

Theology on the *Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

VOL. XII.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

pour me donner des résultats sur l'existence de Madame — ? Si parfois elle était toujours veuve, je voudrais lui faire la proposition de lui demander sa main d'après que j'en aurais des nouvelles. En attendant, Monsieur, votre réponse,—J'ai l'honneur d'être, &c.

Mr. Lewins's description of the scene at the General Post Office in London, as six o'clock in the evening draws near, is graphic and well known :

Now it is, that small boys of eleven and twelve years of age, panting Sinbad-like under the weight of large bundles of newspapers, manage to dart about and make rapid sorties into the other ranks of boys, utterly disregarding the cries of the official policemen, who vainly endeavour to reduce the tumult into something like 'post-office order. If the lads cannot quietly and easily disembody, they will whizz their missiles of intelligence over other people's heads, now and then sweeping off hats and caps with the force of shot. The gathering every moment increases in number ; arms, legs, sacks, baskets, heads, bundles, and woollen comforters—for who ever saw a newspaper boy without that appendage ?—seem to be getting into a state of confusion and disagreeable communism, and yet "the cry is still, they come."—"Her Majesty's Mails," by W. Lewins (1864).

But the stirring scenes which used to attend the closing of the letter-box at St. Martin's-le-Grand (when the great hall led right through the building) no longer exist, at least as things worthy of note. The pillar-boxes and branch offices, in all large towns, lessen the pressure at the chief office.

Mr. Hyde's chapters on Stage and Mail Coaches, Postboys, the travelling Post Office, and those relating to the Savings' Bank and Telegraphic Departments, are interesting and instructive. The volume is well got up, and has several illustrations.

Reviews.

- A *Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament : being an Expansion of Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin.* By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity. London : John Murray. 1885.

THIS is an excellent work ; and we may hope that before long the Committee of Bishops will place it among the subjects of examination for candidates for Holy Orders. As regards intellectual training for the ministry, there are not many English books which give the information supplied by Dr. Salmon in anything like the same clear and well-balanced way. One feels as one reads that one is in the hands of a writer who is master of his subject, and who treats it with a reverent freedom and fairness.

The book is well-timed in its appearance at this season. The lectures were delivered some years ago, and the steady "expansion" of them under the pressure of modern controversy has more than doubled them

in bulk, and probably in value. In spite of some evidence to the contrary, there are good reasons for believing that the wild school of criticism, which once had its headquarters at Tübingen, and which with numerous modifications has thence spread all over Europe, is steadily on the wane; not merely as regards its first crude theories, but also as regards those more specious elaborations which would reach the same goal by less violent means. The desired goal is the disproof of the supernatural: and the means adopted is to throw discredit on the chief evidence for the supernatural. If the life of Jesus Christ lies in the first forty years of the first century, and if our earliest documentary evidence for its supernatural character can be shown to be of a date so long after the events as to be unworthy of credit, then a belief in its supernatural character becomes scarcely tenable. Hence every device has been employed in order to throw the dates of the several books in the Bible as late as possible. And if any fair-minded man wishes to know with what success these devices of criticism have been used, he can scarcely do better than read the summing up in each case of Dr. Salmon. The positiveness of assertion with which destructive critics are wont to supplement their arguments is beginning to break down under the accumulated resistance of old and new facts. And now that the tide seems to be turning, a book of this kind, solid in matter, genial in style, and fair in tone, may be of immense service in helping young students (and old ones too for that matter) to weigh for themselves the chief items of evidence as to the credibility of the books of the New Testament. A reproduction of the contents of this volume in popular style from the pulpit would probably do much good in educated congregations. It is impossible to estimate the number of persons who listen (when they do listen) to sermons with the latent conviction that scarcely a book in the New Testament was written by the person whose name it bears, and that consequently there is little or no contemporary evidence of the main facts of the life of Christ, and not very much of the lives of His Apostles. But whether or no such things can be adequately handled in the pulpit, no one can doubt that it is imperative that every clergyman should be furnished with a solid answer to such questions, whenever they may be put before him in private conversation.

