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The author of this booklet attempts to show that the fourth gospel was written before all the synoptics, about the year 62, the last chapter being added by John himself a few years later, soon after the death of Peter. For this thesis the author sums up his argument (p. 126) thus: "We have undertaken in what precedes to deduce the date of the composition of the fourth gospel from the gospel itself, from the object and plan of its composition, from the type of its teaching, from the selection and arrangement of the matter contained in it, in events, actions, and discourses, from the whole contemporary situation, and the knowledge assumed in the readers, from the contents and ascertainable purpose of the appendix, chap. 21, from the contents and purpose of the epistles in like manner ascribed to the author of the gospel, from the testimony of the gospel to itself, from the preface of Luke, from numerous details, and especially from the literary attestation and the church tradition."

In our judgment, Wuttig entirely fails to make his opinion seem a probable solution of the problem. Of course he assumes the authenticity of the gospel, and much that he says is valuable in favor of that view, which we also share. But he overstates the range of proving power in not a little of the evidence he adduces. Several of the points he makes in favor of the early origin of the gospel are sufficiently explained by the early origin of the tradition therein contained, if its source is the apostle John. Underlying a good deal of Wuttig's argument is a confusion of thought between the historical situation of the narrative and that of the author in writing. We also find a like confusion between the situation of the readers of the gospel and that of the actors in it. Besides this, many points are discussed on speculative grounds which have very little probative force. For example (p. 24): 'If the fourth gospel is historical and Jesus really made these Christological utterances, why may they not have been written down before 70 A. D., since like views are found in Paul's epistles?'

To those familiar with the subject, it will be sufficient to state some of Wuttig's main arguments. He finds, in John 20:31 (p. 8) and the many Old Testament connections of the gospel, reason for believing it was written for Jews. This loses sight of the great extent to which, in the apostolic age, all Christian instruction was mediated by the use of
the Old Testament, and would prove that most of Paul's epistles were addressed to Jews (cf. Acts 15:21; Rom. 16:26; Gal. 4:21). He discovers that the main point in John, chap. 21, is the recent death of Peter, not the destiny of the beloved disciple (pp. 82-88). He interprets Luke 1:1-4 so as to find therein a reference to the fourth gospel, as previously written and known to Luke (pp. 59-69).

Wuttig reproaches Grimm's New Testament lexicon (familiar to all in Professor Thayer's admirable edition) with making the fourth evangelist attribute to Jesus and his disciples an expression (οὐ Θεόκριτος) which in that meaning could belong only to a later time. But Wuttig himself does the same thing again and again, by assuming an exclusive adaptation of the gospel to its readers rather than to the actual setting of the narrative. Thus he affirms (p. 10) that John 10:16; 12:32; 18:37 look to a future yet distant. But this can be evidence for an early writing of the gospel only if the phraseology is adapted to the point of view of the writer, or readers, or both, rather than to that of Jesus, to whom the words are ascribed. He calls attention (p. 19) to the fact that the discourses of the fourth gospel show no recognition of Gentile antagonisms in Asia Minor, which Paul refers to very clearly. But what historical basis would be left for a gospel thus fitted to its age? He even ventures to affirm (pp. 27-30) that the background of the gospel implies that all the institutions of Judaism were still standing when it was written. He has an interesting study of "The Jews" (pp. 38-52) in which he brings out finely the probability that the author was a Galilean, but here as elsewhere he overdoes the inference as to the kind of readers for whom the gospel was intended.

Wuttig's peculiar style of argumentation is exhibited in his treatment of the Logos doctrine of the fourth gospel (pp. 19-23).

He contends that its independence of Philo shows the early date of the gospel. For had it been written near the end of the century, John must either have borrowed more from Philo, or antagonized him more clearly. And then he proceeds to suspect Paul of opposing Philo, especially in First and Second Corinthians! He holds that the Christian development of the Logos idea in the second century points to an early origin for it in the first. Does not the fact that we do not find it mentioned before Ignatius, nor worked up before Justin, rather favor the view that it was not put into Christian circulation by the fourth gospel till near the end of the first century?

But the decisive point for Wuttig's thesis is the relation of the fourth gospel to the other three. Here he must stand or fall. He
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does not appreciate the cardinal importance of this question, and his treatment of it (pp. 52–59) is very inadequate. He appears to think that if the author of the fourth gospel knew the synoptics, then we must concede that John, chap. 11, was worked up from Luke 16:19 ff., and John 12:1–8 from Luke 7:36–50! He takes no account of most of the points of contact between the synoptics and John, such as are mentioned by Weizsäcker (Untersuchungen, pp. 270–289) and Beyschlag (Joh. Frage, pp. 54–124), and he misstates the relation of John 3:22–24 to the synoptics. Indeed he starts from false premises. He regards the synoptics as in the main independent of each other (p. 123, note) and also, apparently, founded on a wide and general knowledge of the materials for a record of Christ's work. It is now generally recognized that the synoptic tradition is limited in scope by the underlying documents, and by the dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark and the Logia. The Johannean tradition, however, if the gospel is John's, was not limited, and this would explain the fact, which Wuttig notes, that the materials of the fourth gospel undoubtedly make the impression of a selection out of abundant stores, not of a mere gleaning after the three synoptics (p. 14). Under these circumstances it is much easier to account for the omissions of the synoptics if they preceded, than for those of John, if he wrote first. John's selection may be regarded as intended to supplement the synoptic record. For instance, Wuttig (p. 17) claims that it is very difficult to account for the insertion of the feeding of the five thousand by John if the three synoptics were known to him. But is it not clear that the miracle is narrated (with its pendant, the walking on the water) to introduce the discourse on the Bread of Life, which is untouched by the synoptics?

Wuttig cannot understand (p. 14) how the seven miracles in the fourth gospel could have been neglected by the synoptics unless they had already been used by John in a written gospel. We reply that they do give two out of the seven, and add nothing essential to the account in the fourth gospel (except Peter's walking on the water, in Matthew alone), so that the only reason why they omitted the other five is likely to be that these were not contained in traditions accessible to the authors, who were probably none of them eyewitnesses. These five miracles apparently belong to parts of Christ's life not included in the synoptic tradition. Finally, it may be asserted with little fear of refutation that all the correspondences between the fourth gospel and the rest are much less difficult to explain on the supposition that the fourth is the latest than that it is the first. Wuttig does not grapple
seriously with this problem, nor touch on many of the points of contact between the synoptics and the fourth gospel.

The book is acute and painstaking, and contains much that is valuable. But the author does not survey the whole field covered by his problem, nor does he show good judgment in weighing evidence or in estimating its range of effect. The chief value of the treatise lies in the fact that it furnishes some new points of evidence in favor of the genuineness of the fourth gospel. C. J. H. Ropes.

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine.

It will be convenient to notice these two books together, as their subject-matter is common. Each of them is occupied with a critical comparison of the text of the recently found Lewis Gospels of Mt. Sinai with the Cureton Gospels of the British Museum. Mr. Bonus' work in this direction is later in date than Dr. Holzhey's, though I cannot find any allusion in his book to the latter; and it supplements it in two important ways: (1) Mr. Bonus uses the more complete text of the Sinai Syriac Gospels which we owe to Mrs. Lewis' further investigations by which an astonishing addition (as well as very many corrections) had been made to the work of the first transcribers (see Some pages of the Four Gospels retranscribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest by A. S. Lewis; London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1896); (2) Mr. Bonus has added to his comparative tables of the parallel readings of the two famous old Syriac texts the corresponding readings of the Peshito. So that for the purposes of textual criticism Mr. Bonus' work puts that of Dr. Holzhey out of court. The former collation is now only useful to check the latter. Moreover, Dr. Holzhey was so sparing of his Syriac
type as to render it often impossible for a scholar to use his collation
unless he had at hand the two texts from which the work was done.
In this respect Mr. Bonus' work is much more convenient.

When we observe also that in some cases Mr. Bonus has occasionally
corrected the slips in the printing of the Cureton text by an actual
reference to the MS. in the British Museum, it will easily be seen that
we have before us an important piece of careful critical work. Both
of the writers in question refer to the supplementary fragments of the
Cureton text which exist at Berlin.

It must not, however, be supposed that Bonus' publication entirely
supplants that of Holzhey. In the prefatory matter of the former
there is little that requires attention: its elegant Latinity disguises
real critical poverty. Problems are stated with no hints for their
solution, and the only thing one can gather is that it will be a long
time before conclusions are arrived at, although as a matter of fact
not a few of the questions involved are either solved already or well
on the way to solution. But we suspect that Mr. Bonus rather inclines
to that impossible Oxford school which is occupied with the task of
maintaining the priority and extreme antiquity of the Peshito.

Holzhey's prolegomena occupy nearly sixty pages, and are a genu-
ine contribution to the question; he sums up his conclusions under
a number of heads, of which the most important are as follows:
that the Lewis Gospel is a translation of a Greek text; that the
Lewis and Cureton texts are recensions of the same primitive trans-
lation to which the Lewis text is nearer than the Cureton; the
Peshito text is a reformed text formed from the same translation; the
Lewis text is more free than the Cureton text from Western readings,
while both texts show traces of what Dr. Hort calls Alexandrian read-
ings. The text of the Diatessaron is held to be dependent from a text
of the Lewis type. These are the chief critical conclusions as regards
the text. They are most of them easily verified, except the last which
is by no means a closed question.

It would be possible to find a few scattered errors in the two col-
lations, but not many. In one passage of the Lewis text to which
Mr. Bonus has properly attached a sic, Luke 17:13, a reference to the
original MS. shows that the printed text is in error, and the supposed
variant can be removed.

It should also be noticed that Mr. Bonus' quotations from the
Peshito are not to be regarded as more than illustrations of the pas-
sages quoted from the two old Syriac texts; they are not intended to
be taken as a collation of the Peshito text with the MSS. in question. Some persons will wish that the work had been further extended in this direction; but we incline to think that Mr. Bonus has given us just what we wanted. To have attempted more would have made his work cumbersome and hard to use. As it is, the conspectus of readings is luminous and convenient.    
J. RENDEL HARRIS.
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.


This important contribution to the study of Paulinism, which is intended to show the connection of the apostle's thought with his life, contains in its third edition considerable new matter, the most valuable of which is an appendix of fifty pages on Paul's doctrine of the origin of sin. The writer accepts all the epistles generally ascribed to Paul except the pastoral epistles. These, he thinks, were composed by some disciples of the apostle on the basis of brief letters of his. Paulinism appears in them to be impoverished rather than enriched. They have in part the doctrine of Paul without the soul.

According to M. Sabatier it should be the end of all history, and is the aim of all biblical criticism and exegesis, to find the original physiognomy of the sacred writers in the traditional type, the man in the prophet or the apostle. Of all the apostles, however, this "historical resurrection" is possible only in the case of Paul, because we have of him alone incontestable writings. He did not aim to construct a system of theology, but he was a missionary and preacher whose thought was influenced by his environment. He should not, then, be studied either from the point of view of those who regard him as a sort of speculative genius creating an a priori system, or of those who "stifle the personal travail of his mind under a crude and mechanical theory of inspiration." Perhaps, however, the course of development cannot, as the author supposes, be as accurately traced for want of data. The victory in the conference at Jerusalem may not have been the occasion of the apostle's belief in the inadequacy of the Mosaic law. May not the idea of grace through Christ as opposed to the law have lain in his mind at his conversion as one of the factors of that event? His "ardent conflicts" may have determined the form rather than the substance of the doctrine in Romans.
The author finds the origin of Paul's ideas of God, of revelation, of righteousness, and of holiness in the Old Testament, while his doctrine as to angels and demons, the two great world-periods—the present age and the age to come—predestination, and anthropology have their source in the Jewish theology. Perhaps full justice is not here done to the Hellenistic influence. But the fact is not overlooked that what was most fruitful and powerful in his thought was due to "the revelation of Jesus Christ." The psychological antecedents of the conversion of Saul do not receive due consideration.

The second book treats of missions, the third of the great conflicts, the fourth of the later Paulinism, and the fifth of the organism of doctrine. The theology is treated under three heads: (1) the Christian principle in the psychological sphere (anthropology); (2) in the social and historic sphere (religious philosophy of history); (3) in the metaphysical sphere (theology). The flesh (σάρκ) is regarded as the seat of sin in the apostle's thought, and the notion of the material organism remains always fundamental. Christ, though "in the likeness of sinful flesh," was sinless because he was "the life-giving Spirit." If this does not take account of character it is because Paul did not think of Jesus as developed through conflict with sin and temptation. As to Christology, preexistence is accepted, but it is not thought with Pfeiderer to be conveyed in the idea of the second man from heaven. Jesus became "the second man" only by his resurrection. This interpretation is not, however, well sustained.

In the appendix on the "Origin of Sin," the two factors, the flesh and the law, are made fundamental. All men sin, like Adam, on account of their fleshly nature. "Because all sinned" (ἐφ' ὅ πάντες ἁμαρτον) means that all sinned individually. The writer's directness, courage, and sincerity must meet with the approval of all his readers, and one great merit of the book lies in the consistent and fearless application of the scientific method which is maintained throughout.

ORELLO CONE.

BOSTON, MASS.


The epoch of the Great Western Schism will always interest the historical student. It was fitting that it should be selected as one of the Ten Epochs of Church History.
Dr. Locke had the general facts of the situation well in hand, and has succeeded in giving us a very readable and popular story.

He begins properly with the contest of Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, and carries the narrative through to the end of the Council of Basle. He closes with short chapters on The German Mystics, The Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century, and Literature and Arts in the Fourteenth Century.

Dr. Locke's style is easy and direct, but bordering all the time on colloquialism,—too much so, we think, for the formal and elegant treatment that a great historical subject should have.

Moreover, he would not himself expect that there would be complete agreement with him in many of his positions—as, for example, his estimates of Wiclif and Huss, their relations to each other, their doctrines and their general influence.

But all in all the general reader will welcome this book, and most students who want a clear and concise statement of the great issues involved in this tumultuous age will find much to interest them.

The University of Chicago. J. W. Moncrief.


When the four-hundredth birthday of Luther was drawing near, from 1880 to 1883, the press of Germany poured forth an enormous flood of books and pamphlets connected with the Reformation and its great leader. Most of these were of slight value, and have long since been forgotten. A few, however, were of a higher grade, and have survived. Among these latter was a small book by Eberhard Gothein on Loyola, the early Jesuits, and the counter-reformation. It was welcomed at once as a work of wide research, of judicial fairness, and of much literary charm. The favorable reception which it met encouraged the author to study his theme exhaustively, and to write it out in a more expanded form. The small volume is now recognized everywhere in Germany as the best brief presentation of the subject, and the larger volume as the best extended presentation.

Indeed, it may be said that no thoroughly good book on Loyola and the early Jesuits existed before Gothein published the results of his investigations. The Catholic writers have always indulged in indiscriminate praise, and the Protestant in indiscriminate blame. The
former could not find any fault in a saint of their own communion; and the latter attributed all the sins of the Jesuits of the eighteenth century to the founder of the order and his immediate disciples, scarcely excepting even Xavier from the general condemnation. Gothein has avoided these extremes.

In preparing for his larger work, Gothein read all the published sources, in itself an enormous task. But, not content with this, he consulted the manuscripts preserved in the archives at Munich, Cologne, Paris, Venice, Florence, and Naples, and thus secured a rich store of new materials.

