

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1864.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Francis Bacon, of Verulam. Realistic Philosophy, and its Age.* By KUNO FISCHER. Translated from the German, by John Oxenford. London, 1857.

WE know of no better exposition of the merits and defects of the Baconian philosophy than this, and it is translated in a free, luminous, and philosophical style. We have no intention to criticise it, or even to sketch a summary of its contents; those who have a taste for the subject, and have not entirely mastered it, ought to read the book. The merits of the Inductive method are proved by the immense additions it has made to the physical sciences since it has been brought into distinct practice. Its defects, as it was limited by Bacon and understood by his followers, may be seen in its influence on the mental sciences as developed or degraded by Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Bayle, Voltaire, Condillac, Holbach, Helvetius, and others of the materialist school.

The natural order of the acquisition of knowledge is, first, that of the phenomena of physical nature around us, and afterwards that of our mental nature; and Bacon fell so far into this order that he unduly fastened the intellect to the leading-strings of physical nature, and restricted all human knowledge to our external experience, and allowed to the mind no inhe-

By Philip Schaff, D.D.,

ART. IV.—*A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical.* By Dr. JOHN P. LANGE, Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn, assisted by a number of Continental Divines. Translated into English, with Additions, original and selected, by Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF, in connection with a number of American Divines of various denominations. New York: Charles Scribner. Vol. I., containing the General Introduction and the Gospel of Matthew. By Dr. Lange and the American Editor. 1864.

It is an argument of no mean force for the divine origin and character of the Bible, that it has been the subject of more discourses and commentaries than any other book or class of books, and constantly invites new investigation, with the promise of a plentiful reward. Fathers, schoolmen, reformers, and modern critics, German, French, English, or American, have dug in its mines of truth, and brought forth precious ore for the benefit of their age and generation, and the long line of commentators will never break off until our faith is turned into vision, and we shall know even as we are known.

Exegesis has its history, like every other branch of theological science. It has its productive and its digestive periods, its periods of rise and decline. Prominent among the productive epochs are three: the age of the fathers; the age of the reformers; and the age of modern critics and scholars. The first laid the foundation of Catholic, the second that of Evangelical theology, the third makes respectful use of both, but is more critical, scientific, and liberal in its character and method, and seems to open new avenues for the future and ever deepening development of Christian theology.

The patristic exegesis of a Chrysostom and Theodoret, Jerome and Augustine, is, to a large extent, the mature result of a victorious conflict of ancient Christianity with Ebionism, Gnosticism, Arianism, Pelagianism, and other radical heresies which stimulated the fathers to a vigorous investigation and defence of revealed truth. The exegetical works of Luther and Calvin, and the other reformers, breathe throughout a polemical spirit against the peculiar dogmas and traditions of Roman-

ism. So the modern evangelical exegesis of Germany has grown up on the battle-field of Christian truth against the gigantic foes of rationalism and infidelity.

If Germany should succeed in the end in thoroughly routing the most scientific and most powerful forms which heresy has ever assumed, it will achieve as great a work as it did by the Reformation of the sixteenth century. For now the very foundations of Christianity are called into question, and the life of the Saviour itself is turned into a myth. Inspiration is denied, and the sacred writers dissected and criticised like any profane author of ancient Greece and Rome. Never before has the Bible been assailed with so much learning, acumen, and perseverance as during the last fifty years in Germany, and within the last few years in England. Never before has it been subjected to such thorough and extensive critical, philological, historical, antiquarian, and theological investigation and research. But never before has it been more zealously and thoroughly vindicated, and defended with the help of all the means which the latest advances of classical and oriental philology and antiquarian investigation have made available. The productivity of the German mind in the critical, exegetical, and historical field has been intense and prodigious during the present century. It is almost impossible to keep up with the ever-multiplying commentaries on almost every book of the sacred canon, but more especially on the Gospels, the Life of Christ, and the Epistles of the New Testament.

In view of this immense activity still going on, it is high time now, and a very favourable juncture, such as rarely occurs, for the publication of a large and comprehensive commentary, which should, from a truly evangelical point of view, present the best and most valuable results of this last creative period of exegesis, and make them available for the practical benefit of ministers and intelligent laymen, thus forming a bridge between the scientific divines and the congregation of the people.

Such a Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament is the one which is now in course of preparation and publication under the editorial supervision of the Rev. Professor Dr. John Peter Lange, in Bonn. It is intended to

be a Theological and Homiletical Commentary, a treasure-house to the pastor, and an exegetical library in itself. The idea originated with the publishers, and the execution was intrusted to a distinguished divine, who is peculiarly qualified for such a work. Dr. Lange is undoubtedly one of the ablest and best men whom Germany has given to the world. He combines a rare variety of talents as a divine, a philosopher, a preacher, and a poet. But he has more than talent, he is a real genius, of extraordinary fertility of mind, and abounding in original and fresh ideas. For the more sober class of minds he is somewhat too imaginative and fanciful, but this feature is not so prominent in his later works, and his fancies are always pious, suggestive, and edifying. He is a profoundly spiritual Christian, evangelical and orthodox in all the fundamental articles of faith, yet liberal and truly catholic. He has written a considerable number of works, poetical, theological, and literary. He was one of the earliest and most successful opponents of Strauss, and was elected professor in Zurich after the defeat of Strauss in 1839, as the one best qualified to represent the opposite side. Several years ago he was called to a professorship in Bonn. He is a moderate Calvinist, (German Reformed,) but without any sectarian exclusiveness. His most important works are a system of Christian Dogmatics, in three volumes, and a Life of Jesus Christ, of which an English translation, in six volumes, has just been published by Messrs. Clark in Edinburgh.

These previous labours, especially the comprehensive and profound work on the life of Christ, gave him the best preparation for the Commentary, to which he is now devoting his whole time and strength, and which will long survive him as the most valuable and useful work of his life. He has associated with him a number of German, Swiss, and Dutch divines, distinguished for sound theological learning, pulpit eloquence, and practical evangelical piety, as Dr. van Oosterzee of Utrecht, Dr. Lechler of Leipzig, Dr. Gerok of Stuttgart, Dr. Moll of Königsberg, Drs. Auberlen and Riggenbach of Basel, Dr. Kling, Dr. Fronmüller, and others.

The publication of the work commenced in 1857, with the first volume, containing the General Introduction, and the

Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. It has since gone forward without interruption. The New Testament is nearly completed; the Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistles and Revelation of John being the only books still wanting. The Old Testament has likewise been taken in hand by a number of contributors, but will not be completed for a number of years. The first and pioneer volume of the Old Testament department, embracing a General Introduction and Commentary on the Book of Genesis, prepared by the editor, has just appeared. In the General Introduction to the Old Testament, Dr. Lange discusses, in eighty-two pages, under suitable headings, in a very fresh and original manner, all the usual historical, critical, and hermeneutical questions, closing with a brief sketch of Biblical Theology in systematic form; the practical exposition and homiletical use of the Old Testament; the organism, with a valuable excursus on the so-called offensive passages of the Old Testament, as *foci* of the glory of the Old Testament religion. The last essay is especially valuable at the present time, as it furnishes the biblical student with excellent weapons against the Colenso school, and other modern attacks on the Old Testament. Dr. Lange is very ingenious in transforming the offences into "*foci* of glory;" and if he is not everywhere satisfactory, he is always fresh, suggestive, and edifying.

The Commentary of Lange and his associates is a threefold Commentary—*critical*, *doctrinal*, and *homiletical*. These departments are kept distinct throughout, which makes the book much more convenient for use.

1. The *Critical* and *Exegetical Notes** explain the words and phrases of the text according to the principles of grammatico-historical exegesis. On all the more important passages the different views of the principal commentators, ancient and modern, are given; yet all mere show and pedantry of learning is avoided. The main object is to clear up every difficulty as briefly as possible, and to present the most valuable and permanent results of original and previous exegetical labours, without the process of investigation itself, in a condensed form for convenient reference. These exegetical notes are based on

* Exegetische Erläuterungen.

a new translation of the text, which precedes them in larger type. The different readings are given in foot-notes, but only as far as they affect the sense, or are of some particular interest. In general, Dr. Lange follows the critical editions of Lachmann and Tischendorf.

2. The *Doctrinal and Ethical Ideas or Thoughts** present, under a number of heads, the leading theological truths and principles contained in, or suggested by, the text. In the Gospels these doctrines are viewed mainly from the christological point of view, or as connected with the person and work of the Saviour. The reader will find here a vast amount of most valuable living theology, fresh from the fountain of primitive Christianity, and the contemplation of the divine human person of Christ, who stands out prominent throughout as the great central Sun of truth and righteousness.

3. The third department is headed, *Homiletical Hints or Suggestions*,† and is of special importance and use to the preacher for preparing sermons and biblical lectures. It contains a rich variety of themes and parts, and mediates between the chair and the pulpit, the scientific exposition and the practical application of the word of God. It shows the inexhaustible wealth and universal applicability of the Scriptures to all classes and conditions of men. These "hints" are by no means intended, however, to supersede, but only to stimulate the labour of pulpit preparation. Under this department the authors give not only their own homiletical suggestions, but also judicious selections of older and more recent practical commentators, as Quesnel, Caustein, Starke, Lisco, Gerlach, and Heubner.

