

THE
CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1890.

ART. I.—THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE OLD AND
NEW TESTAMENTS.

THE interdependence of the Old and New Testaments is a literary fact at once extraordinary and inexplicable. There is no other instance in literature at all analogous to it. That a series of books, separate in themselves and yet forming a recognised and kindred whole, should after a period of four centuries be succeeded by another series claiming relationship with them, and manifestly dependent upon them, is remarkable in itself; but that these two series of books should be written, not only in different languages, but in typical representatives of different families of language, the one Aryan and the other Semitic, is so remarkable that we should antecedently pronounce it absolutely impossible. And yet it is this fact which confronts us every time we think of the Bible as a whole, and that we disregard without attempting to account for it, simply because it is so familiar as to seem not to require to be accounted for. But account for it we must, either upon purely natural principles of common and everyday experience, or else upon principles of another kind, which are not so common, but wholly exceptional. If, however, the result may legitimately be regarded as unique, we may rightly infer that the cause producing it is unique also. I shall endeavour to point out some of the facts which serve to show conclusively that the result is unique.

I. First, then, the Old Testament as a whole is a manifestly incomplete work. I do not stop to inquire how or why it is a whole, I simply speak of the Old Testament as representing the recognised collection of the thirty-nine books comprising the Hebrew Bible, and this book or collection of books on its own showing is an incomplete work. Three times over in

the Book of Genesis what purports to be a Divine promise declares that in Abraham all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, and a like promise is given to Isaac and to Jacob. Now, I take this in the broadest possible way. I care not whether we read it passively or reflectively—"shall be blessed" or "shall bless themselves"—it is both. All such questions of minute criticism are really trivial, and tend to divert the mind from the true issue involved. In like manner I do not care now to maintain that the promise was Divine; if it was, there is an end of the whole matter, for then we have a distinct revelation preserved in a credible record; but I do maintain that in one, as it obviously is, of the very earliest records of the Jewish nation we have a distinct foreshadowing of a particular destiny in store for Abraham and his descendants, and it would be much the same if written centuries later. This must be accounted for in some way, either as an inherent conviction of the Hebrew nation, expressive of their ineradicable consciousness of future greatness and the like, or otherwise. How came this insignificant people to indulge in such lofty aspirations? There is nothing directly analogous in any other history.

And, be it observed, the nature of this promise is different entirely from the other promise of the possession of Canaan, which afterwards was given, and of which promise the history records the fulfilment. But what I desire to show is that the Hebrew Bible closes without the slightest indication of this earlier promise ever having been fulfilled or justified. Fifteen hundred years afterwards there is not the slightest apparent prospect of a hope which was so confidently expressed being realized. And yet there it was distinct, emphatic, unwavering, and there it will be as long as the world lasts, for the world to make what it can of it.

I say, then, that a book bearing on the face of it a promise like this, making no attempt at showing what it meant, but leaving it in its crude and enigmatical form, is an incomplete book.

(ii.) Again, many centuries later, when the promise of the possession of the land had long been fulfilled, however that promise and its fulfilment are to be explained, we find the record of another equally distinct and definite promise given to David—that his throne should be established for ever; and though there is, indeed, a show of this promise being remembered and fulfilled for many centuries, yet in the person of his grandson it was rudely shaken, and finally was falsified altogether in the person of Zedekiah, his remote descendant, who was carried captive to Babylon and died in exile. And some two centuries later the history closes without any restoration of the throne, and almost without any visible heir. Then, I say, whatever may be the meaning of this promise, and however in-

geniously we may reconstruct the history in which it occurs, there it is on the surface of the record, without any apparent purpose, and with no apparent fulfilment. Surely another and conspicuous mark of incompleteness in the narrative as a whole?