But he has not permitted the abundance of these spoils to embarrass him. He has mastered them, arranged them, and presented them to the reader in a form at once exact and fascinating. He writes with much literary tact, and in what may be called the newer German style, which favors short sentences of simple construction.

He has given us for the first time a Loyola whom we can understand, and who, hence, is simply a man subject to all the passions of our common humanity, and triumphing over them by the aid of divine grace. The story of the conversion of Loyola from the ordinary licentious and vain character of a military officer of that day to that of a devout Christian reads like a chapter from *Grace Abounding*. His was a Puritan or Methodist conversion, attended with overwhelming emotions, though it took place in the bosom of the Catholic church. The result was a new life not unlike that of Bunyan or Edwards or Wesley, though at first it took on mediæval forms and reveled in extreme self-mortifications and in visions and ecstasies. Through long years the aristocrat brought up in the ignorance usual to his class struggled to secure an education. Through years he struggled to master his own religious emotions and to learn the lesson taught by the apostle Paul, that "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." Through years he struggled patiently to form the "Spiritual Exercises," the drill-book of his society, by means of which he subdues all its members to obedience and reduces them to a uniform pattern. Through years he struggled to gather about him a small band of remarkable men who should devote themselves to mission work in foreign lands, the sphere to which he purposed that the new organization should limit its activities. When at length circumstances led it to make its home in Europe he struggled for years to give it a constitution adapted to its new field, to confine its ministrations within certain definite lines, and to secure for it perfect freedom of action within the Catholic church. At length
he presented to the world an army composed of selected men, and thoroughly organized, equipped, and disciplined for its campaign.

The story of Gothein ends with the triumph of the Jesuits in every Catholic country of Europe and in many other lands. Had he followed the history further his pages would have assumed more somber colors. For the first fifty years, to which, in a general way, he limits himself, the Society of Jesus contributed to the Catholic church a purifying force of the greatest value. Indeed, it may be said that for a century it was on the whole a blessing to the Catholic world. Then succeeded swift decadence, when the Jesuits became a menace to society; and then their suppression by the Catholic nations of Europe and their flight to South America and to protestant countries, where alone they could find complete toleration. Into these later years of wickedness and disaster Gothein does not enter, and hence he creates in the mind of the incautious reader a certain unbalanced admiration for an organization which has done more than any other both to reform and to disgrace the Roman Catholic church. FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.


It would be difficult to find a period of history which has been more elaborately treated in publications of the sources, in connected narratives, and in special investigations, than the history of Prussia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The mass of printed matter is so great that there hardly seems room left for further original contributions. And yet such are still presented us from time to time by Prussia's patient and ingenious scholars. The present work is indeed limited in scope, aiming at nothing beyond following truthfully the great elector's policy toward the two Protestant denominations of his states, but within its chosen sphere it is thoroughly original, and altogether may be fairly denominated a right worthy child of the severe historical ancestry of Ranke and Droysen.

If the book founds its conclusions, as has been said, upon a mass of new material, discovered chiefly in the state archives and in the archives of the Royal Consistory at Berlin, it does not therefore astonish us with many new results, but confirms rather by the weightiest witnesses the views of Frederick William's church policy which
have been advanced by Droysen, Erdmannsdörfer, and the other predecessors. On the whole, it is but a single novel thesis which is put forward by the author, and that thesis he may be said to have substantiated. Frederick William, we now know, did not attempt to unite the Protestant churches, as is commonly supposed in Prussia, but only aspired to win them both over to accept his great state principle of tolerance. And as a sort of corollary the author establishes the conclusion that if the elector met with difficulties in this course it is not alone the fault of the Lutherans, but also, and in far greater degree than has commonly been supposed, of the Calvinist denomination.

In spite of the remoteness of much of the matter discussed in this book, it is remarkably easy reading. One may say of it that it is fairly free from volubility, and that it is pervaded by a keen sense of order; praise which can only rarely be accorded German historical books. It should also be noted as worthy of consideration that the author, although dealing with highly specialized matter, never loses from sight the larger political points of view, and so succeeds in giving a very just estimate of Frederick William's share in the Peace of Westphalia and of the importance of his assumption of the evangelical leadership in Germany. 

FERDINAND SCHWILL.


In this book Dr. Harris has made a new and valuable addition to the doctrine of evolution, and has at the same time done much to show that this doctrine is consistent with ethics and theology. Since evolution is as far reaching in time as gravitation is in space, it becomes important to conceive of it in such fashion as not to exclude, but to include, those moral and spiritual elements which constitute the real significance of the universe. But the waste and pain of the animal creation, the beasts red in tooth and claw with ravin, the struggle for life, the hecatombs of victims, have seemed difficult to reconcile with benevolence or morals. It is a great gain to learn that even the ante-human life of the world has in it the germs of ethics and of goodness.

Professor Drummond, in his Ascent of Man, gave the first step of
the demonstration. He showed that there is a certain altruism in the brute creation. Reproduction is a giving out as well as a taking in, and care for offspring is not self-regarding, but self-sacrificing. All along the line of upward development there was not only struggle for life, but also struggle for the life of others. In every lion's den and tiger's lair there were the beginnings of sympathy and helpfulness, adumbrations of the moral life that was to come. Evolution of animal life, though not itself moral, was, at least in this one respect, preparing the way for morality in man. So Professor Drummond disclosed a thread of connection between the earlier and the later history of the planet, and pointed out that "through the ages one increasing purpose runs."

But Professor Drummond's justification of the evolutionary process left much to be desired. It showed at most an occasional and partial mitigation of what seemed on the whole to be warfare and cruelty, devastation and slaughter. It is the great merit of Dr. Harris that he has discovered another genuine preparation for morality in the world's prehistoric life. It has occurred to him that altruism is not the whole of morality; that self-preservation, self-assertion, self-perfection are just as important to ethics as self-surrender, self-abnegation, self-sacrifice. Self-love is just as much a duty as love to our neighbor,—in fact, we are commanded only to love our neighbor as ourself. This is not only a divine law, but a rational law; for unless we take care of self we shall have nothing to give to others; and we cannot rightly give to others anything that involves moral loss or harm to ourselves. For the very sake of others, then, I am bound to make the most of myself. Self-defense, self-maintenance, self-perfection are not only duties,—they are the very law of being, and no morality can exist without them.

In the light of this principle, much that before seemed not only unmoral but contrary to morality, in the evolution of life, now falls into line as a natural preliminary to man's self-realization. The very struggle for life has an incipient moral significance, or at least it has in it a germ of good which will in time develop into self-perfecting moral effort. Life is a good, and it is right for the animal to preserve it. Since self-preservation is a prerequisite to self-realization, it is not antagonistic to altruism, nor done away by it. Self has its own claims, and these must be satisfied. And much of the evil look of evolution disappears, or is mitigated, when this principle is recognized. Of a hundred blossoms one survives: but the ninety-and-nine fertilize the
soil and enable the survivor to ripen. The young lions roar and seek their prey from God: God provides the prey, even as he provides animal food for man.

But does Dr. Harris explain the failure to realize themselves on the part of the ninety-nine blossoms that did not survive, or on the part of the sheep that the lion slew? Our author does not claim to have constructed a complete theodicy. He has justified the survivor, but it is more difficult for him to justify the fate of those who do not survive. He shows indeed that strife, waste, and pain are merely incidents, but are not the law, of progress. There might be a progress without them,—at least we can conceive of a progress in which each should take only what the other freely gave. He points out that self-preservation, becoming self-realization, tends to eliminate strife and suffering, and to correct its own defects. But why the defects? Much as we praise the positive merits of Dr. Harris' treatment, and gladly as we acknowledge the new point of contact which he has shown between evolution and ethics, we must regard his solution of the problem as incomplete, both because of an overestimate of what is meant by evolution, and an underestimate of what is meant by ethics.

Evolution is only a method, and nature is but a means, while the agent is God. The idealistic view of the world which regards matter as the constant manifestation of mind and will leaves the universe subject to plan and plastic in God's hands. Just as the stone foundation of the house may be the designed preparation for the brick superstructure, while yet with the superstructure there enter in new methods and laws, so animal life may be the basis of human life, yet fail to explain it. With Lotze we would hold to continual divine reinforcements of the evolutionary process, rather than to a fixed quantum of energy; yet, with Lotze, we believe that these increments of power, once appearing, become inseparable parts of the great whole. And what is true of God is in a limited measure true of man. Man's will can enter into nature and can change and add; though these effects, once appearing, are never again lost. Hence we can believe in miracle, not as an interference from without, but as the working of the immanent God from within. To him who believes in a God of whose mind and will nature is but an expression, there is no inconsistency between evolution and miracle, for miracle is only a unique and forward step in evolution, when the fullness of time has come, a forward step which cannot be explained as an outcome of the past, but which is accomplished by a new impulse of the God whose regular action made that past what it is.
There is another conception of evolution. It intends to be Christian. It speaks of evolution as God's method. But it falls in with the current view of nature as a second absolute, a closed circle, sufficient to itself. It seems to us that Dr. Harris concedes too much to this tendency of thought. Though he does not intend it, his book shows that mechanical views still have hold upon him. There is a general disposition to eliminate the miraculous, and to substitute the operation of natural law. For example, he grants man's rise from savagery, the evolution of the monogamic family from polygamy, the development of the moral sentiments from the instincts of animals, the blossoming of polytheism into monotheism. Though Christ's virgin birth is consonant with his transcendent origin and work, Dr. Harris does not regard it as essential to Christianity. And, although his expressions are somewhat vague with regard to Christ's resurrection, we gather that he attaches greater importance to Christ's life after death and to some sort of spiritual appearance to the disciples than he does to a literal physical coming forth from the tomb.

We regard all these concessions not only as unrequired by a proper view of evolution, but as inconsistent with the historical trustworthiness of Scripture. Moreover, they seem to us to endanger the very ethics for which Dr. Harris is seeking to lay a foundation. For the basis of ethics is the self. The terms which occur so frequently—self-regarding, self-perfecting, self-realizing—are without meaning unless they imply freedom. Freedom does not run in a rut. It involves the possibility of new beginnings. It is capable of unique and exceptional, as well as of regular and automatic, action. Our author grants this in the case of sin. He grants that there is such a thing as degeneration. This reverses the evolutionary process. The loss and destruction that are contrary to virtue are the results, not of the original law of man's being, but of a self-perversion which consists in abnormal exaggeration of the principle of self-love. But virtue is equally the product of freedom, and if man is made in the image of God, God as well as man must be free. The naturalistic view of evolution which treats all miracle with suspicion, if not with denial, is in danger of cutting away the very foundation of ethics by practically ignoring the freedom of both God and man.

Andover has hitherto been a synonym for the doctrine of free will. But it has also been a synonym for the doctrine of disinterested benevolence as the essence of virtue, and of love as the fundamental attribute of God. It is significant of a widening horizon when Dr. Harris
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proposes to make self-love, as well as altruism, essential to virtue, and declares that "self-love is not derived from love to others, but love to others gets its pattern and therefore its measure from love to self." Here is an admission of great consequence to a correct theology. It seems to grant the contention of the older and more rigid systems that in God the self-affirming, self-maintaining, self-asserting attribute, which we call holiness, must be logically prior to the self-imparting, self-communicating, self-sacrificing attribute, which we call love. Dr. Harris, it is true, defines holiness as "wholeness," in a way which seems to us to ignore the definite biblical descriptions of it as purity contrasted with sin; and he tries to include self-love in love, so as to make self-assertion a form of self-impartation, both of which we consider unjustifiable, although necessary to the vindication of the Andover theology. The fact still remains, that we have in this book, in spite of its too great concessions to a naturalistic view of evolution, an approximation to the old-fashioned scriptural view that God's interests are supreme, that he finds his ultimate end in himself, and that holiness and not love is the fundamental attribute of his nature.

If Dr. Harris would grant this formally and fully, rather than impliedly and inferentially, light would be thrown upon matters which his book has left obscure. The necessity of an atonement would be apparent, and it would be plain that, in the redemption of man, God, and not simply man, must be reconciled. If the waywardness of a son may cause grief to an earthly father's heart, and the demand of righteousness that he be expelled from the household may come into grievous conflict with the pleadings of fatherly affection, why should we deny that man's sin brings God's pity into such conflict with God's holiness that only the Lamb slain from before the foundation of the world can reconcile them? And if God's antagonism to sin is justly displayed in judgment, and in the infliction of suffering since man appeared, why should we hesitate to believe that the prehistoric pain and waste and death were congruous incidents and preparations of the great moral drama that was to be enacted upon earth? The problem of physical evil can never be disconnected from the problem of moral evil, and neither of these problems can find its solution apart from a thoroughgoing acknowledgment of the holiness of God and the sin of man. We can hold to moral evolution only as we emphasize the word moral quite as much as we emphasize the word evolution. Much as we admire Dr. Harris' book, it seems to us to lay greater emphasis upon the physical aspect of evolution than upon its moral aspect.
Though the virgin birth is not regarded as essential to Christianity, we can highly commend the new proof which Dr. Harris has given that evolution is perfectly consistent with the supreme and unique position of Jesus Christ as spiritual head of the race. Evolution has in all probability brought forth all the myriads of human beings from a single human ancestor—a fact \textit{a priori} difficult to predict, and, considering the immense number of chance variations which had at favorable times to be taken advantage of, almost incredible. But if it is consistent with evolution that the physical and natural life of the race should be derived from a single source, then it is equally consistent with evolution that the moral and spiritual life of the race should be derived from a single source; and Scripture is stating only scientific fact when it sets the second Adam over against the first Adam, as the head of redeemed humanity, the only name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved. We have put the thought of our author in other words than his, but we fully agree with the substance of it, and we esteem it as still another valuable contribution to the reconciliation of evolution and ethics. 

\textit{Rochester Theological Seminary.}

\textbf{DIE URCHRISTLICHEN TRADITIONEN \ÜBER URSPRUNG UND S\I N\N DES ABENDMAHLS. ZUR GESCHICHTE DES URCHRISTENTUMS.} Von \textsc{Friedrich Spitta.} Erster Band. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1893.

Professor Spitta's essay on the Eucharist has excited much attention in theological circles in Germany, and is both strikingly original and full of valuable suggestions. Some remarks on it will be found in Grafe's lecture on recent theories as to the Eucharist in the \textit{Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche}, zweites Heft, 1895, pp. 101-139.