From this sketch it will be seen that the plan of Lange's *Bibelwerk* is the most comprehensive of any recent commentary, German or English, and views the Bible under every aspect, showing it to be truly a diamond, which shines and sparkles which ever way it is turned. It is a very important feature,

* In German, "Dogmatisch-ethische Grundgedanken;" in the Gospels, where the christological element preponderates, they are called "Christologisch-dogmatische Grundgedanken."

† Homiletische Andeutungen.

as a matter of convenience and economy of time, that the three departments are not mixed up, but kept distinct throughout, so that the reader can easily find just what he wants at a particular time, without going over a mass of irrelevant matter.

The work is mainly designed for ministers and students of theology, and is sufficiently learned to give the reader the assurance that he is everywhere on safe and solid ground, and under the guidance of a master who has gone through the whole tedious process of critical research. But it gives the results, and not the process itself, and presents the building in its beautiful finish, without any of the scaffolding. It is also sufficiently popular in its whole tone to be accessible to intelligent laymen and teachers of Sabbath-schools, if they should at all desire to refer occasionally to a work of such dimensions.

The spirit of the Commentary is truly Christian and evangelical, and falls in very well with the reigning theology of our American Christianity—certainly far better than most German works of the kind, not excluding Olshausen and Tholuck, whose Commentaries have become so widely popular among us. We do not know an exegetical work which is so well adapted to commend itself to all the evangelical denominations of this country. It is altogether free from sectarianism, and avoids all polemics, except against skepticism and rationalism, and occasionally against Romanism. And yet it is by no means loose and latitudinarian, but most decided and positive in all the fundamental articles of our Christian faith and practice.

Upon the whole we do not hesitate to call Lange's *Bibelwerk* the most useful Commentary on the Scriptures which ever appeared in Germany, or in England and America. There are, indeed, single commentaries on separate books, and also complete commentaries on the whole New Testament, which are superior in a particular feature, critical or practical, but there is none which combines so many excellencies and elements of long-continued usefulness. It is more particularly the *pastor's* commentary. It is almost an exegetical library in itself, and has already taken rank among those indispensable works which are constantly consulted as safe guides and intimate friends. The work has already been a decided success, and is selling

extensively not only in Germany, but in all parts of Europe and in the United States. The German booksellers of this country sell a larger number of Lange's *Bibelwerk* than of all other German commentaries combined. Six parts of the original have already gone through two or three editions.

A work of such sterling and permanent value should by all means be made accessible to the theological and religious public of Great Britain and the United States. Several years ago a translation was seriously projected by Dr. Schaff, then at Mercersburg, in connection with several others, and the preliminary arrangements were made with Mr. Scribner, of New York, as publisher. But the Presidential election of 1860, and the consequent Southern secession and rebellion, led to an abandonment or indefinite postponement of so extensive and expensive an undertaking. In the meantime Mr. Clark, of Edinburgh, commenced to issue translations of the first three Gospels of Lange's work, which introduced it to the English public, and created a taste for the whole.

In the spring of 1863 the original plan was resumed by Mr. Scribner as publisher, and Dr. Schaff as editor, and measures were at once taken to carry it into execution. A number of distinguished biblical and German scholars of different evangelical denominations, most of whom are already known as successful translators of German works, were secured, and are now at work on most of the volumes already published in German. Dr. Schaff assumed the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, and moved to New York in January last, to devote himself more fully to this task. Dr. Shedd, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, has in hand the Gospel of Mark; Dr. Yeomans, of Rochester, (the able translator of Dr. Schaff's *History of the Apostolic Church*,) commenced the Gospel of John; Dr. Schäffer, Professor at Gettysburg, (the excellent translator of Kurtz's *Sacred History*,) has already finished about one-half of the *Commentary on Acts*. The *Epistles to the Corinthians* were assigned to the Rev. Dr. Poor, of Newark; the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, to Dr. Kenrick, Professor of Rochester University, and reviser of the Edinburgh translation of Olshausen; the *Catholic Epistles* to Rev. Dr. Mombert, of

Lancaster, who translated Tholuck's Psalms; the Epistle to the Galatians to Rev. Mr. Starbuck, recently assistant Professor in Andover Theological Seminary; the Epistles to the Thessalonians to Rev. Dr. Lillie. Several other distinguished divines, most of them in connection with Theological Seminaries, will probably take part, sooner or later, as the translation is expected to extend also over the Old Testament; and it is likely that the Commentary on Genesis, which has just appeared, will be one of the first to be translated and published.

The American edition will faithfully reproduce the whole of the original, without abridgment and alteration, in idiomatic English, and contain such additions, original and selected, as promise to be of special interest to the American reader, and to give the work an *Anglo-German* character, or to make it a repository of the most valuable results of Anglo-American as well as German Biblical learning. But these additions are to be carefully distinguished from the original by brackets and the initials of the translator. Each contributor assumes the entire literary responsibility of his part of the work. Instead of giving a new translation, the Authorized English Version, according to the present standard edition of the American Bible Society, is made the basis; but the more literal renderings required by the Commentary, or new and generally approved readings, are to be inserted in brackets, and justified in Critical Notes, immediately after the text, with reference to the principal ancient and modern translations in the English and other languages.

The first volume of the American edition, containing the General Introduction to the Bible, and the Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, prepared by Dr. Schaff, is now nearly finished, and will probably be ready for publication in November, or at all events, before the close of this year.

To give the reader a clear idea of the forthcoming American edition of this Exegetical opus magnum, we present a specimen, selecting a difficult and important section of the sixteenth chapter of Matthew.

The Church as confessing Christ, the Son of God.

Matt. xvi. 13—19.

(Parallel passages—Mark viii. 27—30; Luke ix. 18—21.)

When Jesus came into the coasts [parts, τὰ μέρη] of 13
 Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do
 men say that I,¹ the Son of man, am? And they said, 14
 Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias
 [Elijah]; and others, Jeremias [Jeremiah], or one of the
 prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I 15
 am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the 16
 Christ [the Messiah], the Son of the living God. And 17
 Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon
 Bar-jona [Bar Jonah, son of Jonah]:² for flesh and blood
 hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which [who]
 is in heaven [the heavens]. And I say also [And I also, 18

Revision of the Text.

¹ Ver. 13.—The pers. pron. μέ in Cod. C. after λέγουσιν, [in the text. rec. before the verb], is wanting in Cod. B. [and in Cod. Sinaiticus] and in several versions, and is omitted by Tischendorf [and Tregelles and Alford]; Lachmann retains it, but in brackets. The insertion is more easily explained than the omission.—[If we omit μέ, we must translate with Campbell and Conant: Who do men say that the Son of man is? Or with Alford, who retains the grammatical anomaly, if not blunder, of the author. Vers.: *Who (τίνα) do men say that the Son of Man is?* Τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is equivalent to I in the corresponding sentence below, ver. 15. Some who retain μέ in the text (Beza, Clericus, etc.) translate: *Who do men say that I am? the Son of Man? i. e. Do they believe me to be the Messiah?* But this does not suit the form of the answer, and would require either an affirmative *Yea*, or a negative *No*. In the received text τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ must be regarded as opposition to μέ, and is so rendered in the E. V.—P. S.]

² Ver. 17.—[*Bar* (בַּר) is the Aramaic or Chaldaic word used by Daniel in the prophetic passage, vii. 13 (“*I saw . . . and one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, etc.*), for the Hebrew *ben* (בֶּן) *son*. In the Authorized E. V. it is retained as the patronymic of Peter, as Matthew retained it in Greek, Βἄρ Ἰωνᾶ; Jerome in Latin, *Bar-Jona*; Bengel, de Wette, and Ewald, in their German Versions, *Bar-Jona*; while Tyndale, Cranmer’s, and the Geneva Bibles, also Luther and Lange translate it into the corresponding vernacular. Compare similar compound names: *Bar-Abbas, Bar-Jesus, Bar-Nabas, Bar-Sabas, Bar-Timæus, Bar-Tholomæus*. The translation depends on whether the name is here simply the patronymic, or whether it has an allegorical meaning, as Olshausen and Lange contend. In the latter case it must be translated *son* of Jonah, or Jonas. See Lange’s *Exeg. Notes*, and my protesting footnote on ver. 17.—P. S.]