(iii.) Take once more the promise in Deuteronomy, which I for one still fully believe to be the work of Moses: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee." If this was Divinely given, then, again, there is an end of the whole matter, for we have an actual revelation preserved, it may be presumed, in a credible record; but if it was not, still it purports to be the expression of an intention on the part of the Divine Being that Moses should have a successor. Now, we look down the history for a thousand years, and though we find many prophets of great eminence and great individual importance, yet there is no *one* who can claim in any way to be the successor of Moses or like Moses, and certainly no one who was so regarded or esteemed; and to say that the promise of the *one* was fulfilled in the *many* is wholly gratuitous. Why, then, was this blot left on the book? Why was it not obliterated? Why did any compiler, redactor, Deuteronomist, or late editor like Ezra, or the men of the great synagogue, leave such a puzzle as this without explanation or comment of any kind? What did he or they suppose it meant? Did it mean Elijah, or Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or the entire body of the prophets?—nay, that, as I say, it could not mean; for it speaks of *a* prophet like unto Moses, and one cannot mean many, and they collectively were not like Moses. Taken, therefore, as a mere human affirmation, what does it mean? And occurring as it does in a prominent place in this literature, if it is left without any explanation, we can only point to it as another instance of incompleteness in the literature; as a conspicuous and acknowledged instance of a defect that needs to be supplied. The book in which such a defect is found is an incomplete book, because it raises expectations which it does not satisfy, and makes promises which it does not fulfil, and leaves enigmas which it does not explain.

(iv.) I will mention one more instance, and only one. The last of the prophets closes with a very obscure, but very explicit, promise about sending Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. We do not know what is meant by the day of the Lord, except that it is an obscure phrase occurring in the Prophets—for the first time in Joel—and referring apparently to some great national or historical crisis; but if we do not know what is meant by the day of the Lord, still less do we know what is meant by the coming of Elijah. We may even question whether the prophet himself knew; but this, at least, is certain, that the volume of prophecy

ends, and virtually the Old Testament ends, with this distinct challenge to the future. May we not say, then, that this is another mark of incompleteness, and that the book which contains such marks, of which these are but a few specimens, is an incomplete book? It is no reproach to the book itself to say so: it is one of its chief and characteristic features, and without this feature it would not be what it is.

And be it observed that the instances I have chosen are precisely those which are beyond the reach of any critical, disintegrating solvent. They are independent of criticism, and defy the critics, for they are specimens, so to say, of the very configuration of the book; they are not found in one part, but in all parts of it; they are characteristic not of one writer, but of many; they are symptomatic of the book as a whole. Criticism may do what it will with the promise to Abraham, and the promise to David, with the promise to Moses and the promise of Malachi, but as long as the Bible is what it is, there they are, and there they will continue to be; and without even claiming them as Divine, or as of any intrinsic value in themselves, I am warranted in appealing to them as specimens of substantial and substantive incompleteness in the book containing them.

But there is another feature equally characteristic and no less important to which I desire to point, and that is the way in which the writings of the Old Testament appeal to, and are fraught with, another sense than the merely literal and historic one. They oftentimes refuse to be chained down to any reference to the mere circumstances of time and place. An enormous impetus has of late years been given to the historical study of the Scriptures and the Prophets, and may it by all means prosper and progress! but this, I take it, is a certain fact, that time after time the historical meaning, whatever illustration we may bring to bear upon it, fails altogether to exhaust or to supply the sense. It is impossible to imagine any historical circumstances or events which were sufficient to supply a framework capable of sustaining the full and natural import of the language of, say, Ps. xxii., xlv., lxxii., cx., or Is. liii. I say deliberately that any attempt adequately to account for the actual language of these writings in their literal and grammatical sense can only be regarded as, at the best, but a brilliant failure, for the simple reason that it is hopeless and impossible to do so. To take the last of them. The Ethiopian eunuch was wise enough to frame a question that no writer has ever been able to solve or ever will be able to solve, except in the way that Philip solved it: "I pray thee of whom speaketh the prophet this, of himself or of some other man?" If not of himself, of what other man or of what body of men?

The answers can only be divergent, contrariant, futile, because they reject the one answer that presupposes the operation of a principle that must at all hazards be eliminated from our consideration when we approach the study of the Scriptures—the operation, namely, of the Spirit of God, who has chosen the medium of human language as the channel for conveying thoughts, conceptions, and truths, under the burden of which all language breaks down, even as all human incident fails to do more than suggest or illustrate them.

