---

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

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

# HODDER AND STOUGHTON'S NEW LIST.

## THE TREE IN THE MIDST.

A Contribution to the Study of Freedom. By GREVILLE MACDONALD, M.D., Author of "The Religious Sense in its Scientific Aspect." 10s. 6d. net.

## ALCOHOL.

Its Place and Power in Legislation. By ROBINSON SOUTTAR, M.A., D.C.L., Author of "A Short History of Ancient Peoples." 3s. 6d.

## "CLARION" FALLACIES.

A Reply to Mr. Robert Blatchford's Strictures upon Christianity in "The Clarion" and the book entitled "God and My Neighbour."

By FRANK BALLARD, M.A., B.D., B.Sc., F.R.M.S., etc. 1s. net

*A Volume of the "Christian Defence" Series.*

## ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTIONS OF THE LAST THINGS.

By the Rev. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc. 7s. 6d. net.

## THE SELF-PORTRAITURE OF JESUS.

By the Rev. J. M. E. ROSS, M.A. 3s. 6d.

## THE MAID OF SHULAM.

By the Rev. HUGH FALCONER, M.A., B.D., Minister of Trinity Presbyterian Church, Notting Hill. 3s. 6d.

## CHRISTIAN FAITH IN AN AGE OF SCIENCE.

By WILLIAM NORTH RICE, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Geology in Wesleyan University. With 15 Illustrations. 6s.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

---

THIRD EDITION.

In square crown 8vo., handsomely bound in cloth, and fully illustrated.
Price 6s. net.

# IN A MINSTER GARDEN.

*A CAUSERIE OF THE OLD TIME AND THE NEW.*

## By the DEAN OF ELY.

A Charming Succession of Gossiping Chapters.
With many quaint and picturesque Illustrations of the Nooks and Corners of Ely Cathedral and its Surroundings.

"A delightful book; contains numerous pleasing illustrations of Ely Minster and garden, and the cover is tastefully designed."—*Church Bells.*

"It is a book to possess and dip into very often, betraying the personality of the writer, and teaching much that is well worth learning of the past, especially that past connected with the old minster."—*Bookman.*

"In this volume Dean Stubbs reveals himself as a verse writer of no mean ability."—*Globe.*

"Succeeds in bringing before us the wealth of historical, legendary, literary, and scenic material connected with Ely."—*Daily Graphic.*

"A book which has infused into it the charm and the calm restfulness of the cathedral close. The Dean gives us an olla-podrida of history, poetry, anecdote and dialogue. There is a mingled flavour of scholarship, music, antiquarianism, and love of nature. Charmingly illustrated with features of beauty-spots of the cathedral and its surroundings."—*Christian World.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

# ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW PUBLICATIONS.

In crown 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

**GOD AND THE SINNER.** By the Rev. CANON DENTON THOMPSON, M.A., Rector of North Meols, Southport. Containing Twelve Chapters on some Fundamental Truths of Christianity, embracing: God—Christ—Man—Sin—Worldliness—Infidelity—Repentance—Salvation—The Christian Life—Self-Righteousness—Divine Grace, etc.

"The idea of the author is fully realized, and his volume is well calculated to fulfil a wide and useful mission."—*English Churchman.*

"The success with which Canon Thompson has accomplished his difficult task justifies his courageous act in undertaking it."—*Church Bells.*

CHEAP EDITION.

In crown 8vo., tastefully printed and bound, with Two Illustrations from Photographs, price 1s. net.

**THE TRUE GROUND OF FAITH.** Five Sermons preached in the Cathedral Church at Bangor. By the Rev. R. S. MYLNE, M.A., B.C.L. The Titles of the Sermons are: The Word of God; The Cross of Christ; Divine Worship; The Primitive Church; The Faith of Christ.

"All that Mr. Mylne writes is beautifully expressed."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 5s.

**SHORT READINGS FOR PARISH VISITORS.** By EDWARD SIMEON ELWELL, D.D., Worcester College, Oxon. (Vicar of Long Crendon).

"Dr. Elwell deserves the gratitude of many parish visitors by his kind efforts to lighten their labours and make their visits acceptable and interesting."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"There is but little doubt that this work will be in considerable demand."—*Oxford Times.*

In royal 16mo., paper boards, lettered, price 2s. 6d.

**THE ESSENCE OF ECCLESIASTES.** In the metre of Omar Khayyám. By ALASTAIR BUCHANAN.

"There's naught but vanity beneath the sun."

