. xv.; he is charged with it later; and it is source of his special zeal. The great reversal (Umzwung) of the apostle is a problem for theologians and psychologists. Note the revelation is "*in me*;" it is similar to that to other apostles; source of his gospel; and came from without bringing conversion. The accounts in Acts differ, but agree that something exceptional came suddenly; he was blinded; went direct to Damascus; had intercourse with one who introduces him to Damascene Christians. The change he is convinced through life was sudden; contained also his apostolate, his gospel of Christ's death, and his mission to the Gentiles. The psychologists are to explain a *complex* conviction: that cannot come without reflection. Psychology after all only explains how; final cause is back of that. He is convinced that by Christ comes the righteousness the law requires, and that difference of Jew and Gentile vanishes. He as Pharisee, zealous for the law, saw the people moving further from it, and now heard how splendidly Jesus fulfilled the law of love. Here is the offering God requires and the people fail to bring. Christ lives, they say; then his death was no misfortune, but an offering. Isaiah 53 is fulfilled. Trusting in Christ there is protection before God. Historically we cannot say why Paul believed Christ lived. He is not conscious of development, and for the first 20 years we have only the testimony of his own consciousness. His recognition of the call to missionary work implies the conviction that he is needed. He goes not to Jerusalem! What strength of conviction then! History justified it.

After three years in Damascus and Arabia he came to Jerusalem only to know Peter personally—nothing about the Church. He only *saw* James. He gained the friendship of Barnabas, who was a Hellenist of Paul's country, and probably minister of the

Hellenist Christians in Jerusalem. Now northwards to find at Antioch many Jewish Proselytes probably with a looser relation to the law. Antioch became the second centre of Christianity. Jerusalem was provincial, but here was the third greatest city of the world and cosmopolitan ground. Christianity retained for long a city character.

The churches of Judea praised God for him says Gal. i. Did they from 34 to 51 A.D. become more legal then? No; it was only at first news of him they praised God. Paul's account knows nothing of Barnabas and his going up with gifts from Antioch (Acts xi.)

For 14 years we have only Acts 13 and 14; so this is only a sample of his journeying and covering a few months. The account is detailed, and awakens confidence. The route is historical and a little more; but the ideas attributed to Paul are not those in the Epistles.

B.—Strife about the Law and its Preliminary Solution.

Paul's gospel is a gnosis of the death of Christ. Early preaching gave the picture of Christ in history: Paul preaches a *doctrine* of faith in Christ—a knowledge of the risen Christ. Knowledge of the historic particulars, however, he must have to be confident he preached the Lord (*Cf.* also 1 Cor. xv., &c.) The danger that what Christ was in Himself would be lost to the world is here past. In the cross, Christ overcame flesh; spirit overcame matter. Man is flesh in body, soul, and spirit. Law is good, but serves in man only to strengthen sin. It is not to be done away or idealised; but you come through Christ to live from the spirit and the law is fulfilled.

To Paul as Pharisee law was literally the Word of God: this with threefold limitation:—(1). Promise is older; (2). Law comes to an end—had its right in Jesus Christ; (3). Though Divine it is to prepare for the entrance of the real source of righteousness. (*a*) bringing sin to ripeness, (*b*) making confession of sin, (*c*) leading as Paedagogue, to Christ. This is Mosaic Law, but there is a parallel to it in the conscience of the heathen. Promise is primary and fundamental in God's relation to man; law is medial and temporary. The heathen did not understand this dialectic; but universalism of salvation and the gracious God they did understand. The conditions of salvation are the same to Jews and heathen. There is one difference: the promise is specially to Jews. So Paul is not consequent heathen Christian as Baur calls him. He is more Judaic than any other source in the N.T. (*Cf.* Hebrews or John).

The Apostolic Council. There are two accounts (Gal. ii. and Acts xv.) Their relation to one another, and the previous history has been a great question since Semler and Baur. Baur does service by showing the importance of previous history, but he exaggerates and misunderstands. Gal. 2 is written to make clear what is laid on the Gentiles by the Jews. They must not become

proselytes in order to become Christians. Paul had been 15 years without going to Jerusalem, and then went, not for personal assurance, but to remove imputation of ungenuineness from his work. In speaking of those "who seem to be somewhat," and of "the pillars," there is no rough opposition (Baur), but he takes up the terms δοκοῦντες and στύλοι which the Jewish missionaries in Galatia had used. His description of his relations to the original apostles is optimistic throughout. Titus remained uncircumcised, being a Greek. Paul is neither against the apostles nor the Church, but against the false brethren who came to Antioch spying out and are his opponents at Jerusalem. The apostles neither added anything to nor corrected anything in the position he reported. They accepted also his personal position as missionary. Peter is to go to the circumcision: he to the uncircumcision. They acknowledge there may be a preaching of Christ where the law is set aside. Compared with other great movements (*e.g.* the Reformation or Islam), the wonder is that the tendency to harden to law is overcome. But a Jew, faithful to the law, could not mix with heathen. The two parties recognise one another on the basis of faith, but until Christ shall come they will remain as they are. As to intercourse with heathen, they did not decide what was to be done, hence the difference later between Peter at Antioch and "those from James." Acts xv. 29 is not historical. The law given there was active in the last quarter of the century (*Cf.* xxi. 24). It is here dated earlier, but wrongly. Paul said they didn't lay anything on him. Shortly before 71 A.D. this further step was taken. They came more and more to the Pauline standpoint (Weizsäcker agrees); but a small active party would not know anything of the heathen.

The simpler way of removing particularistic and national elements from the gospel was by *the allegorical method*. This is followed by Philo-Judaism in the latter part of the first century —a proof that a Jewish stream had been flowing that way. The O.T. is the revelation, but rightly understood it is universalistic. In this way the greater part of Judaism came to Christianity. But here the antithesis of salvation by faith is fully lost. They are still in bonds of law, only it is of spiritual content. Paul says, sublime the law as you will righteousness does not come so.

There are four stand-points from 51 A.D. forward. (1). Of rough Jewish Christian: Law is necessary to salvation; you must be a Jew before you can be a Christian. (2). Of Peter and John: Law is not necessary, but to the Jew it is a matter of piety; the question as to intercourse with Gentiles remains. (3). Of Paul: The law is fulfilled and superseded by Christ. It is God's word; is still valid for the Jew. The believer is above it: Christ is in Him. The heathen must not hold it or Christ died in vain. The Jew may still hold it for missionary purposes. Judaism has no prerogative, but is chosen means to the universal end. (4). Of Philo-Judaists: Law avails; but it is and has been spiritual. Christianity is identical with rightly-understood O.T. Christ gives the power to obey.

IV.—The Spread of the Gospel in the Roman Empire Through Paul and Others.

The years 52-59 A.D. are the best known to us. Paul's Epistles and important pieces in Acts are the sources. The preaching of the gospel continues the preaching of Monotheism with new power. Preparation had been made by the spread of Jews, unity of the Roman Empire, spread of Greek language, prevalence of law and order, unity on the higher sides of life through Greek philosophy, and the great proselytising mission of the Pharisees. Judaism took its flight, 50 B.C., to the West, and spread most rapidly. In the first century the Jews formed small corporations in all cities. They were found among the upper class; and were always very poor or very rich. There was antipathy to them in Rome and Greece; but their morality, simplicity of cultus, and faith won respect. "Lead us to Jerusalem," was being fulfilled. Yet in another century there were to be no more Judaist Greeks. In 51 A.D. there came one from Antioch to raise the empire out of its quick decay. Religion had been a State affair. When the small city states were being broken up; religion felt the influence of the dissolution. Though the moral state of society then has been painted very black there was not a "generatio aequivoca." Disposition to religion was there; Greek philosophy had brought a deeper moral nature; the Stoics had emphasized the importance of individual manhood. The law system of Rome shows there was no general decay. The Augustinian age was both most immoral and most religious, but by Antonine's time the pbilosophic moral view had become much more penetrating. The idea of immortality, under the influence of oriental religion and Platonic philosophy, was rising in the apostolic age. Yet a mechanical atonement, not a moral salvation is alone thought of.

Barnabas, probable author of "Hebrews," left Paul; Silas (who is not Titus and not Luke), joined him, Timothy makes the third. He is circumcised because born of Jewish mother and claimed as a Jewish child. Unless circumcised he could not have missioned among born Jews. They go to Troas. Reflections are assured to Paul by nightly dreams. Troas is on the direct road to Rome. The spirit moves him with the large idea of going quickly to the metropolis and working outward from thence. Now the "we"-pieces, possibly from Luke, come in with all particulars. At Philippi, a colony more Latin than Greek, Paul brought the divining woman, by great power of mind, to rest. Overbeck says that Paul's reported right of Roman citizenship is a bit of tendenz; but the fact that we cannot tell why he did not claim his right earlier is no reason for casting all away. As to the earthquake, what is true we cannot say. It is suspicuous that the same occurs with Peter. The "we"-pieces cease before the earthquake.

Note the composition of the Church in Thessalonica; it is characteristic of many—some Jews, a great number of Proselytes

and a few women of best society. Whoredom and dishonesty are the great sins.