For instance, let it be granted that Is. xlvi. was written in Babylon with reference to the stirring events of the time; then what is the appositeness or natural connection of such words as these: "Hearken unto me, ye stout-hearted, that are far from righteousness: I bring near My righteousness; it shall not be far off, and My salvation shall not tarry, and I will place salvation in Zion for Israel, My glory" ? Allowing that the salvation might refer to the deliverance from captivity, what about the righteousness? How was it to be brought near? And why were the stout-hearted to hearken unto God while He brought it near? What, again, has the sprinkling of many nations by the Lord's servant to do with the escape from Babylon, when the Lord went before them and the God of Israel was their rearward? Or, again: "When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I the Lord will hear them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them;" or, "The Lord is well pleased for His righteousness' sake; He will magnify the law and make it honourable;" or, "I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for Mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins;" or, "I have blotted out as a thick cloud thy transgressions, and as a cloud thy sins." All this, and much more of the same kind, shows that no present deliverance from captivity, even if it supplied the occasion for what was said, was sufficient to exhaust its meaning. The writer spoke from another standing-ground; he appealed to another sense; he looked out into another world; and the power which enabled him to do this was as much above and beyond nature as any power would have been which enabled him to depict and describe events far hidden in the future beyond the range of mortal ken. Thus, when the cold-blooded critic has exhausted from the prophets' language all reference to anything but the incidents of their own time, he forgets that he has solved but a part only of the problem which requires to be solved. Is the promise that "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" less definite, emphatic, and Divine than that which said of Cyrus a century and a half before he appeared upon the scene, "He is My shepherd, and shall perform all My pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt

be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid," stopping short, as the prophet did, with unexpected self-restraint at the very point when the work of Cyrus ended and that of Darius began? From all this, which might be indefinitely multiplied, we see that the prophets spoke from the high vantage-ground of the possession of a spirit and a spiritual insight and experience which was absolutely unique and unparalleled till the Gospel of Christ was preached and the Pauline Epistles written. And in the contemplation of this phenomenon we are contemplating an effect without a cause, unless we anticipate and presuppose the impetus which was given by Him who said, "Behold, I send the promise of My Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." If the spirit which breathes in the Prophets and the writers of the Psalms was not the result of the operation of a like power from on high, and in no degree derived from their own personal intuition or dependent on their personal circumstances, we are at a loss to know to what to ascribe it. For that it was not merely natural is certain.

The phenomena of Old Testament prophecy can only be compared to those coruscations of glory and many-hued brightness in the early morn which herald and precede the advent of the sun. Were the great luminary to delay his coming, or, still more, to fail altogether from the heavens, there would be no messages of splendour shot across the sky. The promises of light would be quenched in darkness, and the sombre vault of heaven would be unrelieved by the variations of colour. In like manner the glories of the Old Testament, however splendid, are inadequate to account for themselves unless we postulate something for which they were the preparation, and to which they were designed to point. They are virtually an effect without a cause, a tale of little or no meaning, couched in mighty but incongruous and inappropriate language. Surely, therefore, the Old Testament looks forward to and anticipates something beyond itself upon which it is dependent for the full revelation of its meaning, the full development of its hope and promise. Before proceeding to treat of the converse, I must dwell briefly upon certain conditions essential to the study of the Old Testament.

We have reached a period in the evolution of human thought when it seems to be considered necessary for all history to be written over again, and especially that of the Old Testament. Let those who would understand my meaning look at the article "Israel" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." They will at once find that the history of the Jewish nation is not to be learnt from the national records, but from the conjectures of Wellhausen. The plainest and simplest testimony of the Scripture