"A beautifully written poem in the metre of Omar Khayyám."—*Outlook.*

In foolscap 8vo., paper cover, price 6d.; also in parchment cover, price 1s.
Special Terms for a quantity.

**THE MEASURE OF A MAN.** An Address to Boys and Young Men. By the Author of "Unpainted Pictures," etc.

"The little pamphlet is not unworthy of careful consideration."—*Guide.*

In large 8vo., appropriately bound, price 7s. 6d.

**A LIST OF EMIGRANT MINISTERS TO AMERICA, 1690—1811.** For the use of the Genealogist, Biographer, Topographer, and Church Historian. Compiled, with Notes, by GERALD FOTHERGILL.

In foolscap 8vo., parchment cover, price 2s. 6d.

**THE EPIC OF THE MIDDLE AGES.** A simple account of the "Divina Commedia." By a Lover of Dante.

NEW NOVEL.

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 6s.

**THE VICAR'S MISTAKE.** By H. HARGREAVES.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

# The National Protestant Church Union.

To Maintain the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

**President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.**
**Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.**
**Treasurer—T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq.**
**Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.**

**The National Protestant Church Union witnesses for—**

1. **The supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.**
2. **The sole and sufficient efficacy of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross.**
3. **The justification of man by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ.**
4. **The right of every believer to direct and unimpeded access to God, through Christ.**
5. **The freedom and sovereignty of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.**

***WILL YOU HELP THIS IMPORTANT WORK?***

*For List of Publications, Terms of Membership, etc., apply to the Secretary, N.P.C.U.*
**324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.**

# "LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

**Patron:** H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

**£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.**

**HUNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.**

## THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

*Patron:* HIS MAJESTY THE KING.


*Vice-Patrons:*
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.

THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Seventy-six harbours are occupied. Income in 1903, £49,701.

**Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed,** should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N. 11, Buckingham St., Strand, London W.C.

## OPERATIVE JEWISH CONVERTS' INSTITUTION

*(In connection with the Church of England.)*

President: J. K. D. WINGFIELD-DIGBY, Esq., M.P.

**OBJECT.**—To assist young Christian Jews in distress by enabling them to help themselves. They are received for three years, provided for entirely and taught trades.

**SUPPORT.**—Orders for Printing and Bookbinding are very helpful, but subscriptions and donations are also needed, and will be most thankfully received by the Principal, the Rev. H. O. ALLBROOK, Palestine House, Bodney Road, Hackney, N.E.; or by the Hon. Treasurer, A. R. PITE, Esq., Effingham House, Ramsgate.

*Bankers*—Messrs. BARCLAY & COMPANY, Ltd., 54, Lombard Street, E.C.

# Church of England Zenana Missionary Society.

PATRONESS:
H.R.H. THE DUCHESS OF CONNAUGHT.

CHAIRMAN:
SIR W. MACKWORTH YOUNG, K.C.S.I.

**OBJECT:—To make known the Gospel of Christ to the Women of India and other Heathen and Mohammedan Countries.**

The Society has at present 65 Stations, and employs 213 Missionaries in Home Connection, and over 800 Bible-Women and Teachers.

It has 14 fully equipped Hospitals and numerous Dispensaries, where nearly 300,000 cases were treated last year.

The Magazine of the Society, "INDIA'S WOMEN AND CHINA'S DAUGHTERS," published monthly (price 1d.).

***Donations and Subscriptions are Much Needed.***

HON. TREASURER—**Col. ROBT. WILLIAMS, M.P.**
LAY SECRETARY—**Mr. J. B. BRADDON.**

CLERICAL SECRETARY—**Rev. G. TONGE, M.A.**
CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SECRETARY—**Miss MULVANY.**

OFFICE—**27, Chancery Lane, LONDON, W.C.**

# The Friends of Armenia.

President: THE LADY FREDERICK CAVENDISH.
Vice-Presidents: Hon. Mrs. FRASER and Mrs. ALFRED BOOTH.
Chairman of Committee: E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.
Treasurer: HECTOR MUNRO FERGUSON, Esq.
Secretary: Miss E. CANTLOW.

***FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.***

**AN ORPHAN RESCUED, FED, CLOTHED, AND EDUCATED FOR**
*Per* **£5** *Annum*
**BY THE MISSION HOMES IN ARMENIA.**

***FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.***

**DONATIONS IN AID OF WIDOWS & ORPHANS** gratefully received by the Hon. Treasurer as above.
CHEQUES SHOULD BE CROSSED "LONDON AND WESTMINSTER BANK."