ἀγαθός, say] unto thee, That thou art Peter [Πέτρος], and upon this rock [πέτρα]³ I will build my Church [ἐκκλη-

³ Ver. 18.—[Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ,—one of the profoundest and most far-reaching prophetic, but, at the same time, one of the most controverted sayings of the Saviour, the exegetical rock on which the Papacy rests its gigantic claims (but not by direct proof, but by inference and with the help of undemonstrable intervening assumptions, as the transferability of Peter's primacy, his presence in Rome, and his actual transfer of the primacy upon the bishop of Rome), under the united protest of the whole Greek Catholic and Protestant Evangelical Churches, who contend that Christ says not a word about successors. Leaving the fuller exposition to the *Exegetical Notes*, we have to do here simply with the verbal rendering. In our Engl. Vers., as also in the German, the emphasis is lost, since *rock* and *Fels* are never used as proper names. We might literally translate: "Thou art *Peter*, and upon this *petress*;" or: "Thou art *Stone*, *Rockman*, *Man of rock* (*Felsenmann*), and upon this *rock*;" but neither of them would sound idiomatic and natural. It is perhaps remarkable that the languages of the two most Protestant nations cannot render the sentence in any way so favourable to the popish identification of the rock of the church with the person of Peter; while the Latin Vulgate simply retained the Greek *Petrus* and *petra*, and the French translation: "Tu es *Pierre*, et sur cette *Pierre*," even obliterates the distinction of the gender. The Saviour, no doubt, used in both clauses the Aramaic word ܨܦܬܪܐ (hence the Greek *Κηφᾶς* applied to Simon, John i. 42; comp. 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; ix. 5; xv. 5; Gal. ii. 9), which means *rock*, and is used both as a proper and a common noun. Hence the old Syriac translation of the N. T. renders the passage in question thus: "*Anath-hu* ΚΗΡΗ, *v'all hode* ΚΗΡΗ." The Arabic translation has *alsachra* in both cases. The proper translation then would be: "*Thou art Rock, and upon this rock*," etc. Yet it should not be overlooked that Matthew in rendering the word into Greek, no doubt under the influence of the Holy Spirit, deliberately changed the gender, using the masculine in the one case and the feminine in the other. He had, of course, to use Πέτρος in addressing a man (as Maldonatus in *loc.* correctly remarks: *Petrus, quia vir erat, non petra fœmineo, sed Petrus masculino nomine vocandus erat*); but he might with perfect propriety have continued: ἐπὶ τούτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ, instead of ἐπὶ τούτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ (which change Maldonatus less satisfactorily accounts for simply on the philological reason that the masculine πέτρος *et Atticum et rarum est*). The masculine πέτρος in Greek (in Homer and elsewhere) means generally only a piece of rock, or a stone (like the corresponding prose word λίθος), and very rarely a rock. (Meyer, however, quotes for the latter signification a passage from Plato: Σίσυφου πέτρος, one from Sophocles, and one from Pindar); but the feminine πέτρα always signifies *rock*, whether it be used literally or metaphorically (as a symbol of firmness, but also of hardheartedness). I would not press this distinction, in view of the Syriac ܨܦܬܪܐ, and in opposition to such eminent commentators as Bengel and Meyer, who, like the Rom. Cath. commentators, admit no difference of the terms in this case. (Bengel: *hæc duo, πέτρα et πέτρος stant pro uno nomine, sicut unum utrinque nomen ΚΗΡΗ legitur in Syriaco.*) But it is certainly possible, and to my mind almost certain, that Matthew expressed by the slight change of a word in Greek, what the Saviour intended in using, necessarily, the same word in Syriac, viz., that the *petra* on which the Church is built by Christ, the Divine architect and Lord of this spiritual temple, is not the *person* of Peter *as such*, but something more deep and comprehensive; in other words, that it is *Peter and his confession* of the central mystery of Christianity, or Peter *as the confessor of Christ*, Peter in Christ, and Peter, moreover, as representing *all the other apostles* in like relation to Christ (comp. Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xvi. 14). Nor should we explain ver. 18 inde-

σῖα];⁴ and the gates of hell [hades]⁵ shall not prevail against it.⁶ And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of 19

pendently of ver. 23. It is very significant that, while the *believing* and *confessing* Peter here is called rock, the *disobedient* and *dissuading* Peter immediately afterward (ver. 23), with surprising severity, is called for the time being Satau, the enemy of Christ. If the papacy has any claim to the rocklike nature of Peter, it has certainly also fallen at times under the condemnation of the sataucic, anti-christian, and denying Peter. Let us hope that it may imitate Peter also in his sincere repentance after the denial. Bengel: *Videat Petra romana, ne cadat sub censuram versus* 23.—Comp. the *Ezeg. Notes* below, and the translator's *History of the Apostolic Church*, § 89, p. 351 sqq.—P. S.]

⁴ Ver. 18.—[All the English versions before Queen Elizabeth, except that of Wiclif (which reads *chirche*), translate ἐκκλησία by the corresponding English word *congregation*; but the Bishop's Bible substituted for it *church*, and this, by express direction of King James, was retained not only here, but in all the passages of the N. T. in the revised and authorized version of 1611. Among German translators and commentators, the Roman Catholics, (Van Ess, Arnoldi, Allioli) render ἐκκλησία by the term *Kirche* (*church*); while the Protestant translators and commentators (Luther, John Friedr. von Meyer, Stier, de Wette, Ewald, H. A. W. Meyer and Lange) render: *Gemeinde* (*congregation*). The Greek ἐκκλησία, from ἐκκαλέω, to call out, to summon, occurs 114 times in the N. T. (twice in the Gospel of Matthew, but in no other Gospel, 24 times in the Acts, 68 times in the Epistles, 20 times in Revelation,) and corresponds to the Hebrew כְּנֶסֶת. It is not to be confounded with the more spiritual and comprehensive term *kingdom of God* or *kingdom of heaven*, so often used by our Saviour. It means generally any popular convocation, congregation, assembly, and in a Christian sense the *congregation of believers* called out of the world and consecrated to the service of Christ. It is used in the N. T. (1) in a *general* sense, of the *whole body of Christian believers*, or the *church universal*, Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Gal. i. 13; Eph. i. 22 (and in all the passages where the church is called the *body of Christ*); 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. xii. 23, etc.; (2) more frequently in a *particular* sense, of a *local congregation*, as in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Ephesus, in Corinth, in Rome, in Galatia, in Asia Minor, etc.; hence, also, it is often used in the plural, e. g., αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Ἀσίας, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἰθνην, Rom. xvi. 4; the seven churches, Rev. i. 4, 11, 20, etc. The Saviour himself makes use of the word only twice, viz.: in our passage, where it evidently means the *church universal*, which alone is indestructible, and in Matt. xviii. 17, where it can be understood only of a *local church* or *congregation* (*tell it to the church*). John never uses the term except in his third epistle. The word *church* is properly no translation of ἐκκλησία at all, but has etymologically a different meaning, being derived from the Greek κυριακόν, i. e. *belonging to the Lord*, through the medium of the Gothic, whence also the cognate terms in the Teutonic and Slavonic languages, the German *Kirche*, the Scotch *kirk*, the Swedish *kyrka*, the Danish *kyrke*, the Russian *zerkow*, the Polish *cerkiew*, the Bohemian *zyrkew*. (Leo, *Ferienschriften*, Halle, 1847, derives the word from the Celtic *cyrch* or *cylch*, i. e., centre, meeting place; but this would not explain the introduction of the word into the Slavonic nations, who received Christianity from the Greek church.) The word *church* is now used both in the general and in the particular sense, like ἐκκλησία, and in addition to this also in a third sense, viz., of a *building*, or house of worship, (Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* ix. 10, calls the meeting-houses of the Christians κυριακὰ οἰκία). As regards the English translation of ἐκκλησία, a number of modern commentators advocate a return to the term *congregation* throughout the whole N. T. But it is neither possible nor desirable to expel the term *church* from the English Bible, which has long since become the full equivalent of the Greek ἐκκλησία. We might use *church*, where the word signifies the whole body of believers, and *congregation*, where a particular or local assembly of Christians

heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

is intended. But even this is unnecessary. The Geneva Bible also employed the term *church* in a few passages, though not in ours, where it seems to me to be more appropriate than *congregation*.—P. S.]

⁵ Ver. 18.—[Πύλαι ᾄδου, in Hebrew שַׁעֲרֵי שְׂאֵרֶיךָ *shaäre sheol*, Isa. xxxviii. 10, an alliteration. On *hades*, as distinct from *hell*, compare the *Exeg. Notes* below, and also the *Crit. Notes* on xi. 23, p. 210.—P. S.]

⁶ Ver. 18.—Οὐ κατισχύσει αὐτῆς, from κατισχύω *twos, prævalere adversus aliquem*, comp. Isa. xv. 18, Sept. Tyndale, the Bishops', King James', and the Douay Bibles agree in translating: *shall not prevail against it*; the Lat. Vulgate: *non prævalebunt adversus eam*; Luther, de Wette, Ewald, Lange: *überwältigen*; Meyer: *die Obermacht haben (behalten)*. I prefer the *prevail* of the Authorized Vers. to *overcome* (Geneva Bible) as expressing better the idea of ultimate triumph over long-continued passive resistance. The term must be explained in conformity to the architectural figure which runs through this whole passage:—*gates, build, keys*. Hades is represented as a hostile fortress which stands over against the apparently defenceless, yet immovable temple of the Christian Church, to which our Lord here promises *indestructible life*. (*Ecclesia non potest deficere*.) The gates of *hades*, or the realm of death, by virtue of the universal dominion of sin, admit and confine all men, and (like the gates in Dante's *Inferno* with the famous terrific inscription) were barred against all return, until the Saviour overcame death and "him that hath the power of death" (Hebr. ii. 14) and came forth unharmed and triumphant from the empire of death as conqueror and Prince of life. Hades could not retain Him (Acts ii. 27, 31). The same power of life He imparts to His people, who often, especially during the ages of persecution and martyrdom, seemed to be doomed to destruction, but always rose to new life and vigor, and shall reign with Christ for ever. Comp. Rev. i. 18: "I am alive for ever more, and have the keys of death and *hades*;" and 1 Cor. xv. 26: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed, is death." This interpretation of the figure appears to me much more appropriate than the usual one, which takes *hades* here in the sense of *hell*, and assumes an active *assault* of the infernal armies, rushing, as it were, through these gates and storming the fortress of Christ's Church. To this interpretation I object: (1) That *gates* are not an active and *aggressive*, but a passive and *confining* power; (2) that *hades*, although closely related to *geenah* or *hell* and including it, is yet a wider conception, and means here, as elsewhere, the realm of death (*das Reich der Todten*), which swallows up all mortals and confines for ever those who have no part in the victory of Christ over death, *hell*, and *damnation*.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES.