After very valuable criticisms of the theories of Strauss, Renan, Baur, and others in his first four lectures, Dr. Salmon goes on in his fifth lecture to discuss the Muratorian Fragment, respecting which we have already had an elaborate dissertation from his pen in the "Dictionary of Christian Biography," edited by Smith and Wace. As is well known, Dr. Salmon dates this invaluable fragment about forty years later than most other scholars (about 210 A.D. instead of about 170 A.D.), and conjectures Caius to be the author of it: and he argues, not unsuccessfully, to show that *nuperrime temporibus nostris* is not absolutely fatal to this view. But most people will probably continue to think that this expression is an unlikely one to use of what took place some sixty years before. We should not now, under any but the most exceptional circumstances, be led to speak of the Battle of Waterloo as having taken place "very recently in our own time." But what is of more importance for our present purpose than the date of the Muratorian Canon is the evidence which this fifth lecture gives us of Professor Salmon's independence and fairness of judgment. He does not hold a brief for orthodoxy. He examines each question on its own merits, and endeavours to arrive at a just conclusion, without being prejudiced by the effect which that conclusion will have on the case for the authenticity of certain books. If the Muratorian Canon is forty years later in date than has commonly been supposed, then one very important witness as to the authority of

most books in the New Testament is appreciably diminished in value. With this conspicuous instance of Dr. Salmon's freedom from bias before us, we go on with increased confidence to examine his conclusions on other matters.

In the sixth and subsequent lectures he has some exceedingly valuable remarks upon the very plausible theories, generally destructive in their tendency, of which Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, Master of the City of London School, is one of the chief exponents. They will be found in his article on the Gospels in the new edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, in the *Modern Review*, 1882, pp. 559, 716, and in the (in some ways) useful little book "The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels."

It used to be the fashion among those who questioned the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel to deny that it was known to Justin Martyr. After the admissions of Renan, and the demonstrations of Dr. Ezra Abbot (whose early death is one of the most serious losses to Christian scholarship in the present generation), this is no longer possible. Consequently, the ground has to be shifted. It is admitted that Justin knew the Fourth Gospel, but it is urged that if he had valued it he would have used it very much more. Hence it becomes a matter of serious importance to reduce the coincidences between Justin and this Gospel to a minimum. This is the line adopted by Dr. Edwin Abbott: "He does not deny that Justin may have been acquainted with St. John's Gospel," says the Professor, "but he denies that he valued it, or indeed that he ever used it. A number of coincidences are explained away one after another. . . . It seems to me that, however difficult it might have been to resist the cumulative force of so many coincidences, Dr. Abbott would have done better for his theory if he had avoided making the fatal concession that Justin might have known the Fourth Gospel. For then we have a *vera causa* which at once accounts for the coincidences with it, and it becomes unscientific in the last degree to invent imaginary disciples of Philo or unrecorded traditions in order to explain what can be perfectly well explained without any such hypothesis. If any author of the present day presented as many coincidences with a previous writer, he would be laughed to scorn by his reviewers if, while he had to own that he had seen the previous book, he denied that he valued it or had used it. . . . It seems to me clear that, if Justin knew the Fourth Gospel, he used it, and that copiously; if he used it, he valued it, for his whole theological system is founded on it."

When pressed to explain how this Gospel, despised by Justin (according to Dr. Abbott's view), came so soon afterwards to be everywhere accepted, Dr. Abbott replies: "Because it truthfully protested against the thaumaturgic tendencies of the Church, by exhibiting Jesus principally as a worker of spiritual, and not material, marvels." On this Dr. Salmon quietly remarks: "This seems undeserved praise to give to the narrator of the healing of the man born blind, and of the raising of Lazarus; nor does it seem a satisfactory explanation to say that a 'heretical' [*i.e.*, admired by the Valentinians, and therefore, according to Dr. Abbott, disliked by Justin] 'book won the favour of the Church by reason of its protest against the tendencies of the Church.'"