**47, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.**

**AN EARNEST APPEAL.**

## HAMPTON'S MISSION FOR THE BLIND

*Westminster Bridge Road, London, S.E.*
(FOUNDED 1870.)

**Patron:** The Right Hon. LORD LLANGATTOCK.

BANKERS: LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN BANK, LIMITED, SOUTHWARK, S.E.

An Unsectarian Mission and Relief Work carried on for thirty-four years amongst the destitute ***BLIND POOR*** of London.

**UNENDOWED AND IN GREAT NEED**

***The Bitter Cry for Help*** of the Destitute Blind poor of "London over the Border." ***Poverty allied with Blindness.*** Is not this a double calamity?

Contributions gratefully received by
R. K. CAUSTON, ESQ., M.P., *President and Chairman.*
F. L. BEVAN, ESQ., *Hon. Treasurer of the Mission.*

## PAROCHIAL MISSIONS TO THE JEWS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

*President*—THE DEAN OF WORCESTER.
*Hon. Secs.*—CANON SIR JAMES E. PHILIPPS, Bart. ARCHDEACON SUTTON.
*Org. Sec.*—REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

*Work in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Bombay.*

Applications for Grants have constantly to be refused owing to want of Funds.

**Office: 39, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.**

Now Ready. In demy 8vo., clear type, with 23 Illustrations, about 400 pages. Cloth. Price 7s. 6d.

# WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT.

## AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY by the REV. CANON RICHARD HOBSON,

*Late Vicar of St. Nathaniel's, Windsor, West Derby, Liverpool*

With an Introduction
By the RIGHT REV. F. J. CHAVASSE, D.D.,
*Bishop of Liverpool.*

"The book appears to have a special message for the critical days in which we are now living."—F. J CHAVASSE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool.

"It would form a very suitable and useful present to any young clergyman."—*English Churchman.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C

THE

# CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1904.

## ART. I.—THE TRANSFIGURATION.

THE writers of the Synoptic Gospels are careful to place the Transfiguration, the most sublime and impressive event in the life of our Lord, immediately after His first prediction of His rejection, sufferings, and death. This connection is the key which unlocks the mysteries of the solemn scene. The Apostles were ever thinking of Messiah's kingdom. They expected a prince to reign, not a priest to suffer. Christ's announcement of His approaching death was an astounding blow to their hopes. The Transfiguration was vouchsafed that the disciples might learn that, while their expectation of a Messianic kingdom was no mere illusory dream, it was through suffering that Christ would enter into glory. I say, with reverence, that it was needed for the encouragement of Jesus Himself. Our Lord's words to St. Peter, "Get thee behind Me, Satan," tell us that He realized that the remonstrance of the disciple was but a re-enactment of the great initial temptation of the Devil after the forty days' fast in the wilderness—the thought of a kingdom without a cross.

In a subject so suggestive I can only bring out the leading lessons of this august and transcendent scene.

"And after six days, Jesus taketh with Him Peter and James and John" (Mark ix. 2). Probably these three disciples had a greater moral fitness for the spectacle. St. Paul mentions them together as the pillars of the Church. In the words of Archbishop Trench, "they were the Coryphæi, the flower and crown of the Apostolic band." They had previously witnessed the raising of the daughter of Jairus, to prepare them for this anticipatory view of the resurrection body of Christ. Had they but known it, these three were allowed to witness the glory that should follow His decease,

that when they beheld the agonies of Gethsemane they might recall the Transfiguration, and think of the glory to which these sufferings would lead. In later times, with minds enlightened by the Holy Spirit, they would realize that the scene on the holy mount afforded them a glimpse of their own glorious future, which would enable them to say, "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed."

When I remember the deep importance of the Transfiguration, when I think of the assaults of scepticism—that Renan should ignore the scene, that Strauss should say that the narrative is a poetic imitation of the shining of the face of Moses, that Neander should speak of it as a dream, and that even writers in the Anglican Church should describe it as a vision of the night—I recognise the Divine wisdom in the selection of accredited spectators, so that out of the mouth of two or three witnesses every word should be established.

St. John says: "We beheld His glory." St. Peter says: "We were eye-witnesses of His majesty."