After years Paul came again and to Achaia. Greece had not risen again: its cities had become villages. Athens was the only great city in Attica. It had lost its old Greek life. Its temples and high places were in ruin, only to be restored later by Hadrian and Antonine. Athens had no longer the significance of former times for other lands. The writer of Acts feels it is a great moment: but Paul's letters say nothing of it. No wonder, for he made no impression. In no city did heathendom maintain itself longer than in Athens. It was an ancient Oxford, but like Oxford Conservative. Dionysius plays a great role in later legend, as patron of the Church of France, &c. The account is so dramatic as to raise suspicion. Altars to an "unknown God" could be found there, the desire being to leave no God unhonoured. Paul went out as street preacher, like a philosopher of the lower grade. He came into dispute with Epicureans (recruited from the higher class), and Stoics. Chrysostom says they probably understood Christ and the resurrected Christ as new Gods—a spiritual God would not be new to them. The leading thoughts of the speech at the Areopagus are not Pauline.

Now Paul goes to Corinth—the antithesis of Athens—a world city, oriental, and of fluctuating population. The pro-consul Gallio was the elder brother of Seneca. It was said, in the third or fourth century, that there had been an exchange of letters between Seneca and Paul. Paul found Aquila and Priscilla, Christians, there from Rome. Timothy came from Thessalonica a second time bringing good news.

Baur only allowed four letters genuine—Gal., 1st and 2nd Cor., Rom.; but in his own school 1 Thess. was later accepted, and to-day it is generally received. 2 Thess. is given up by many on grounds not conclusive to Harnack, Paul dictated his letters and then read them before sending them off. Difficult passages possibly arise through his marginal remarks being brought into the body of the letters. He wrote a few words at the end sometimes. They are different in style. This is a usual difference between dictation and writing. There was an imperial post, but it could not be used by private persons; so transfer of letters was precarious. False letters were written under Paul's name, and false portions were inserted in genuine letters. In 2 Thess. he is engaged with the coming of Christ, influenced by Daniel and Jewish Apocalypses. "το κατέχον," which is to be done away is probably the Roman Empire. There is nothing of controversy with Jews here: it is not yet.

The Corinthians were easily moved. A tendency to mysticism prevailed among them; they thought Christianity was a greater Gnosis. Paul's answer is the foolishness of the Cross. He baptized very few. He says, sadly, he planted but did not water. Another lively and gifted man, Apollos, came and produced a

greater effect. Sectarianism arose: they would be Paulists, &c., not Christians: this he condemns.

The most difficult years of his life are 55-58 A.D. Justin says missionaries were sent by the Jews to the whole Diaspora. They were not too choice in means (see Gal. and 2 Cor.) The contentions were: (1). You must become Jew to become Christian. (2). Only Apostles who had seen the Lord were authentic. (3). The Apostle himself was under satanic influence, his inner revelation was none, he was very courageous in letters but not when present, he would make them Pauline and heathen, not Christians. It was a sad position to be compelled to defend himself and the Gospel together. Such a task requires a great character. In his letters all hardness is overcome; 1 Cor. contains the song of love, 2 Cor. the hymn of the persecuted.

He visited Galatia. Some tried to make out that these Galatians were Germans, and then pointed out how the German Reformation arose from a return to the Epistle of Galatians. This was a very pretty notion; but the Galatians were Celts.

Ephesus was like Corinth, but with more old associations. Its temple of Diana made it celebrated. It was important to Christendom and on the way from Palestine to Rome. The rise of Christianity on the west coast of Asia Minor was quicker than anywhere outside of Rome. Pliny tells how it affected the markets for cattle, none being used now in sacrifice. There was much superstition there. All the West was covered with priests called Chaldaeans—the name also of Mathematicians. Mathematics were long thought dangerous in Rome. Suppose one going to-day to Loretto to preach against the use of pictures, believers and unbelieving traders would attack. So it was here. Probably in the reference to fighting with wild beasts there is no trope but record of reality. Paul made the friendly acquaintance there of Apollos of Alexandria. This one knew of Christ, but his history was false, and he only baptized with the baptism of John. So John's movement had spread notwithstanding Christ's coming. The whole heathen literature knows nothing of this movement, but the Talmud has remembrances of it, and later eastern sources know of a society of Zebäer. Apollos worked in Corinth with great success whilst Paul was at Ephesus. He watered (*i.e.*, baptized), and gave philosophic spiritual explanation of the O.T. as a Sophia. Paul first worked in the synagogue at Ephesus and then in the Schola of Tyrannus. Scholæ were houses hired by wandering rhetors for lecturing. As such Paul appeared here, and founded a circle of churches—Smyrna, Philadelphia, &c.,—in the district.

Sad news came from east and west. In Galatia there was Judaising wholesale. The Epistle to them was probably written from Ephesus. From the west there was news from Corinth. From 1 Cor. 5_9 it is apparent that a first letter, about fornication and eating of flesh offered in heathen sacrifice, has been lost. Then comes our 1 Cor. following on news brought by the slaves of Chloe respecting divisions. Baur, following Semler, has worked much on

these four parties. Peter represented the strong Jews and Apollos the philosophic Philonic party. The Christ party Baur says is the strongest Jew party, offering greatest opposition to Paul and knowing Christ not as Messias. Schenkel said they held to Philo and the philosophy of Apollos but mystically. It is probable there was *no* Christ party. Except for 2 Cor. 10_7 no one would have thought of it. Paul says Peter, Apollos, and he differ, but all build on Christ. Clemens Romanus 6_{40} should have mentioned a Christ-party had their been one. Chrysostom knows nothing of it. "I am of Christ" is Paul's own contra-statement. These young Christians imitated the educated folk in assigning themselves to a particular school and scholar; but Paul says Christendom is no school, a temple rather on Christ-foundation. Differences are to be left to God and the final trial.

The Peter party is free from the law, and does not mean in general the apostle party. Baur thinks it impossible, but it is very probable from analogy, that Peter had been in Corinth. They knew of him going round with a sister. 1 Cor. is important as being the only epistle giving concrete Church conditions. Between the second letter (our 1 Cor.) and 2 Cor., a letter (lost) and a journey come in. *Cf.* 2 Cor. 13_1, 2_3 *ff.*, and 7_7 *ff.* It was a letter raising a crisis, and that does not agree with our 1 Cor. He had gone to Corinth and returned quickly. Why we don't know, but they could say his presence was weak. Hausrath thinks 2 Cor. x.-xii. is the lost letter, because of the complete change of voice and new beginning when the epistle seemed closed, but exegesis makes this improbable. Paul wrote to make an example of one agitator (Judaistic). He could not stay in Ephesus. Acts says it was because of the Diana image-makers, but the chief reason we see was another, He went to Troas—much excited—thence to Macedonia, and met Titus, who came with news of his authority restored. He wrote now 2 Cor., like Phil., in its heartiness. Here Paul is to be studied psychologically. There is much about himself: ecstacy, thorn in the flesh, &c.

He travels now to Corinth, Dec. 57, to Feb. 58 or a year later. Acts knows nothing of this, says nothing of two visits to any place: is only concerned to show the advance of the gospel. "Romans" is written from here (Ch. 15_{31}). He had had long in view to go to Rome. He is near now, but must bring the gifts to Jerusalem. Representatives from all his circles must go with him. Neither he nor his disciples had founded the Roman Church. In 50 A.D. Aquila and Priscilla came from there. He does not go on to others' ground. He is only to call on his way, carrying the gospel to the limits of the empire. Baur, Hoffmann, and Mangold maintain the Jewish character of the Church, Weizsäcker, Beyschlag, and Harnack say it contained a small circle of born Jews, and many heathen of all shades, previously in connection with Judaism, and knowing the O.T., but interpreting it allegorically. The faith of the Church was renowned. It is a great thing that a Church having no connection with any prominent apostle, had such good Christianity.

Paul will present the chief characteristics of his preaching—antinomistic. Chs. 12-15 give us Paul's ethics. Ch. xvi. has caused difficulty, and is not part of the letter. The letters when used liturgically had different endings in different localities.

Paul is decided to go to Jerusalem, but has premonitions of danger. He sagaciously takes with him representatives of his converts. "We"-pieces again Acts 20_5, up to arrival at Cæsarea, giving the journey with great particularity. In Tyre, brothers speaking in the spirit, say he must not go; but he is driven by the spirit so the spirit's voice is no absolute voice. He is with Philip at Cæsarea, and is warned by Agabus, but duty says "forward." At least twelve accompanied him as he entered Jerusalem.

V.—The Conclusion of the Lives of Peter and Paul.

Acts is the chief source, but there is no certainty about some passages belonging to the "we" pieces, and although Chs. 21-28 have much for them, points of dogma forbid reliance.

To Jerusalem in 58 A.D. He had a friendly reception; paid an official visit to James and the elders, and recounted his work. But, say they, there are many Jewish Christians zealous for the law; pay then for the four men taking the Nazarite vow. There is a contrast here to Ch. 15, where James speaks in the name of the people. Critics say, if this is true, Gal. and Cor. are false. But Paul is here among Jews, and nowhere does Paul say a Jew is not to hold the law. Paul consented, but it was of no avail; Jews from Asia began a tumult about Trophimus being taken into the Temple. Paul is completely isolated. James must apparently surrender Paul to save the Church. Roman authority interfered. He is brought to Felix, who ruled with royal might, but slavish purpose. He is brother-in-law to Claudius. There was no unfaithfulness he was not capable of, and, like many Roman procurators, was very covetous. Paul had brought money to Jerusalem and had friends, so for two years he was kept in Cæsarea 58-60 A.D. In 60 or 61 he goes to Rome under the centurion Julius, appealing to Cæsar; Timothy, Aristarchus, and the author of the "we"-pieces with him. Phil., Col., Ephes., and Philemon were written from Rome. Paul rejoices on nearing the City. He hired a dwelling, and could receive visits. He preached freely, so that imprisonment was a sort of blessing.