Ver. 13. **Into the parts of Cesarea Philippi.**—The cure of the blind person at the eastern Bethsaida (Mark xiii. 22) had taken place before that. *Cesarea Philippi*, formerly called *Panœas* (Plin. II. N. v. 15,) from the mountain Panius, dedicated to Pan, in the immediate neighbourhood. The town is supposed to have been the ancient *Leshem*, Josh. xix. 47; *Laish*, Judg. xviii. 7; and *Dan*—"from Dan to Beersheba." It lay near the sources of Jordan, at the foot of Mount Lebanon, a day's journey from Sidon, in Gaulonitis, and was partly inhabited by heathens. The town was enlarged and beautified by Philip the Tetrarch, who called it *Cesarea (Kingston)* in honour of Cæsar Tiberius. The name *Philippi* was

intended to distinguish it from *Cæsarea Palestine* (Robinson, *Palest.* ii. 439; also, vol. iii. sect. ix.) Tradition reports that the woman with the issue of blood resided here. Her name is said to have been Berenice. Agrippa II. further embellished this city, and called it *Neronias* in honour of Nero. The modern village of Banias, and the ruins around it, mark the site of the ancient city.

Who (not whom) do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?—How do men explain the appearance of the Son of Man? Meyer: What do they understand by the designation, Son of Man? De Wette: I who am a humble, lowly man. But this completely misses the peculiar import of the expression, *Son of Man*.

Ver. 14. **Some say.**—"The reply shows that, in general, He was *not yet* looked upon as the Messiah:" Meyer. But according to the representation of the evangelist, we must rather infer that Christ's enemies had by their calumnies succeeded in lowering the popular estimate concerning him.

John the Baptist.—See ch. xiv. 2. This, for a time, had been the opinion of the courtiers of Herod.—**Elijah,**—as the precursor of the Messiah. Such was the view professed by those whom fear of their superiors induced to deny His claims to the Messianic office, while, from a desire of not entirely surrendering the expectations which had been excited by His appearance, they still regarded Him as a prophet.—**Jeremiah.**—Of course, in the same sense as Elijah,—not in the sense of literally revisiting the earth, nor in that of implying the doctrine of the transmigration of souls [metempsychosis].* The opinion of these persons concerning Jesus was evidently lower than that of those who regarded Him as Elijah. (Mark xv. 35; John i. 21). The one party referred especially to what might be designated as the reformation inaugurated by Jesus, while the other had regard to His denunciations of the corruptions of the times.—**Or one of the prophets.**—According to the lowest view, He was represented by discouraged friends as one of the old prophets. Three points are clearly brought out in this conversation: 1. That, to a certain extent, Jesus was still generally acknowledged by the people. 2. That the faith of the majority had been lowered and misled by the influence of their superiors, so that diverging opinions were now entertained regarding Him. 3. That this inconsistency and wavering led to a decreasing measure of homage.

Ver. 15. **But who say ye that I am?**—This was the decisive moment in which the separation of the New Testament *ἐκκλησία* from the Old Testament theocracy was to be made. The hour had come for the utterance of a distinct Christian confession.

Ver. 16. **Simon Peter.**—Peter answered not merely in his own name,

* [Some, however, no doubt believed in a bodily resurrection of Elijah or Jeremiah. The latter was accounted by the Jews as the first in the prophetic canon. See Lightfoot on Matt. xxvii. 9.—P. S.]

but in that of all the disciples.*—**Thou art the Christ**,—*i. e.* the Messiah Himself. And this, not in the sense in which carnal Jewish traditionalism held the doctrine of the Messiah, but in the true and spiritual import of the title—**the Son of the living God**. The latter expression must not be taken merely in a *negative* sense, as denoting the *True God* in opposition to false deities; it must also be viewed in a *positive* sense, as referring to Him whose manifestations in Israel were completed in and crowned by the appearance of His Son as the Messiah. This, however, implies Sonship not only in a moral or official, but also in the ontological sense. Thus the reply of Peter had all the characteristics of a genuine confession—being *decided, solemn, and deep*.

[The confession of Peter is the first and fundamental Christian confession of faith, and the germ of the Apostles' Creed. It is a confession, not of mere human opinions, or views, or convictions, however firm, but of a divinely wrought faith, and not of faith only (*I believe that Thou art*), but of adoration and worship (*Thou art*). It is christological, *i. e.*, a confession of Jesus Christ as the centre and heart of the whole Christian system, and the only and all-sufficient fountain of spiritual life. It is a confession of Jesus Christ as a true man (*Thou, Jesus*), as the promised Messiah (*the Christ*), and as the eternal Son of God (*the Son—not a son—of the living God*), hence as the God-Man and Saviour of the world. It is thus a confession of the mystery of the Incarnation in the widest sense, the great central mystery of godliness, "God manifest in the flesh."—Compare also the excellent remarks of Olshausen (in Kendrick's Am. ed., vol. i. p. 545 sq.) and Alford, who, following Olshausen, says *in loc.*: "The confession is not made in the terms of the other answer: it is not '*we say,*' or '*I say,*' but '**Thou art.**' It is the expression of an inward conviction wrought by God's Spirit. The excellence of this confession is, that it brings out both the human and the divine nature of the Lord: ὁ Χριστός is the Messiah, the Son of David, the anointed King; ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος is the Eternal Son, begotten of the Eternal Father, as the last word most emphatically implies not 'Son of God' in any inferior figurative sense, not one of the sons of God, of angelic nature, but **the Son of the living God**, having in Him the Sonship and the divine nature, *in a sense in which they could be in none else*. This was the view of the person of Christ quite distinct from the Jewish Messianic idea, which appears to have been (Justin Mart. *Dial.* p. 267) that he should be born from men, but selected by God

* [This is the correct view, already maintained by the fathers, *e. g.* Chrysostom, who, in Hom. 54, calls Peter in this connection *the mouth of the apostles*, τὸ στόμα τῶν ἀποστόλων: by Jerome, *Petrus ex persona omnium apostolorum profetetur*; and by Thomas Aquinas, *Ipse respondet et pro se et pro aliis*. Some Rom. Cath. commentators, as Passaglia and Arnoldi, for obvious reasons, maintain that Peter spoke only in his own name. But the Saviour addressed His question to all the disciples, and they certainly must have assented to Peter's confession of faith, which they had from the time of their calling, and without which they could not have been apostles. Comp. John i. 42, 46, 50, also the remarks of Dr. Schegg, a Rom. Cath. Com. *in loc.* (vol. ii. p. 349).—P. S.]

for the office on account of his eminent virtues. This distinction accounts for the solemn blessing pronounced in the next verse. *Zῶντος* must not for a moment be taken here, as it sometimes is used (e. g., Acts xiv. 15), as merely distinguishing the true God from dead idols: it is here emphatic, and imparts force and precision to *υἱός*. That Peter, when he uttered the words, understood by them in detail all that we now understand, is not of course here asserted, but that they were his testimony to the true Humanity and true Divinity of the Lord, in that sense of deep truth and reliance, out of which springs the Christian life of the Church." Meyer, indeed, takes *τῷ ζῶντος* simply as the solemn epithet of the true God in opposition to the dead idols of the heathen; but there was no reason here for contrasting the true God with heathen idols, and Peter must have meant to convey the idea, however imperfectly understood by him at the time, that the Godhead itself was truly revealed in, and reflected from, the human person of Christ in a sense and to a degree compared with which all former manifestations of God appeared to him like dead shadows. He echoed the declaration from heaven at Christ's baptism: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," and recognized in Him the essential and eternal life of the great Jehovah.—P. S.]

Ver. 17. **Jesus answered.**—Also a confession, decided, solemn, and deep; being the divine confession of the Lord in favour of the Church, which had now confessed His name, and of her first witness.—**Blessed art thou** (comp. Rom. x. 9), **Simon, son of Jonah.***—Meyer denies in vain the antithesis between this address and the new title given to Peter. Different views have been taken in reference to this antithesis. 1. Paulus explains it: Simon, or obedient hearer,—son of Jonas, or son of oppression. 2. Olshausen: *דביר* *dove*, with reference to the Holy Spirit under the figure of a dove. Thou, Simon, art a child of the Spirit. 3. Lange (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 469): Thou, Simon, son of a dove (which makes its nest in the rock, a figure of the Church), shalt be called a rock (the rock-like dwelling-place of the dove, *i. e.*, of the Church).† With this antithesis the other in the same verse is connected. According to the flesh, thou art a natural son of Jonah; but according to this revelation of the Spirit, a child of the Father who is in heaven (referring to his regeneration, and

* [According to Lange's version. Comp. my critical note above.—P. S.]