The Sabbath sun had set ere Christ and the three began to ascend the "high mountain apart," the slopes of the snow-capped peak above them. They see the afterglow. The dome of Hermon is bathed in rose-coloured light. Then a deepening flush steals over the scene, as the warm purple shadows creep slowly on. Still they climb. With the departing light a death-like pallor covers the higher slope, and for a time the darkness is only relieved by the whiteness of the snow. Ere long the moon appears, and the stars hang down like lamps from the Syrian sky. Jesus and the three are alone amid the solitude and silence of the mount. The Master retires for a space to pray. He prays for Himself. His heart is troubled. Never before has the Cross been brought so distinctly into view. From this time, as never before, His prayer was, "Father, save Me from this hour. Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me." He prays for strength to accomplish His awful task. He prays, too, doubtless, for His weak disciples. His cry is, "Who hath believed our report?" The Father hears; the Father answers, blesses, comforts. He reveals the glory of the eternal future. Not for the disciples merely, but for the Master was this prelibation of glory: "Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross." The face that was "marred more than any man" is suddenly transfigured. He who had climbed the steep ascent with weary limb and aching and burdened heart is now radiant with superhuman glory. "The fashion of His countenance was altered" (Luke ix. 29). The effulgence shines, not as with Moses from without, but as

with Stephen from within. The light of His Deity shines through the lantern of His humanity. His very raiment is white and glistening as the surrounding snow, white as the robes which the glorified wear. Well might the disciples, struggling against sleep, be aroused to a perfect wakefulness. Well might St. John record, "We beheld His glory."

Our first lesson is that moments of real prayer are moments of transfiguration. St. Luke writes, "As He prayed, the fashion of His countenance was altered."

> "We kneel, how weak! we rise, how full of power!
> Why, therefore, should we do ourselves this wrong
> Or others: that we are not always strong;
> That we are ever overborne with care;
> That we should ever weak or heartless be,
> Anxious or troubled, when with us is prayer,
> And joy and strength and courage are with Thee?"

I return to the narrative. St. Peter, St. James, and St. John saw more than the Transfiguration of their Lord. They saw "with Him," says St. Luke, "two men," radiant forms, whom they recognised as Moses and Elijah. They heard the subject of their conversation with Christ. "They spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem" (Luke ix. 31), the very theme which had been such a stumbling-block to Peter and the rest of the disciples. They spake of "His decease"; as it is in the Greek, "His exodus." The death of Christ, the true Paschal Lamb, and the Resurrection of Christ, the true Firstborn, were His exodus and the exodus of His Church, the Israel of God, from the captivity of sin and the grave. Moses is seen as the representative of the law, and Elias appears as the representative of the prophets, and the Atonement is the subject of both. The Cross of Christ is the only key which unlocks the mysteries of the moral empire of God. In the persons of these two ambassadors from the court of heaven Christ saw the representatives of the Old Testament Church, and in them the firstfruits of a multitude which no man can number who owed their immortality to His decease. He is thus strengthened to do His Father's will by making His soul an offering for sin, and from the night of His Transfiguration "He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem," the city of sacrifice.

The words spoken on this holy mount tell us and the Church in every age that whilst the Cross of Christ is a stumbling-block to some and foolishness to others, it will be the theme in the heavenly world on which glorified intellects will ponder, and for which glorified tongues shall utter endless praise. Moses and Elias talked with Christ. The thought of

a future eternally silent world is insupportable. The Transfiguration speaks of a time when the glorified saints shall sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, when praise only shall break the silence, when nothing shall jar with the melody of the eternal chime, when the roll of the pealing Hallelujahs shall be like the voice of many waters, when every saint shall have a song, when each shall offer his tribute of thanksgiving, when all shall refer their blessedness to the decease which Christ accomplished at Jerusalem.

This night of glory is not ended. St. Peter, in his impulsive ardour, exclaimed: "Master, it is good for us to be here; let us make three booths, one for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias, not knowing what he said" (Mark ix. 5). Observe, he placed Moses and Elias on an equality with Christ! "While he thus spake, there came a cloud and overshadowed them," the Shekinah cloud, the symbol of God's presence, the cloud that sometimes filled the Temple with its mystic radiance, and shone for ages over the mercy-seat; a bright, luminous cloud, to use Milton's phrase, "dark with excess of light." And "there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is My beloved Son, hear Him," and "when the voice was past, Jesus was found alone" (Luke ix. 35, 36). This is that prophet of whom Moses said, "unto Him shall ye hearken." "God, having of old time spoken unto the Fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of the days spoken to us in His Son." Christ is the *supreme* revelation. He was "the Word," the articulate expression of the mind and heart of God to the human race. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father. No man hath seen God at any time. The only-begotten Son . . . He hath declared Him." He was not only the supreme, but the *ultimate* revelation of God. The prophets were the chords through which the heavenly music sounded. The incarnate Son of God was the complete instrument which gave to man the perfect melody of heaven. This voice of the eternal Father proclaiming the Deity of Christ declares the infallibility of the Revelation. Believe that the Son of God in His human nature shared the ignorance of the men of His generation as regards the statements which He made, and I for one must either wander into the morass of scepticism or seek rest in that Church which professes the infallibility which my moral nature demands. A standard of infallibility is a necessity of man's thinking mind, a need of man's moral nature. Let all voices be silent, and with adoring reverence let us listen to the word on the mount: "This is My beloved Son, hear Him."