Ephesians is not Pauline, but pieces in it are. Col. is nearly related to it. Holtzmann says Col. is in ground genuine, but there are interpolations by the writer of Ephes. The passages akin to the latter can be excluded without disturbing the connection. Paul in Philemon, which mentions the same names as Col., hopes to be free, but will go to Asia Minor not Spain. Phil. contains the same hope; yet he expects no more from the world—his course is perfected. He had received money from Philippi, though not from others. He stood in near relation to that Church.

What follows now? There are many hypotheses. It is highly

probable Paul died in the Neronic persecution 64 A.D. In Ch. V. of "Clemens Romanus" (A.D. 96), the martyrdom of Peter and Paul under authorities, is worked upon as well known. The Danaiden and Dirken there referred to are found to be related to the persecution under Nero. No tradition allows Paul to end life elsewhere: no other place has claimed the honour; the grave of Paul is shown on the way to Ostia. The date of Paul's death can be traced to a late day in June, and this agrees with Tacitus as to the time of the persecution. There is some probability he was free again and went to Spain. *Cf.* Clemens Romanus, Ch. v. It is possible to accept a journey to the East also. Harnack holds Timothy and Titus for compilations of the time of Hadrian, containing Pauline pieces. In 2 Timothy iv. Paul is free, and makes a journey we know nothing of already. So if anything is genuine in the pastoral Epistles it is highly probable Paul made a journey to the East.

Peter, Acts 12_{17}, left Jerusalem, and James took the place. In 51 A.D. he was there, and was entrusted with the mission to the circumcision. He worked in Samaria and the Philistine coasts. In Gal. we find he was at Antioch, and from Cor. that he had gone about with a sister. Paul came to Corinth 58 A.D., and Peter was no longer there. The latter was regarded in the circle in which John's Gospel arose as having died a martyr; 2nd Peter is not accepted, but 1st Peter is a memorial of early Christianity. It is from a Paulinist and a cultured man, to Pauline churches. Earlier the letter did not pretend to be Peter's. It is much cited without the name of Peter. The first verse and the conclusion (*re* Babylon) must have been added later. Peter died probably at Rome in the Neronic persecution 64 A.D. The authorities are, the reference in Jno. and in Clement, the Ignatian letters, a fragment quoted by Origen, and the information of Papias. He may have been there as early as 59-61 A.D., but cannot have been there long, scarcely have become Bishop there. The joint martyrdom of the two Apostles closes the Apostolic Age.

Some few notes followed on the Jewish revolutions, the taking of the Temple, on Ephesus as centre of Christian propaganda, and on John and the Book of Revelation.

THE GREAT MONASTIC STAGES,

OR,

THE SPLENDID RECORDS OF ASCETICISM.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Introduction.

1, Ascesis; 2, Ἀσκεῖν; 3, Professor Harnack's "Monasticism"; 4, Paradox; 5, Theme; 6 Not of the First Century; 7, Outline; 8, True Field of History of Christianity; 9, Prejudice; 10 Law for Asceticism to-day.

I.—First Monastic Stage, Anthony. 300 A.D.

1, Why Reform; 2, Growth of the Iron System of Relief under Apostolic-episcopal Rule; 3, Rome adopts the System; 4, Revolt of life, Monks, Saviours.

II.—Second Monastic Stage, Benedict. 500 A.D.

1, Degeneracy of First Monks; 2, Reformer Monks always Laymen, not Priests; 3, Fall of Rome (a) Barbarians, (b) Physical decay, disease, enervation; 4, Helpless Church; 5, Benedict and his Rule, Salvation.

III.—Third Monastic Stage, Clugny. 900 A.D.

1, Producers of living thought; 2, Wealth and learning of Benedictines selfish at first; 3, Rise of worldly canonries; 4, Clugny's "Order" and "Congregation"; 5, Inspiration, Sacred Song; 6, Crusades.

IV.—Fourth Monastic Stage, Francis and Dominic. 1,200 A.D.

1, The new world-problem; 2, Francis, saint, universal brotherhood in poverty; 3, Tertiaries; 4, Dominic, criticism of Franciscanism; 5, Dominican exaltation of Truth for all; 6, Preaching born again; 7, Inquisition; 8, Religious roots of Mediæval Revival, (a) Renaissance in Art, Literature, Education, Politics, (b) Master Scholasts, religious power, control to-day.

V.—Fifth Monastic Stage, Luther and Loyola. 1,500 A.D.

1, "Conscience" the watchword of the new asceticism; 2, Loyola, conscience of the Body Catholic, Missions, Rule of Christendom; 3, Luther, Individual Conscience.

VI.—Sixth Monastic Stage, to-day.

Divine Conscience, Love, Knowledge, Labour, Immanuel.

Mr. Pater, in his exquisite book on the Renaissance, speaks of that ascesis, that strong control of will and rule of hand, which mark the leading years and men in every great epoch. This ascesis, he says, filled that age of new birth which we call the Renaissance.

2. The hunter after early forms of speech starts at hearing Passow say Ἄσκησις (exercise) — *Uebung, das Bestreben sich eine Fertigkeit anzueignen* (to gain skill) *Thuc. 2, 39, n. a. Attik.,—bes. die Uebungen u. die ganze dazu gehörige Lebensweise der Athleten* (the training, etc., of the athletes). 2)—*Profession, Beschäftigung. Luc. vit. auct. 7. A.D. 120 vitarum auctio, sale of the Philosophers.* And Ἀσκεῖν —*Fleiss u. Sorgfalt verwenden. Bei Homer nur von der Kunstgeschicklichkeit mit welcher rohe Stoffe geformt od. Kunstproducte gestaltet u. verziert werden.* He adds "*This Homeric usus loq. lasts through Hdt. and the Tragedians, but so that rather the result of the artistic work is considered, i.e., the nice and graceful fashion of the article.*" Again "*Amongst the Attic writers there prevails the general signification that had been used even by Pindar and Hdt. (to be diligent), sich befleissigen, Fleiss u. Sorgfalt zuwenden.*" Seldom is a lexicon's page so fine a tale of an early art, oft lost, yet every generation's brightest goal. Ascesis! We smile "Eureka!" and almost vow we will become ascetics.

3. Prof. Harnack's rich historical harvests send in ever and anon some pamphlet-fashioned tiny sheaf that proves to be the very quintessence of a feast, and such was his little brôchure on Monasticism.* Keen questions bristle over it all, as does on the very second page the sober reflection, "But can Monasticism have a history? Can it have changing ideals? What history can they live or make, who have fled the world and turned their backs on all its changing forms and on all history? "Or is not a history of the Ideals of Monasticism itself a protest against the very idea of Monasticism?"

Yet hereupon Harnack begins a wonderful sketch of that very Monasticism, its Ideals and its History. At this outset of my own words I acknowledge my pupillage to Harnack; for, although a pupil may not render much service to the master, it is an honour to one's soul to follow the luxuriant thinking and catch a little of the enthusiasm of a glorious young leader like Harnack.

4. His tract on Monasticism is a paradox, a history of what can have no history. Just here lurks the spring of intensest interest kindled by this sort of theme: it is filled and covered with the paradoxes of life. We start upon our roads and quests accompanied by some meet friend; but, ere we can well hold a day's converse, his path and ours diverge, while another, a stranger's path, comes crossing ours, his steps run parallel awhile, and anon the stranger is a fast friend; while the loved one of our earlier hour has grown quite strange, his doings are almost nothing to us, his face all lost to sight and in truth to memory hardly dear. The sorrows of life become its joys, the joys grow gray, November-tinged. Along the winding rivers that we navigate, the onward-pointing prow faces sometimes the setting sun, and again glides eastward, yet ever onward. So do we never truly turn the back to any of the world's blisses, but God orders our swaying, vibrating, pulsating lives so that we shall see at one time or at another all the joys He gives. Only in such strange way do sons of man become evermore sons of God. Did the "Preacher" harangue of old, "Vanity of vanity, all is vanity?" Had he said, "Paradox of paradoxes, all is paradox," he would have spoken the same truth with possibly a little more of quaint pleasure.

5. A truce to introduction, it leads away out into the wide world from which it ought to lead us quietly aside. This be enough that we are to consider the Paradox of Life that nestles in our very souls, as it worked in the Story of the Great Monastic Stages, the progress of negations, the Splendid Record of Gloomy Asceticism. We seek rest; we find it as we move. We seek satisfaction, fulness; he alone can win that blessedness who hungers.

6. I am not to theorize now concerning the first Founder and the first followers of Christianity as utterances of the Divine Law of Asceticism, "Die to live." Let me only record the fact that our well-known story of Paul does put once into his lips the words, "I

* Das Mönchthum, seine Ideale u. seine Geschichte. u. s. w. 88s. 3te Aufl., Giessen, Ricker, 1886

am an ascetic" (ἀσκέω), filling into the word the noble classical meaning, "I hold myself in from some things to the great end that I may accomplish something higher."