writers is to be without hesitation or scruple set aside in favour of the reckless assertions and the groundless conjectures and imaginary theories of a novel and self-asserting scholar, who begins with assuming what he professes but omits to prove, and ends with the assumption with which he began. And this, forsooth, we are to accept as history, which has been rescued and reconstructed from the contortion and misrepresentation of the original records. Of course, if we throw discredit on the beginnings of things, it is alike impossible to say what may or may not have happened and what did happen. We may imagine the history for ourselves, with sublime indifference to all available records and sources, but the process will be like that of blowing bubbles and mistaking them for worlds. The real question we have to decide is not the *inspiration* of the Old Testament—that, if a fact, will take care of itself—but whether or not the Old Testament is to be trusted in the plain and obvious testimony which it bears to itself. Kuenen has distinctly told us it is not, and brushes it aside accordingly. The law was invented by Ezra; the rebellion of Korah is “entirely unhistorical” (the very words are his).¹ Deuteronomy is the romance of an unknown adventurer in the time of Josiah, and the like. Again and again we ask, where is the proof of all this? We search and search for it, but all in vain; it is not forthcoming: it is always going to be produced, but is never produced. Meanwhile, the only proof we have to rest upon is that it agrees with certain conjectures that have rashly and unscrupulously been adopted, and therefore in defiance of all evidence is to be received. The question, therefore, is one of authority: Shall we believe Ezra or Wellhausen? Shall we accept the facts of the Mosaic narrative of the exodus and the wanderings, or take the fictions of Kuenen in their place? Now, my answer, it may be, is a rough and ready one, but still I am inclined to think practically valid, and it is this: I see the hand of God so plainly in the broad facts of the history as we have it, and as we were manifestly intended to see it; and I find from thus seeing it so much light thrown on the facts of human life generally, and of my own personally, so much that is analogous in the individual, the national, and the universal, that I am willing to accept this history as the suggested key to the dealings of Providence generally, and as a leaf out of the revelation of God. If it is not this it is a lie, and we are left in total darkness, not only as to the facts of the history, but as to the revelation which is presumed to shine through them. In fact, revelation there is none; it is reduced to a vanishing-point, and may be relegated to the tales of the nursery and the dreams of childhood. The

¹ “Religion of Israel,” vol. ii., p. 168.

infancy of Israel was like that of other nations. Israel underwent the same process of evolution as other nations, and all that we can learn is what we can gather from illusion and myth, and snatch from the darkness of misconception and misrepresentation to set in the broad daylight of modern life and everyday experience. Only, then, there is another element also that we have to account for, and that is the lofty spirituality and the sublime ethical teaching of the Prophets and the Psalms. And if God spoke by the *prophets* of Israel, may He not also have spoken by the *history* of Israel, not as we choose to reconstruct, but as we read it. In the former case it is surely evident that He has, to those who have eyes to see and ears to hear; is it wrong to infer that He has revealed Himself, and spoken also, in the other? But then, if so, we must be prepared to meet with miracle, and must not object to prophecy. And, indeed, it is, after all, this, and this only, that is the real obstacle. There never was anything of the nature of a true miracle; there can obviously be no such thing as real prophecy, and, therefore, the facts of the history and the phenomena of the literature must at all hazards be made to square with this theory. It is, in short, if we may dare to say so, the unbelief which has inspired the criticism, not the criticism which has necessitated the unbelief.

The whole matter is a long story, and the ramifications are manifold, and the issue is one that we are not likely to see wrought out in our own day; but the true question is not so complex as we are sometimes led to believe. The sun is shining in the daytime, whether or not he is hidden from us, for it is the sun that rules the day; and so if it is heavenly, and not earthly, light that shines in the Old Testament, it can only be because it comes from the Sun of Righteousness, who, it was promised in the last page of the Old Testament, should "arise with healing in his wings to those who fear the name of the Lord." It is a significant promise, because it shows that a moral condition is prerequisite in order to behold, or at all events to be healed by, this rising; and with this consideration we may pass on to inquire in what way the New Testament is dependent on the Old.

II. Now it is, of course, obvious that not a page of the New Testament could have been written if the Old had not previously existed. The first verse of the New Testament implies the history of David and Abraham, and so on throughout; there is hardly a book of the Old Testament which is not referred to as known by the writers of the New. Whatever may be the value of allusions in any one book of the Old Testament to other books of the Old Testament, as, *e.g.*, in Joshua, Judges, and Samuel to the Pentateuch, and in the Prophets and Psalms to the historical books, there is no possible shadow of doubt that when the writers of the New Testament