Once more—the Transfiguration speaks of "the power and coming" of Christ. St. Peter tells us that it was a prelude

and earnest of the coming glory. In the words, "they spake of His decease," we have Christ the Priest; in the words of the eternal Father, "hear Him," we have Christ the Prophet; in the scene itself we have Christ the King. Moses, raised from the empty tomb in the heights of Abarim, where he had been "sent to sleep," as the Arabs say, "by the kiss of God," was a forerunner of those who shall be raised from the dead at the coming of Christ. Elias, translated from the Plain of Gilead by a simoon of the desert,[1] a precursor of those who shall be alive at the Second Advent, and shall be transformed and transfigured. "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." As of old the beacon fires, lit up from hill to hill, announced to those far away from Jerusalem the advent of the solemn feast, so does the glory kindled on the Mount of Transfiguration shine through the darkness of the centuries and tell of the Resurrection morn, when Messiah as King shall come to reign.

In the early centuries of the Church's history men like Jerome, in his cave at Bethelehem, or the hermits of the Thebaid or of the wilderness of Engedi, and, later still, the monastic system in Europe, said, "Let us make three tabernacles." Devout souls wished to abide with Christ in the solitude of the mount. The impartial reader of history believes that monasteries had their part in the development of our national history, and that they were for a time a source of blessing to our land; but the monastic system had one inherent evil, an evil of which St. Peter's words were but the germ. It separated the salt from that which it was intended to conserve. It erected religious *houses*, but it did not create religious *homes*. Men forgot the prayer of Christ: "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil." To-day the temptation of the Church is in an entirely different direction. Amidst the manifold and increasing activities of life we are apt to forget that the streams which are to fertilize the barren wastes of human existence can only be supplied from the spring in the solitude of the mountains, where souls hold communion with God. In proportion as we think of the decease accomplished at Jerusalem, in that proportion shall we get some glimpses of the coming glory of the final Easter dawn.

St. Matthew writes: "They came down from the mountain,"

[1] The narrative indicates that Elijah was raised by a whirlwind. The chariot of fire would symbolize not only the prophet's ministry of burning zeal and judicial righteousness, but the refining influences, also, which were needed to prepare and transfigure his body before entering into a state of immortality.

"They were come to the multitude," a connection of thought which is strikingly illustrated in the last great picture of Raphael, which suggests a concluding lesson for us, a lesson of the deepest practical import—privilege is but the prelude to duty. We must ever go down from the mount of contemplation to mingle with our fellow-men in the business of life—our one desire to follow in the steps of Him who went about doing good, of One who left the Mount of Transfiguration and all its glory to comfort a father's heart and heal his lunatic boy. May we, by our every thought and word and action, in little things as well as in great things, in our homes as husbands and wives, as parents and children, as masters and servants, in our business lives, in our social engagements, and in our seasons of recreation and rest, so live and act as those who have seen some glimpses of the glory revealed in the mount. People who live in the Riviera count the days in the season in which they have seen the distant island of Corsica. How often do we see in private prayer and in the services of the sanctuary, it may be faintly and afar off, the hills that are round about our eternal home, the holy mount, the city of our God, where our Lord is now unchangeably and eternally transfigured!

J. W. BARDSLEY.

## ART. II.—LOISY'S SYNTHESIS OF CHRISTIANITY.

### III.

I PRESENTED in my last paper two curiously conflicting answers to the question, "What is Christianity?" To the ordinary reader the difference in the definition of the "kingdom" of the Saviour is probably less startling than the license claimed by both Harnack and Loisy in handling the actual narrative of the Gospels. In this respect there is not much to choose between the two critics. It is assumed by each that the province of the exegete is to "devour and break in pieces, and stamp the residue with the feet," and then claim a special veneration for his own footmarks. It is a method that, of course, would not be tolerated in the case of ordinary ancient literature. The comparison of the two interpretations of Christianity may, at least, be useful as illustrating its arbitrariness. Sometimes the elements in the Gospels dubbed spurious by Loisy contain for Harnack the essence of Christianity. On the other hand, the Acts, on which Loisy's system really depends, is for Harnack a "late book," whose reception is "perhaps the most striking

phenomenon in the history of the canon."[1] Which is the true prophet of the Higher Criticism?