Passing on to the question of the antiquity of the Synoptic Gospels, Dr. Salmon well remarks that an urgent necessity for written Gospels must have arisen just at the time when tradition tells us that the first three Evangelists wrote. The Apostles ordained Elders in every city, and these new Elders had to teach the facts of the Gospel history. How were they to obtain and preserve the knowledge when the Apostles moved on to other places? How was the knowledge to be securely transmitted to successors? A written statement was the obvious device, and, in a com-

munity in which many could write, a device almost certain to be adopted. "If Matthew, Mark, and Luke wrote their Gospels at the time tradition says they did, they only met a demand which must have been then pressing, and which, if they had not then satisfied it, somebody else must have attempted to supply" (p. 150). And again, with regard to the jealousy with which the Gospel narrative, once written, was preserved from change, Dr. Salmon says: "I cannot believe that those who were in possession of narratives, supposed to have been written by men of such rank in the Church as Matthew, Mark, and Luke, could allow them to be altered by inferior authority. Little do those who suppose such an alteration possible know of the conservatism of Christian hearers. . . . The feeling that resents such change is due to no later growth of Christian opinion. Try the experiment on any child of your acquaintance. Tell him a story that interests him; and when you meet him again, tell him the story again, making variations in your recital, and see whether he will not detect the change and be indignant at it" (p. 152). The present writer had chanced to make this very experiment before reading Dr. Salmon's book, and with precisely the result predicted. The child noticed the change at once, and resented it. Its rooted conviction was, "The old is good"—too good to be altered without loss.

In discussing theories as to the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, Dr. Salmon shows how unworkable is the hypothesis that any two or one of them borrowed wholesale from the other one or two. He contends for a common Greek original, probably in a documentary form, which was used by all three of the Synoptists as one of their main sources of information. But he has nothing favourable to say of Dr. Abbott's attempt to recover this common Greek original by the mechanical process of striking out all that is not common to all three Evangelists. How illogical to suppose that all three Evangelists use the whole of this common material; that it may not frequently happen that two use it and the other not; that it may not sometimes happen that one uses it and the other two not. The reader who is acquainted with Dr. Edwin Abbott's writings will appreciate the gentle irony of the following passage:

"It is certainly worth considering, if we could find the 'original Gospel,' what would be its value as compared with those which we have. Suppose, for instance, we could recover one of those earlier Gospels which Luke mentions in his preface, that would certainly be entitled to be called an 'original Gospel.' It was probably defective rather than erroneous; and we may certainly believe that all that was not erroneous has been embodied by St. Luke in his work, so that by a simple process of erasure, if we only knew how to perform it, we might recover all that was valuable in the 'original Gospel.' But would that be an improvement on St. Luke? The Primitive Church did not think so, which allowed the earlier work to drop into oblivion. But could it now be restored, the whirligig of time would bring in its revenges. In the eyes of modern critics every one of its omissions would be a merit. 'It only relates six miracles!' 'What a prize!' 'It does not tell the story of the Resurrection!' 'Why, it is a perfect treasure!'" (p. 180).

The source of that earlier Gospel, of which all three Synoptists have made so much use, Dr. Salmon conjectures to be St. Peter. After a very interesting discussion of the much-debated question as to the original language in which St. Matthew's Gospel was written, Dr. Salmon is "disposed to pronounce in favour of the Greek original." The way in which he shows how the imposing amount of testimony as to the existence of a Hebrew original might have arisen without there being any Hebrew original, is masterly. Specially valuable is the careful sifting of

the, at first sight, irresistible evidence of Jerome, who believed that he had himself not only seen, but translated, the Hebrew original of St. Matthew. When properly cross-questioned, Jerome turns out to be a witness for the other side.

Lectures XII. to XVII. are devoted to the Johannine Books. The results at which Professor Salmon arrives after patient inquiry are these : that the five books commonly attributed to the Apostle St. John, the Revelation, the Gospel, and three Epistles, were written by him ; that the difference in style is not fatal to common authorship if we suppose the Apocalypse to have been written considerably before the other four, and is more than outweighed by the coincidences, especially in doctrine, between the Apocalypse on the one hand and the Gospel and First Epistle on the other ; that the very existence of any such person as John the Elder is highly problematical ; that the Second Epistle is addressed to a Church, and not to an individual, and is probably the very letter referred to in the Third Epistle (v. 9), "I wrote somewhat to the Church."