Spitta confesses at the outset that he has been led to abandon his earlier views on the subject, expressed in his treatise "On the Reform of Evangelical Worship." The true key to the understanding of the real meaning of the last supper is to be found, he thinks, in the words of institution, which, as Keim rightly remarks, form one of the most certain parts of the tradition of the life of Christ. Spitta indeed holds that St. Paul's version of the words is not so trustworthy as that contained in the synoptics. He is of opinion that the original tradition might have received accretions during a period of twenty years, such as elapsed before St. Paul wrote. Here I cannot agree with him,
for surely the same reasoning would apply to the record of the words in the synoptics themselves, and indeed with double force, since the synoptic tradition was in all probability not reduced to writing till much later. But more of this presently. The author next proceeds to examine the evidence for the day on which the last supper took place. Here his position that St. John's gospel fixes the night of the last supper as the evening of the 13th of Nisan, and that this, and not the following evening, was really the evening on which it took place, seems to me unassailable. As scholars have always hesitated on the point, his arguments may with profit be recapitulated here. The opening words of St. John 13:1 are: "Now before the feast of the passover," and in what follows there is no hint that the occasion was that of the paschal supper. "Supper being ended" is an entirely general expression; nor would the washing of the disciples' feet have been at all in place during the solemn ritual of the paschal feast. The same holds true of the episode of Judas Iscariot. No proof is adduced when it is asserted, as it commonly is, that the dipping of the sop was a feature of the passover ritual, and it would have been a very serious breach of ritual law for Judas to have left before the end of the meal, to say nothing of the reason alleged for his departure, viz., to buy things necessary for the feast. Moreover, the words of 13:1 (δια τον ἀγάπην . . . ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀγάπης), followed as they are by so many counsels of love (δύναμις), suggest that the meal was an Agape. Again, although 19:36 ("A bone of him shall not be broken") shows that the connection between Christ and the paschal lamb was a familiar thought with the apostle, not a word is said in chaps. 13-17 to suggest any connection with the passover on the occasion of the last supper. Very conclusive too is the often-quoted passage "that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover." To "eat the passover" could refer to one thing only, viz., the paschal supper, which evidently had not then taken place. It is also probable that Pilate released Barabbas before the supper with the special purpose of enabling him to join in the great national feast. The expression "the preparation of the passover" would be redundant had not Good Friday been not only a Friday, but the Friday before the passover; a circumstance which also throws light on the fact that "that Sabbath-day was an high day." And is it not highly incredible that our Lord should have celebrated the paschal supper on the day before the legal day, as some suppose?

So far Spitta's position is unassailable. But when he proceeds to find a difficulty in reconciling the section St. John 6:51-59 with this
view, and therefore proposes to treat it as an interpolation, Grafe* seems to me to be right in considering such a course wholly unneces-
sary. Spitta finds a difficulty in the words: "Whoso eateth my flesh
and drinketh my blood." It is part of his theory that such a notion
as that of drinking blood would have been abhorrent to a Jew. So it
would if it had had reference to the blood of a victim. But where, as
Spitta himself argues, the reference is simply to the fruits of the earth
as being, symbolically speaking, Messiah's flesh and blood, the diffi-
culty vanishes. In St. John, chapter 6, we read that the Jews, who refused
this hard saying, did so because they denied the claim which it involved.
"How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" He is not such a super-
natural being as we look for in a Messiah! It was an exactly similar
feeling which excited the remark, "Who is this Son of Man?" It
was not that they denied that the Son of Man would possess super-
natural powers. The Book of Enoch sufficiently proves the contrary.
But they simply did not believe that Christ was the Messiah. They
were not content to look for his supernatural powers solely in the
spiritual region. They did not look to the "spirit and life" of his
words, but to his human limitations. The disciples on the contrary
confessed, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." They learned the
lesson of the loaves. They saw that Christ possessed the powers of
earthly life. The very bread they ate was, as it were, his flesh, and the
wine they drank his blood. And as he possessed the powers of earthly
life, so too they believed he could give them the powers of heavenly
and eternal life. Spitta, to my mind rightly, believes this to be the
primary meaning of the words of institution. Why then not also of
the sixth chapter of St. John? Perhaps further reflection may lead
him to alter his opinion on this point.

But how came the synoptic gospels to differ from St. John on this
point? Spitta assumes that they do differ, and again attempts an
explanation by a supposed interpolation, viz., the section St. Mark
14:12-16. Here I venture to disagree with him on both points. It
will be enough to take this section and show how it is not necessarily
inconsistent with St. John. In vs. 12 (R. V.) we read: "And on the
first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover, his
disciples say unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and make ready
that thou mayest eat the passover?" Clearly the 14th of Nisan is
here referred to, but it must be recollected that the 14th of Nisan
began at sunset on Thursday. It is not at all unlikely that it was

*Lac. cit., p. 121, n. 1.
in the late afternoon when the Lord had, as usual, retired with his disciples to the Mount of Olives, that this question was addressed to him. The paschal supper must be celebrated the following evening. It was time to secure a room and make preparations. How natural that the Master and his disciples should occupy the room that same evening for the purpose of an ordinary supper! The words of vs. 17: "And when it was evening, he cometh with the twelve," are more literally, "when it was late evening," which is confirmatory of this supposition. For if it was about sunset when the disciples set off to prepare, the Lord would leave them time for their preparations, and not come till the late evening.

In support of this contention I would further urge a passage in Hippolytus. Referring to St. Luke 22:16, "I will no more eat the passover" (οὐκέτα ἔγω φάγωμαι τὸ πάσχα), Hippolytus adds: "ἐλεώς τὸ μὴ δείκνυν δείκτησον πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα, τὸ δὲ πάσχα οὐκ ἔφαγεν: οὐδὲ γὰρ καμίος ἦν τῆς βρώσεως αὐτοῦ." The Quartodecimans had argued: "Christ ate the passover on the fourteenth day." Hippolytus replies: "Christ did not eat the passover at all," and bases his assertion not, as might have been expected, on St. John's gospel, but on St. Luke's. Now I suppose most of us have been in the habit of taking the words "I will not any more eat thereof" to mean "I will never after this occasion," but Hippolytus shows us that this sense is inadmissible, and, indeed, in the R. V. οὐκέτα is omitted, and we have simply "οὐ μὴ φάγων;" in which case the whole passage will run: "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will certainly not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." I do not see how in the face of this passage it can any longer be maintained that St. Luke regarded the last supper as a paschal supper.

But it will be said: "Have not scholars always traced strong points of resemblance between the last supper and the paschal supper?" Let us, with our author's help, briefly examine these points. The first cup mentioned by St. Luke is said to correspond to the first of the four cups at the paschal feast, and St. Paul mentions the cup "after supper," which would correspond to the fourth cup. But these two cups were usual at ordinary suppers. Then the singing of a hymn is said to correspond to the Hallel (Pss. 115-118). But the paschal supper did not conclude with the Hallel, but with the last cup. On the other hand, it was the custom to close ordinary suppers with a song of praise. If it be said that the institution took place at the third cup,
and the fourth was omitted, most of us would agree with Meyer that it is highly improbable that the fourth cup would be omitted. It will be asked: "Did not the expression in 1 Cor. 10:16, 'the cup of blessing which we bless,' refer to the third paschal cup?" Spitta replies that at ordinary suppers there was a cup "after supper," over which a thanksgiving for the food received was pronounced, and this may very well have also been known as "the cup of blessing." Certainly the words "μετὰ τὸ δείπνον" confirm one in the impression that the third paschal cup, which did not come after supper, cannot be signified.

We may note here in passing that Spitta agrees with Westcott and Hort in omitting St. Luke 22:20 (the second cup), though he would retain vs. 19. Yet he thinks that the concluding words of vs. 19, "Do this in remembrance of me," were not actually spoken by Christ, but were a later accretion which had been added by the time St. Paul wrote. They are not found in the tradition of St. Matthew and St. Mark. St. Luke and St. Paul, he holds, who were neither of them eye witnesses, had mistaken the words in question for a real dictum of the Lord. This seems to me impossible and unlikely. St. Paul wrote many years before St. Mark's gospel could have been written, and though he had had little personal intercourse with the apostles it is hardly conceivable that he would so definitely say that he had received these words from the Lord, that is, as being the Lord's own words, had he not found a very strong tradition to that effect, both in Jerusalem and Antioch. There would have been many who, like Barnabas, could at once have corrected him, had he been wrong. It seems to me also that Spitta has wrongly interpreted the phrase. He wishes to connect the word λανθάνεις with Exodus 12:14, but the word there used is μηθόμονην. It is very important for the true understanding of the institution of the eucharist that the meaning of this clause "Do this in remembrance of me" should be clearly understood. I therefore make no apology for quoting in full the following passage from Scudamore's Notitia Eucharistica, pp. 552-553:

"There is great reason to think that the verb ποιεῖτε, which is here rendered by 'do,' ought to be understood in the sense of 'offer:' 'Offer this in remembrance of me,' or, rather, as we shall see, 'Offer this for my memorial.' ποιεῖν is frequently used by the LXX in this sense, both of the priest and the people: e.g., 'Thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin offering;' 3 'The priest of his sons, that

3 Ex. 29:36.
is anointed in his stead, shall offer it (a meat offering of fine flour); 'There he offered burnt offerings;' 'I will offer bullocks with goats.'

In one place our version gives the word 'sacrifice' where the Septuagint has ποιεῖν: 'Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God.' This mode of speaking originated in the idiom of the Hebrew, the verb הולך, to do or make, being constantly used to signify to offer or to sacrifice. We find a trace of the same usage in the New Testament. Thus in the order given by St. Paul to Timothy, that supplications, prayers, etc., be made for all men, the version should rather be, offered for all men, as it is in the Syriac. I find but one clear instance of this usage in any Gentile Father; and that is in Justin Martyr, who being himself a native of Samaria, and at the time disputing with a Jew, would very naturally fall into it: 'The offering of the flour commanded to be offered (ποιέω) for persons cleansed from leprosy was a type of the bread of the eucharist, which our Lord Jesus Christ gave command to offer (ποιεῖτε) for a memorial of the suffering which he underwent for those whose souls are cleansed from all iniquity.'

Spitta wishes to deny that Christ even intended to institute anything. "The so-called words of institution" (as recorded by St. Mark), he writes, "give one the impression of having been spoken as the inspiration of the moment, and nothing is said as to any repetition of the ceremony." But when St. Mark wrote the eucharist was a fixed institution, and no one doubted that Christ had instituted it. There was no occasion to record everything that Christ said, and it was probably not usual at the Agape to do more than repeat the words recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark. In fact, the clause 'Do this in remembrance of me' is, as Scudamore notes, "omitted in the Roman and Greek liturgies, including that of Jerusalem, in the Milanese, the Armenian, the Nestorian, and St. Mark, nor do I observe it in any of the thirty-eight Syrian liturgies published by Renaudot. It occurs in all the Egyptian (both Coptic and Greek) in the same words as our own. The Moz-Arabic has 'Do this, as oft as ye shall eat it, in remembrance of me.'"

This suggests a very simple explanation of the omission of the words in St. Matthew and St. Mark. They simply repeated the liturgical formula, whereas St. Paul and St. Luke made careful enquiries as

---
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to the actual words of institution, the original command on which the whole observance rested. Spitta makes a very good point when he notes that in all four accounts of the eucharist the "εὐλογεῖν" or "blessing" precedes the "breaking of the bread," whereas in the paschal supper the words "Blessed be he who brings bread upon the earth" follow the breaking of the bread. And he further points out that the εὐλογεῖν also comes first in the miracles of the loaves, and the breaking of the bread at Emmaus. The close correspondence between our Lord's action on these occasions seems to me to give the key to the true primary meaning of the eucharist. "He took the loaves and gave thanks and brake," or, "Looking up to heaven, he blessed and brake." Now this act of taking the bread and solemnly blessing God for the gift of it was a sacrificial act. Christ offered it for a memorial before God, as a memorial of God's love. It was a sacrifice of thanksgiving. Moreover, as we learn from St. John, chap. 6, he taught his disciples to regard these earthly gifts of bread and wine, specially given through him, as his flesh and blood, though but a foretaste of the bread and wine of the kingdom of God, those heavenly gifts, whereby they should be nourished unto life eternal, which God would give them through him hereafter. This, indeed, is the special interpretation of the words "This is my body," "This is my blood" for which we have to thank Professor Spitta, though he does not connect them, as I have done, with St. John 6. But I would urge that the words "Do this in remembrance of me," understood in the sense "Offer this for a memorial (before God) of me," connect perfectly well with the above interpretation of the words of institution. As Scudamore shows ἀνάμνησις is the word used in the LXX in such passages as Lev. 24:7, Num. 10:10 ("for a memorial before your God"). I do not, however, think that the expression "a memorial of me" should be understood primarily of a memorial of Christ's sacrifice, but rather of a memorial of his miraculous gifts of bread and wine, the earnest of the heavenly gift of eternal life.

The author next examines the eucharistic prayers in the "Didache," or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and the "Apostolical Constitutions." In the Didache the blessing of the cup precedes that of the bread, exactly as in 1 Cor. 10:16, and on this Spitta remarks, "The oldest form of the eucharist appears to have been not a repetition of the actual procedure of Jesus at the last supper, but such a feast as an ordinary Jewish supper, at which the blessing of the cup and the bread was made an occasion to recall the words of Jesus." In
process of time a separation was made between the *Agape* and the eucharist. This had occurred when the Apostolical Constitutions were written. There we find the eucharistic prayers of the Didache reappear in a new recension (vii, 25, 26). There is a reference to the sufferings and death of Christ which is absent in the Didache; and whereas in the Didache it appears from the words “μετὰ τὸ ἐμπληθώνυμι” that the supper was still a meal, in the Apostolical Constitutions the idea of a meal has disappeared, and “μετὰ τὴν μετάληψιν” is substituted. Another very striking difference is that in the Didache the words “Hosanna to the *God* of David,” and the invitation “If anyone is holy, let him come” are closely associated with the parousia, and simply echo the words of Ps. 118: 19, 20: “The righteous shall enter in,” etc., whereas in the Apostolical Constitutions we have “Hosanna to the *Son* of David,” and the words are made to have a reference to the coming of Christ in the eucharist, an idea which still survives in many liturgies of the church to this day.

It will, however, be necessary to justify more at length the special meaning which Spitta attaches to the words of institution. The whole question is treated in his second section, pp. 266–337. It has generally been supposed that the words “This is my blood of the covenant” are an echo of Exodus 24:8, “Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you.” But Spitta justly observes that Christ spoke of a liquid which was to be drunk, not sprinkled, and that his words had reference to wine, not blood. Moreover, the covenant which Christ referred to was not the Mosaic, but the Davidic-Messianic—the “New Covenant.” Now in what is said about the “New Covenant” in the Old Testament eating and drinking, and the figure of a great feast play a great part. Thus, to take one example, in Isaiah 55 “Ho, everyone that thirsteth,” and the invitation to a feast of good things which follows is associated with the covenant, “and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.” The *locus classicus* on the point Spitta considers to be Isa. 25:6–8. One traces a continuous expression of the idea in the apocalyptic and rabbinic literature, and references to this great Messianic feast at the coming of the kingdom are frequent in the gospels—*e.g.*, St. Luke 14:15. “Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God,” and above all our Lord’s own words at the last supper, “I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.” Moreover, it was said that the wine to be used at this feast should grow on a wonderful
vine. This idea finds its expression in Ap. Baruch 29:5 f. “Et in vite una erunt mille palmites, et unus palmes faciet mille botros, et botrus unus faciet mille acinos, et unus acinus faciet corum vini, et qui esurierunt jucundabuntur.” Schürer holds that this apocalypse was not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, but I suppose it reflects the ideas current in that age, and Papias quotes these particular words as a saying of Christ. In this same apocalypse (29:8) it is said that the miracle of the manna should be repeated when Messiah came, and this is an idea which frequently recurs in Jewish theology. Spitta further compares Prov. 9:5 in which wisdom says “Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled,” and Ecclesiasticus 24:17, 19: “As the vine I put forth grace. . . . Come unto me . . . and be ye filled with my produce.” The manna again is spoken of in Wisdom 16:20, 1 as “the sweetness of the divine wisdom.”