refer to the Old, the Old was in existence for them to refer to. It is proved to be so by the use they make of it. Why the like evidence should be of less value in the case of the several books of the Old Testament, the one to the other, I am at a loss to understand; but let that pass. It is certain, therefore, that the New Testament is dependent on the Old in this way, and to this extent. As a matter of fact, some five centuries after the bulk of the Old Testament had been written there suddenly sprang into existence a number of writings which assumed to a large extent the position and standing-ground of the writers of the Old; and that not in such a way as to show conscious and deliberate imitation of them, but solely because, as these later writings bore ample witness, certain events had occurred which appeared to fill up and consummate all that they had left incomplete. The reality of these events, so far as the life of Christ is concerned, is a matter of undoubted history. The problem we have to account for is, why these events should have produced these writings, and why the writings should have assumed the form they did, and why the writers should have been able to build as they did on the foundations of the Old Testament. It is clear that, such as they were, the foundations were already in existence. They were in no way modified or altered by those who built upon them. They used them as they found them, and as they were. For it was not a matter of mere verbal application, but the broad and general hope expressed in them was proclaimed as fulfilled. The promises had been made good and the expectation realized.

It is to be noted, then, that we have three factors. First, the Old Testament, in its aspect of unsatisfied longing and unfulfilled promise, which is neither more nor less than we have seen it to be. Secondly, the career of Christ, which is known from other sources to have been substantially what the Gospels represent. And, thirdly, the production of the New Testament as the result of the conjunction and combination of the former two. There is no visible reason why the union of the two first should have produced the last, but as a matter of fact it did. It was like the fusion of two chemical substances producing a third unlike both. It is useless to say that the nature of the first factor was not such as legitimately to produce the third, and it is idle to say that the character and the work of Christ should be viewed apart altogether from any bearing it may have had upon the Old Testament, because the historical problem that we have to account for is the results that followed the combination of the two, both in literary production and in missionary activity, as well as in social regeneration, of which the writings themselves are an abiding monument. And I maintain that it is the contemplation of these three factors which as long as the world

lasts will present an insoluble puzzle, except only upon one hypothesis—that, namely, of Divine purpose and intentional design. If you eviscerate the Old Testament of its prophetic characteristics, and eliminate them, then you cannot account for the career and character of Christ; if you pare down the character of Christ, you destroy the possibility of His work and its known effects, of which the production of the New Testament may be regarded as the greatest. And if you direct and confine your assaults to the New Testament, and deny the accuracy and credibility of the Gospels, you have still many facts to account for, the Epistle to the Romans being one of them, besides a host of others that are inexplicable, except upon the supposition of its being broadly and in the main what it claims to be, and of the Old Testament and the character of Christ being adequate to produce it. If they had not been agencies of sufficient dynamic force, the New Testament could not have resulted from their combined operation. It would have been different from what it is, or it would not have existed at all. Nor is it possible to ascribe successfully this result to an exaggerated imagination on the part of Christ, or of the disciples of Christ, because it was no part of the work of Christ to make the Old Testament what it is; and if it had not been what it is, He could not have done what He did with it. Neither would any undue admiration of, or reverence for, His character on the part of His disciples have resulted in the effects produced, such as the founding of Churches and the writing of such letters to them as the Apostles wrote. We must estimate each of these factors at its true value, or else we shall be confronted with results in their combination which will throw us out of our calculation and convict us of error. We have, as it were, given these three factors, and from their mutual relation we have to discover a fourth, which, if we state the problem correctly, and work out its solution aright, will be nothing less than a demonstration of the will and mind of God, the proof of an actual Divine revelation. Neither the Old Testament, nor the character of Christ, nor the New Testament, estimated fairly in all its bearings, can be explained on merely natural principles or regarded as a merely human phenomenon; but the mutual relation and interdependence of the whole combined is a unique phenomenon which points only to one fact as its explanation, namely, that God has chosen this method of making known His will to man, and has given him this proof of its being His will.