In discussing the Apocalypse, without setting up any counter theory of his own, he shows good reasons for distrusting some of those which are very popular just at present, and which have found a vigorous advocate in Archdeacon Farrar. One of the strangest passages in the latter writer's works is in vol. ii., p. 295, of "The Early Days of Christianity," in which he prints the number of the beast, not in capitals, as St. John's readers would see it, but in small letters, and then comments as follows : "The very look of it was awful. The first letter was the initial letter of the name of Christ. The last letter was the first double-letter (st) of the Cross (*stauros*). Between the two the Serpent stood confessed with its writhing sign and hissing sound." To this Dr. Salmon evidently alludes in a foot-note : "Young computers must be warned against an error into which some have fallen, viz., that of confounding the *Episemon*, which denotes six in the Greek arithmetical notation, either with the final sigma, or with the comparatively modern abbreviation for σ which printers now use for the *Episemon*, thereby so misleading simple readers, that I have found in a scientific article the information that the name of this numerical sign is *Stau* ! It need hardly be said that no light is cast on the number 666 by observing how it looks in modern cursive characters" (pp. 300, 301).

The Professor remarks that with a little ingenuity and laxity of spelling almost any name can be twisted in either Greek, Latin, or Hebrew, so as to make 666, and that, therefore, to find a name that fits the number is not much towards solving the riddle. As an amusing illustration he points out that "Neither Farrar's nor Renan's explanation of this [the false prophet allowing no man to buy or sell who has not his mark] is so natural as that we have here a plain prediction of 'boycotting'; and sure enough *παρρηίλλος* makes 666."

The pleasure of writing about this most instructive volume has already made this notice of considerable length. Only one topic more can be mentioned—the discussion of 2 Peter in Lecture XXV. Dr. Salmon sums up one-half of the argument thus :

"On a review of the whole external evidence we find clear proof that 2 Peter was in use early in the third century. With regard to second-century testimony, the maintainers and the opponents of the genuineness of the Epistle make it a drawn battle. There is no case of quotation so certain as to constrain the acknowledgment of an opponent ; but there are probable instances of the use of the Epistle in sufficient number to invalidate any argument against the Epistle drawn from the silence of early writers" (pp. 617, 618).

As regards the internal evidence he believes that the writer of 2 Peter used the Epistle of Jude, and not *vice versa*, and that this in no way excludes the possibility of Apostolic authorship; for in his First Epistle St. Peter certainly uses the Epistle to the Romans. Following the *Speaker's Commentary* (p. 228), he points out that the resemblances between 1 and 2 Peter must be set against the differences, and that some of the latter are such as might occur in any two letters written on different occasions by the same person.

Dr. Salmon then proceeds to deal with Dr. Edwin Abbott's attack on 2 Peter in the *Expositor* of 1882, based upon (1) alleged ignoble language, (2) alleged ignoble thoughts, (3) alleged borrowing from the *Antiquities* of Josephus, a work not published until A.D. 93, when St. Peter had been dead many years. Dr. Abbott contends that the Greek of 2 Peter resembles the "Baboo" English of an Indian newspaper; the author aiming at fine language, but making himself ridiculous by constant misuse of words and constructions. Dr. Abbott gives some specimens of Baboo English, and then translates some portions of 2 Peter with the bald literalness of a third-form schoolboy, claiming thereby to have proved that 2 Peter is written in pretentious, incorrect Greek. Not only any book of the New Testament, but the *De Corona* itself, might be proved by such a method as this to be written in Baboo Greek: "One may readily acknowledge," says the Professor, "that 2 Peter offends at times against the proprieties of Greek speech, without being convinced that his style is fairly represented in the English of Dr. Abbott's translations. Now, in respect of Greek, we are all more or less Baboos—I suspect that there are few of our prize copies of Greek prose or verse to which a Greek of the age of Pericles would apply a more gentle epithet—so that if 2 Peter be written in Baboo Greek, it is odd that it should have been left for a Baboo to find it out. Of the Greek Fathers—whether those who accepted the Epistle like Athanasius, or those who rejected it like Eusebius—none seems to have made the remark that its Greek is absolutely grotesque" (p. 631).

And this last point refutes the charge of ignobility of thought also. On this question men like Athanasius, and Jerome, and the Fathers at the Council of Laodicea, were at least as good judges as Dr. Abbott. The A.V., and even the R.V., may be better English than the original of 2 Peter is Greek. But that does not affect the *thought* of the Epistle. Each of us can here judge for himself whether the teaching of 2 Peter is twaddle.