7. Now I will pass away from those days to days and deeds less controverted. Come to the age when Christianity and Rome, a despised religion and the great honoured world seemed to become all one. The history I shall tell is not obscure, but belongs so much to the dazzling history of Europe that we need only fear lest the record be too brilliant. Yet there is little room for fear, for if the pages we are to read are well-known, the paragraphs I am to point to are well-hated. I am to recount the rise, and again the new rise, and the rise again and yet again of the Monks: I am to tell of the service which these ever new renunciations and even fanatical abstinences from the world have done. It will perhaps change into gentleness the prejudice at once upspringing, inclining the ear to reflect more often on those voices of song that sound across the ages from the lips of monks. For we sing indeed to-day the psalms that monks wrote and sang long ago, and again for many a day our lips shall speak our keenest hopes in the passionate song of those old ascetics. Berno of Clugny, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas of Celano, Thomas Aquinas, Francis Xavier—these are the names that lie between the leaves of our hymn books like sprays of fragrant woodruff. Their hymns we sing and few hymns have more beauty. We murmur softly their whispered fear and faith, or in glad hours we break into their choruses of assurance where Heaven seems almost a visible place of joy:—

> "Jerusalem the golden
> With milk and honey blest."

But like many a fair fabric that we use, these things of beauty come from fair fingers we have forgotten and scarcely care to know.

Passion had those monks? Yea, so strong that their very strength drove them to fierce struggle to control that strength. The struggle proved often cruel, and failure was the result; but the very failure proved the power of the forces that fought in those breasts. Strong men those were, in sore need of God, surely, sternly crying for His help.

8. The story of Christianity is the story of these cries and faiths, and fears and songs: Christianity is not synonymous with the Roman Empire which is the so-called "Church." When shall we turn from our strange regard for the history of Popes and Emperors to read the story of the men I have named, to an Anthony, a Basil, a Benedict, a Francis, a Savonarola, looking to these latter, no longer to those former, as the lighthouses of the voyage of life, the beacons along the main line of Christianity?

9. It is true that these men could learn to do awful deeds. Their asceticism could become a cruelty that curdles our blood. The Dominican invented the horrors of the Inquisition, and we hate to-day their last hovering traces that prowl about our homes like shameful demons. We are growing ashamed even of that

cruel torment of little children, the black dog painted by thoughtless elders as ready to leap from behind upon the little one who does what these elders call naughty. This is, perhaps, one of the last baneful relics of the *Domini-Cani*, "the dogs of God," robed in black, who were ever ready to pounce on those whom a still more shameless elder, the Church, called "naughty." The lingering relic is hateful now; no wonder that we turn away half sickened from the very name Dominic. But the Inquisition was the function laid by a bad Church on degenerate Dominicans; and Dominic and his first thoughts and deeds were something very different, for they were a great spiritual revival. Nascent Dominicanism, its original nature, and its true utterance were preaching, thinking, and intense care for the knowledge of truth by the people. So were Savonarola and Tauler true Dominicans. In these great preachers, and not in Torquemada, was the essence of Dominicanism, else surely they had abjured it or never chosen it.

So, too, Franciscanism has become the synonym for devoutest folly and most abject indignity to self. But the first great scholastic masters, men who dominate conservative thought to this very day were Franciscans; and the name Francis itself is an almost sacred word that tells of the man perhaps most Christlike in all Christian story, whose strange self-sacrifice was all to the end that to the poor the gospel might be preached.

10. There is more than folly in asceticism: its record is not all black; nay, it seems at times the most splendid record in all Christian story. What have they done? Let us ask the question in vindication both of the ascetic of the past, monk though he may have been, and of the asceticism of the present, severe and morbid though it seem. The question should be asked for the guidance of the ascetics of to-day, for they will be totally unlike their forerunners in all the past unless they be ever rendering a splendid service to mankind.

Turn then to read a few pages of the story.

I.

The first that we shall read was written fifteen hundred years ago, and it tells how the first Christian monks became monks that they might break the iron chain of ecclesiastical oppression.

1. The life that was in Anthony and his fellows, brave men and lovers of God, could not bear the death-grip of the now old, but then new Catholic Church. They broke away from the Church, renouncing world and Church all in one, for one they had become; and away into the desert they fled, alone or in handfuls, the first monks, and the first monasteries. They did this for us all. They were the first Reformers demanding freedom for life's new and constant yearnings; therefore they burst the iron bonds of the new Roman Church. And their deed saved the world.

2. What need was there for reform? It is a question of surpassing interest to ask and try to answer how there grew the tremendous strength of the organisation, named the Christian

Church, which Constantine adopted. The power that first drew and bound those men together lay in the Crucified One on Calvary. His agony of loneliness was all swallowed up in the great Rest of immanent oneness of His own Spirit with His great Spirit Father. Out of that great Divine Rest came the glad gospel of forgiveness even for the worst men. Such love from God drew weary souls in multitudes, and they awoke to joy, to strength, to thoughts and deeds of love. That was the first Church of Christ, His very body.

A century rolled past, and already these multitudes in their gatherings were forming relationships between assembly and assembly, between town and town, chiefly to the end that they might succour one another in their needs, poverty, journeyings, and toils. The control of these relationships became centred in the hands of those officials who administered the property of the societies. Fixed qualifications for admission to a share in the material privileges took form: certain visible marks of membership, and a definite visible law became established.*

Another century passed, and the Roman Emperors found within their empire another empire as strongly knit together as their own, strongly officered, its members strictly distinguished from all other men by initiatory rights and periodical observances, the whole based upon a definite canon, and all these factors, canon, rites, and officers declared to be of apostolic origin, that is, of Divine institution. In short, here was a rival system of government, an *imperium in imperio*, with sharply-marked features, and these all inseparably linked with the deepest religious reverence of the members' souls. The whole was held to have come from the twelve witnesses of the cross, and the sacredness of the cross made the system as sacred as the Lord Himself. Men lived by the system, and they died for it. Such was the mighty Episcopal system of old Catholicism with its apostolic succession of bishops, its apostolic creed, its apostolic sacraments, and its canon of apostolic writings. What must the Roman State do with this rival? The Emperor must break it or adopt it, else Rome must soon fall. To break it they first tried, and then were the awful persecutions of Dioclesian. But in the struggle Rome failed. The other alternative followed. Rome adopted the organisation, and the Roman Catholic Church was born, 1550 years ago.

3. Rome had failed. The failure marked the iron strength of the ecclesiastical system that was stronger than Rome. What room, then, was there for spirit and life, wherein to move and to expand, to burst forth on this side and on that after its own innate law? The struggle for room to breathe in was hard before the victory over Rome: what, then, must have been the deadly pressure on the soul beneath Church and Rome combined? As the great freedom of God to follow His own great laws is God's own very life; so only freedom of soul to be its own ever new,

* See Hatch's "Bampton Lecture," and Harnack's "Dagmengeschichte."

God-ordained self is the very life of a soul. If that freedom be hemmed in or crushed by any really outward force, so far forth the life dies. So in Constantine's day died life within the Church organisation. Rome's fall under the Church's grip was the fall of the Church as well; and the proof lies patent herein that when the wild Gothic invaders shook the eternal city and the vast empire to the very death, then the Church had no power to save her. That very city where the central ecclesiastic sat, holding all ecclesiastical power in his hand, and surely able to save them if he could save at all, was the very spot where the northern hordes with wild mockery and laughing scorn struck and struck again, hurling all to ruin. Such death did Constantine's union of Church and State work for both State and Church.

4. But life does not die. It falls and seems all dead, but from the dead it rises again. Crushed and driven out, it flies away to breathe and bloom elsewhere, in some new land, in some strange form unknown before, seeming uncouth perhaps like the emigrant, but in reality heavenly in its very newness. So when Rome and the Church drank of the one fatal poison and grasped each other in deadly drunkenness, the crushed life within fled away to the desert. Away sped Anthony despising world, church, forms, organisation, glory, hastening to a haven and heaven in the Theban wilds. Away he turned from sacraments, away from bishops, away from creed, away from literature, law, and canon. He needed none, for he needed life; and whereas life would again produce all forms it might need, for the time being these forms were crushing life. Out into monastic loneliness went life, and the Ascetic saved the life of the world. So to-day, while forms are a necessary product of life, and its necessary encasement, yet simple souls do right to turn away, refuse, fly from, break from what is even valuable if it crushes life. In due time the true value and use of the forsaken form will be discovered, and all the more truly used by him who, for life's sake, lays form down. Meantime, for the sake of life, that cries out in struggling protest, out, away, on into the wilds, alone into the desert. Crucifixion it is, and that is the way to life. For Christ died and rose again.

Yonder, fifteen and a half centuries ago, when Anthony led the first flight of monks out from the bonds of organisation and church form, yonder, asceticism struck its first great blow for freedom. The monk marched out in the vanguard of the first great procession of Christian freemen. God was with them, and they established themselves outside the forms of the Church, as so true a part of Christ's body, and bearer of His Being that ere long the very Church they had revolted from eagerly incorporated them as a part of itself. Monasticism, at first an extra ecclesiastical phenomenon, was speedily sought after as a most vital factor in the great Church system. So speedily does the bark of the tree once burst, creep round the rent again, and harden and thicken until it seems toughest where once the break was. The splendid record of asceticism lies in the initial stages of the Monastic de-

velopment, not in the later degenerations. That which we have learned to dislike and even despise in the Monk is the character he takes on while he is becoming absorbed in the Church system; but his initial step, his revolt against iron system, is almost the finest feature in Christian story. Turn now from the first page of its splendid record to a second.