The New Testament, then, is clearly dependent upon the Old, inasmuch as had there been no Old Testament there could have been no New. It is conceivable that there might have been a Gospel preached, but it could not have been the Gospel of Christ, for the idea of a Christ is impossible without the Old

Testament. He might have been proclaimed as the Son of God, but he would not have been the Christ, for to be the Christ is to set the seal to the hopes and promises of the Old Testament. If, therefore, Jesus of Nazareth was rightly proclaimed as the Christ, and claimed to be the Christ, He took upon Himself the responsibility of vindicating and verifying the supposed promises and hopes of the Old Testament. And this was in no sense an adaptation to the popular notions of the Old Testament; it was to all intents and purposes an adoption and endowment of those notions as correct. If the popular opinion derived from the Old Testament about a Christ was false, then Jesus of Nazareth was assuredly not justified in professing to be the Christ; and if He claimed to be the Son of God, His claim to be the Christ was enhanced and emphasized thereby. We must, therefore, be especially careful how we deal with the so-called Messianic elements of the Old Testament, because if we deny them this as their true character, we impugn the validity of Christ's title, not so much by denying His claim as by disparaging and making worthless the title which He claimed. We do not so much deny His right to the crown as affirm by implication that the crown is tinsel and paltry; and this is incompatible with any reverence for or belief in Christ. If, therefore, we say that the historical meaning of the prophets and the Old Testament is their only true meaning, we cut at the foundation of Christ's claim, because that was built upon the true and valid sense which they had in addition to, and equally with, their historical sense.¹

It was not Christ who imparted this sense to them; for not He alone, but the whole nation, read it there; and if it had not been there He would have been wrong in appealing to it, for He would have availed Himself dishonestly of misconception, which, being false, would have been fatal to the validity of His own claim. And when we find Him appealing to the Scriptures, not only in the most solemn hours of His own passion, "How, then, shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" "This that is written must yet be accomplished in Me," and the like, but after His resurrection and His triumph over the conditions of mortality, when, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself," and said, "These are the words which I spake unto you *while I was yet with you*, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the Prophets, and in

¹ If it is maintained that Jesus never professed to be the Christ, and that the claim was advanced by His disciples, then we ask, What was it that He claimed to be? For assuredly His career, apart from His claims, whatever they were, is absolutely unintelligible, and His death likewise is inexplicable, apart from His claims.

the Old Testament concerning Me," we cannot maintain that the Messianic sense of these Scriptures is not a true one, or that their natural grammatical historical sense is independent of their Messianic sense, or that we can adequately develop and exhaust the one while we disregard and neglect the other. For, if so, Christ is an untrue interpreter of the Scriptures upon which He based His own claim, and when He opened the understanding of His disciples, that they might understand the Scriptures, so far from opening their understanding, He rather perverted their judgment, and taught them to discover and import into the Scriptures a meaning which was not there.

The New Testament, therefore, can never be independent of the Old, nor can the validity and trustworthiness of the Old Testament ever be disparaged without proportionally damaging the foundations of the New. I am quite aware of the danger, as Paley long ago said, of "making Christianity answerable with its life for the circumstantial truth of each separate passage of the Old Testament, the genuineness of every book," and the like; but there can be no question that we are pledged, not only by our allegiance to Christ, but by our estimate of Him as a conscientious teacher and an honest man, to accept what I may call the net result of the teaching of the Old Testament about the coming of a Christ as the true and valid conclusion we were intended to arrive at, and as indicating the point to which the earlier revelation of God was intended to lead us. And I maintain that we cannot decline to accept this, and accept Christ as in any special and personal sense charged with a Divine mission. The Old Testament is so far dependent upon the New for its interpretation and for the full revelation of its meaning, and the New Testament is so far dependent upon the Old for the truth and validity of the claims which it based upon that interpretation. To attack the one is to attack the other in its most vital part, and if the authority of the Old Testament in this point as the chosen instrument of special Divine revelation is overthrown, a death-blow is struck at the historic foundations of Christianity; for though its ethical teaching may survive, its faith in the person of Christ must perish, for in His last moments He declared on oath that He was the Christ of God, and if there is no Christ in the Old Testament, there can be no Christ in the New, for the conception of Jesus which identified Him with the Christ of the Old Testament was an error on the part of His disciples, and a most serious and fatal blot in His own teaching.