Dr. Salmon puts his finger on the source of these wrong-headed criticisms. "Dr. Abbott's whole tone is amusingly like that of one correcting a 'schoolboy's exercise.' That is just it. With Liddell and Scott by his side, he scores a red mark wherever 2 Peter has a word not found in that indispensable volume, or a usage not sanctioned by passages there cited. Yet Wharton's *Etyma Græca* contains a collection of 5,000 words not given by Liddell and Scott; and it would be rash to suppose that any Greek Dictionaries exhaust the Greek language. And the attempted proof of ignobility of thought reminds one of Arry putting a moustache and tall hat to a bust of Venus and then remarking that that isn't his style of beauty.

The much more serious attack remains. Did the writer of 2 Peter borrow from Josephus? And here Archdeacon Farrar seems to Dr. Salmon, and to a good many other scholars, to have made very hasty and uncritical concessions. He declared in the *Expositor* his conviction that Dr. Abbott had proved "beyond all shadow of doubt that Josephus and the writer of the Epistle could not have written independently of each other;" and said that "it would be impossible for him to feel

respect for the judgment of any critic who asserted that the resemblances between the two writers were purely fortuitous," and that outside theology "no critic could set aside the facts adduced without being charged with a total absence of the critical faculty."

Dr. Abbott thought to strengthen his case by showing that 2 Peter borrows not only from Josephus, but from Philo. Dr. Salmon makes him a present of a good many more instances of coincidences between 2 Peter and Philo, and shows that the sum-total of them does not prove borrowing.

"But I have no interest now in contesting that point; for I am surprised that Dr. Abbott had not acuteness to see that, in endeavouring to establish 2 Peter's obligations to Philo, he was doing his best to demolish his own case. Josephus admired Philo, and notoriously copied him (*Dict. Chr. Biog.*, iii. 452). The preface to the *Antiquities* of Josephus, which Dr. Abbott supposes to have served as a model to 2 Peter, is itself derived from the opening of *De Opif. Mund.* of Philo (p. 646).

"We are now in a position to deal with Dr. Abbott's list of coincidences. We first strike out coincidences in commonplace words; for the whole force of the argument from coincidences depends upon the rarity of the words employed. . . . [We next strike out] alleged coincidences in which there is no resemblance. . . . When Dr. Abbott's lists have been thus weeded of futilities, and I come to inquire what Archdeacon Farrar refers to as 'startling and unusual words,' or, as he calls them *hapax legomena*, found in two authors, I can think but of two cases—that 2 Peter uses ἀπερὶ concerning the excellence of God; and that he speaks of the divine 'nature' *θεία φύσις*" (pp. 647-649). And upon examination it turns out that the first of these two comes, if borrowed at all, from either 1 Peter ii. 9, or from Philo, and the second also from Philo. "Thus," continues Dr. Salmon, "Dr. Abbott has completely failed to establish his theory: but I must add it is a theory which it was never rational to try to establish. . . . I must, therefore, estimate Dr. Abbott's speculation at the same value as the ingenious proofs that have been given that the plays of Shakespeare were written by Lord Bacon, or the Epistles of Clement of Rome by Henry Stephens."

In a foot-note it is pointed out how admirably Mr. Cotterill's *Proteus Peregrinus* illustrates the fallacious character of Dr. Abbott's argument. Mr. Cotterill has collected coincidences quite as close and far more numerous in his attempt to show that Stephens forged the Epistles of Clement. But these Epistles are found in MSS. which were in existence many centuries before Stephens was born, as well as in a Syriac translation. Which shows how exceedingly precarious the argument from coincidences is.

With this sketch of the discussion of 2 Peter, a notice which has exceeded its limits must close. The writer will rejoice if what he has written induces some to study the volume for themselves. He can assure those who do so that they will not find that the reviewer has picked out all the plums: he has not found a dull or uninteresting lecture. The work is probably the most solid and trustworthy book of the kind that has appeared since Dr. Westcott's volume "On the Canon of the New Testament," and Dr. Salmon's book contains a great deal of matter not to be found in the earlier work, and for the ordinary student is in a more convenient form.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Justifying Righteousness. A Consideration of some Questions concerning the Acceptance of the Believer before God. With an Appendix of Extracts from Fathers and Older Anglican Writers. By H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Seeley and Co.