In the light of such a cycle of ideas, it must be confessed that the words of institution, “This is my body,” “This is my blood,” receive a natural interpretation. Bread and wine had been miraculously multiplied by Christ; through him they had been given in special abundance, as the manna of old through Moses. They were gifts which God gave men through him, or, metaphorically, his body and his blood. And they were an earnest of higher gifts, when the disciples should “eat and drink at Christ’s table in his kingdom.”

As we have seen, this interpretation receives some support from the earliest liturgy of the church, contained in the Didache, which says nothing of a remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, but speaks of spiritual food. “Thou didst give us spiritual food and drink and life eternal” (10:3). In the early liturgies generally the bread and wine are called “God’s gifts,” and the oldest and most central part of the service (“It is very meet, right, etc.”) contains a special thanksgiving for God’s gifts in creation, concluding with the Ter Sanctus. It seems probable that the earliest form of service simply connected these earthly gifts with the higher heavenly gifts promised through Messiah, and specially the gift of eternal life. According to Harnack (History of Dogma, English translation, p. 66, note), “The earliest theory of the supper was that which viewed it as a communication of eternal life, and an anticipation of the future existence.” A careful examination of the references to the eucharist in the earliest Fathers such as Ignatius, Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria, and again of the inscriptions in the catacombs, will confirm this statement.
The reader will find an excellent catena of passages in Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, pp. 181 ff. And this is exactly the conception of the sacrament postulated by Spitta’s theory, according to which the eucharistic bread and wine were a covenanted pledge of the food of immortality—the bread and wine of heaven. That is one great point in favor of our author’s view. In the note just quoted, Harnack speaks of this essay as a profound and remarkable investigation, but he hesitates to accept Spitta’s idea that the Pauline account of the supper was not the oldest. The words of 1 Cor. 11:23 (“For I have received of the Lord,” etc.) are too strong for him; as, indeed, they are for me. Yet the other suggestions of the essay remain most valuable, and will, I trust, be carefully considered by the theological world. If I am not mistaken, they promise to prove an “eirenicon” on that most vexed of all questions, the nature of the so-called “real presence.” The only “real presence” on Spitta’s view is the presence of the Creator in his gifts. This presence must of course be admitted by all. Is it too much to hope that a way may thus be opened to close this chapter of theological controversy?

Another remark of Harnack’s on the subject of the eucharist is (p. 210, note): “The real sacrificial act in the supper consists, according to Justin, only in the εἰχαριστίαν ποιών, whereby the καίνος ἀρτος becomes the ἀρτος τῆς εἰχαριστίας.”

If this be Justin’s conception of the sacrifice, it is also the conception for which I have pleaded in the modification of Spitta’s theory which I have proposed. The bread and wine are to be offered with thanksgiving for a memorial before God—a memorial of all his mercies, but above all his mercies in Christ.

At the same time it was no doubt under divine guidance that the church amplified this first simple intention of the sacrament by a further reference to Christ’s death and resurrection, and a thanksgiving for them, as the means whereby the promised gift of eternal life is to be realized. This step appears to have been taken by St. Paul, though it would be too much to say that the church owes the change to him alone.

At first the Christian *Agape* was a joyous remembrance of the promised gift of eternal life (see Acts 2:46, “ἐν ἄγαλματι”). But when this joyful character of the feast produced excess and disorder in the church, as it did at Corinth, a more somber character was given to the rite by specially associating it with the remembrance of the redeeming death of Christ (hence St. Paul’s words: “As often as ye eat this
bread and drink this cup," etc.). What was more natural than that this should lead to a different conception of the words of institution, especially amongst the Gentiles, to whom the strictly Jewish ideas of Messiah the giver of the manna and of the wine of paradise were strange? And this changed conception of the words is evidenced by the additions which they received in the later texts. It may fairly be urged, as it is by Spitta, that St. Mark's text represents the oldest form of the words. If we look at St. Mark 14:24, we find, "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many." On Spitta's view that would be interpreted of the promise that the wine of heaven should be poured out for the eternal felicity of many souls at the great banquet in the kingdom of God. But in St. Matthew we have, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins." The very fact of the absence of the italicized words in St. Mark's, the earlier, text is significant of the changed point of view from which the words of institution were regarded. Doubtless the change was due, not only to St. Paul's influence, but to the natural association between the blood of Christ and the blood of the paschal lamb. It can be rendered very probable that our Lord suffered on the cross at the same time that the paschal lamb was being offered in the temple. It was precisely this association of Christ with the paschal lamb which opened the apostles' eyes to the significance of Christ's death; and henceforth the words of institution would have an added meaning for them. They would be well aware that the words, "This is my blood," at the institution referred simply to the fruit of the vine, but how suggestive of the blood "poured out" on the altar of the cross. Hence the words assumed a secondary meaning, which remained when the primary meaning was forgotten.

It will be seen that the chief objection to Spitta's theory is that he thinks St. Paul was not in touch with the original idea of the eucharist, but regarded it as an institution of Christ, whereas it was merely an inspiration of the moment. I hope I have sufficiently shown my strong dissent from such a view. I believe St. Paul had full opportunity for knowing and recording exactly what Christ said at the last supper, but in accordance with his general principle of preaching "Christ crucified," he brought the sacrament into close and lasting connection with the thought of theredeeming death of Christ.

No doubt many will cling to the old idea that the eucharist is the Christian passover. Historically speaking, the eucharist is probably no more the Christian passover than Sunday is the Christian Sabbath.
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But just as, practically, Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, so the eucharist is practically the Christian passover. For the spirit of the ancient Jewish rite has passed over to the Christian rite. But this is not only true of the passover. All the sacrifices of the law find their true anti-type in the great Christian sacrifice.

Personally I have found Spitta's study very helpful. It seems to make the last great act of the life of Christ more natural and lifelike. Understood in this new light, the eucharist becomes the last example of the primary and secondary meaning of the prophetic Scriptures. Doubtless the rite was intended by the Holy Spirit to receive a fuller and deeper meaning in the light of the cross and the resurrection. The church came to think of the body broken, and the blood poured out on the cross, although these ideas were not directly associated with the words of institution. It was inevitable, too, that the Messianic ideas originally connected with the words should, as the church spread through the Gentile world, be more and more forgotten. A somewhat parallel case may be found in the way in which the reference to Christ's Davidic descent, which occurred in the earliest confessions of faith, disappeared about the close of the first century. We are too apt to forget that the contemporaries of Christ lived and moved in the peculiar atmosphere of a set of ideas totally foreign to ourselves. The study of Jewish apocalyptic and rabbinic literature is doing much to place Christ and early Christianity in a truer light than that in which we have been accustomed to view them; nor need we fear the result of a closer scrutiny of the foundations of our Christian faith. On the contrary, let us welcome the fuller light: it can only serve to throw out into bolder relief the unique personality of him who was both God and man.

STURMINSTER, NEWTON, S. O., J. H. WILKINSON.
Dorset, England.

LIFE AFTER DEATH AND THE FUTURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

The fundamental postulate and the method of this book are explicitly set forth in the author's preface to the English translation: "The rule laid down, and followed to the best of our ability, has been to accept no guide except Holy Writ; and we venture to hope that we
have succeeded in our endeavors to be faithful to our rule. In all doubtful points we have tried to draw a clear distinction between what is actually revealed to us in Scripture, what is only hinted at, and what is simply the result of more or less ingenious human speculation." The rule has been adhered to with impressive fidelity; neither reason nor sympathy is allowed to influence in the slightest degree our author's exegesis of biblical texts or the conclusions deduced from them. Affirming that salvation comes only through Christ, and that the only known way of connection with him is by the Word and the sacraments, he discusses the fate of unbaptized infants, and concludes that "we may entertain a hope of salvation and bliss for our unbaptized children immediately after death, yet not more than a hope. But the question is still unanswered. Under any circumstances we have this consolation, that if the hope should be unfounded such children will at least have the opportunity of the uncalled at some time to receive God's gracious call" (p. 227).

Obviously Bishop Dahle's view is needlessly limited. Of modern scientific thought he seems to be totally ignorant. Death is regarded as an unnatural event, yet "the best educational institution," a break in the life process due to the sin of Adam, and the argument that there are evidences of death prior to the appearance of man is met by the curious plea that that past period cannot be proved to fall within the six days of creation, and "it is only with the creation dating from that epoch that we have here to do—it is the dominion of death in this creation we have to explain" (p. 40). The moral and philosophical arguments for immortality are superficially stated and curtly dismissed since revelation is the sole and sufficient authority.

In dealing with the Bible, moreover, the author makes no account of critical methods and conclusions. We are told that "between the Old Testament and the New there lies a period of between three and four hundred years" (p. 113), and the hope is expressed that after the "restoration of the Jews" the sons of regenerate Israel will help solve some of the riddles of the Old Testament "which is now misunderstood and torn to pieces by an unbelieving criticism that is foreign to its spirit" (p. 311). Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that we must look to the New Testament rather than the Old for light regarding the future, since the earlier revelation was "imperfect" (p. 126), yet the advance of the New Testament from the Old is made merely by the method of addition.

Herein lies the radical fallacy of our author's method. The prog-
ress of revelation is not by addition alone, but by addition which works transformation of earlier ideas. Where thought is vital, as Hebrew thought preeminently was, it grows not mechanically but chemically. Hence a new conception is not only beyond, but different from, an old idea, perhaps even contradictory to it. The New Testament Hades, which Dahle regards as denoting solely the abode of the wicked in the intermediate state, is not more definite than Sheol, but the two ideas are contrary to each other. In a word, the biblical texts bearing upon eschatology cannot be harmonized on a horizontal plane; their unity is to be found only in the ordered continuity of developing life. In the New Testament we discern slight differences of teaching due to individual peculiarities, but of these our author is entirely oblivious. This critical defect vitiates the treatment.

Bishop Dahle's eschatological programme has become familiar to us in the writings of a certain school of Bible readers in England and America. After death the soul passes into an intermediate state. The souls of the wicked go to suffer in Hades, while the souls of the righteous, from whom sin has been forever abolished by the event of death, pass into the bliss of heaven. On earth the forces of lawlessness are held in check by the conservative respect for law and order, and also by "him that letteth," whom our author regards as an angelic personality; but soon this restraint is removed and the anarchistic energy is embodied in a single personality, Antichrist. Before the manifestation of Antichrist, however, the restoration of the Jews occurs, not necessarily to their ancient land, but certainly to God's favor by reason of their acceptance of Jesus as the Christ. The appearance of Jesus in the clouds is signal for the binding of the Devil, the resurrection of "the dead in Christ," the transformation of the righteous living, the rapture of these two classes of saints, and the beginning of the millennium. After the thousand years are over, Satan is loosed and makes war upon the saints, which is terminated by the coming of Jesus upon the earth, the resurrection of all the dead, the day of judgment, with its decrees of unending woe and bliss, the renovation of the heavens and the earth, and the entering of the elect upon their everlasting home, the new heaven and the new earth wherein dwellth righteousness. In the course of the argument many subsidiary questions are discussed, such as the "interim corporeality," the relation of souls to one another and to the world during the intermediate state, the nature of the resurrection body, and the fate of those dying without a knowledge of Christ.
Upon the last mentioned topic Dahle holds substantially the view known in this country as the Andover hypothesis. The dilemma is clearly presented: If heathen uncalled before death are saved solely by obedience to the light actually granted them on earth, then another salvation than through Christ must be acknowledged; if, however, men are saved only by acceptance of Christ, as the New Testament expressly declares, then those who have never heard his name must be called by him in the intermediate state. Dahle accepts the latter alternative, resting his decision upon the famous passages in Peter. But he is careful to state that if once the proclamation of the gospel reaches the ears of a man on the earth his opportunity of future probation is cut off. Considering the better chance one would have of accepting salvation when convinced by actual experience of future life and punishment, and especially when preached to by angels or even by Christ himself, we cannot help wondering whether, on Bishop Dahle's view, it is not a mistaken mercy to deprive men of this better opportunity.

The style of the book is remarkably lucid, and the arrangement is orderly. Everywhere it gives evidence that the author is preacher rather than scholar. Yet in spite of close literalism and narrow exegesis, a reader conceives genuine respect and admiration for his author's unmistakable sincerity and absolutely unfaltering allegiance to biblical authority. A critical scholar will find little in the volume to repay study, but for what it aims and purports to be, the book is decidedly valuable. W. W. Fenn.

Chicago.


This book is the most serious piece of writing yet done by Dr. Van Dyke. Beginning as a series of sermons in his own pulpit; then extended into the Yale lectures for 1896; then amplified into a volume for the general public, it has at once the religious fervor of the prophet, the didactic quality of the lecturer, and the literary charm of the man of letters. The gospel which the author has for the age of doubt is essentially the teachings of the Westminster Confession, held unequivocally and tenaciously; yet held so generously, winsomely, and
tenderly, that for the average reader this presentation "steals away their sharpness ere he is aware."

The first chapter is a remarkable analysis of the temper of the present age as mirrored in its literature. The questioning, critical spirit of the nineteenth century is set forth with a wealth of quotation rarely equaled. Through all modern literature, English, French, and German, the author roams, gathering up the sad or passionate expressions of doubt, gloom, and pessimism, until his diagnosis of the modern world leaves us like Virgil's women of Troy—pontum adspectabant flentes. Indeed, it is a little bewildering to meet so many witnesses at once, and we hardly know what conclusions to draw when we are carried through twenty authors in twenty pages, referred at once to Madame Bovary and Beyschlag's New Testament Theology, and introduced in half a chapter to Mrs. Humphrey Ward, St. Augustine, Benjamin Kidd, Von Hartmann and The Methodist Review.

Then the author asks how we shall meet this temper of the age, and skillfully shows that science cannot furnish its own remedy, and neither philosophy nor a priori theology can furnish the answer. A positive gospel is needed; a gospel which is a fact and force in human history and embodied in a personal life. "This presentation of a person to persons, this is preeminently the gospel for the age of doubt." This chapter is full of noble loyalty to the historic Christ; but Christ is the unveiling of the Father. "The first Christians saw what the church has always seen in Jesus Christ—a real incarnation of God." With no uncertain sound the writer sets forth the deity of Christ. For such a gospel the world is now prepared, for modern thought has proven the shallowness of agnosticism. But theology must not lose sight of Christ's humanity, as it too often has done. The works of Shedd and Liddon obscure the real humanity behind metaphysical formulas. But in Christ was a real self-emptying, and the doctrine of the Kenosis is in no way at variance with the Scripture; only a really human Christ can be a real Saviour. In the teaching of Christ the idea of the kingdom is central, though the emphasis in modern theology is seen in Hitchcock's Complete Analysis of the Holy Bible, whose index contains one solitary reference to the kingdom of God. Dr. Van Dyke seems to make Christ the King. Is this in harmony with Christ's own teaching? He also represents the kingdom, not as a divine society and fellowship, but rather as a school in which Christ is the authoritative teacher. Surely, the authority of Christ as a teacher is not identical with his doctrine of the kingdom of God on earth.
Then in three chapters the author plunges into the three problems of Liberty, Sovereignty, and Service. “The modern fatalism is Calvinism with the bottom knocked out.” Determinism is not proven, and we are free to accept Christ's clear teaching of the genuine freedom of the soul. An age which “has hypnotized itself by its own denials” surely needs the clear assertion of Jesus as to human liberty. Yet the sovereignty of God also is fundamental in Christ's teachings. His sovereignty embraces human freedom, as the ocean surrounds the island. Miracles are “rare works, unique, transcendent,” but not against nature. Evil is self-destroying; as for Satan (pace Westminster!) “the day is coming when he must perish,” and God be all in all.