† [I confess that this allegorical exposition of the term appears to me as far-fetched and improbable as that of Olshausen. *Bar Jona* has nothing to do with a dove, but is a contraction for *Bar Joanna* (Chaldaic), *i. e.*, *Son of John*, as is evident from John xxi. 15, 16, 17, where Christ addresses Peter: *Σίμων Ἰαάννου*. But there may be in this use of the patronymic an allusion to the title *Son of Man* in ver. 13, which would give additional emphasis to the counter confession, in this sense: That I, the Son of Man, am at the same time the Messiah and the eternal Son of God, is as true as that thou, Simon, art the Son of Jonah; and as thou hast thus confessed Me as the Messiah, I will now confess thee as Peter, etc. If the Saviour spoke in Aramaic or Chaldaic, as He undoubtedly did on ordinary occasions and with His disciples, He used the term *Bar* in ver. 17, from Dan. vii. 13, the prophetic passage from which the Messianic appellation *Son of Man* was derived, so that *Bar enahsh* (*Son of Man*) and *Bar-Jonah* would correspond.—P. S.]

consequent faith and confession. [Similarly Alford: The name "*Simon Bar Jonas*" is doubtless used as indicating his fleshly state and extraction, and forming the greater contrast to his spiritual state, name, and blessing, which follow. The name Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ, Simon, son of Jonas or Jonah, is uttered when he is reminded by the thrice-repeated inquiry, "Lovest thou me?" of his frailty, in his previous denial of his Lord, John xxi. 15, 16, 17.—P. S.]

Flesh and Blood.—Various views have been taken of this expression.

1. Calvin, Beza, Neander, De Wette, refer it to our physical nature in opposition to the πνεῦμα. To this Meyer objects, that our physical nature is termed in Scripture only σὰρξ, not σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα (in 1 Cor. xv. 50, "*flesh and blood*" should be literally understood). 2. According to Lightfoot and Meyer, it must be taken (with special reference to the fact, that the Rabbins use בֶּשָׂר וְדָם as a kind of paraphrase for *Son of Man*, including the accessory idea of the weakness involved in our corporeal nature), as simply denoting *weak man*, equivalent to *nemo mortalium* (as in Gal. i. 16). 3. We explain it: the natural, carnal descent, as contrasted with spiritual generation. John i. 13: οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, κ. τ. λ. This appears still further from the connection between the expressions, "*flesh and blood*" and "*son of Jonah*," and from the antithesis, "*My Father who is in heaven*." Hence Gal. i. 16 must mean: When I received a commission to preach to the Gentiles, I conferred not with my Jewish nationality; and Eph. vi. 12: In reality, we wrestle not with beings of human kind, but with the powers of darkness, whose representatives and instruments they are; and 1 Cor. xv. 50: The kind which is of this world (of the first man, who is of the earth) shall not inherit the kingdom of God; but we must enter it by a complete transformation into a second and new life which is from heaven. Accordingly, the antithesis in the text is between knowledge resulting from natural human development, or on the basis of natural birth, and knowledge proceeding from the revelation of the Father in heaven, or on the basis of regeneration.

Hath not revealed it,—but my Father.—A difficulty has been felt, how to reconcile this declaration with the fact, that the disciples had at a much earlier period recognized Jesus as the Messiah (John i. 42, 46, 50).

1. Olshausen holds that this confession of Peter indicates a much more advanced state of knowledge: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ ζῶντος. 2. Neander thinks that all earlier revelations had more or less proceeded from flesh and blood. 3. Meyer suggests that the text refers to that first acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, in consequence of which the disciples came and surrendered themselves to Him.* 4. In our view, the new element

* [Not exactly. In the fourth edition of his *Com. on Matt.* p. 320, Meyer assumes that Peter, although long since convinced, with the rest of the disciples, of the Messiahship of Jesus, was on this occasion favoured with a special divine revelation on the subject and spoke from a state of inspiration. "Daher," he says "ist ἀπὸ κἀνοψὸς nicht auf eine schon beim ersten Anschliessen an Jesum erhaltene Offenbarung, welche den Jüngern geworden, zu beziehen, sondern auf PETRUS und eine IHN auszeichnende besondere ἀπὸ κἀνοψὸς zu beschränken.—P. S.]

in this confession lies, first of all, in its ethical form. It was no longer a mere knowledge (or recognition) of Christ. While the general *knowledge* of the Jews concerning the Messiah had retrograded and degenerated into discordant and self-contradictory *opinions*, the knowledge of the disciples had *advanced*, and was now summed up and concentrated into an act of spiritual faith in Peter's confession, which, in view of the hostility of the Jewish rulers, may be characterized as a real martyrdom (*μαρτυρία*). Another new element lay in the view now expressed concerning the Messiah. On all the main points, the Jewish and traditional notions of the Messiah had evidently been thrown off, and a pure and spiritual faith attained from converse with the life of Jesus. In both these respects, it was a revelation of the Father in heaven, *i. e.*, a heavenly and spiritual production. The new life was germinating in the hearts of the disciples. —De Wette regards this passage as incompatible with the earlier acknowledgments of the Messiah; while Fritzsche, Schneckenburger, and Strauss talk of a twofold period in Christ's ministry: the first, when He was a disciple of John; the second, when He attained to consciousness of His Messianic dignity. But these critics have wholly misunderstood this narrative.

Ver. 18. **But I also say unto thee.**—The expression shows in a striking manner the reciprocity existing between Christ and His disciples. Their confession solicits His confession.*

Thou art Peter.—Πέτρος, in Aramaic, ܩܝܡܐ, *the stone, or the rock* (see Meyer). The Greek masculine noun arose from the translation of the name into Greek; the name itself had been given at an earlier period, John i. 42. It was now bestowed a second time to indicate *the relationship subsisting between Peter and the Ecclesia*, rather than to prove that Peter really was what his name implied (Meyer). From the first this name was intended to be symbolical; although its real meaning was only attained at a later period in the history of Peter. But at the same time the words of Jesus imply the acknowledgment that his character as Peter had just appeared in this confession. [It should be observed that in John i. 42 (in the Gr. text, ver. 43) we read: "Thou shalt be called (καλεθήσῃ) Cephas," but here: "Thou art (εἶ) Peter."—P. S.]

And on this rock.—For the various interpretations of this passage, see Wolf's *Curæ*. We submit the following summary of them: 1. The term "rock" is referred to *Christ* Himself. Thus Jerome,† August-

* [MALDONATUS: "ET EGO. Elegans antithesis, Græce etiam efficacior: κήρυξ δέ, SED ET EGO DICO TIBI; quasi dicat; tu, qui homo es, Filium Dei vivi me esse dixisti, ego vero, qui Filius Dei vivi sum, dico te esse Petrum, id est vicarium meum [1], quem Filium Dei esse confessus est. Nam Ecclesiam meam, quæ super me ædificata est, super te etiam, tanquam super secundarium quoddam fundamentum ædificabo."—P. S.]

† [This needs modification. JEROME, in his *Comment. on Matt. xvi. 18* (*Opera*, ed. Vallars., tom. vii. p. 124), explains the passage thus: "Sicut ipse lumen Apostolis donavit, ut lumen mundi appellarentur, cæteraque ex Domino sortiti sunt vocabula: ita et Simoni, QUI CREDEBAT IN PETRAM CHRISTUM, Petri largitus est nomen. Ac secundum metaphoram petræ, recte dicitur ei: ÆDIFICABO

tine,* Chemnitz, Fabricius, and others.†—2. It is referred to Peter's *confession*. Thus most of the Fathers, and several of the Popes,

ECCLESIAM MEAM SUPER TE." The last words (*super te*) show that he referred the *petra* not only to Christ, but in a derivative sense also to Peter as the confessor. So in another passage (*Ep. ad Damas. papam*, Ep. 15, ed. Val. i. 37, sq.) he says of *Peter*: "*super illam petram œdificatam ecclesiam seio.*" Jerome also regards the bishop of Rome as the successor of Peter, but advocates elsewhere the equal rights of bishops, so that he can be quoted only in favour of a Roman primacy of honour, not of a supremacy of jurisdiction. Comp. on Jerome's views concerning the papacy the second vol. of my *General Church History*, now preparing for the press, § 61, p. 304, sq.—P. S.]

* [*I. e.*, AUGUSTINE in his later years; for at first he referred the *petra* to the person of *Peter*. He says in his *Retractions*, i. cap. 21, at the close of his life: "I have somewhere said of St. Peter that the church is built upon him as rock. . . . But I have since frequently said that the word of the Lord: 'Thou art *Petrus*, and on this *petra* I will build my church,' must be understood of him, whom Peter confessed as Son of the living God; and Peter, so named after this rock, represents the person of the church, which is founded on this rock and has received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For it was not said to him: 'Thou art a rock' (*petra*), but 'Thou art *Peter*' (*Petrus*); and the rock was Christ, through confession of whom Simon received the name of Peter. Yet the reader may decide which of the two interpretations is the more probable." In the same strain he says, in another place: "Peter, in virtue of the primacy of his apostolate, stands, by a figurative generalization, for the church. . . . When it was said to him, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c., he represented the whole church, which in this world is assailed by various temptations, as if by floods and storms, yet does not fall, because it is founded upon a rock, from which Peter received his name. For the rock is not so named from Peter, but Peter from the rock (*non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra*), even as Christ is not so called after the Christian, but the Christian after Christ. For the reason why the Lord says, 'On this rock I will build my church,' is that Peter had said: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' On this rock, which thou hast confessed, says he, I will build my church. For Christ was the the rock (*petra enim erat Christus*) upon which also Peter himself was built; for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Thus the church, which is built upon Christ, has received from him, in the person of Peter, the keys of heaven, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins." (*Aug. Tract. in Evang. Joannis*, 124, § 5.) AMBROSE, too, at one time refers the *petra* to Christ, as when he says in *Luc. ix. 20*: "*Petra est Christus*," etc., but at other times to the person of Peter, as in the famous morning hymn quoted by Augustin (*Hoc ipsa petra ecclesie Canente, culpam diluit*), and again to his confession, or rather to Peter and his confession. Comp. my *Church History*, vol. ii. p. 304. A similar apparent inconsistency we find in other fathers. The reference of the rock to Christ was also advocated by THEODORET, *ad 1 Cor. iii. 11*, the venerable BEDE in *Marc. iii*: "*Petra erat Christus* (1 Cor. x. 4). *Nam Simoni qui credebatur in PETRAM CHRISTUM, Petri largitus est nomen*;" and even by Pope Gregory VII. in the inscription to the crown he sent to the rival emperor Rudolph: "PETRA (*i. e.*, Christ) *dedit PETRO* (Peter), *PETRUS* (the pope) *diadema Rudolpho*."—P. S.]