II.

The second page of the record tells of the new birth of asceticism two hundred years after Anthony and Constantine. It is the story of the Benedictine age, about 500 A.D.

1. The followers of Anthony and of his great companion leaders Basil and Pachomius, became, as generations passed, as iron-like and strong a system, as rigid a part in the great Church system as before them had been the forms from which they fled. But ever-living life must compel new liberty, and the new bonds must be burst again.

2. Strange but true it is that the new advancing life of Christianity has always become manifested in some person or movement lying outside of the recognised organisation. The leaders of great movements of advance and reform have almost invariably been laymen and not priests. It may be counted an axiom that, if we would be true teachers and leaders in goodness, we must not be stationary parts of a formal system. The true preacher must be part of the laity, by being as free to think as God is to inspire, and as man's soul is to be inspired. When a layman in name is not free to think, to gaze on the most hidden depths of God's knowledge, and on the new facts always known to God but never known by man before, when a layman shrinks from such searching and lonely thinking, then he is no layman, but truly a cleric, a priest, a mere iron rod in the great system which life must break. But the thoughtful layman, bound by no forms, ever holding the finger of the great spirit Father as he speeds forward in his creative path, ever free as God, is the true leader of his fellow-men. This was singularly manifest in the story of the layman Anthony, and now also it was to be proved by the story of Benedict. Again and again the Monastic leaders were not priests but laymen.

3. The organisation of Roman Christianity was not full of salvation, but full of death. Ere long her protégé came to ruin. The fairest city and centre of the empire fell, done to death, saved neither by her sword nor by her Church. Struck at indeed she was by many a blow.

(*a*). Struck from without by the eager explorers from the north and east. Shall we not compare those Goths, Huns, Vandals with our own Columbus and Cook of the past, and many another somewhat self-seeking explorer of cold seas and dark continents in this century? Room, room for life they wanted, and would have, even at cost of cities and fields and homes of the invaded. Brave they were, like all explorers, fearing no sword, eagerly struggling up to light, seizing Rome's bright beauty as a child

seizes a sunbeam or a lad carries off a prize. Surely, they thought, here was bliss, light, knowledge, power, beauty, life. Dying Rome gave her good things to men to bring them joy. Did not the joy of the new strong ones justify the striking of the feeble! A verdict against the barbarous Goth would be quite contrary to some of the facts.

(*b*). But Rome was struck at by a more fearful foe, for it was born in her own bosom, of her own very wealth, aye, of her own living masses. It lay and lurked unseen, creeping along the ground, under the dust where her own fleshly decay rotted, and the offcastings of the past life bred the deadly poison of the present. Humility and caution become humanity, for we breed our own nausea by our own wealth. "Look ahead" is as important a counsel as "know thyself." Ignorance of laws of health strangled Rome then, as it strangles the inhabitants of Rome's Campagna to-day. The seeds of fever grew luxuriant in the fetid soil, where to-day the naturalist may trace the very paths of the old destroyer that undermined and enervated and broke down great Rome.

4. For all this evil the Church's highest bishop, her highest battalion of priests, had no medicine and no advice. "Die, and be saved," was all they would say, and it was a grimly true advice amid the gruesome ills. Bury was all that the divine and helpless priest could do for men; and he buried and filled the deadly earth full again with death. Then earth worked herself desolate in strangely instinctive struggle to be healed. Italy became a desert. Fair Italy, sunny slopes of Apennines became more lonely than African wilds.

What were the old monks doing now? If they were saviours long ago, could they not save now? They could not, for they rather made the ruin worse by their utter refusal to meddle in worldly things, toils, thought, counsel, action. Their sacred flight from man's company and interests had become cursed idleness when practised as a sacred habit of the past. The saviours of the past cannot be the saviours of the present, unless they be again crucified and let that very body die which once was their life and their all in all. The body of the Christ, which we are, must be ready to lay down its beautiful heritages of form, dear as the very Lord's body though they be; for, by the divine law of life so only can we attain unto the resurrection of the dead. So in the fifth century the old Monasticism and its laws, sacred though they were, must die.

5. Benedict of Nursia saw that the monks themselves were the worst idlers amid the supine idleness that was ruining Italy and man, world and Christian Church together. Full of false devotion to that idleness, they sat apart with folded hands while the poor world that God loved to create and to bid be fruitful sank into ever deeper desolation. Untilled, unhoused, unused for lack of men to love her and seek her fruits, earth lay rotting under the heaps of poisonous decay that she held close upon her bosom.

Earth was rotten, so was Church, so were monks, all dying in sacred, idle rottenness.

Away out again from all this fled Benedict, man of blessed name. Out from the custom of idleness, as well as out from the haunts of idle man and idle monk. Out, away he speeds, until in the loneliest untrammelled spot he can ordain for self and fellows the newest life of labour and study. Leave the worldliness of old Monasticism, till the soil, read the writings of all learned men, work, study, commanded Benedict. It was an astounding revolt from the religion of the time. But on that sunlit hill of Southern Italy, beautiful Monte Casino, Benedict lit up a beacon fire that has burned and beamed to lighten all nations from that day till now. To-day sings Jean Ingelow in sweetest girl-voiced verse how at morning dawn the iron horse snorts and tosses his white plume to the blue sky as he speeds away round the base of that venerable hill as if hailing with young joy the ancient home that has given him birth. For our nineteenth century light and strength are all a fabric that was designed by the true saint Benedict on Monte Casino 1300 years ago. Every Benedictine abbey has been in some sense a link in the blessed chain of students and labourers who have thought out and built up God's beautiful world and our beautiful home of to-day.

Asceticism accomplished this second salvation of the world by breaking the bonds of sacred custom and fleeing away from the iron law and Church and world of the time to a severe life of devotion to learning, to culture of the soil, and to every precious art. And again it was a layman and no priest who led the blessed advance, and wrote this second splendid page of ascetic story.

III.

We hasten on to ask why should ever again Reform be needed. What new deed remained for men to do, what new plan for men to follow, what new record to be written?

1. Alas for the foolish superficiality of those mechanical performers amongst us, the mere machine tenders, the mere repeaters again and again of well-known methods, who dream that they are the only producers in this world. They cannot see how he who thinks out a new part of God's plan is the truest producer. He who tells men new laws and sends great hosts of men to walk in altogether new paths of life is far more truly a producer than they. He who produces new currents of thought and plan for men is the true creator among them. The thoughtful preacher is far more really a producer than the machine owner or the capitalist. So Benedict's great method and work must be, not indeed supplanted, but supplemented by preachers of still wiser ways. The Order of the Clugny monks of 900 A.D. was the new stride onward.

2. Benedict's rule, blessed as it was, held in itself a prophecy of its own decay. For the learning and labour, to which the Benedictines fled, was at first for themselves alone. It was not for the world without, nor even for fellow Christians that at first they

toiled and read. They would save their own souls, therefore it was that they turned from the death that was about them. They read, and learned, and stored masses of knowledge, but these were for the inmates of the cloister only. They delved and span, and the kindly soil and willing flock teemed with grateful fruits, but these were for the use and joy of the one monastery alone. Soon the storehouses of these brotherhoods were bursting and the coffers and the lands of these monks were the wealthiest treasures of the world. The individual monk possessed nothing indeed, but his convent was often immensely rich, and would bid its inmates revel at ease. World-flight was inverted by its own hand into world-enjoyment. The ascetic had won triumphs of ease by his self-control, and now his ease mocked his asceticism. Self-restraint had proved itself the best policy in the world, and its selfishness hardened its own heart to death. Such a deadly discovery shall every ascetic make who does not give himself up for others; for history proves that the son of man may not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give all, even his life, a ransom for others.

3. Death, then, was the satire and nemesis of the Benedictine life while it was selfish. Their wealth was quickly tracked and seized by the avenging fate, for the men of this world will not let this world's possessions lie long in the hands of a few men of another world. A share they will have, and a share can soon be secured, by perfectly regular methods, by every one who will win a share. If the monk owned the whole world's wealth, the whole world would turn monk and wear the cowl to enjoy the benefice. Such was the origin of our cathedral canonries and prebends and many another well-endowed living legally arranged to furnish a lifelong abundance to men who shall do nothing. The age of the rise of these lay between 500 and 900 A.D., between the reforms of Benedict and of Clugny. That was the age when it became respectable, as it is to this day, to be elected or even born amongst those who toil not neither do they spin. That England is rich in such learned or noble *faineants* is an interesting note of our archaic character, preserved by our isolation. In the lands where the gardens of godly ease were not so walled around as here, the violent took the Kingdom of Heaven by force too much, until the wounds by friends were too much for the heritage, and the would-be heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven learned the very manners of the savage. Thieving became the most gentlemanly employ.

4. Then again arose the self-denying Reformer. No priest it was, but again a layman, this time a prince. Away fled Clugny's founder, and led the flight of many from the weary, deadly life of selfish sin. The ascetic solved again the world's problem. The new flight and struggle condemned the self-seeking of the single convent, and laying down its independence, bowed under the yoke of the Order. Then arose two famous words, "Order" and "Congregation"; these were the watchwords of the great Clugny Reform of 900 A.D. Its rulers were men like Bruno of Clugny and Bernhard of Clairvaux, princes all; and their rule was the princely

law of equal submission of all brothers and brotherhoods to the central voice and hand. All monasteries must be brothers in one monastic family called an "Order," which shall meet regularly to choose and counsel its rulers by the solemn voice of the whole "Congregation." Now no convent shall be unduly rich, none may despise poorer brothers, for all goods shall be for the good of all. All must work together for the life, joy, salvation of each member of the band. Salvation and perfection are no longer to be selfish ends, although they are not yet for any outside the Order.