The chapter on Service is a lofty and moving call to the service of man. Not equality but fraternity are we to preach, and the only election is an election to bless the world. With fine enthusiasm this thought is unfolded until we reach the closing statement, a compact and guarded theology in a sentence: “We must enter into life by giving ourselves to the living Christ who unveils the Father in the human life, and calls us with divine authority to submit our liberty to God's sovereignty in blessed and immortal service to our fellow-man for Christ's sake.”

The only dubious feature in the book is the ponderous appendix occupying nearly one-third of the volume, consisting of extracts more or less weighty, from authors known and unknown, profound and shallow; extracts that are admirable in a commonplace book, but which, if relevant, are so discordant as to add more to the “doubt” than to the “gospel.” Our very admiration for the clear thought and limpid style of the author makes us a little impatient when, after a page of prophetic fervor, we come upon the inevitable: “See Appendix, note 66,” and our prophet condescends to become the curator of a museum. But two-thirds of the volume is by Dr. Van Dyke himself, and will help thousands of readers in solving the questions of today.

New York, N. Y.

THE GOSPEL MESSAGE. By R. N. Cust, LL.D. London: Luzac & Co., 1896. Pp. xx + 494; cloth. 7s. 6d.

In this book is distilled the clear thinking of “a humble student of the philosophy of missions and observer of the great work in the field and the committee room of many churches and denominations in the mission fields of the world for half a century.”

Twenty-five years' experience as a magistrate in British India
among the native peoples, twice as many years as student of the languages, especially of Africa and Asia, with critical and comparative study of ancient and modern religions, with an intense and almost consuming enthusiasm for Christian missions to non-Christian races and people, have fitted Dr. Cust to write as few men can or will on the greatest of practical Christian themes.

This volume of nearly 500 pages condenses the matter of his forty or more volumes and pamphlets. The result is probably the most informing, critical, suggestive, and valuable single volume on missions now extant. Almost every phase of the subject is discussed, for Dr. Cust has been a long and patient sitter and hearer in committee-rooms and missionary anniversaries and knows both the inside and outside of his subjects. It would be less easy to find what important theme or phase of the subjects he has not treated than to enumerate the many lines of inquiry which he has illuminated. He groups his studies under the heads of motive and duty; servants of the Lord; incidents and dangers; results. He preaches the duty of self-sacrifice and shows the glorious opportunity to the young men. He believes heartily in the work of women, but he does not believe that the missionary ought to marry until he has at least been tried on the field, found capable, and, above all, has mastered the language. He insists that the details concerning wives and children ought to have no place in missionary reports, and persistently, with appeal, sarcasm, and solid argument, returns to this subject. He calls for the best men and women to do Christ's glorious work abroad. Throughout he insists that the Christian message should be the simple gospel only, and that the messenger of Christ should leave politics severely alone and not try to dictate to European governments or to meddle with native polity. Furthermore, the missionary ought not to intermeddle with the social customs, tradition, literature, and even religion of the people in an hostile, overbearing, and polemic way, but rather in love and sacrifice deliver the gospel message of reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ. No one more than he recognizes the great obstacles to Christianity both among ourselves and in that common human nature which is modified by old beliefs, customs, superstitions and national inheritances. He pleads that the man who today first hears the gospel ought to have the same equal opportunity of taking advantage of it as did the Greek or Roman citizens to whom Paul or Peter preached. Unfortunately, the average pagan of today does not have the advantage of those to whom Paul preached. He is expected to embrace as much dogmatic theol-
logy as if he were in Europe or America with centuries of Christianity behind him, and he is too often compelled to take a large quantity or flavor of Anglican, Yankee, German, or occidental notions and customs as part of his Christianity. Dr. Cust discusses with clearness and force the relations of missionaries and missionary societies to the ideas and institutions of the various nations. He lifts the voice of warning for the twentieth century in view of the waste and failure of the past, which we all know has been great.

With most of the conclusions of the author we heartily agree. The method of carrying on missionary work is in need of radical reformation. This book, excellent for the beginner or the veteran in the field or the pastor at home, ought to be read and pondered by all who believe intensely in the Master's command to evangelize the nations and who hold that economy and practical wisdom in carrying on missionary work are as important as in everyday business.

ITHACA, N. Y. WM. ELLIOT GRIFFIS.


This handsome volume is an important and valuable addition to the apparatus for liturgical study. Nearly twenty years ago Mr. C. E. Hammond put forth his Liturgies, Eastern and Western, which promptly commended itself as the most available handbook of the texts of the chief historic liturgies. The present work is in some sense an extension of Mr. Hammond's book. A new edition of the latter was called for, and Mr. Hammond entrusted the preparation of it to Mr. Brightman, Pusey librarian at Oxford. The result is a truly monumental piece of scholarship, remarkably elaborate in contents, and set forth in great typographical beauty by the Clarendon Press. The plan of the original work has been so much amplified that in place of one small volume of about 400 pages we are now to have two large ones, of which the present book is the first,—much more than a four-fold increase. This first volume deals only with the Eastern liturgies, and contains little besides the texts and the critical introduction thereto, all general summaries and discussions being reserved for the
future. This being its scope, we shall content ourselves with a rapid
description of the main contents of the volume, noting one or two
of its points of special excellence.

One of the best features of Mr. Brightman's plan is his elaborate
exhibition of the sources available for the texts presented. He does
not claim that his own use of these sources has been exhaustive,—
doubtless their almost infinite extent precludes that for any single
investigator,—but he evidently has been exceedingly painstaking in
his study of what was immediately accessible to him, and highly judi-
cious in his use of the work of others. Here Mr. Brightman's book is
a notable advance on all its predecessors, both in scope and in the
handling of details.

The introduction to the present volume occupies about 100 pages,
in which we have a sufficiently exhaustive exhibit of the sources (1) of
the Syrian Rite, including the so-called Clementine Liturgy, and the
Greek and Syriac liturgies of St. James, which run out into many
fragmentary variants, (2) of the Egyptian Rite, including the Greek
Liturgy of St. Mark, the Coptic and Abyssinian liturgies, with their
partial variants, (3) of the Persian Rite, with some partial variants, (4)
of the Byzantine Rite, including the Orthodox liturgies in their multi-
form ramifications in several languages, and the Armenian liturgies,
with their historic variations.

In discussing the details of manuscripts and other sources the
editor displays a splendid mastery of his materials, an acute and
balanced historical judgment, and an enviable power of compact and
lucid statement. It is safe to say that the matter covered by this
introduction has never before been so succinctly massed or so con-
veniently classified for reference. Special space is taken for the vexed
problem of the Clementine Liturgy, which (following Funk's mono-
graph) is affirmed to be Antiochene, "worked over and expanded by
the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions, who is also the pseudo-
Ignatius, and filled in with prayers, which, whatever sources they may
include, are very largely the work of the same compiler" (p. xliii).
The evidence adduced is finely marshaled, and the various conclu-
sions are apparently sound.

The main portion of the volume—450 pages—is occupied by
the actual texts of the great liturgies in full, arranged with elaborate
care as to the distinction between rubric and formula, as to the sub-
ordination of supplementary to essential passages, as to the parallel-
ism of synchronous exercises, and as to the indication of biblical
quotations. Where the texts are in Greek, they are given in the original: in all other cases they are translated into English. Mr. Brightman has taken pains, "wherever possible, to represent the whole liturgy as it is celebrated on some given day,"—a plan which involves the introduction of the proper lections and hymns for that day. Whether this touch of vividness amounts to much may perhaps be queried, unless it is accompanied, as we wish had been practicable, by a tabulation of the other lections and hymns which might also occur at the same points on other days. It is not always remembered that liturgical usages form great cycles, the variable parts being combined in rotation with the invariable, and the impression of the whole, as it would be made on one constantly engaging in the rite, depending on the sum total of the parts, invariable and variable. To the technical student of liturgies in the narrow sense the examination of the fixed structure, the regular sequence of parts, the language and ritual of the more critical and central exercises, and the mystic significance attached to the core of the sacramental observance, is so absorbing that it is not as common as it ought to be to see a proportionate interest in the vast body of other liturgical materials (not only variable, but collateral, comparatively unemphasized, perhaps not fully formulated, usages) which really belong to the subject of liturgical history and praxis, well deserving scrutiny and record in connection with the technical "liturgies" themselves. Our author's labor to perfect his presentation in certain variable particulars is therefore a pleasing sign of thoroughness. We hope that in time the same principle of research will give greater attention, not only to the scope and order of lectionaries, of stipulated antiphons, canticles, hymns, etc., but even to such neglected matters as the ritual of secondary services of every description, including, when possible, usages that are merely tolerated as well as those that are enjoined.

After the texts—the details of which we do not pause to examine—come almost a score of valuable appendices, occupying nearly 100 pages more, in which are given in full several specially important descriptions and rescripts of usages from various sources, largely of the first ten centuries,—all designed to throw light on the historical development of the forms now held to be standard. Here again, both in the selection of matter and in his often minute annotations, the editor shows conspicuous wisdom and care. The beginning in this direction had been made by Mr. Hammond, but Mr. Brightman has gone much further.
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The volume is rounded out (1) by a very full index of biblical quotations, arranged in the order of their occurrence in the liturgies themselves, from which the inquirer as to the amount and character of the scriptural matter used may derive what he needs with perhaps reasonable convenience; and (2) by two glossaries of technical terms, the one English, the other Greek, which are finely wrought out, especially in their massing of the terms for the same thing in different languages, and in their compact references to the historical growth of certain usages.

The appearance of the second volume of this noble work will be awaited with great interest.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.


The order of subjects indicated in the title is the reverse of that in the book, in which we have first the meditations on the passion and then some brief addresses on the seven last words of Christ. These meditations were delivered in St. Mark's, Philadelphia, during Lent of 1895, and the addresses were delivered on Good Friday of that year at the three hours' service.

The style of both the meditations and the addresses is clear, simple, direct, and forceful. In this respect they are worthy of hearty commendation. In many passages redemption through the sufferings and death of Christ is justly and ably presented. Would that we could here close our criticism! But our author holds that, in addition to what Christ has done to save men, those who are redeemed by him must do penance. In his view penance is suffering for sin. He says: "The sorrows of life" are "the necessary penance for sin." Narcotics should not be used to deaden pain, since that thwarts our penance; and any suffering for sin which we thus avoid in this world we shall be compelled to endure in the next. This is unquestionably "another gospel."

The addresses on the last words of Jesus, batting some slight blemishes, are excellent; but from the words, "I thirst," the author draws, by what occult principle of hermeneutics we have been unable to discover, the subject, "temperance."
The meditations especially are sadly marred by allegorical interpretation. Thus the crown of thorns, because it was pressed upon the head of Christ, denotes the expiation made for evil thoughts. Thorns by which the ground is cursed, on account of Adam's transgression, mean penance for sin. God revealed himself to Moses in a thornbush (sic!), which indicates that God reveals himself anew to men in their penance. Eve was taken from the side of Adam, so the bride, the church, is taken from the wounded side of Jesus. The nails driven through his hands and feet "were typified in the Book of Numbers, where we are told that the princes and nobles of the people with their staves dug the well. Strange instrument with which to dig a well, a staff, type of the nails by which were dug in the hands and feet of our Redeemer the wells from which the living water of life should flow!" The nails also were typified by those who supported the hands of Moses while Israel fought with Amalek. When the blood ran from the hands and feet of Jesus, from four wounds, as he hung on his cross, the words found in the second chapter of Genesis were "fulfilled," "A river went out of Eden to water the garden, and from thence it was parted and became into four heads." The Italics are ours. Havilah, the land "where there is gold;" gold is here "the emblem of love." The wagging of the heads of those who passed by the cross indicates "the revolt of human reason—the head—against Christ."

These are a few of the many specimens of allegorical exposition scattered over the pages of this book. As one reads he is compelled to turn back to the title-page to assure himself that he is not perusing a book written by some monk of the Dark Ages. These meditations are musty with fanciful, discarded, mediæval interpretations. We lay down these discourses with the positive conviction that the most cogent proof of the divine origin of the gospel is that it survives the interpretations given to it by some of its advocates. Galusha Anderson.

The University of Chicago.

Ancient India, its Language and Religions. By H. Oldenberg. (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1896, pp. 110; 50c.) With this comprehensive title are presented translations of three (in the original two) articles by Professor Oldenberg in the Deutsche Rundschau: "The Study of Sanskrit," "The Religion of the Veda," and "Buddhism." In the first, a brief sketch of the century's work, the study of the Vedic literature is more particularly considered. The
second bears the same title as the author's well-known volume, *Die Religion des Veda*, and from the same point of view indicates the character of the Vedic conceptions. The essay on Buddhism directs attention to the close relationship of its fundamental principles (the evil of life, the circle of births, the means of release) to those of the Orphic and Pythagorean movements and Plato. In the explanation of these similarities the author remarks that "we may and must be satisfied with the similarity of historical causes." In the same way he would account for resemblances in literature and institutions between Buddhism and Christianity.—A. W. Stratton.

*Studia Sinaitica*, No. V: *Apocrypha Sinaitica*. Edited and translated into English by Margaret Dunlop Gibson, M.R.A.S. (London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1896.) While the original texts in Syriac and Arabic which are here published for the first time will be interesting to scholars, especially to students of the New Testament and of ante-Nicene ecclesiastical history, the translations will be found as entrancing as a good story to all those who love the literature of romance and folklore. For, as the editor remarks in her introduction to the Preaching of Peter: "Such tales probably took a similar place within the cloistered fane to the modern religious novel in Puritan families." The Clementine literature receives a valuable contribution in the two Arabic recensions of the *Recognitions* in the *Martyrdom of Clement* and in the *Preaching of Peter* (which is entirely different from that Kerigma of which Dobschütz writes in the ninth volume of Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*). The stories of the martyrdom of James and of the preaching and martyrdom of Simon, the son of Cleopas, present some new points for consideration in determining such questions as their relation to the Lord and to each other. The superscription to the *Preaching of Simon* will show this: "This is the preaching of the blessed and holy Simon, son of Cleopas, who was called Jude, which is, being interpreted, Nathaniel, who was called the Zealot, and was bishop in Jerusalem after James the brother of the Lord Jesus the Christ."—R. D. Wilson.

*L'Écriture et le caractère*. Par J. Crépieux-Jamin. (Paris: Felix Alcan, 4ème éd., 1896, pp. x + 463, fr. 7.50.) This interesting and elaborate attempt to interpret character from handwriting assumes that a relation exists between character and writing similar to that between character and gesture, writing being considered as composed of numerous gestures in miniature. "Graphology rests upon the most securely
established psycho-physiological conclusions; it has its laws, its experimental method, its classification, its technique; it can no longer be justly denied the rank of a science.”

Various styles of chirography are reproduced in facsimile, and from an analysis of these, certain signs or characters of writing are determined, and the author attempts to establish a definite relation between these signs and (1) the superiority or inferiority, (2) the intelligence, (3) the moral character, (4) the will, (5) the aesthetic sense, (6) the age, (7) the sex, and (8) the pathological tendencies of the individual. The volume closes with a chapter of instructions to amateurs on the analysis of handwriting.