I propose to deal in this and my next paper with that which strikes me as the most serious defect in both syntheses—viz., the elision from the Gospel story of the preterhuman personality of the Saviour. I believe that the "kingdom" He came to establish cannot be defined till we have fully realized the claims of the King. Reserving, then, the former subject, let us ask whether either critic has really presented to us the Jesus of the Synoptic narrative.

We have seen how Harnack and Loisy respectively interpret the Saviour's claim to the title "Son of God." The French critic has, of course, struck a true note when he argues that the term connotes primarily the Jewish Messianic ideal, not, as Harnack says, a subjective realization of God. "En tant que le titre de Fils de Dieu appartient exclusivement au Sauveur, il équivaut à celui de Messie, et il se fonde sur la qualité de Messie."[2] But, according to Loisy, the preterhuman attributes of Messiah had no correspondence in the Saviour's own consciousness. "Jésus lui-même a vécu sur la terre dans la conscience de son humanité." His Divinity is a doctrine "qui a grandi dans la conscience chrétienne, mais qui n'avait pas été expressément formulé dans l'Évangile." The divergence here from the Catholic belief is so serious, and so vitally affects the question, "What is Christianity?" that we may well ask for substantial proofs of this statement. The only positive answer we get is an appeal to the Epistles, in which Loisy thinks he finds a gradual Christological development from the earlier discourses presented in the Acts. Negatively, the result is reached by an elision from the Gospels of the most striking passages militating with the theory.

It is, of course, most difficult to grapple with a criticism that assumes these rights of arbitrary expurgation. In my present attempt to defend the Divine personality of the Jesus of the Gospels, I enter the arena with one arm tied up. To meet Loisy on his own terms, one must accept for the nonce the position that the fourth Gospel is in no sense history. Jesus could only have paid Jerusalem a single visit—the one connected with the crucifixion. The plain assertion of the Divine Sonship, which we are told was made when the cripple was healed at the pool of Bethesda (John v. 19-47), was really never uttered; the miracle itself is imaginary. Christ's claims to be "the Light of the world," "the Son" who alone

[1] "History of Dogma," vol. ii., chap. ii.
[2] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 91. [3] "Autour," etc., pp. 116, 117.

can make men free, the One who was "before Abraham," and has the attribute of eternal self-existence (John viii.), are "the experiences of three-quarters of a century of the Gospel" strung upon purely fictitious incidents and ideal speeches. Thomas's confession, "My Lord and my God" (John xx. 28), is merely a piece of bold prosopopœia. The historic data which we find in the fourth Gospel "n'y sont pas à raison de leur caractère primitif, mais à raison du sens qui y a été rattaché." Besides this elision of the evidence of the fourth Gospel, the story of the birth of Jesus as given in the first and third, with its recognition of the "Emmanuel," the "Son of God," the "Light for revelation to the Gentiles," of course cannot be claimed for "le Christ de l'histoire." Much certainly is lost when these elements in the biography are gone. Yet even so there remain, I think, intact the outlines of the orthodox Christology. Supposing the Gospel records thus mutilated, let us see how Loisy's conception of a purely eschatological Messiah, who was identified by the Apostles only after the resurrection, and whom later on they deemed to be Divine, squares with the Synoptic narrative of the ministry.

I first assail the statement that Christ only proclaimed a future, not a present, kingdom, and that "le rôle du Messie est essentiellement eschatologique." This was not the Jewish expectation. Neither is it a fair account of the actual claim of Jesus, for it is obvious that He professed to have certain powers *on earth* by reason of His Messiahship, notwithstanding reservations in His revealing to men all that this Messiahship implied. To construe John Baptist's question as meaning "si Jésus ne va pas être le Christ" is a mere evasion of the words, "Art thou He that cometh?"[1] John meant just what the woman of Samaria meant when she said, "I know that Messiah cometh: when He cometh He shall tell us all things"; or, if the fourth Gospel be inadmissible as evidence, what the Jews meant when, in the language of Ps. cxviii., they hailed Jesus as "He that cometh in the Name of the Lord." A Messiah was generally expected whose powers were to be manifested on earth. "It is by no means the case," says Schürer, that "pre-Christian Judaism did not expect the Messiah till after the judgment. In decidedly pre-Christian documents Messiah appears for the overthrow of ungodly powers."[2] It is just this work of "overthrow" that the Gospel story sets forth as confirming the claims of Christ. To it He actually appeals in the reply to John Baptist, with

[1] Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19.
[2] "The Jewish People," etc., Div. II., vol. ii., p. 158.

its instancing of miraculous cures. It being the work of His followers, we find similar "authority over the power of the enemy" delegated by Jesus to the seventy (Luke x. 17-20).