5. Splendid results once more followed the new self-denial of the ascetic. It was a march onward beside God, and the marching host saw the ways of God more surely now than ever before. From the new fellowship with Him came new Inspiration. The new Order was new beauty, a new divine grace. Then was the age of inspired and graceful song, for that age has given to us sacred songs we never shall forget, like: "Jerusalem the golden" and "Jesus, thou joy of loving hearts."

So sang the princely voices, at once jubilant in expectation of royal honours besides their king, and filled with the sweetest, richest pathos that has ever filled devout Christian hearts. Then came the days of Minne-song, and Troubadour, although the historians of literature have not yet learnt how deep was the religious tributary of that mediæval stream of poetry. Will not the religious teacher of the people to-day begin to point out to his audiences these simple facts of the story, and by their more than romantic beauty win the hearing now almost altogether denied to the customary preaching of bold speculations, subjective fancies, and cold platitudes. The story of Religious Life in all the past days of our fathers, and even in those middle centuries so strangely styled "Dark Ages" will one day give to preacher and hearer inspirations far beyond our present dreams.

6. But the "Orders" of that day bore more than literary blossoms and fruit. The strength of rule and the strength of obedience carried all Europe out of its old selfish greed and carelessness. At the word of command the new-born West sailed away across the Eastern waves braving the storms of sea and land in the great Crusades. Order after order arose, and host after host sprang at the preacher's call, crying "Eastward Ho, for Christ's Cross and His Holy Land." Ever new waves of devotion swelled and poured their life out to replace the dead who had fallen in the holy quest. The spring of all the great crusading was truest religion, misguided indeed in the means taken, but aiming certainly at doing right, and blessing mankind by exalting the Cross. And they did bless mankind. Great waves of mankind's movements generally do bless men, ill-ordered or blinded although they be. The Crusaders who lived to reach home again brought back most precious treasures in the Arab learning which they discovered, in the new thought of the Divine Unity, that is, "Simplicity of the Universe," which the great Semitic faith gave to their own half polytheistic souls; and last, but not least, in the confidence in

themselves which sprang from the very waves and storms they met and overcame. Forerunners they were of every thoughtful, trustful, fearless thinker and toiler on land and sea in the centuries that followed. But another lesson had to be learned ere such thought and toil should bless or even be.

7. For death came in again. The Crusades brought light, but they left the dead behind in thousands. Alas for the people whom the prince leads out to war. That which seemed to be ordained for life proved to be, in some sense, the very rod of death. Order was a great gain, but it was not the ultimate end. Life alone must be our end as, thank God, it is His. For even when we bring death on ourselves by our ignorance of our true aim, then out of death rises life again. So once more the ascetic, denying himself the world's applause, was to save that very world from the ruinous cost of its glory.

IV.

The fourth page of the splendid record of asceticism is the story of Francis of Assisi and Dominic of Spain, founders of the mendicant orders.

1. The world had a new problem, again the ascetic should solve it. He had saved freedom itself by Anthony's world-flight, 300 years after his Master's cross. He had saved mother Earth by Benedict's toil and learning when 500 Christian years had rolled away. And he had saved order in Clugny in the 900th year. But how shall he save men? How shall he save more than himself, and home, and well-ordered brother? How shall he save the world of men whom God so loved that for them all Christ died? Francis and Dominic rise, to try at least, to save the common people.

2. Francis of Assisi, in fair Umbria, again no priest, but a layman, long denied even priest-like rank, a son of wealth and joy, will give his all and himself to win every man into brotherhood with himself and so with his Master. They say his life was so united to that Master's life and death that he bore marks upon his hands and head and side and feet, like the marks of thorns, spear, and nails upon the Lord's own body. These stigmas of honour may be all legendary, but certainly Francis strove, like Paul, to fill up the afflictions of the Christ which were yet behind when Calvary was accomplished. And this he did to the end that he might be one with the most afflicted and the poorest. This purpose may not have been clearly grasped at first, but it grew ever more distinctly the central principle of the leader of the Franciscans.

By this he would heal the death that Clugny had increased. He would give life to all men, leaving out no outsider, but declaring the poorest common toiler of the field a member of the Perfect Body equally with the rich prince or the well-housed monastery brother. But how could he realise a brotherhood of equality between all, for the wealth and comfort of some marked them off sharply from all others? He would make all equal and equally

wealthy by making all equally poor, and this he did by making all absolutely poor. No brother should call anything his own. They should even lay off the very robe of flesh, scourging the body to the point of death; their garments and food and home should be not their own. They were content to be called "mendicant;" and they have turned into titles of honour the soubriquet of Minorites, or Little Brothers and Sisters of the Poor, that meant originally, monks of less importance, or poor brothers and sisters of less importance, or poor brothers and sisters of low rank.

3. Did a hindrance to the realisation of the ideal lie across its very threshold? Was it impossible to bring all men and women into the customary celibate ranks of monasticism? Then the Order would deny itself this sacred tradition and go out from the very sacredest boast of self-renunciation itself to include in the blessings of salvation the whole world whom the Lord Jesus and St. Francis loved. There should be, indeed, the primary fellowship of Franciscan brothers, then the secondary sisterhood of Clara; but then should follow also the Tertiaries, who were not celibates nor strict monks at all, but simply men, women and children of every class and of every craft who sought to follow Francis and his Lord. They should be counted as part of the Order, if they bound themselves to follow the first and second ranks in simple vows of honesty, kindness, and all possible evangelisation of the world which they could accomplish in their daily common tasks. Here, then, certainly lay the stream of life flowing from Christ; here was the salvation of men, their rest and joy wrought out even in spite of the traditional prejudices of those who wrought the blessing. Here, indeed, was Christianity, working out the problems of life, and finding ever new solutions, strange as they seemed, for human difficulties.

It is remarkable that thoughtful Romanists of to-day are ready to acknowledge that the central excellence of St. Francis's aim and work lay in his gathering together, not his Brothers, nor his Claras, but these Tertiaries. They formed the far greatest division of his following: and were they not those most needing salvation, and perhaps the most valuable when saved? Certainly it was through these that Francis became a great leader of the Reformation, for these Tertiaries were the brothers of the Waldenses, and thus became the spiritual fathers of the mystic friends of God, and of Wycliffe's preaching friars.

4. Let us here reserve indication of the most wonderful fruits of the Franciscan reform, until we have first marked the rise of the parallel movement under Dominic. Opponents the two Orders were, but this only means that, while differing, they were co-ordinate efforts to answer the same question. The patent criticism of Francis's theory could not long escape utterance, and it was no doubt plain at once to the keener, though not kinder, but quite as devoted Dominic. Francis's gospel of absolute poverty involved a fatal fault. When he bade all men give up all possession, he forgot that each must possess at least his body, and this must carry about

with it some other little havings, of food and surely of garment. He forgot equally with most other ascetic reformers, that personality is an indelible possession, and that it carries about with it at least some phantoms of opinions and a strange power of taking interest in its environment, and linking itself and its interests into a network often as strong as adamant. The saintly reformer fought against the laws of his own God, and failed. While that Tertiary part of his Order which virtually renounced his own principle in order to bless men was a singular success, the parts which seemed most illustrative of the founder's principle were doomed to rapid degeneracy and speedy shipwreck on the very question of possession of property. They fell under a Papal ban more consistent than disinterested; and only retained some small importance by becoming a Papal tool without a character.

If Clugny had tried to set up an insufficient Socialism, Francis tried impossible Communism. Both had to pass away from the world of thoughtful, busy, brotherly men. Both were eager, benevolent answers, and truly Christlike answers, to the cry of men, and therefore is their record splendid; but the world of men must press forward as the Son of Man goes eagerly forward at their head, and the faulty methods must fail utterly, while even the true methods of the past fail if applied to the new needs of new life.

5. Dominic sought the same end as Francis: he too would save all men. But he saw more keenly the soul's need of a possession, and set out to give each "the Truth." This was the central characteristic of Dominic. This was his determined and noble task, on which indeed was cleverly grafted by evil ecclesiastics the infamous methods of the Inquisition. His plan was one with the Franciscan plan in its poverty. But while Francis was first poor and then a preacher and teacher of his own ideal and love, Dominic was first a preacher of truth, and then to this end he was poor. For him truth was the first of all treasures, and all things must be sacrificed for truth's sake. Alas, here lay the fatal steps to later wrong. In the fatal faith that life itself must be sacrificed to exalt truth, the tenderest heart that loves must turn and flee away to dwell with what is true; this earthly life must be cast off or crushed out of this earth that truth may live alone. Dominic dreamed that the dream of Francis should be fulfilled in veriest dread reality. Here is the key to the almost inexplicable fanaticism of Inquisition days, for while evil deeds of murder and torture corrupted good aims into something worse than devilish, there must have been some truth at the bottom of the awful error.