The collection of autograph letters and signatures is very rich, and of unusual interest to the lover of such matters.—W. I. Thomas.

Die Apostelgeschichte St. Lucä in Bibelstunden für die Gemeinde ausgelegt. Von W. F. Besser. Dritte Auflage. (Halle a. S.: · R. Mühlmann, 1896, 3 vols., M. ro.) This is part of an exposition of the entire New Testament in plain language for ordinary readers. Twelve volumes have already appeared. The work has been most cordially welcomed in Germany, and parts of it have achieved a great circulation and have passed through many editions. Though intended for popular reading, and not encumbered with the discussion of critical questions, it is the fruit of scholarly study. Besser writes from the standpoint of a strict Lutheran believer, with much insight, much weighty thought, and much gracious emotion.—Franklin Johnson.

A Man's Value to Society: Studies in Self-Culture and Character. By Newell Dwight Hillis. (Fleming H. Revell Company, pp. 321, $1.25.) This is a series of essays or lectures or sermons in which very familiar truths are put in pungent, epigrammatic forms. It discusses “Memory,” “Character,” “Visions,” “The Imagination,” and kindred themes, with remarkable profusion of allusion and anecdote. At times it mounts to a height of vision and oracular utterance which reminds us of Emerson, but anon the miscellaneous incidents and exhortations bring us to the level of Samuel Smiles' Self-Help. Yet the tense and nervous apotheogms in which the work abounds must drive home many a needed truth to the minds of young men.—W. H. P. Faunce.

The Divine Life in Man and Other Sermons. By Frederick A. Noble, D.D. (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1896, pp. 311, cloth, $1.25.) In this volume of fifteen sermons we have
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the discussion of practical topics which "come home to men's business and bosoms." While these discourses are strictly evangelical, they are replete with the best and freshest thinking of our day. The author has read widely and thoroughly and has a comprehensive and strong grasp of historical, literary, and scientific facts. His style also is clear and fairly forceful.

Most of these sermons, however, lack directness of address. The preacher does not grapple with his audience. He says "we," "our," "us," but in only two brief passages, in all these 300 pages, does he say "you." Were it not for the fact that the subjects of these discourses are pertinently unfolded from texts of Scripture, the reader might think that he was perusing simply a series of interesting essays. And the long sentences encountered here and there, some of which contain more than 200 words, would confirm the impression. Then there are words which are out of place in discourses addressed to popular audiences, such as "immanent," "transcendent," "differentiates," "oppugnant," "atrophied." The great Preacher of the ages, Jesus Christ, never used such words when he proclaimed the truth to men. But these are only slight blemishes in sermons which, taken as a whole, are worthy of hearty commendation.—GALUSHA ANDERSON.

Obdachlos: Bilder aus dem sozialen und sittlichen Elend der Arbeitslosen. Von Constantin Liebich. Mit einem Vorwort von Professor Adolph Wagner. (Berlin: Wigandt & Grieben, 1894, pp. 256, M. 3.) The introduction by Professor Wagner gives a guarantee of faithful treatment and genuine first-hand observation. The author has gained his materials by direct intercourse with the wretched human beings whom he describes. He follows them from the demoralized home, become a purgatory through poverty, vice, and discord, along the highways, in the relief stations, lock-ups, lodging houses, warming halls, asylums, restaurants, criminal gangs, markets, penitentiaries, labor bureaus, intelligence offices and workmen's colonies. The pictures of a German tramp's life are instructive for us in America, because the same industrial forces are at work to produce this pathetic and discouraging type of humanity, on which Salvation Army, rescue missions, institutional churches, settlements, charity organizations, and all benevolent citizens are spending so much money and sympathy, without other result thus far than serious increase of the plague, with the exceptional rescue of individual vagrants.—C. R. HENDERSON.
Bilder aus dem Menschenleben in Lichte des göttlichen Wortes. Von G. Stabler. (Stuttgart: Rud. Roth, pp. 487, M. 3.20.) The author gathered a large number of illustrations, anecdotes, proverbs, and maxims for his own use in teaching a Bible class in Sunday school. He made notes for the conversational lectures before his classes. These he shaped into this book, which contains brief comments on events and teachings in the gospels, together with a generous supply of stories and other pictorial forms of instruction.—C. R. Henderson.

Juvenile Offenders. By W. Douglas Morrison. (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1896, pp. 317, $1.50.) The chaplain of Wandsworth prison, London, to great devotion in his pastoral duties has joined a profound study of the literature of modern penology. The work here mentioned bids fair to become a classic in its particular field. It discusses the conditions which lead children and youth into crime: physical environment, domestic influences, economic opportunities, and industrial training. The various methods of dealing with young offenders are described and criticised; admonition, conditional release, fining, corporal punishment, imprisonment, corrective institutions. A very important conclusion is that the remedies lie in bettering social conditions rather than in reformatories and prisons, and that the church should crown its work for individuals by lending its powerful influence to the removal of those general causes which produce misery. —C. R. Henderson.

NOTICE.

The recent numbers of The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, and of The Biblical World, contain the following reviews of books which will not be reviewed in THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY:


THE MIDRASHIC ELEMENT IN CHRONICLES. By W. E. Barnes;
The Expositor, December 1896, pp. 426-439.

The manifest didactic Tendens of the chronicler gives a Midrashic
color to his narratives. Does this extend to the inclusion of Hag-
gadah? There are five conspicuous stories in Second Chronicles, having
no parallel in Kings, which have been considered Haggadic: (1) Abijah's
victory over Jeroboam (13: 3-20). The enormous armies, the quo-
tation from the priest code, the tone of Abijah's speech, tell against
the narrative. Yet the victory is by no means improbable, and the story
is circumstantial and self-consistent. (2) Asa's victory (14: 9-15).
This narrative is not difficult to accept if the Cushites be regarded as
from Arabia, and the million invaders understood as merely an innu-
merable host. Kings is generally silent on matters concerning Judah
alone. (3) The invasion of Moab, Ammon, and Edom (chap. 20). The
vagueness of the military details, and the particularity of the religious
and liturgical, give to this narrative a Haggadic appearance. Yet an
unsuccessful migration of these tribes into Judah is not improbable.
Jehoshaphat's prayer and the coloring of the narrative may belong
to the chronicler, but there is probably a basis of fact. (4) Uzziah's
leprosy (26: 16-20). The law of the altar seems to be of later origin.
Kings has no reference to any cause of the leprosy, though the
expression יֵעַל (plagued) may indicate that it was regarded as a judg-
ment. Eliminating the marks of late style and phraseology, there
seems to remain a pre-exilic narrative presenting, in general, the same
account. (5) The repentance of Manasseh (33: 12, 13). This nar-
rative is not necessarily inconsistent with the unqualified condemna-
tion of Manasseh in Kings. If the repentance came late in life and
the reformation was only partially and temporarily successful, they
might easily be omitted by the almost contemporary writer. But the
chronicler was bound to notice anything good of a Davidic king.
The phraseology is not necessarily late.

The discussion of this problem must take into account the narrative
of Jehoiada's revolution (chap. 23). The prominence of the Levites and
the law, the anachronism of the porters, the sanctity of the temple, the
supereminence of the priest, and the marks of post-exilic style, all ren-
der the story suspicious. But as there is in this case a parallel in
Kings, a detailed criticism is possible, and the narrative is seen to be
essentially historical. The difficulties are due to some minor errors
and additions of the chronicler. The same is probably true of the
other narratives. They are based on historical sources, though doubt-
less they are modified, even in important details, in accordance with
the Tendens of the writer.

The five narratives selected afford a very fair test of the problem under discus-
sion. The conclusion seems to present the view to which scholarship is tending. The
writer well shows that the criticism of Chronicles cannot proceed by a simple compari-
sion with Kings and the wholesale application of the argumentum e silentio. While
his conclusion concerning the Manasseh narrative may be correct, he has not consid-
ered the objection of Graf and Wellhausen that the story is introduced as an explana-
tion of Manasseh's long and prosperous reign.

ROCKFORD, ILL.

THEO. G. SOARES.

DER TAG DES LETZTEN ABENDMAHLS UND DES TODES JESU. Von PROFESOR DR. BELSER; Theolog. Quartalschrift, Viertes Quartalheft,
Tübingen, 1896.

Both John and the synoptists agree that the last supper was cele-
brated on a Thursday evening, and that the crucifixion was on a Fri-
day. The only point in doubt is the day of the month. The author
of the present article holds that it was the thirteenth, and so that Jesus
observed the passover one day before the legal time. The fourth gos-
pel, which is to be regarded as chronologically exact, furnishes the fol-
lowing data: (1) 18:28. The Jews entered not into the judgment
hall that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover. Com-
parison with the synoptists, specially Luke, shows that we must think
of the passover proper, and not of the Chagigah. This is confirmed by
Jewish writings. Moreover, the defilement caused by entering a
heathen house would have lasted seven days, and not simply till sun-
down, as some say. (2) 13:1. It was before the passover that Jesus
gave the signal proof of his love in washing the disciples' feet, with
which the supper and the passover were associated. This passage
leads us to the evening of the thirteenth. (3) 19:14. "Preparation of
the passover" is not the name of a day of the week, but is the day of
preparation for the passover. The Jews called the sixth day ταιρασκευή
του σαββάτου because it was the day on which they made ready for the
Sabbath. By analogy παρακενή τοῦ πάσχα must mean preparation for the passover. The context in John also requires this. (4) 19:36. This proves that the evangelist thought of the crucifixion as contemporaneous with the slaughter of the passover lambs. (5) 19:31, 42. The Sabbath that followed the day of the crucifixion was great, and that is explained by the fact that it was the first feast day.

This testimony of John is confirmed by many early writers, as Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Apollinaris, Eusebius, the Gospel of Peter, the Acts of Pilate, and the Toldoth Jeschu.

Now the language of the synoptists is not in conflict with John. For they bear witness that the trial of Jesus was not on a feast day, but on a work day. Note the going out with swords and staves, Simon’s coming from the field, the request of the people that a prisoner be released, care for the burial of Jesus, the trial, the sending of the prisoner to Pilate, and the tumult in the streets. It is impossible to suppose that these things took place on the first feast day. This was holy, and no work might be done thereon.

Moreover, the synoptists tell us that the leaders purposed to avoid the arrest of Jesus during the feast, and there is nothing to indicate that this plan was abandoned. Further, trial by the Sanhedrin was not allowed on Sabbaths and feast days. To the objection that if Jesus’ trial was the day before the feast his crucifixion must have been on the feast day, it is to be said that the Pharisees indeed held that a sentence of death could not be executed on the day of its passage, but the Sadducees, who were in office when Jesus was crucified, disregarded this rule.

The statement of Matt. 26:17, that Jesus kept the passover on the first day of unleavened bread, and the fuller statement of Mark 14:12, must be regarded as using the word πρῶτος in a peculiar sense. Mark may have had ὁ πρῶτος before him, which was used in the sense of preceding.

This article by Dr. Belser is an interesting argument for the 13th of Nisan as the date of the last supper and for the harmony of the synoptists with John. Some points which seem to us not made out are (1) that the defilement of entering the judgment hall would last seven days; (2) that John 13:1, which puts the washing of the disciples’ feet before the passover, puts it just twenty-four hours before it; (3) that John, in 19:36, thinks of Jesus as the antitype of the paschal lamb; (4) that the various activities which the synoptists put on the day of the crucifixion might not, in extraordinary circumstances, have taken place on a feast day; and (5) that men who wrote Greek readily could have said τῷ πρῶτῷ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἐξήνεμων when they meant the day before the feast.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.
French Protestantism has reached a crisis in its history. It has suffered for years from a division in its ranks into liberals and orthodox. This division is killing Protestantism. Attempts at reconciliation have reached a crisis at the Synod of Sedan, June 1896.

The purpose of these articles is: (1) to show the present state of French Protestantism; (2) to estimate its proposed achievements in our country; (3) to seek the causes of the gradual extinction of its churches; (4) to conduct the entire discussion in a purely historical spirit.

If Protestants have been guilty of vituperation and flagrant misrepresentation of Catholics, we shall exhibit no such spirit.

French Protestantism can be divided into three principal groups: the Lutheran church, with 77,000 souls; the independent churches, with 11,000 souls; the Reformed church, with 540,000 adherents.

There are other independent churches of foreign importation with small followings, as the Methodists and Baptists, but the French spirit is hostile to these exotic ravings (rêveries exotiques). It is an uncontestable fact that the coexistence of these different churches, having each its work and its societies, is one of the scourges of Protestantism.

The Calvinistic church in France far outnumbers all the rest. Now, is there unity in this church? Is unity possible? Calvinism has always offered the illogical contrast of a synodal organization strongly authoritative and a principle essentially revolutionary. In the course of time and in various phases this contradiction worked itself out in deeds.

Immediately after the battle of Waterloo France was invaded by large numbers of rigorous Calvinists, who pushed to the extreme the doctrines of predestination and the uselessness of works. This brutal dogmatism embraced by the young pastors stirred up the most vigorous opposition to the ancient school and prepared the way for destructive German criticism and Renan’s Vie de Jésus. Renan at once had a very large following. The result was a denial of the supernatural element in Christianity and the widest liberty in the interpretation of Scripture. The audacity of these negations aroused orthodoxy, which immediately prepared for the meeting of a national synod. The synod met at Paris June 6, 1872. After stormy debates they voted as follows: “The supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures in the matter of faith and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ — the only Son of God — who died for our sins and arose again for our justification.”
It voted further that candidates for ordination must subscribe to
this declaration.

It remains to the liberals to submit or separate. Strangely enough
they do neither, and Protestantism is left in that uncertain condition
which is neither unity nor schism—a condition of organized anarchy
ruling every sphere of activity in the church. This anarchy exists not
only between the two factions but within each of the factions. There
are no common rules admitted by all. Attempts are made to draft a
discipline, but who will obey it? What legal sanction has it? The
pastors enjoy an exaggerated independence. What is still worse—
think of the spiritual anarchy!

Here, then, we come to the true crisis in French Protestantism; it
is unable to escape a terrible dilemma, either schism or apostasy. If
schism is perpetuated it is death. Peace can be concluded only upon
the ruins of the faith.

In the midst of this perplexity a third party, the moderate right,
arises. It opposes the theory "everything or nothing," advocates a
theology of the conscience, and makes Christianity a life of the heart.
Ostensibly it is with the orthodox, but its closest affinities are with the
liberals.

Thus matters go on from bad to worse until the Synod of Sedan
convenes June 2, 1896.

The synod is confronted by many grave problems, such as mixed
marriages, religious indifference, deficit in the budget. This last
seriously affects theological students, pastors, and the education of
pastors’ children. All these things are consequences of the division.

But the gravest of all the problems is: What can be done to
restore unity? The parties are well organized, the debates are spir-
ited, and the conference ends with an apparent reconciliation. But
we do not fear to affirm that this assembly was fatal to Protestantism,
because it marks a decisive step of orthodoxy towards liberalism. Its
contradictory and equivocal votes conceal, with the danger of more
complete failures in the near future, a real betrayal of Christ, of the
faith, and of souls.