It is doubtless impossible to say that the Jews always defined the expected Messiah as Divine. But it is clear that in certain quarters the predictions of a Davidic King familiar to us in one stratum of Old Testament prophecy, and those of a Theophany, or reign of God on earth—patent in Isaiah and the later Psalms—had been merged in the anticipation of a preterhuman Being, a "Son of God," who should establish God's kingdom on earth, and reign as His vicegerent. In this development we Christians may see a Divine guidance; and it is no objection if this current Messianic terminology was capable of yet higher adaptation, and Judaism uttered truths profounder than it knew. Blended with crude material elements, this anticipation meets us in such works as the Book of Enoch and the Psalter of Solomon. It familiarized men with a Messianic terminology, which Jesus appropriated and enriched with deeper significance. It has been sufficiently shown that Enoch is of prechristian origin, and it is here especially that we find this important link between the Old Dispensation and the New, and the title "Son of God" supplementing the more usual Messianic attributes of King and Judge. Harnack's attempted subjective limitation of the term, as meaning "nothing but the practical consequence of knowing God," is ruled out by all Jewish usage. In the Old Testament it is functional or titular, denoting angels or theocratic vicegerencies. At the time our Lord appeared it evidently had a more special connotation as a designation of the Christ. "Inasmuch as the Messiah is the chosen instrument of God,"[1] says Schürer, quoting Enoch and the fourth book of Ezra,[1] "He is called the Elect, . . . or, like the theocratic King in the Old Testament, the Son of God." It is this use of the term that explains to us Peter's confession of his Teacher as "the Christ, the Son of the Living God." It also elucidates the scene before Caiaphas, where the trial is brought to a climax by the accused appropriating to Himself the titles "Son of the Blessed" and "Son of Man." From this scene Loisy quite rightly infers "que le Sauveur a été condamné à mort pour avoir affecté des prétentions à la royauté d'Israel, c'est-à-dire, au rôle de Messie." But what ground is there for Loisy's other inference that Christ had never definitely asserted this claim until that final visit to Jerusalem? We who accept "les récits de l'enfance" may read in Luke ii. how, with a dawning sense of the significance

[1] Enoch cv. 2; 4 Ezra vii. 28, 29, xiii. 32, 37, 52, xiv. 9.

of His mission, Jesus as a boy of twelve claimed that he must be ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου. Peter's very confession shows that Jesus had made sufficiently distinct assertion of the claim. It is consistent that the Synoptics (especially Matthew) continually present Jesus as speaking of a Sonship[1] that is His peculiarly. There is no reason here to distinguish the subjective from the objective significance. His use of the phrase "*My* Father" naturally connects with the Messianic assumption a consciousness of an unbroken oneness in spirit with God. The whole portraiture is that of one who claims that His relation to God as Son "is not that of other men, but that He is the Son *par excellence—the* Son of God in a special and solitary relation of life and affection."[2] This claim is easily connected by us with the appropriation of the Messianic character. Its significance in the field of consciousness is fully enunciated in the passages Matt. xi. 25-27, Luke x. 21, 22, which, as I shall show below, there is no reason for repudiating.

But this term, "Son of God," is scarcely more significant than that other title which Christ claimed in the audience before Caiaphas. Its meaning is not so apparent to the ordinary reader of the Gospels; but it is strange that Loisy, while devoting a chapter to "Le Fils de Dieu," has nothing to say about the designation "Son of Man." For this, too, was a Messianic title, and, as we all know, our Lord appropriated it long before that final scene, and distinctly applied it to the circumstances of His ministry on earth. In the old prophetic passages which lie behind this designation "Son of Man" (Dan. vii. 13, 14; *cf.* ii. 42), it seems that a kingdom of the saints of the Most High, as contrasted with the four bestial kingdoms, is in view, rather than one of any personal Messiah. As in the case of the titles "Servant of the Lord" and "the Chosen" in Isaiah, Israel may be the primary object of the prophetic aspiration, and it was, perhaps, only in the realization of the Messiah as the centre of all Israel's hopes that the term received a personal interpretation. But be this

---

[1] *Cf.* Matt. xii. 50, xvii. 26, xviii. 35, xx. 23, xxii. 41-44, xxiv. 36; Mark xi. 35-37, xiii. 32; Luke xx. 13, xxi. 41-44, xxii. 29. The evil spirits cry out, "Thou art Christ, the Son of God," and He restrains them (Luke iv. 41; *cf.* Mark i. 24, v. 7).