This is a valuable treatise on a most important subject. A clear apprehension of the ground on which our acceptance as sinners before Almighty God rests, is essential to the due formation and development of the Christian character. Without it, the conscience can have no solid peace, the spirit no true freedom, the life no real power. To contribute to such a clear apprehension on the part of his readers, by setting aside one mistaken view of the ground of acceptance, and asserting in its place the true Scriptural view, is Mr. Moule's object in this little volume. That he has attained his object and rendered useful service cannot, we think, be doubted.

In these busy days of many books and little leisure for reading, we are grateful to a competent writer, who has himself mastered his subject, if he will give us, as Mr. Moule has done, the results rather than the processes of thought and study. We have here, in some twenty pages of clear, readable print, the whole discussion, unencumbered by notes and references, a *catena* of authorities being reserved for a brief Appendix.

The mistaken view of Acceptance with God, which it is the author's aim to combat, we gather to be that which regards it as resting, in whole or in part, on the work of grace in the believer's soul as its procuring cause. He begins by tracing that work of grace to its root and source in "the mystical union of the Lord Christ with His people," which "from the point of view of our spiritual life" he holds to be "the central truth of the whole Gospel." Of the nature of that union, and of its absolute necessity to the reception and maintenance of spiritual life, it would be difficult to speak in more forcible terms than are to be found in these opening pages. To some of the statements and methods of expression we should be inclined to demur. It does not help us, for example, to be told that "the Lord Christ's exalted Being and His people's are *solidaire*." But with the general conclusions we substantially agree.

Granting, however, the necessity of union with Christ and its possession by the individual believer, the question still remains to be answered, What is the ground of his acceptance with God? "I ask, then, how and why at this moment am I, a member of Christ, ACCOUNTED RIGHTEOUS BEFORE GOD? How am I, in union with the Lord, viewed as satisfactory at this moment before the LAW, as regards my acceptance from the LAW's point of view?" To this question the answer given is, that I am not so accounted righteous, and am not so viewed as satisfactory, by virtue of my union with Christ, if by union we mean only that aspect of it "which is concerned with communication of Nature and of Life-power." Other aspects of revealed truth exist, and one of them especially must be taken account of here. It is not Christ in me, but Christ for me, that is the ground of my peace with God. The Law has a demand upon me; and that demand is satisfied, not by what Christ is in me, but by what He is for me.

"The life of Jesus may be manifest," and in blissful degrees of outshining beauty and of internal truth, 'in the mortal flesh' (2 Cor. iv. 11), and yet the saint may be (and if his view of facts be a healthy one, he will be) just the very man to shrink, with his face in the dust, before the uncreated Light of the spiritual Law. Coming into its presence, consciously and as a sinner, though a regenerate and life-possessing sinner, he comes across ideas and demands of *another order* than those of birth

and life and health and growth, and the out-blooming of the flower of glory from the holy bud of the present indwelling of his Lord."

He needs, therefore, to be "in Christ" in another sense, as having an interest in His perfect obedience, and His satisfaction of the demands of the Law. He needs to apprehend Christ not only as in him, the life of his life, but as for him, his Advocate with the Father and the Propitiation for his sins. In a word, "The believer must go evermore for his divine secret of power for service, and of inner deliverance and victory, to the great central truth, CHRIST IN ME, I IN CHRIST; to the mystical union in its aspect of communicated Life. But he will not dare to forget, if the Scripture is supreme with him, that even this leaves wholly unaltered the claim of Eternal Law, taken in itself, and that *another* range of 'the truth as it is in Jesus' is needed to meet that claim and transfigure it into peace and rest."

In this conclusion and in the main argument by which, if we have understood him rightly, Mr. Moule arrives at it, we heartily concur. It is, if our memory serves us, the late Mr. Robertson of Brighton who somewhere compares the present holiness of a Christian, as it is in itself, to the Flora of a tropical clime struggling to develop itself in an Arctic region, and as it is regarded and accepted by God in Christ, to the same Flora in all the glory and beauty of its perfect development in its native home. But even so regarded and accepted, it enters not into nor forms any part of the ground of our acceptance. The perfect righteousness of Another stands alone there.