M. Portalie assured us that his discussion should be conducted in the purely his-
torical spirit. We had a right, then, to expect samples of all the facts, a judicial calm,
a sympathetic attitude towards the entire situation, even though the criticism might be
adverse. It is difficult to see how he has met the requirement in any one of these particu-
lars. He rather appears from beginning to end as an advocate, indeed as a consistent
Jesuit. His readers must consequently, while learning from him, keep both eyes wide
open.
The French Protestants left the mother church, and in pursuing their own unpiloted way have been wrecked upon the rocks of anarchism and infidelity. What shall they do now? He does not tell us in words, but the inference can hardly be mistaken. Correct the initial mistake, come back to the mother church, and all will be well.

It is extremely improbable that French Protestants will ever consent to such doctrines as are found in the Pope's last encyclical, e.g., "The dispensation of the divine mysteries was not granted by God indiscriminately to all Christians, but to the apostles and their successors."

Moreover it may be that his view of Protestantism is too limited. Possibly the very rivières exotiques which he dismisses so summarily may be an element in the further development of French Protestantism.

The University of Chicago.

J. W. Moncrief.

Early British Christianity. By F. Haverfield; The English Historical Review, July 1896.

Of the first bearers of Christianity to Britain, of the time of its introduction, and of the section of Christendom from which it was brought we are entirely ignorant. The claim that one of the apostles — no less than six have been named — first preached the gospel in the island is supported by no sort of evidence. The story of King Lucius is without historic basis. The celebrated passage in Tertullian would seem to fix the date at the beginning of the third century, but its "rhetorical coloring" "forbids precise conclusions." With the opening of the fourth century we reach sure historical ground. In 304 the persecution of Diocletian was felt in Britain, to which later ages ascribe the martyrdom of St. Alban. At the Council of Arles, held in 314, three British bishops were present from York, London, and Lincoln. There is ample literary proof that "an organized church existed at the outset of the fourth century." By the end of the century Pelagius was actively engaged in sowing his heresies. "By 400 Christianity had made vast progress in Britain."

Archaeology throws light on early British Christianity in at least three respects: (1) The Christian monogram, Chi-Rho, has been found on mosaics, building stones, pavements, cups, rings, lamps, etc. To the fourth century certainly some and perhaps most of these objects must be referred. (2) Inscriptions on stone are less numerous, and can only plausibly be ascribed to the fourth century. Two tombstones belonging to this age have recently been dug up on which were found the phrase, plus minus, a Christian phrase "used of a man's length of life." (3) To monograms and inscriptions must be added the discov-
ery in 1892 at Silchester of "a small building which by its ground plan declared itself to be a fourth-century Christian church."

From these literary and archaeological remains it is fair to conclude that in the fourth century there was in Britain a "fully organized church," that it had at least three bishops, that "the seats of the bishoprics were in three of the largest towns," that Christians were in every part of the island—in the villages as well as the great centers of population. In the Roman army Christianity seems to have had few adherents—clear signs of its presence are wanting.

The latest researches controvert the view advocated by Mr. Hugh Williams and others, that "the church of fourth-century Britain was the church of the resident Roman population, not of the people of Britain." On the contrary it was an essentially British church, or rather a Romano-British church, whose existence and character would not be seriously affected by the presence or withdrawal of the Roman army and population.

Professor Haverfield's article is "an attempt to summarize what is now certain or probable respecting British Christianity during the first four centuries of our era." That part of the summary which presents the literary proofs and gives an estimate of their weight and value quite accords with the judgments expressed in recent works on English church history whose opening chapters treat of the introduction of the Christian religion into the island. The chief interest of the article lies, not in its literary proofs, but in the archaeological evidences adduced concerning fourth-century Christianity.

**NOTE**

**Dionysische Bedenken. Von Dr. Johannes Dräseke; Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1897, pp. 381–409.**

The date of the writings of Dionysius has been greatly discussed during the last decade, and much learning has been brought to bear on the subject. One of the latest writers is Jos. Stiglmayr who claims to have found four definite time-limits after which the composition of these writings must be placed, viz.: (1) the Council of Chalcedon (451); (2) the works of Proclus (412–485); (3) the introduction of the *credo* into the liturgy of the mass (476); and (4) the issue of the Henoticon under Emperor Zeno (482). He therefore designates as the date of their composition the period of the religious controversy at Constantinople, 533.

Cogent reasons for rejecting this view are given by Harnack, Langen, Hipler, and others. They all agree that these writings must have been composed in the latter part of the fourth century, but that
they underwent at a later time many alterations. In this view they are supported by Victor Ryssel, the well-known Syriac scholar and palaeographer, who states that early, perhaps in the fifth century, Dionysius’ writings were translated into Syriac, as is shown by the manuscript in the British Museum and also by the citations of Isaac of Nineveh, who lived in the fifth century, and certainly did not know the Greek language.

Against Stiglmayr’s assertion that the term ὀνόμασθαι in the meaning of person as opposed to nature—ὁθώνα—so frequently used by Dionysius—points to a time (440-482) long after the Synod of Alexandria, 362, when both words were still employed with the same meaning, reference is made to Apollinarius of Laodicea (especially to his Dialogues on the Holy Trinity) and to Gregory of Nyssa who as accurately distinguish between these two words as does Dionysius.

The dependence of Gregory on Dionysius is proof conclusive against the position of Stiglmayr: 1. In a discourse on the Feast of the Birth of our Lord, Gregory, alluding to the two cherubims on the ends of the mercy seat in the holy of holies, makes reference to another who has discoursed on this same theme. Dionysius is indisputably in Gregory’s mind, and not Athanasius, as Stiglmayr supposes. 2. In the conclusion of Gregory’s second great theological discourse Περὶ θεολογίας this dependence is also perceived. In a passage in which he speaks of the great inferiority to God of the celestial and supercelestial (ὑποπανίων) beings, notwithstanding their superiority to human kind, Elias of Crete not only refers to Dionysius but expressly calls our attention to the dependence of Gregory on Dionysius. 3. Gregory pictures in bold outlines only the world of angels who continually surround God; and who from this divine fountain of light become illuminated, as it were, thus themselves becoming fountains of light for others inferior to themselves; they are ministers of the divine will and by their natural and supernatural powers and the lightness of their substance are able to hasten over all places ready to serve. Thus they lead all to the One, the created to the Creator. This description shows the dependence of Gregory on the greater and larger work of Dionysius, as Elias of Crete intimates.

Finally may be mentioned an Alexandrian writer, Syonesius, who, when yet a heathen, wrote about 403 his Δίων, in which he alluded to certain mystical and theosophical expressions frequently and with preference used by Dionysius and common in the monastic circles in which he was a leader.
These arguments show that the composition of the writings of Dionysius must be assigned to the latter part of the fourth century.

The University of Chicago. Adolf Schmidt.


That the only-begotten Son of God was before his incarnation in and with God, and that in the incarnation and after it he became no other in essence, but that he revealed his divinity during the period of his humiliation, are positions which have been held and taught in Christendom from the earliest days. These positions constitute a connected teaching; they are of vital importance, being intimately associated with the views of Christians as to the person and work of Christ, and as to his permanent relation to the church. It is generally believed that this teaching is scriptural. Before proceeding to examine its scriptural foundation, however, it is proper to cast a glance at the views now taught on the subject by Ritschl and his numerous school. Ritschl says of the preexistence: "Christ exists for God eternally as one who for us is revealed in the limitations of time; but only for God: because for us Christ as preexistent is concealed;" and of the divinity of Christ: "This attribute cannot be considered complete unless the same activities through which Jesus reveals himself as man are considered in the same relation as peculiar predicates of God, and means of his revelation through Christ." This language is obscure, and, when cleared of its obscurity, unsatisfactory, because it evaporates the real and objective preexistence of Christ, and thereby makes of no effect his essential divinity. The Scriptures throughout are clear in indicating the reality and objective character both of the preexistence and of the divinity of our Saviour. In the synoptic gospels Jesus designates himself as the Son of Man, but names no other man by that term; thus making it clear that he recognizes himself as a member of the race of Adam, but, at the same time, puts a difference between himself and all other members of the race. He also calls himself the Son of God. He claims God as his father in a unique sense. The combination of these two self-designations and their appropriation by any other, in this sense, would be nothing short of madness. This relation is especially emphasized in Matt. 11:25, 27; Luke 10:21, 22. God only can know God perfectly. If the Son knows God the Son is God. In the trial of Jesus before Caiaphas he declared himself the
future judge of his judges as the Son of Man, which is meaningless unless the judge is divine. The same “I” is the Son of Man and the Son of God. The converse of this is found in the recognition from heaven of the unique sonship of Jesus (Matt. 3:17; Luke 9:35). So also in the words of the annunciation (Luke 1:32–35), and in the final commission to the disciples (Matt. 28:19, 20). Here Jesus assigns himself a place between the Father and the Holy Spirit, certifying a certain unity of essence in the three. All this is confirmed and corroborated by the miraculous works recorded of Jesus in the synoptic gospels. The Pauline teaching on this subject is not less pronounced. To Jesus Christ is attributed here also a certain character before his incarnation which logically involves his preexistence (1 Cor. 10:4; Col. 1:15–17; Phil. 2:5–12). The epistle to the Hebrews confirms this view (1:1 ff.). The emphasis here is on the fact that Christ is the heir; the beginning of this heirship is not spoken of, but the end of it is naturally the entrance of the heir upon the inheritance; in any case, heirship is recognition of rights which already exist. Christ possesses his rights in the incarnate state, because he possessed them in the pre-incarnate state. Further, God has created the world by him, and he is the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance. Only God can be said to uphold all things by the word of his power. If these apostolic expressions regarding the deity of Christ should be considered obscure, there are others clearer. Compare 1 Thess. 1:11, 12; Rom. 9:5; Titus 2:13; 2 Peter 1:1. But the ripest and clearest view of the apostolic teaching on the subject is to be found in the gospel of John. In 3:13 his being in heaven while on earth is an indication of divine nature. In 5:19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 30, the prerogatives described are received from the Father; but yet they express equality with the Father. In 6:28; 8:23, 42, 58, there are expressions teaching not only heavenly preexistence, but timeless eternal essence; and as the Father and Son are of the same essence, he can say (10:30) “I and the Father are one,” and (vs. 38) “the Father in me and I in the Father.” Compare also 14:10, 11. “I and the Father are one” can only mean essential unity, as the only unity that can exist between two persons is that of essence. This idea of essential unity with God was so inwrought in Jesus’ consciousness that he could and did say: “Who hath seen me hath seen the Father” (13:45; 14:9). Accordingly, in his intercessory prayer (17:15–24) he gives utterance to his consciousness of unity with the Father, and does not refuse or reject the ascription of divinity by Thomas. To
these utterances of Jesus, reported by John, must be added the words of John himself as to the Logos (1:1-5, 14). The Logos, whatsoever else may or may not be found in that term, is the eternal Son before and after the incarnation. This Logos was both distinct from, and one with, God.

It is true that the Old Testament does not know the only-begotten Son. Its rigid monotheism would not risk the possibility of misunderstanding by even suggesting separate personalities in the Godhead, but this monotheism is not revealed as an empty numerical unit. The Old Testament, though not teaching the Trinity, leaves the way open for it; and, finally, the divinity of Christ is a fact which must enter into the experience of the Christian in order to secure perfect freedom and fullness to his Christian activity (Matt. 28:18, 20).

It is impossible to reproduce the full force of an article like this in a condensation. The argument of the writer depends very largely on the impression made by his special exegesis. And no adequate idea can be given of the exegetical refinements of a serious and scientific thinker on such a subject except by reproducing them in detail. We can only say therefore that with few exceptions the deductions of the writer from the text of the New Testament seem to us valid. The exceptions would hardly alter the general conclusion he reaches.

McCormick Theological Seminary.

A. C. Zenos.

Das Verhältniss des evangelischen Glaubens zur Logoslehre.

Vortrag, gehalten in Eisenach am 5. October, 1896. Von Professor Dr. I. Kaftan, Berlin, 1897, 27 pp., 8vo, M. 1; Separatabdruck from Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, VII, 1-27.

This topic has been selected for discussion at the suggestion of Professor Harnack, because we regard it as a good thing to take heed of the inheritance of truth which has been preserved for us even when we cannot accept certain phases of a doctrine.

1) What permanent truth of Christianity is it for the expression and formulation of which the older theologians made use of the Logos idea? The position occupied by this doctrine in the writings of the early apologists, and in the historical development down to the times of Athanasius, shows that it was the intention to express thereby the absolute character of the Christian religion and the fact that the significance of the Christian religion depended on the incarnation of the divine Logos in the person of Jesus. The application of the Logos idea is new, but the fundamental idea is as old as Christianity itself, only with this difference, that in the primitive congregation this con-
sciousness was manifested in another form, namely, in the belief of the speedy return of the Lord unto judgment. But in both forms the fundamental idea remains the same, namely, that the spiritual content of Christianity, as a whole, is to be regarded as superior to the world, and that the embodiment of these contents, Jesus Christ, is to be associated (zusammenstellen) with that God who controls the world.

These motives the Christian church can never discard. Nor is it possible that there should be a separation of the two fundamental conceptions in this doctrine, i.e., the absolute character of Christianity cannot be maintained without the absolute character of the person of Jesus.

2) And why must we, nevertheless, reject the traditional Logos doctrine? At all events, it is impossible to return to the older formulas by which the fundamental ideas of this dogma were expressed, namely, the expectation of the speedy return of the Lord. For, in the first place, it is a settled fact that the Lord has not returned; and, secondly, the Logos idea is in so far a higher expression of this idea, as it bases the absolute significance of Christ not on a divine function which he performed, but on his person. But how is it with the Logos doctrine? It cannot be expected by anyone that we should revive the old philosophical dogma of the Logos, for this is based on an unnatural idea of transcendency, and includes in itself the danger of pantheism. Neither of these elements, however, has in the Logos doctrine of the church been taken over from the Logos idea. And yet we cannot accept even this, nor can we rest contented with the thought that we are here dealing with a mystery which we should respect as such without bringing it in any connection with actual piety. For this in itself militates against evangelical faith. We know only mysteries in the sphere of conceptional thought of a kind which are open to faith and profitable for personal piety. But it causes us to hesitate when it is remembered that the Logos doctrine, even in the shape in which it has been accommodated to the needs of Christianity, misleads and corrupts Christian faith. But it leads to a false conception of the biblical picture of Jesus. And then, too, it is based on another conception of the idea of what the highest good is than the idea of Christianity on this subject, namely, the Catholic idea of the highest good, the characteristic feature of which is the subordination of the ethical to the logical thought. The Logos doctrine seeks the purpose, the object and aim of the Spirit, and indeed of God himself, in knowledge. Genuine Christianity, however, seeks this in the domain of moral activity. In direct and immediate connection with this we find
another thing, that in this doctrine the divine life and the participation in it is represented as something physical of a higher order. But this conception of what the highest good is was thoroughly rectified by the Reformation. This movement again grasped the unity of religion and morality as found in the gospel, and has carried out this thought in every department except that of doctrine. This is the reason why we have not at all, yet, become sufficiently conscious of the fact that the doctrinal questions of Christianity must also be apprehended from a religious point of view, and that we overlook the fact that the ultimate questions of knowledge are of a different nature from that which we ordinarily call science.