6. The striking evidence of this lies in the work of the great Dominican preachers. The Dominican Order was, as we have seen, a brotherhood of preachers. The devotees of truth marched out with solemn gladness to proclaim their truth to all men from every pulpit. Savonarola was a Dominican. Savonarola, the great voice of Italian truth and light, was essentially a Dominican. His great pulpit was the high godlike voice of the primitive pure Dominican devotion. So was Tauler a Dominican, so was many

another great preacher: and indeed if we search the causes of any great mediæval preacher's greatness we shall almost always find the answer "He was a Dominican." Preaching and Dominicanism were almost synonymous. So the ascetic rendered again a glorious service to his fellows.

7. But Dominic and his followers knew not all the truth, and herein lay the secret of their failure. Men cried "What is truth?"[3] and slew each other in vain struggle after the ever fleeting vision. Then earth cried aloud, as not the blood but the smoke of the ten thousand victims rose, rolling in appealing clouds, covering as it were God's own face from the horror. And God heard. While inquisitors slew, God trained the dying to die. In death man learned the power of the individual conscience over earthly agony. Here then arose almost silently a newer, greater asceticism, most splendid of all. The best fulfilment of the dreams of both Francis and Dominic was to come by the simplest soul's denial even to death of what was false in the dream of each.

8. But the religious revival of 1200 A.D., that was typified in Francis and Dominic, had far greater and nobler results than the deeds of later Franciscans and Dominicans. It is right to count the whole Renaissance and Revival of Art in painting, sculpture, architecture, poetry and romance, in philosophy, in education and in politics, as the result of that great religious revival.

a. This is a field for a separate essay, but be it enough here to point to the facts, that Giotto's first great toil was to adorn with his pencil the tomb of his loved St. Francis. And while Giotto painted, his close friend Dante sang beside him of the other world, and discussed the politics of this. What consequences came from the work and word of that inspired pair! And their inspiration came from the religious awakening and asceticism of Francis of Assisi! The fruits are to be read on the one hand in the story of art through the three wondrous centuries that culminated in Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, and Raffaelle; on another side in the brilliant days of the *Literæ Humaniores*; and on yet another side in the Republics of Northern Italy, of the Netherlands, and of modern days.

b. Two other immediate followers of Francis were the great Bonaventura and the likewise great Alexander of Hales. Two contemporary followers of Dominic were Albertus Magnus, and his greater pupil Thomas of Aquino. The new religious life of the new Monastic leaders burned as scarcely ever life burned elsewhere. Devouter men have seldom lived, and the simple, pure, spiritual devoutness of these four mendicant monks bore its most natural fruit in their devotion to deepest knowledge, and in the enduring strength of their teaching. Those four men were the great master scholasts, and, excepting perhaps their forerunner Abelard, the most brilliant philosophers and theologians of the past down to the days of Kant. The enduring strength of their work is testified by to-day's adherence to it, for the "olden belief"

for which many or all formalists strive to-day in opposition to "modern thought" is almost exactly the doctrines and systems of those four great scholasts. two of the early Franciscans, and two of the early Dominicans. The mediæval revival of art and letters, education, and philosophy, and of government in State and Church, was the fruit of a religious awakening. We have seen that the revival of the pulpit, and of devout associations among men at large, sprang also directly from this religious awakening, whose prophets and watchwords were Francis and Dominic. Such is the fourth page of the splendid records of asceticism.

V.

A new great wave of asceticism rolled across mankind in 1500 A.D.

1. The exaltation of brotherhood and truth had failed: conscience cried aloud, "I rule." The cry was echoed by two great voices, Luther's and Loyola's. For each of these leaders in the new struggle felt equally the failure of the past, and each felt equally the whisper of the new divine revelation for which men were ready. The weary people cried: What is the true law of brotherhood, and what is that source of truth that will pour forth life as well?

The two great reformers cried, "Conscience;" and for conscience's sake each leader in the new asceticism laid down all else, fled out from all other joys, counting them all but worldly and deadly. Here was the new stage of Monasticism. Luther's work may be counted as fully ascetic as that of Loyola; Loyola's as thoroughly a reformation as Luther's. Each abjured all law save that of conscience, finding God's voice there; the difference between the two lay in their definitions of conscience.

2. Loyola heard the voice of conscience in the common voice of the great visible brotherhood of the Church; and, in absolute submission to that, he and his have wrought wonders that amaze a world. How intense the power that led Francis Xavier out over the wide earth to face the fiercest resistance that missions have ever known, and in at least some sense to overcome! His power was his absolute faith in the ecclesiastic conscience exalted by his Order and obeyed with sublimest self-denial. The same power is more manifest to the ordinary eye in the control which the Jesuit Order holds over the whole of modern Romanism. In asceticism is power; of this Jesuitism is a most striking proof. But just as surely does asceticism always undermine and make havoc with its own doctrines. For when the voice of the great organised Roman Christian brotherhood is to be the voice of conscience, who is to be prophet of that voice? Who is to be interpreter of the Church's one voice that speaks in myriad tones? Who but he who firmly believes in that voice? Who but the central mind and tongue of the Jesuit Order may speak and be the Roman Catholic conscience? The Jesuit doctrine of the great Church-conscience comes to be the law for the whole Church uttered by the one voice of the Jesuit. The answer which Loyola gave, "Conscience is the

Church's voice," so condemning as cursed heresy Luther's individual conscience, proves in the end to be most truly the conscience of a single individual.

3. But it is vain to try here to touch all the gleaming points of interest in this field. To later essays must be reserved the fuller exhibition of the paradox of Jesuit asceticism; and much more must be deferred, the exhibition of the asceticism of the Protestant Reformation. Here let it be only said that if Loyola, Dominic, Francis, Bernard, Benedict, Anthony, abjured much for God in their world-flight, much more did Luther lay down. For conscience sake he fled from his beloved and spiritual home, from friends, from possessions, and from peace. But he fled also even from great truths which we are to-day slowly recognising.

Indeed, herein necessity was laid upon him by the very nature of the soul. Partial souls are we, and only part we see; while God sees all, and sees also that invisible future of his own plan which He Himself has not worked out. He sees all the visible. He can reason out likewise all that invisible result of the visible, whose elements and whose logical necessity are far beyond our present grasp. So Luther saw God; but seeing only part of His great face, and loving that intensely, he turned away from what was equally Divine. So truly he who flees from God's world flees from God. Here lies the certainty of a new asceticism to-day.

VI.

Shall we try to characterise in a word this new ascetic stage? Shall we try to utter the watchword which links us with the serried Monastic brotherhoods of the past? That word is "divine sonship," wherein are bound up in one the freedom of the soul and the inseparable unity of man and God. Now there shall be for us no more Anthony's loneliness, no more Benedict's mere toil and thought, no more Clugny's absolute control and order, no more Francis's commune and Dominic's truth, no more the ecclesiastical conscience of Loyola, nor yet even the individual conscience of Luther. From all these souls comes to us the breathing of God's presence that walked with them; and the soul echoes to-day, "As they were with God, so, O God, am I too with Thee!" We too have in us the same great author, spirit, our personal friend, patron, guide, strength, master, Father. Aye, God's Son is brother soul to us. Hence then springs the new ascetisism. We are with God, in us is God. But in each brother too He is. And to the end, that God may have His Divine Being perfected by the fitting together and co-working of all that we are as God's utterance with all God's other voices in our brothers and in the silent book of God, we go out from our lonely fellowship with God as we know Him, and merge ourselves in the greater being of mankind and of God's world. I find my task in working out the solid personality of the great family of man, of which the Son of Man is centre, head, type, and sum. To know the conscience of God, I sacrifice ever. I flee from my

own past toil, and toil on ever. From my own past knowledge, thought, and desire I flee and learn on, think on, love on. Even from my own individual conscience I rise, and I believe and obey more, ever

Nearer, my God, to Thee.

This is the lesson for to-day from the history of the past, even God with men in the past; the past, God's story of His presence. Therefore God is ever present, the Kingdom of God is at hand, God is with us to-day. God-man is the story of the past, and therefore the life of to-day. The world's clue is Immanuel.

August 13*th*, 1888.

FINIS.

Index.

Abbott, Dr., 210.
Absalom, 159.
Acts of the Apostles, 99, 215 *ff.*
"After-failure," 180.
Ahab, 184*f*, 187.
Ahaz, 125, 130.
Amos, 113 *ff.*
Angels, Religious Significance of, 198 *ff.*
Anselm, 80 *f.*
Anthony, 231 *ff.*
Anti-Christ, 12.
"Antiqua Mater," 89 *f.*
Apocalypse, 11 *ff*, 18, 218, 224.
Apocrypha, 58.
Apostles, 49 *ff*, 225.
Apostolic Age, 215 *ff.*
Apostolic Council, 221 *f.*
Ascension, 216.
Ascesis, 229.
Asceticism, Splendid Records of, 229 *ff.*
Assyria, 132 *f.*
Astrology in the Apocalypse, 18.
Athanasius, 58.
Athens, 224.
Atonement, 84, *see* Day.