We thus arrive by an inductive process, through an examination of the New Testament, at the Divine authority of the Old. The Old Testament was the selected channel of a Divine revelation, and consequently to this extent and to this purpose the

writers of the Old Testament must have been Divinely inspired. They must have been and were guided, overruled, and enlightened to the extent and to the end required by their mission. They may have been conscious or unconscious of their high calling. There is much to show they were largely conscious of it; of the extent to which it reached they could hardly have been conscious, for in a multitude of cases their words were not their own, but God's; and certainly the result they left behind them bears the mark and stamp and evidence of His revelation. That was the old covenant of God with man, and its function was to prepare men's minds for, to point to, and to introduce, the new covenant. But as the new covenant cannot be independent of the old, so neither can the old pass away with the coming of the new, for the old is the foundation of the new, and if the foundation is overthrown the building cannot stand, but hath an end.

We have no space to discuss the question as to the weight of authority attaching to individual Scriptures in consequence of their use in the New Testament, or of the interpretation given of them there. I do not know that the validity of Christ's argument from Ps. cx. would be destroyed if it could be proved to demonstration that that Psalm was not David's, His point clearly being to show that the Son of David is also called (and that presumably by David) the Lord of David; but seeing that the Psalm is traditionally ascribed to David, and that by those who must have known at least as well as any among us of any reason why it should not be David's, linguistically or historically, I should prefer to insist upon this demonstration being given, in the most assured and imperturbable confidence that it is impossible to give it, and waiting with the like confidence until it is given. But when I find that Christ, in the most trying hour of His temptation in the wilderness, three times stayed Himself upon the Divine word of the Second Law, and confronted and confounded the tempter with the assertion "It is written," I must demur to the modern notion that anything written in the time of Josiah, and palmed off upon that illiterate though pious king as the work of the great lawgiver eight centuries before, can possibly, by any misconception or ignorance on the part of Christ, have been so dignified by Him; or if so dignified by Him, owing to some misapprehension on the part of the evangelist, that it was worthy, if produced under such circumstances, of being reckoned as the Word of God I must most emphatically deny. When the romancing ingenuity of the nineteenth century after Christ is gravely ascribed to the seventh century before Christ, and employed for the production of the second law under the guise of Moses, it is not possible to characterize the fiction otherwise than as an audacious forgery;

which, according as it is successful, becomes a portentous fraud and to suppose that the Spirit of the holy God was under the necessity of resorting to such measures to convey the knowledge of His will to His chosen people, or that He condescended to make use of them when so resorted to, is surely to betray a most unworthy conception of God, and an equally distorted idea of the nature of revelation. When it can be shown to demonstration that Moses did not write Deuteronomy, then it will be time to consider how we stand with reference to the use Christ made of it, and to the New Testament generally; but knowing perfectly well that it is simply not possible to do so, I am content to marvel more and more as I discover and trace more and more the close interdependence of the Old and New Testaments; and while my reverence for each increases as I study it with earnest faith, I am moved to adoration and to gratitude, as I learn ever more and more to see that as the New Testament rests upon the Old, so the Old Testament is fulfilled in, and established by, the New, and am constrained to confess that it is this intimate and indissoluble interdependence which effectually confirms them both.

STANLEY LEATHES.

ART. II.—PASTORAL WORK.¹

AT a great political crisis in Rome, 1,935 years ago, when Julius Cæsar was making his most daring bid for power, the oligarchs entrusted their cause to a senator and rhetorician named Favonius. He was allowed one hour for his speech. Some of you will remember how he employed it. He consumed this unique opportunity in commiserating himself, because the space of time allotted to him was so short. Unlike him, I am congratulating myself that I have only to speak to you for half that time—not at all because I am reluctant to address you, for, indeed, I regard it as a great privilege that I am permitted to do so—but solely for this reason: I am a country clergyman, and as far as my clerical life is concerned, I have never been out of a country parish. And, therefore, much of what I may say on pastoral work will, I fear, be found of only little use by those of you who either are, or are going to be, engaged in work in town parishes. In obedience, however, to the distich which bids us

Be niggards of *advice* on no pretence,
For the worst avarice is that of sense,

¹ An address given at Selsdon Park on June 21, 1890, to young men about to be ordained.