3) And how shall we in evangelical dogmatics do justice to the unchangeable motives of the Logos doctrine? Here we can give only hints and suggestions. The Logos idea was at one time the uniform conception of the philosophy of being (Weltanschauung) in the non-Christian world. The apologetic writers of primitive Christianity in unifying this idea with Christianity could also in a philosophical manner place Christ at the center of their idea of things. The same thing must be done now again. Now, unfortunately, we do not possess such a uniform conception of things with which we could unite this idea. We can accordingly only proceed from that which has shown itself for us in our Christian faith to be the real sphere of divine activity. This is the ethico-historical sphere. In the place of cosmological speculation a new way of looking at affairs steps in, and that, too, one that confines men to the historical, and the controlling idea is found in that of personality. Accordingly, we do not say that the divine Logos became man in Jesus Christ; but we say that the personal God has assumed historical form in the man Jesus. This, it is true, is no explanation of his being, but rather a fixing of the fact upon which our faith rests. And there remains also untouched the unique character of Jesus, which is not lost in our conceptions.

With this expression full justice is done to the motives of the Logos idea. For in this way Christ is absolutely placed at the center of history, and in it everything is made to refer to him. But is it possible, as has been done in the case of history, to subordinate also nature to the religion, the spiritual contents of which have been transmitted to us through Christ? However, in the first place, this limitation of speculation to the domain of history is not destructive in its character, but is, rather, a bulwark against all kinds of pantheistic speculations; and, in the second place, the specific subordination of nature
to the spirit has been accepted everywhere. And it is preeminently the natural sciences of our day that have proved themselves to be the real ground of history and are the immense territory in which to discover the means of the life of the personal spirit. But if we attempt to formulate the relation of nature to spiritual life, we can have recourse to no other way than that of nature in history; i.e., to accept a grand scheme of development, the end of which is humanity, the absolute center of which, again, is Christ.

Finally, the question, Is the modern theory of development a precursor of a new and uniform philosophy of existence? Will this idea prove to be the unity in which evangelical faith and evangelical order of life will become purified into a higher state or order of things in our thought and tendencies of civilization, and all this based on God?

And one confession we must make which attains to unity and continuity of Christian faith through all the changes of the thought of centuries. Whether we engage in metaphysics or metaphistorics, that faith remains, that we in our religion lay hold of God himself, and the foundation of this faith remains the same, namely, that it is established on Jesus Christ our Lord!

This is probably the most noteworthy dogmatical article that has appeared in Germany for many months. Its significance is rather representative than individual. It was originally delivered as an address at the convention of liberal theologians held in October at Eisenach, and can practically be regarded as the position of advanced theological thought on this fundamental problem.

COLUMBUS, O.


i. The caveat of Scripture.—Had the relation of Romans to the canon of the New Testament, and that of Job to the canon of the Old Testament, been rightly apprehended, a deal of trouble would have been saved the world.

The philosophical section of Romans, chaps. i-11, contains the assumption, that "the invisible things of God since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made." In other words, God is self-manifesting. The order of the world shows him forth. But the Jew and Gentile alike failed to apprehend God as he is. God's effort through the Jewish cult to recover the world had for its specific aim the development of an attitude of
faith. The worship of the Divine Spirit is manifested both in the psychology of individual experience and in the cosmical movements. Jesus, as the concrete evidence of faith in its clearest light, is the soul's deliverance. This is God's world. He is manifesting himself through it, and men are without excuse for not recognizing him. But some races have had a decided advantage over others in the divine pedagogy. However, there is no injustice in this. Paul concludes, more practically than logically, that all have been shut up unto disobedience in order that God may have mercy upon all. The conclusion is reached by 'insight, figure, and imagination. The problem of seeming injustice which puzzles the mind of the apostle is solved by the prophetic faculty of his heart. This faculty must be exercised in determining any doctrine of God or of man.

The Book of Job sustains to the Old Testament a significant relation. It reaches a conclusion somewhat analogous to that observed in Romans. When examined from the broad standpoint of motive the Book of Job is an attempt to make clear that man has not said the right thing concerning God. The pith of the whole document is summed up in a sentence: "And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right." In fact, the right thing concerning God cannot be spoken without profoundest insight and a conscientious regard for all the facts. As much as to say, that the modest, teachable, expectant, undogmatic attitude should characterize the student of religion.

These two documents with their refusal to remain in the simple outlines of truth, and their leaping forward into the untried ranges of thought by expectant faith, ought long ago to have sounded an alarm which should have prevented the narrowness of theology in the past.

2. The warning from science.—God's self-revelation in nature is primary. No additional revelation can contravene it. The concrete is the most intrinsic kind of revelation. For this reason theology must consult science. The history of astronomy, geology, and the doctrine of evolution is a warning, parallel to the caveat of Scripture, against trusting in dogmatic assertions. Science joins with Romans and Job in pleading for patience, perseverance, and expectancy in the search for a better and better knowledge of God.

3. The practical necessity.—It is capable of substantial proof that the traits of our time, its mental attitude, the unsatisfactory condition
of certain primary questions in theology, demand a radical, though tentative, reconstruction of theological science.

4. Fundamental requirements.—Great progress has been made within the present century in the direction of a broader, simpler, profounder, theology. While the Germans have contributed much to this end, their efforts have lacked the practical directive which has been given in the more constructive works of English-speaking writers. The progressive movement has been Christocentric, in which fact lies its promise and glory. The time has come to accelerate the work. In this anticipation there are certain great foundations which cannot be shaken. (1) The yearning of the heart after God. (2) Christ. Theories of his person will change. Indeed to emancipate Jesus from the hypotheses within which we have tried to place him is the need of modern theology. (3) Experience. This is the counterpart of the religious impulse. (4) Scripture. It is a slow deposit of the ages found in tradition, on monuments and cylinders, and in the sacred books of eastern peoples. Every Scripture in breathed of God is inspired. Every Scripture is not equally valuable. The literature of the Jews most nearly approaches the oracular. All Scripture, however, must be used in furnishing a scientific basis for theology.

The first requirement of a reconstructed theology is a scientific basis. In place of the present threefold basis,—fact, authority, and faith,—theology should have but one basis, fact. Whatever legitimately belongs to the other two is really only fact. Faith is an eye of the mind and soul, but the content of things perceived thereby must always be open to revision in conformity to the results of ampler and acuter vision. We must apply the inductive method. This requires a larger definition of Scripture. The inbreathing of God in man is not partial, but universal. Man’s capacity to receive has determined the degree in which God has spoken to him. Scripture is endeavoring to impart a kindling of the soul. It is not a bulletin or an objective content of knowledge. We must apprehend Scripture in its true function. God is to all men a Speaking Presence, leading them to duty, aspiration, and a greater hunger to know and live the truth.

5. The line of direction.—A new day shall dawn for religion, when theology shall recognize the true function and scope of Scripture, and shall submit itself, without reservation, to the inductive process. In doing so there will be a setting aside of our a priori rubric of theological instruction, and an inductive, experimental study of the religious faculty. A theology thus grounded will pass out upon the broad
tablelands of theological knowledge, namely, the indwelling of God's Spirit, the processes of the upbuilding of spiritual life, a right Christed ethics, God's manifestations of himself everywhere.

6. Discoveries and effects.— The reconstructed theology will be most studious and teachable. What man is, and how shall he be saved, will engage its consecrated and concentrated powers. The whole subject of the reciprocal interaction of the seen and unseen worlds will be patiently studied. Research and discovery will be made in the sphere of motive.

This will have a real and a much-to-be-desired effect in theology. Many graven images, which have been wrought out with the holiest intent in the sphere of dogmatics, will be ground to powder. There will be also a sifting of men. Many who are now foremost in dogmatic assertion will drop out of the theological ranks. The places thus made vacant will be filled by men full of earnest endeavor, who are willing to devote their lives to the study and progress of a theology founded upon fact. This theology will change the world.

Dr. Beach, at the expense of much space and labor, has endeavored to expound Romans and Job as notes of warning against narrowness in theology. His conclusions are more ingenious and helpful to his main thesis than true to fact. Paul may have, indeed did discover much of the truth of God by the means of patient "insight," but Romans was not written to illustrate the fact; nor can it be so easily maintained that the "moral" of Job is in its protest against man's dogmatic assertions concerning God.

The main portion of this article is in full sympathy with the present demand for a simple dogmatic. There is not much new material here, but a great deal of creditable feeling. In his avowed effort to emphasize the "factual" in theology, the writer does excellent service to theological science. The chief merit of the article, in our opinion, is not so much in its argument as in its illustration of some strong present tendencies. The writer's view of the scope and function of Scripture, although shocking to the bibliolater, in fact detracts nothing from the value of the Bible. The distinction made between Christ and theories of his person is pregnant with helpful suggestion.

PONTIAC, ILL.

ELIPHALET A. READ.


The synod of India in November 1894 discussed this question: Whether, in the case of a Mohammedan or Hindu with more than one wife applying for baptism, he should in all cases, as a condition of baptism, be required to put away all his wives but one. By a vote of 36 to 10 the synod requested the general assembly to leave the ulti-
mate decision of all such cases in India to the synod of India; adding that "it is the almost unanimous opinion of the members of the synod that under some circumstances converts who have more than one wife, together with their entire families, should be baptized." Of thirty-six missionary ladies present all but three agreed with the majority of the synod. The Panjab Missionary Conference, the Madura Mission, and many able and devoted missionaries and uncompromising Christian statesmen of India are cited as supporting this conclusion. It is the object of this paper to set forth the considerations upon which it is defended.

The question at issue is not whether it is ever lawful for a professing Christian to contract a polygamous marriage, but whether in the case of an applicant for baptism in a non-Christian country who, previous to conversion and in good conscience, has contracted polygamous relations, the law of Christ requires him to put away all his wives but one; and whether his refusal to do so would be inconsistent with a credible profession of faith and therefore necessarily a bar to his baptism.

When the validity of the polygamous marriage is considered the obligation to put away all his wives but one is not so luminously clear that no sincere Christian can doubt it. It is maintained by the Christian jurists of British India that a polygamous marriage is not nullified by conversion. The husband is bound not only to continue to maintain his wives, but to admit to conjugal rights all who wish to live with him. It does not appear that a Hindu who refuses to defy the law by denying the validity of his marriages may not be a Christian and as such entitled to baptism.

The New Testament principle of the temporary toleration of an admitted evil in the final interests of the highest righteousness is urged, as clearly applicable to polygamy as to slavery. Duty in this case is extremely uncertain. Which of his wives shall the polygamist keep? The ruling of the general assembly, choosing the first, is not a self-evident answer. For the first marriage was probably contracted in infancy or childhood. If it alone is valid to the convert, the church may seem to give moral support to an atrocious system. Further, since the second marriage among the Hindus has commonly been contracted because of the childlessness of the first, the ruling of the assembly would involve in most instances the cruel injustice of putting away a mother and thereby bringing her under the suspicion of unchastity. Even when suitable provision for the support of the discarded wife is made, there is still a serious breach of contract in the refusal of the cohabitation to which she is legally entitled. And how
can a father bring up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord the children whom he has turned out of his house? In answer to the claim that a converted polygamist may be recognized as a Christian but not admitted to the church where his presence would occasion offense, it is held that if he is a Christian he cannot justly be denied baptism and church membership. Thus the lesser wrong must for a time be tolerated to avoid greater wrong.

A scriptural argument for the baptism of polygamous Christians is found in 1 Tim. 3:2, which is interpreted: A bishop must not be a man who is living with more than one wife. From the emphasis put upon this qualification for the bishopric is inferred the possible presence in the churches under Timothy's charge of men who were not in the sense intended husbands each of one wife.

Objections to the position of the paper are considered, as that the testimony of the church against polygamy will be neutralized, and that there is danger, if this practice be permitted, of the growth in India of communities of polygamous Christians. Appeal is made finally to the one scriptural condition of church membership, as set forth in the Presbyterian standards, viz., a credible profession of faith and loyalty to Jesus Christ. To this simple and plain condition not one iota must be added from any consideration of supposed prudence and care for the purity of the church.

The surprising approach to unanimity among Christian residents in India, missionaries and laymen, in the positions of this paper is very significant in contrast with the equally unanimous contrary opinion at home. The argument from the legal validity of polygamous marriages in India is strongly put. Churches accustomed to legislate against the use of intoxicating liquors or indulgence in certain amusements by the imposition of pledges as a condition of membership will hardly admit the force of the appeal to the single scriptural condition upon which the argument in the main rests. The scriptural argument from 1 Tim. 3:2 based upon a disputed interpretation of a single text is a precarious one.

Chicago, Ill.

A. K. Parker.


The religious man is one who calls the religious elements of his nature into activity. We are born with a religious nature; we are

1 See the Missionary Review of the World for February 1897, p. 109, where five missionaries of Japan and ten of China give cogent reasons against receiving polygamists into the churches.

G. A.
responsible for its proper exercise; and its proper exercise brings us into conformity with duty. He who makes it his habitual aim to do his duty is accepted by God, even if he knows nothing of God, and when he dies will be received into heaven. It is not affirmed that any ever turn to duty without some conscious reference to God; but the possibility of doing so is maintained. When one turns to duty, he finds himself so weak and so greatly in need of aid to keep his high purpose that he instinctively calls on God in prayer. But the essence of conversion is the turning to duty, and if the man subsequently turns to God, this does not constitute a new moral attitude. He who is truly striving to perform his duty is truly religious. Thus the religious life is strictly natural. The drift of the human soul is not toward sin. If a man is unworthy, he is so not because Adam fell, but because he is untrue to his own higher self. The claims of the religious life grow out of its nature; he who does not lead it fails in duty, is recreant to himself, and becomes subject to his own contempt.

This article states an interesting half-truth and pushes it to an extreme which neither the Bible nor Christian experience justifies.

It presents a low view of sin in its statement that it is not natural to sin. It suggests a definition of sin which will not bear inspection. For a man to sin, it tells us, is "to count himself a brute and to live by mere animal instinct and impulse." But sin exists in full control in men who no longer feel the power of animal instincts and impulses. The aged, who have lost all appetite and passion and ambition, are often completely alienated from God, self-centered, self-willed, and contented with their condition. Those who explain the existence of sin in the human heart by referring it to mere animal passions as yet unsubdued should account for its continued reign after these passions have decayed and disappeared. They should account, still further, for the fact that a much larger percentage of young persons, in whom these passions are strong, begin the religious life than of the aged, in whom they are no longer found.

Presenting a shallow view of sin, the article is consistent in presenting also an inadequate view of regeneration. Or rather, it entirely omits regeneration as an act of the Holy Spirit. The change from the unreligious life to the religious is chiefly the act of man himself. Repentance is repentance toward duty, and not toward God, except as God happens to stand in the same direction with duty. But little place, if any, is found for Christ as a savior from sin. The obligation to turn from sin to duty is an obligation which man owes to himself, and is associated but slightly with the fact that God is his Creator, Benefactor, and Redeemer.

This gospel, which exalts the natural and sees but little of the supernatural, can never win men in general to a life of duty. Men are converted when they are brought into contact with God in Christ, when they recognize the awful character of sin as a revolt against infinite love and holiness, and when they seek power to conquer it from the Being whom it has offended. They have already a sufficient confidence in the natural, and it is of the supernatural that they need to think.

**The University of Chicago.**

**Franklin Johnson.**
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