The minor details of Mr. Moule's treatise we have neither space nor inclination now to criticize. Its concluding section on the Sacraments would require a separate paper to deal with it. In taking leave of it we would only express our wish that in addition to what he has given us, the writer had shown clearly, what indeed he has more than once hinted at, how both aspects, that of spiritual life and that of justifying righteousness, are, if not always exhibited, yet really included in the one truth of the mystical union of the believer with his Lord. If *Christ in me* be the fountain of my life, no less true is it that *I in Christ* is the ground of my acceptance. "I am crucified with Christ," writes St. Paul. Christ's death was my death, not only morally but legally. "He speaketh here," says Luther, "of that high crucifying, whereby sin, the devil, and death are crucified in Christ and not in me. Here Christ Jesus doth all Himself alone. But I, believing in Christ, am by faith crucified also with Christ, so that all these things are crucified and dead unto me." So again, describing the mystical union under this its other aspect of justifying righteousness, the same Apostle writes: "There is no condemnation to them that are *in Christ Jesus*." So, too, he sets it forth as his own high aim to be "*found in Him*, not having a righteousness of my own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." My justification is complete, my peace is assured, not only because *Christ is for me*, but because *I am in Christ*. In the familiar but never trite words of Hooker, "Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him. In Him God findeth us, if we be faithful; for by faith we are incorporated into Him. Then, although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which in himself is impious, full of iniquity, full of sin; him being found in Christ through faith, and having his sin in hatred through repentance, him God beholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto by pardoning it, and accepteth him in Jesus Christ as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all that is commanded him in the law. Shall I say, more perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law? I

must take heed what I say : but the Apostle saith, ' God made Him which knew no sin to be sin for us ; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.' Such we are in the sight of God, as is the very Son of God Himself." And this by virtue of the mystical union, as it procures acceptance for us and conveys to us justifying righteousness.

T. T. PEROWNE.

Short Notices.

The Spiritual Needs of the Masses of the People. [Report of Joint Committee of Convocation.] Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

IN the July CHURCHMAN (in the article on "Archdeacon of Lewes and Cathedrals") appeared an allusion to this Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury. We are pleased to see the Report as a publication of the S.P.C.K. The Appendix has been omitted, for which some will be sorry, but on the whole perhaps the omission was wise. The Report by itself, now before us, takes up thirty pages ; and it will, we hope, have a very large circulation. What subject more important ? what so important ? We earnestly invite attention to a pamphlet, the work of leading clergy, and of Bishops, which deals with "the spiritual needs of the masses of the people."

In the first part of this pamphlet appears a summary of questions and replies. Among the replies sent in from clergy in various parts of the country, we notice, suggestions for Church Reform are prominent, and of these several have been strongly advocated in THE CHURCHMAN.

The second part of the pamphlet contains the suggestions of the Committee. It is of high value, the more especially from the stress which is laid upon the spiritual aspects of ministerial work. We quote the opening paragraph :

We have reason to fear that even now, after all that has been said and done on this subject, there are still to be found among the clergy some who, though kindly it may be, and generous, abundantly willing to minister to their flocks in carnal things, accepting a certain amount of Sunday duty, and occasionally visiting the schools, yet are not sufficiently impressed with the great truth that they can win souls only by toil, self-sacrifice, unworldly living, continual prayer for each and for all, by being constant in season and out of season, by putting their profession before aught else, and suffering nothing to hinder them from carrying out the duties of their calling, whether in towns or in the country. This, as we think, lies at the root of all, and the answers which we have received tend to show that wherever this is grasped and realized, the work of the ministry very rarely fails.

Around the Cross. Some of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ.

By W. HAY M. AITKEN, M.A., author of "The School of Grace," "The Highway of Holiness," "Mission Sermons," etc. John F. Shaw and Co.

By an accident which we sincerely regret, a full review of this volume, written some months ago, soon after the book appeared, was mislaid and lost. It is the third volume of "The Mission Pulpit." The second volume of this valuable series we had the pleasure of recommending as a book of singular merit and value ; but we are inclined to think the present volume will prove, for evangelizing purposes, the most useful of the series. The