Baal, 184 *ff.*
Baptism of Jesus, 100.
Barnabas, 225.
Basil, 231.
Baur, F. C., 165, 169, 203 note, 215, 222, 224 *ff.*
Bekker, B., 202.
Benedict, 231, 235 *ff.*
Bernard of Clairvaux, 231, 235.
Bible, Inspiration of, 9.
Bigg, Dr. C., 179.
Birth of Jesus, 99 *f.*
Broad Church Party, 208 *ff.*, 211.
Buddha, 36 *ff.*
Buddhism, Morality of Early, 39 *ff.*

Calvin, 59, 175.
Canaan, Canaanites, 152.
Canon of the New Testament, Rise of, 49 *ff.*
Canonization of Saints, 200.
Canterbury, Archbishop of, 212.
Catholic idea of the Church, 161 *ff.*
Celibacy, 172 *ff.*
Cetchwayo, 208.
Chaldœan, *see* Astrology, and Genesis.
Christ, 7, 51 *ff*, 72 *ff*, 91 *ff*, passion, *see* Jesus.
Christolatry, Criticism and, 61 *ff.*
Christology, *see* Christ.
Christ Party, 226.
Chronicles, Book of, 20 *ff*, 199.
Church, Idea of the Church, 161 *ff.*
Church of England, 174, 208 *ff.*
Clugny, 237.
Colenso, Bp., 208 *ff*, 212.
Collingwood, W. G., 18.
"Congregation," 238 *ff.*
Congregational Union, 147, 198
Constantine, 234 *f.*
Conversion, 124, 219 *f.*
Corinth, Paul at, 224 *ff.*
Cox, Rev. Sir G. W., 207 *ff*, 211 *f.*
Creed, 82 *ff*, 91 *ff.*
Criticism, 61 *ff.*
Crusades, 239.

Daniel, Book of, 30, 73.
Dante, 207, 243.
Darwin, 203.
David, 121, 151 *ff*, 181.
Davids, T. Rhys, 42.
Day of Atonement, 26.
Deuteronomy, 24.
Devil, 29, 196, 198 *ff.*
Devils, Religious Significance of, 198 *ff.*
Dionegsius, 200.
Doctrine, Science of Christian, 147 *ff.*
Dominic, 240 *f*, 245.
Dorner, quoted, 165 *f*, 169.
Drummond, Dr. J., 178.
Duhm, 129, 199, note.

Economics, A System of Christian, 140 *ff.*
Elijah, 181 *ff.*
Ephesians, Epistle to, 227.
Ephesus, 225.
Epistles of N. T., 50 *f.*
Eschatological Discourse, 111.
Eusebius, 57.
Evolution and Christianity, 3 *ff*, 204.
Exile to Alexander, 18.
Ezekiel, 25.

Family, the, 171.
Fairbairn, Dr., 42.
Farmer, Hugo, 201.
Fetichism, 32.
Francis, St., 232, 240 *ff.*
Francis Xavier, 231.
Franciscanism, 232, 241.
French Revolution, 141.

Galatians, 225.
Gautama, 6.
Genealogies of Jesus, 100.
Genesis, 85.
Giotto, 243.
God, 7 *f*, 70 *f*, passim.
Gospels, 49 *ff*, 99 *ff*.
Goths, 235 *f*.
Guthe, 131, 133.

Haggai, 23.
Hallel, 25 *f*.
Harnack, quoted, 11 *f*, 90, 166, 179, 214, 215 *ff*, 230 *f*.
Hatch, Dr., 179, 233.
Hebrews, 18 *ff*, 29, 37.
Hebrews, Epistle to, 54 *ff*.
Hermas, Pastor of, 165 *ff*.
Herzfeld, 29.
Hezekiah, 133 *f*.
Hofmann, 206.
Holiness, 120, 124, 126 *ff*.
Holtzmann, 90.
Holy Spirit, Doctrine of, 165 *ff*.
Hosea, 116 *f*.

Ignatian Epistles, 173.
Immanuel, 246.
Incarnation, 94.
Inner Mission, 161.
Inspiration, 9.
Isaiah, 19, 23, 27, 112 *ff*.
Isaiah and Zion, 112 *ff*.
Isidore, 57.
Islam, 6

Jahweh, 26 *ff*, 121 *f*, 151 *ff*, 181 *ff*.
Jehu, 188 *f*.
Jeremiah, 27, 28, 137 *f*.
Jerome, 58.
Jesuits, 244 *f*.
Jesus, 63 *ff*, 72 *ff*, 77, 99 *ff*, *see* Christ.
Job, 28 *f*.
John, 50, 60, 79.
Judas, 216.
Justin Martyr, 51, 74 *f*, 99.

Kaut, 67, 203, 243.
Kings, Book of, 24.
"Kernel and the Husk," 204.
Knutsford, Lord, 212,
Krenkel, Dr., 13.

Lagarde, 18, 130.
Langalibele, 208.
Law of Moses, Jesus and, 104.
Law, Strife about, 221 *f*.
Lecky, 200.
Levites, 24 *ff*.
Lightfoot, 191 *ff*, notes.
Logos, 73 *ff*, 178.
Lord's Prayer, 105, 190 *ff*.
Loyola, 244 *f*.
Luke, Gospel of, 98 *ff*, 190 *ff*.
Luther, 59, 174 *f*, 201, 244 *f*.

Manasseh, 137.
Marcion, 53, 193.
Mark, Gospel of, 99 *ff*.
Marriage, Christian Doctrine of, 171 *ff*.
Masiach, 30.
Matthew, Gospel of, 99 *ff*, 190 *ff*.
Messiah, 20, 30, 73, &c., *see* Christ.
Mill, J. S., 68, 204.
Milton, 65, 69, 83, 207, 241.
Miracles, 7, 9, 100, 106, &c.
Mishna, 29.
Mission Preaching, 218 *f*.
Mohammed, 72.
Monastic Orders, 174, 229 *ff*.
Monastic Stages, 229, *ff see* table p. 229
Monolatry, 35, 37 *f*.
Moses, 31 *ff*.
Mother, 67.
Müller, F. Max, 146.
Muratori, Canon of, 53, 55, 60, 165, 170

Natal, Bp. of, *see* Colenso.
Natal, Bishopric, 211 *f*.
Nicene Creed, Nicœa, 75.
Nirvana, 39 *ff*.

Omri, 184.
"Order," 238 *f*.
Origen, 56 *f*.
"Outside," 180.
Oxford, 224.

Parables of Jesus, 101, 105.
Pastor, *see* Hermas.
Pastoral Epistles, 172 *f*, 228.
Pater quoted, 229.
Paton. Dr., 161.
Paul, 49 *f*, 215 *ff*.
Passow quoted, 229.
Pearson, Karl, 174 *f*.
Pentateuch, 18, 21.
Peter, 215 *ff*.
Pfleiderer, 42, 45, 99 *ff*, 213 *f*.
Philip, 217.
Philippi, 223.
Philo Judœus, 73, 178 *f*, 222.
Phœnicia, 185,
Poetry, two Sonnets, 180.
Power of the Keys, 163 *f*.
Prayer Book of Church of England, 75 note, 174.
Programme Parables, see parables.
Programme Speeches, see speeches.
Property, Idea of, 142 *ff*.
Prophets, 23, 186.
Protestant idea of Church, 161.

Psalms, 26 *ff.*

Q—D—Sh, 126 *ff.*

Rabbis, 191 *f.*
Reformation, 175.
Rehoboam, 183.
Resurrection, 96, 209 *ff*, 215.
Revelation, Book of, 11 *ff*, *see* Apocalypse.
Robertson, Rev. F. W., 172 note.
Rogers, Rev. J. G., 143.
Roman Church, 226.
Roman Empire, 223, 233.
Romans, Epistle to the, 226.

Samaria 117.
Satan, *see* Devil.
Saul, 153 *ff.*
Saussaye, de la, 85 *ff.*
Savonarola, 231 *f*, 242.
Schleiermacher, 205.
Scriptures, 7 *ff*, 49 *ff*, 61, &c.
Semler, 59, 201, 225.
Sermon on the Mount, 104.
Seventy, the, 107 *f.*
Shelley, 70.
Simon Magus, 217.
Sinai, 34.
Sinlessness of Jesus, 92 *f.*
Social Ideal, 142.
Solomon, 121 *f*, 181 *f.*
"Son of," in Hebrew, 26,
"Son of Man," 101.
Speeches of Jesus, 103.
Spirit, see Holy Spirit.
Spirits, good and bad, 98, 166 *f.*
Spread of Gospel, 223.
Stoicism, 43, 223.
Strauss, 215.
Swete, quoted, 169.
Symbolik, 148.
Synoptic Gospels, 99 *ff.*
Synoptik, 99 *ff.*

Talmud, 22.
Targums, 219 *f.*
Tauler, 232, 242.
Tertiaries, 241.
Tertullian, 54, 173, 200.
Testament, New, 54 *f*, &c.
Testament, Old, 63, &c.
Thessalonica, Church at, 223.
Thomas Aquinas, 231.
Thomas of Celano, 231.
Transfiguration, 110.
Trinity, 73 *ff.*
Tübingen School, 51 *f. see* Baur.
Twelve Apostles, 102, 107.

"Urchristenthem" of Pfleiderer, 213 *f.*
Urmarcus, *see* Mark.
Uzziah. 118 *ff.*

Virgin Mary, virgin-birth, 173 *f.*
Vischer on the Apocalypse, 11 *ff.*

Weiss 49 *ff.*
Weizsäcker, 172, 222.
Whitsuntide Account, 216.
Witch of Endor, 115.
Worship, 65, 97 *f.*
Worshipful, the, 65 *ff.*

Yahweh, *see* Jahweh,

Zion, 112 *ff.*
Zwingli, 59, 175.