† [Especially CALOVIUS in the Lutheran, and quite recently Dr. WORDSWORTH in the Anglican, and (evidently under the influence of Wordsworth's arguments) Dr. JOS. A. ALEXANDER of the Presbyt. Church (although the latter, as usual with him in critical passages, does not finally decide). Dr. Wordsworth rests his laboured defence of the later Augustinian interpretation mainly on the difference between *πέτρος*, stone, and *πίτρα*, rock, which he thinks (referring to Lightfoot and Beveridge) had a parallel in the Syriac *Cephas* or

Leo I,* Huss in the *Tractat. de ecclesia*, the *Articuli Smalcald.* in the *Append.*, Luther, Febronius, and others.—3. It is applied to Peter him-

Kepha (doubtful); on the fact that in the O. T. the title *Rock* is reserved to God Almighty (2 Sam. xxii. 32; Ps. xviii. 31; lxii. 2, 6, 7, etc.); and on the admitted equality of the apostles. He thus paraphrases the words of the Saviour: “I myself, now confessed by thee to be God and Man, am the Rock of the Church. This is the foundation on which it is built.” And because St. Peter had confessed Him as such, He says to St. Peter, ‘Thou hast confessed Me, and I will now confess thee; thou hast owned Me, I will now own thee; thou art Peter, *i. e.*, thou art a lively stone, hewn out of, and built upon Me, the living *Rock*. Thou art a genuine *Petros* of Me, the divine *Petra*. And whosoever would be a lively stone, a *Peter*, must imitate thee in this thy true confession of Me the living *Rock*; for upon this *Rock*, that is, on *Myself*, believed and confessed to be *both God and Man*, I will build My Church.’” This is all true enough in itself considered, but it is no exposition of the passage. Everybody knows and admits, that in the *highest* sense of the term *Christ* and He alone is the immovable (divine) *Rock* of the Church, the foundation (*Στεῖνον*), on which the apostles built and besides which no other can be laid, 1 Cor. iii. 11; comp. 1 Cor. x. 4 (*πέτρα*); Matt. vii. 24, 25. But it is equally true that in a *subordinate* sense the *apostles* are called the (human) foundation on which the Church is built, Eph. ii. 20; (*ἰσχυροὶ θεμελίοντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, κ. τ. λ.*); Rev. xxi. 14 (*θεμελίον δόδικα, κ. τ. λ.*). Now in our passage Christ appears not as rock, *i. e.*, as part of the building itself, but under a higher figure as *architect* and *Lord* of the whole spiritual temple; and the mixing of figures in one breath as this interpretation implies, would be a plain violation of rhetorical taste and propriety such as we should not for a moment think of in connection with our Saviour. Again, the *antianaclassis* (*i. e.*, the rhetorical figure of repeating the same word in a different sense) is conclusive against this explanation. The demonstrative *ταύτη* must refer to *πέτρος*, which immediately precedes; for there is not the least intimation that the Saviour, after having said: “Thou art *Rockman*,” turned away from Peter, and pointing to Himself, continued: “and on *THIS rock* (*i. e.*, *Myself*, ἐπ’ ἑμυαυτῷ) I will build My Church.” On the contrary, He immediately continues: “And I will give TO THEE,” καὶ δώσω σοί, which can, of course, mean nobody else but Peter. This interpretation of Augustine and Wordsworth destroys the rhetorical beauty and emphasis of the passage, and can give us no advantage whatever in our controversy with Rome, which must and can be refuted on far better grounds than forced exegesis.—P. S.]

* [This reference to the fathers is too indefinite, and hardly correct as far as Leo and the popes are concerned. The majority of the fathers, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo I., Gregory of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, etc., vary in their interpretation, referring the *petra* sometimes to the person of Peter, sometimes to his faith or confession, and sometimes (as Jerome and Augustine) to Christ Himself. (Comp. Maldonatus, *Comment. in quatuor Evangelistas*, ed. Martin. tom. i., p. 219 sq., and my *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii., §§ 61 and 63, pp. 302 sqq. and 314 sqq., where the principal passages are quoted.) But this inconsistency is more apparent than real, since Peter and his faith in Christ cannot be separated in this passage. *Peter* (representing the other apostles) as *believing and confessing Christ* (but in no other capacity) is the *petra ecclesiæ*. This is the true interpretation, noticed by Lange sub number 3. b). Comp. my *Critical Note*, No. 3, below the text. But the confession (or faith alone cannot be meant, for two reasons: first, because this construction assumes an abrupt transition from the person to a thing, and destroys the significance of the demonstrative and emphatic *ταύτη* which evidently refers to the nearest antecedent *Petros*; and secondly, because the church is not built upon abstract doctrines and confessions, but upon living persons believing and confessing the truth (Eph. ii. 20;

self. (a) In the popish sense, by Baronius and Bellarmin, [Passaglia,] as implying that Peter was invested with a permanent primacy;* (b) with reference to the special call and work of Peter as an Apostle. By thee, Peter, as the most prominent of My witnesses, shall the Church be founded and established: Acts ii. and x. So, many Roman Catholics, as Launoi, Dupin,—and later Protestant expositors, as Werenfels, Pfaff, Bengel, and Crusius. Heubner thinks that the *antanaclasis*, or the connecting of *Peter* with *πέτρα*, is in favour of this view. But he [as also nearly all other commentators who represent this view] combines with it the application of the term to the confession.†—4. It is applied to Peter, *inclusive of all the other Apostles*, and, indeed, of *all believers*. Thus Origen on Matt. xvi. 18: "Every believer who is enlightened by the Father is also a rock."—5. In our opinion, the Lord here generalizes, so to speak, the individual Peter into the general *πέτρα*, referring to what may be called the Petrine characteristic of the Church—viz., *faithfulness of confession*,‡—as first distinctly exhibited by Peter. Hence the words of

1 Pet. ii. 4-6; Gal. ii. 9; Rev. xxi. 14). Dr. Jos. A. Alexander, however, is too severe on this interpretation in calling it as forced and unnatural as the Roman Catholic. It undoubtedly implies an element of truth, since Peter in this passage is addressed as the bold and fearless confessor of Christ.—P. S.]

* [The Romish interpretation is liable to the following objections: (1) It obliterates the distinction between *petros* and *petra*; (2) it is inconsistent with the true nature of the architectural figure; the foundation of a building is one and abiding, and not constantly renewed and changed; (3) it confounds priority of time with permanent superiority of rank; (4) it confounds the apostolate, which, strictly speaking, is not transferable but confined to the original personal disciples of Christ, and inspired organs of the Holy Spirit, with the post-apostolic episcopate; (5) it involves an injustice to the other apostles, who, as a body, are expressly called the foundation, or foundation stones of the church; (6) it contradicts the whole spirit of Peter's epistles, which is strongly anti-hierarchical, and disclaims any superiority over his "*fellow-presbyters*;" (7) finally, it rests on gratuitous assumptions which can never be proven either exegetically or historically, viz., the transferability of Peter's primacy, and its actual transfer upon the bishop, not of Jerusalem nor of Antioch (where Peter certainly was), but of Rome exclusively. Comp. also the long note to § 94 in my *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 374 sqq.—P. S.]

† [So also OLSHAUSEN: "Peter, in his new spiritual character, appears as the supporter of Christ's great work; Jesus Himself is the creator of the whole, Peter, the first stone of the building;" DE WETTE: "ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, on thee as this *firm confessor*;" MEYER: "on no other but this (ταύτῃ) rock, *i. e.*, Peter so called for his firm and strong faith in Christ;" ALFORD: "Peter was the first of those *foundation-stones* (Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14) on which the living temple of God was built: this building itself beginning on the day of Pentecost by the laying of *three thousand living stones* on this very foundation;" D. BROWN: "not on the man Bar-jona; but on him as the heaven-taught Confessor of such a faith;" and more or less clearly, Grotius, Le Clerc, Whitby, Doddridge, Clarke, Bloomfield, Barnes, Eadie, Owen, Crosby (who, however, wrongly omits the reference to the confession), Whedon, Nast. I can see no material difference between this interpretation and Lange's own sub No. 5, which is only a modification or expansion of it. I have already remarked in a former note that this is the true exposition which the majority of the fathers intended, though with some inclination to the subsequent Romish application of the promise to a supposed successor.—P. S.]

‡ [*Die petrinische Bekenntnistreue*.—P. S.]

Jesus only refer to Peter in so far as by this confession he identified himself with Christ, and was the first to upbuild the Church by his testimony. But in so far as the text alludes to an abiding foundation of the Church, the expression refers not to the Apostle as an individual, but to *πίστευ* in the more general sense, or to faithfulness of confession. That Peter was here meant in his higher relation, and not in himself, appears from the change of terms, first *πέτρος*, then *πέτρα*; also from the contrast in ver. 22; while the fact that his distinction conferred no official primacy is evident from this, that the same rights and privileges were bestowed upon all the Apostles: Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 23; Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14. That he himself claimed no preëminence appears from his First Epistle, in which he designates Christ as the corner-stone, and Christians as living stones, 1 Pet. ii. 5, 6 (as themselves Peters, or related to Peter). Lastly, that he knew of no successors in the sense of the Papacy, is proved by his exhortation to the presbyters not to be lords over God's heritage (the *κληροί*, 1 Pet. v. 3.)

My Church.—Here the *ἐκκλησία* of Christ appears for the first time in distinct contrast to the Jewish congregation, *קהלה*. Hence the passage refers not simply to a community of believers, but to a definite organization of this community (compare what follows on the keys). Accordingly, the passage alludes to the Church as the organized and visible form of the *βασίλεια τῶν οὐρανῶν*. The Church is not the kingdom of heaven itself, but a positive institution of Christ, by which, on the one hand, the kingdom of heaven becomes directly manifest in the world by its *worship*, while, on the other hand, it spreads through the world by means of its *missionary efforts*. The Church bears the same relation to the kingdom of heaven as the Messianic state under the Old Testament to the theocracy, the two being certainly not identical.

The gates of hades (underworld).—De Wette: "Here, equivalent to the kingdom of Satan." But this is not the scriptural conception of hades or sheol. Throughout the Bible hades means the kingdom of death; which is, indeed, connected with the kingdom of Satan, but has a more comprehensive meaning. Hades is described as having *gates*; it is figuratively represented as a castle with gates (Song viii. 6; Job xxxviii. 17; Isa. xxxviii. 10; Ps. cvii. 18). These gates serve a hostile purpose, since they opened, like a yawning abyss of death, to swallow up Christ, and then Peter, or the Apostles and the Church, in their martyrdom. For a long time it seemed as if the Church of Christ would become the prey of this destroying hades. But its gates *shall not ultimately prevail*—they shall be taken; and Christ will overcome and abolish the kingdom of death in His Church (see Isa. xxv. 8; Hos. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 15; Eph. i. 19, 20). Of course, the passage also implies conflict with the kingdom of evil, and victory over it; but its leading thought is the triumph of *life over death*, of the kingdom of the *resurrection* over the usurped reign of the kingdom of *hades*.—Erasmus, Calvin, and others, refer it to the victory over Satan; Grotius, to that over death; Ewald, to that over all the monsters of hell, let loose through these open gates; Glöckler, to that over

the machinations of the kingdom of darkness (the gate being the place of council in the East); Meyer, to the superiority of the Church over hades, without any allusion to an attack on the part of hades. The idea, that the Old Testament *ἐκκλησία* would fall before the gates of hades, is here evidently implied (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 887).

Ver. 19. **The keys of the kingdom of heaven.**—Luke xi. 52; Rev. i. 18, iii. 7; ix. 1; xx. 1. It is the prerogative of the Apostles, either to admit into the kingdom of heaven, or to exclude from it. Meyer: "The figure of the keys corresponds with the figurative expression *οἰκοδομήσω* in ver. 18; since in ver. 18 the *ἐκκλησία*, which, at Christ's second appearing, is destined to become the *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* [as if this were not already its real, though not its open character, which at Christ's second coming shall only become outwardly manifest!]
—is represented as a building. But, in reference to Peter, the figure changes from that of a rock, or foundation, to that of an *οἰκονόμος*; or, in other words, from the position and character of Peter to his office and work." But evidently the antithesis here presented is different from this view. Peter is designated the foundation-stone as being the first confessing member of the Church, though with an allusion to his calling; while in his official relation to the Church he is represented as guardian of the Holy City. Hence the expression, rock, refers to the nucleus of the Church as embodied in Peter; while the keys allude to the special office and vocation in the church.

[ALFORD: "Another personal promise to Peter, remarkably fulfilled in his being the first to admit both Jews and Gentiles into the Church; thus using the power of the keys to open the door of salvation." WORDSWORTH applies the promise in a primary and personal sense to Peter, but in a secondary and general sense also to the Church, and especially the ministers who hold and profess the faith of Peter, and are called to preach the gospel, to administer the sacraments, and to exercise discipline. AUGUSTINE: "*Has claves non homo unus, sed unitas accepit ecclesie.*"—P. S.]

And whatsoever thou shalt bind.—A somewhat difficult antithesis, especially with reference to the preceding context. Bretschneider, (*Lexicon*): "The expression '*binding*' means to bind with the Church; and '*loosing*,' to loose from the Church." But this is to confound ideas which are very different. Olshausen understands it of the ancient custom of tying the doors. But the text speaks of a key. Stier regards it as in accordance with rabbinical phraseology, taken from the Old Testament; *binding* and *loosing* being equivalent to *forbidding* and *permitting*, and more especially to *remitting* and *retaining* sins. But these two ideas are quite different. Lightfoot, Schöttgen, and, after them, Von Ammon, hold that the expression implied three things: 1. Authority to declare a thing unlawful or lawful. Thus Meyer regards *δέειν* and *λύειν* as equivalent to the rabbinical אסר and היתיר, *to forbid*, and *to permit*. 2. To pronounce an action, accordingly, as criminal or innocent. 3. Thereupon to pronounce a ban or to revoke it. But as the Lord here speaks of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, He can only have referred directly to the last-mentioned meaning of the expression, though it involved the first and second,

as the *sentence* of the Apostles would always be according to truth. A comparison of the parallel passage in Matt. xviii. 18 confirms this view. There *Church discipline* is enjoined on the disciples collectively, to whom precisely the same assurance is given which in the text is granted to Peter alone; while in John xx. 23 the order is reversed: the expression, *remitting* sins, being equivalent for *loosing*, and *retaining* sins, for *binding*. The whole passage forms a contrast to the ecclesiastical discipline of the Pharisees, Matt. xxiii. From the evangelical character of the New Testament ministry, it seems to us impossible to interpret the expression as meaning to *forbid* and to *permit*, according to the analogy of rabbinical usage. To bind up sins, as in a bundle, implies coming judgment (Job xiv. 17; Hos. xiii. 12); while, on the other hand, sins forgiven are described as loosed (LXX. Isa. xl. 2). Both figures are based on a deeper view of the case. When a person is refused admission into the Church, or excluded from it, all the guilt of his life is, so to speak, concentrated into one judgment; while its collective effect is removed, or loosed, when he is received into the Church, or absolved. The object of this binding and loosing is stated only in general terms. No doubt it combined all the three elements of the power of the keys, as the non-remission or remission of sins (Chrysostom and many others),—viz.: 1. The principle of admission or non-admission into the Church, or the announcement of grace and of judgment (the kingdom of heaven is closed to unbelievers, opened to believers.) 2. Personal decision as to the admission of catechumens (Acts viii.). 3. The exercise of discipline, or the administration of excommunication from the Church (in the narrower sense, *i. e.*, without curse or interdict attaching thereto). In the antithesis between earth and heaven, the former expression refers to the order and organization of the visible Church; the latter, to the kingdom of heaven itself. These two elements then—the actual and the ideal Church—were to coincide in the pure administration of the Apostles. But this promise is limited by certain conditions. It was granted to Peter in his capacity as a witness, and as confessing the revelation of the Father (Acts v.), but not to Peter as wavering or declining from the truth (Matt. xvi. 23; Gal. ii.).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL IDEAS.

1. At first sight it may seem an accident that the first announcement of the Church as distinct from, and in contrast to, the State—while the ancient theocratic community combined both Church and State—should have been made in the district of Cæsarea, which owned the sway of so mild a monarch as Philip. At any rate, the event was one of universal historical importance, and may be regarded as the preparation for the feast of Pentecost.

2. In what passed between our Lord and His disciples we are led to observe,—(1) The contrast between human opinions of religion and a confession of faith prompted and evoked by the grace of God:—in the for-

mer case, fear, dejection, uncertainty, and discordance; in the latter, courage, frankness, certainty, and unity. (2) The indissoluble connection between true confession and a life of revelation and in the Spirit, or regeneration; (3) between a common confession and the formation of the visible Church; (4) between the confession of the Church to Christ and Christ's confession to the Church; (5) between the character of the first believing confessor and his official calling.

3. In the text, Peter is presented to us in a two-fold relationship: (1) As Peter; (2) as receiving the keys. The former designation applied to him as the first believing confessor, the first member of the *ἐκκλησία*, to which others were afterwards to be joined. Hence it referred to his practical life as a Christian bearing witness to Jesus, rather than to his official position in the Church. This spiritual character formed the basis of his office in the narrower sense, the main purport of which was to arrange individual believers into a community, and, by organizing a visible Church, to separate between the world and the kingdom of heaven. As being the first witness to Jesus, Peter, so to speak, laid the foundation of the Church: (1) By his confession on this occasion; (2) by his testimony, Acts ii.; (3) by his admission of the Gentiles into the Church, Acts x.; (4) by being the means of communicating to the Church the distinguishing feature of his character—fidelity of confession.

4. On the fact that the Church indelibly bears not only the characteristic of Peter, but of all the Apostles; or that all the apostolic offices are unchangeably perpetuated in it, comp. Com. on ch. x, (against Irvingism); and Schaff's *History of the Apostolic Church*, § 129, p. 516, sqq.

5. In its *apostolic nucleus, its apostolic beginning, and its apostolic depth and completeness*, the Church is so thoroughly identified with the kingdom of heaven itself, that its social determinations should in all these respects coincide with the declaration of God's Spirit. But this applies only in so far as Peter was really Peter—and hence one with Christ, or as Christ is in the Church. That there is a difference between the Church and the kingdom of heaven, which may even amount to a partial opposition, is implied in the antithesis: "*on earth*"—"in heaven."

6. The present occasion must be regarded as the initial foundation, not as the regular and solemn institution, of the Church. The promises given to Peter still relate to the future. For the strong faith which prompted his confession was rather a prophetic flash of inspiration (the blossom), than a permanent state of mind (the fruit). This appears from the following section.

7. In this passage Peter is represented as the foundation-stone, and Christ as the builder; while in 1 Cor. iii. 11, Christ is designated the foundation, and the Apostles the builders. "The latter figure evidently alludes to the relation between the changing and temporary labourers in the Church, and her eternal and essential character, more especially her eternal foundation; while the figurative language of Jesus applies to the relation between the starting-point and commencement of the Church in time, her outward and temporal manifestation, and her eternal Builder."

(From the author's *Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, p. 886). Riechter (*Erklärte Hausbibel*, i. 157): "The Church opens the way into the kingdom of heaven. Christ built on Peter and the Apostles, not his *kingdom*, but his *Church*, which is *one*, though not the *only*, form in which Christianity manifests itself." Hence Olshausen is mistaken in regarding the ἐκκλησία as simply tantamount to the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[WORDSWORTH observes on the words: *they shall not prevail*; "That these words contain no promise of infallibility to St. Peter, is evident from the fact that the Holy Spirit, speaking by St. Paul in Canonical Scripture, says that he erred (Gal. ii. 11-13).* And that they do not contain any promise of infallibility to the bishop of Rome is clear, among other proofs, from the circumstance that Pope Liberius (as Athanasius relates, *Historia Arian.* 41, p. 291) lapsed into Arianism, and Honorius was anathemized of old by Roman pontiffs as an heretic."—P. S.]

8. For special treatises on the supposed primacy of Peter, see HEUBNER, p. 236; DANZ, *Universalwörterbuch*, article *Primat*; BRETSCHNEIDER, *Systematische Entwicklung*, p. 796, etc.

9. On the power of the keys, see HEUBNER, p. 240; THE AUTHOR'S *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1182,—the literature belonging to it, p. 1196; *Berl. Kirchl. Vierteljahrsschrift*, ii. 1845, Nr. 1; ROTHE, *Ethik*, iv. 1066. [Compare also WORDSWORTH, ALFORD, BROWN, and the American commentators, BARNES, ALEXANDER, OWEN, JACOBUS, WHEDON, NAST on ch. xvi. 19.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL HINTS.

The Church of Christ founded under the sentence of expulsion pronounced on Christ and His Apostles both by the Jewish Church and the State: 1. Its preparatory announcement, ch. xvi.; 2. its complete and real foundation (Golgotha); 3. its solemn institution and manifestation, Acts ii.; comp. ch. iii. and iv. and Heb. xiii. 13.—The decisive question, "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?"—Difference between opinions about Christ and the confession of Christ.—The first New Testament confession of Christ, viewed both as the fruit and as the seed of the kingdom of heaven: 1. The fruit of the painful labour and sowing of Christ; 2. The germ and seed of every future confession of Christ.—The confession of Peter an evidence of his spiritual life: 1. In its freedom and cheerful self-surrender; 2. in its decidedness; 3. in its infinite fulness; 4. in its general suitableness for all disciples.—Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God: 1. In His nature; 2. in His mission; 3. in His work.—The joy of the Lord at the first-fruits of His mission.—The Confession of the Lord to His Congregation: 1. How it will continue to become more abundant even to the day of judgment. (Whosoever shall confess Me," etc.) 2. What it imports. (The blessedness of Simon in his character as Peter.)—The

* [But this was only an error of conduct, not of doctrine; and hence proves nothing against the inspiration of the apostles nor the pretended infallibility of the pope.—P. S.]

Son of the living God acknowledging those who are begotten of the Father as His own relatives and brethren.—The life of faith of Christians ever a revelation of the Father in heaven.—Genuine confession a fruit of regeneration.—The rock on which Christ has founded His Church, or Peter in a spiritual sense, is faithfulness of confession (*Bekennnistreue*).—Fidelity of confession the first characteristic mark of the Church.—Relation between Christ, the Rock of the kingdom of heaven, the corner-stone of the everlasting Church, and the rock-foundation on which His visible Church on earth is reared: In the one case, the Apostles are the builders, and Christ the rock and corner-stone; 2. in the other case, the Apostles are the foundation, and Christ the builder.—Only when resting on that rock which is Christ will his people become partakers of the same nature.—How the Church of Christ will endure for ever, in spite of the gates of Hades.—The old, legal, and typical Church, and the new Church of the living Saviour, in their relation to the kingdom of death: 1. The former is overcome by the kingdom of death; 2. the latter overcomes the kingdom of death.—Complete victory of Christ's kingdom of life over the kingdom of death.—First Peter, then the keys; or, first the Christian, then the office.—The power of the keys as a spiritual office: 1. *Its infinite importance*: announcement of the statutes of the kingdom of heaven; decision respecting the admission and continuance [of members]; or, in its three-fold bearing—(a) on the hearers of the word generally, (b) on catechumens, and (c) on communicants. 2. *The conditions of its exercise*: a living confession, of which Christ is the essence; readiness to bind as well as to loose, and *vice versâ*, the ratification of the kingdom of heaven.—The keys of the prisons of the Inquisition, and of the coffers of Indulgences, as compared with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or, the difference between the golden and the iron keys.—The confession of faith kept as a secret from the enemies of Christ.—The preparatory festival of the New Covenant.

STÄRKE:—It is useful, and even necessary, for preachers to be aware of the erroneous fancies which are in vogue among their hearers on the subject of religion.—*Cramer*: Every man should be able to give an account of his faith, John xvii. 3.—The discordant thoughts respecting the person of Christ.—*Majus*: The just must live by his own faith.—*Osiander*: Be not vacillating, but assured in your own minds.—*Jerome*: *Quemadmodum os loquitor pro toto corpore, sic Petrus lingua erat Apostolorum et pro omnibus ipse respondit.*—The other two confessions of Peter, Matt. xiv. 33; John vi. 68.—If we acknowledge Christ aright in our heart, we shall also freely confess him with our mouth, Rom. x. 10.—The divine and human natures combined in the person of Christ.—Blessedness of faith.—To know Christ is to be saved, John xvii. 3.—*Quesnel*: True blessedness: 1. It consists not in the advantages of birth, nor in natural gifts, nor in riches, nor in reputation and dignity; but, 2. in the possession of the gifts of grace through Christ.—*Hedinger*: All true faith is the gift of God.—*Osiander*: If the truth of God is mixed up with human fancies, it does

more harm than good.—Let no one hastily talk of the good which he has received, but let him first make experiment of its reality, Eccles. v. 1.

GERLACH:—The Christian Church possesses this power of the keys, not in its outward capacity or organization, but in so far as the Spirit rules in it. Hence, whenever it is exercised as a merely outward law, without the Spirit, the Lord in His providence disowns these false pretensions of the visible Church.

HEUBNER:—In order to be decided, and to become our own faith, we must publicly profess it.—How little value attaches to the opinions of the age on great men!*—The independence of Christians of prevalent opinions.—Peter's confession not his faith only, but that of all disciples, John vi. 68.—Peter's confession the collective confession of the Apostles.—See what value Christ sets on this faith.—It is impossible for any man, even though he were an apostle, to impart faith to another. This is God's prerogative.

* [Not, *How much great men are influenced by the opinions of the age*, as the Edb. trsl., misled by the German *wie viel* (which must be understood *ironically*), reverses the meaning of the original, thus making Heubner contradict himself in the next sentence. Heubner alludes to the confused and contradictory opinions of the Jews concerning Christ, ver. 15, and then contrasts with them the firm conviction of faith in Peter, ver. 16. Great men, during their lifetime, meet with the very opposite judgments at the bar of ever-changing popular opinion, and they are not truly great unless they can rise above it and quietly pursue the path of duty, leaving the small matter of their own fame in the hands of a just God and of an appreciating posterity which will judge them by the fruits of their labour.—P. S.]

ART. V.—*The Freedom of the Will as a Basis of Human Responsibility and Government*; elucidated and maintained in its issue with the Necessitarian Theories of Hobbes, Edwards, the Princeton Essayists, and other leading advocates. By D. D. WHEDON, D. D. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

Freedom of Mind in Willing; or, Every Being that Wills, a Creative First Cause. By ROWLAND G. HAZARD. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.

THESE works agree in being occupied with some preliminary discussions in regard to the nature of the Will, Liberty, and Necessity, and then in being devoted mainly and avowedly to the refutation of Edwards's famous treatise on this subject. However successful or unsuccessful these attempts, they are