[2] Professor Orr, in Hastings' "Dictionary," *s.v.*, "Son of God." A recent article by Rev. C. T. Shebbeare well illustrates the consistency of this portraiture. "Christ speaks always as One sure of Himself, as One who has no fear of any moral failure . . . never admits to Himself the possibility that His judgment may be wrong. . . ." He is confident that "He is giving the last word on the subjects on which He speaks, the word by which men are to be judged at the last day." "He never . . . speaks of His own 'faith' or 'hope.'"

as it may, "Son of Man" was at the time when Jesus taught a title applied to the expected Messiah as the determiner of all human destinies. The author of the Book of Enoch, in his second allegory (chaps. xlv.-lvii.), so applies the term in his description of Messiah's mission and the establishment of His kingdom.[1] Nor is there any reason to suppose that his use is peculiar. I infer, however, from John xii. 34[2] that this Messianic designation, the "Son of Man," was less familiar to the Jews than "Son of God." The celebrated passage containing Peter's confession (Matt. xvi. 13) shows, too, as we might perhaps expect, that it was not so directly significant of the Divine personality as that other title "Son of God."[3]

Just as Jesus here bids men read into "Son of Man" all that they associated with the "Son of God," so does He elsewhere distinctly connect the title with a spiritual rule suggestive of Divine authority. It is not the case that Jesus applies the term prophetically to a posthumous reign mainly connected with eschatology. He appropriates it in connection with certain distinct pronouncements authoritative now, and with the circumstances of His whole career on earth. This fact of itself contradicts Loisy's postulates—"Jésus lui-même a vécu dans la pleine conscience de son humanité," and "Jésus ne s'avouait pas Messie dans sa prédication." Thus, the three Evangelists represent Jesus as claiming to have power to forgive the sins of the paralytic man before curing him, a power which the bystanders rightly discern to be peculiar to God. His justification is that "the Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sins." That this incident is at the beginning of the ministry disposes of Loisy's reservation: "Il n'a voulu avouer sa qualité que le jour de sa mort."[4] Again, all three ascribe to Jesus a claim to reshape the method of Sabbatical observance. What is the ground taken on the occasion of the disciples plucking the ears of corn? "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath." So, again, we have, "The Son of Man came to seek and save that which was lost" (Matt. xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10). "Likewise shall also the Son of Man suffer of them" (Matt. xvii. 12). "The Son of

---

[1] Schürer, "The Jewish People," etc., Div. II., vol. iii., pp. 57-69.

[2] What a meaningless fiction this question of the Jews in John xii. 34 becomes when the Gospel is regarded from Loisy's point of view! (See "Le Qu. Év.," p. 692.)

[3] On this passage see Liddon's "Bampton Lectures," pp. 7-10. I agree with the writer that it shows that the title "Son of Man," though to the disciples it implied "first of all Messiahship of their Master," bespoke, though "less prominently," the relationship to our race as the ideal Man, and the fact of his "true humanity."

[4] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," p. 88.

Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28). Elsewhere, of course, we find this term applied to the Messiah of the eschatology. The original vision in Daniel is appropriated by Christ, who as the "Son of Man" is to be revealed in the glory of His angels, and sits as Judge of mankind. But it is plain that this claim has already been vindicated by a sufficiently distinct revelation of Himself as the Teacher and Legislator on earth.

It is important to press this feature, because Loisy, in his insistence on the *posthumous* realization of the Messianic character, forgets that it was a most distinct work of reshaping the Jewish Law that Jesus attempted in this character of Messiah, and that it was just this attempt that first caused hostility to His teaching. Misinterpreting the text, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil," Loisy really robs the human Jesus of all ethical originality. "Il ne s'est pas présenté comme le révélateur d'un principe nouveau." "Chercher dans l'Évangile un element tout à fait nouveau par rapport à la religion de Moïse et des prophètes est y chercher ce que Jésus n'y a pas voulu mettre."[1] My answer is that the Sermon on the Mount of itself takes us beyond this ideal. However we connect its precepts with the Decalogue, their ground is obviously a personal claim to transcend and reshape at will. Was it not "un principe nouveau" for a Jew that he was "not to swear at all"? Where is there anything like this prescription in Moses and the Prophets? And what larger claim can be made than that which is here assumed? "Ye have heard that it was said to [not "by"] them of old time . . . but *I* say unto you. . . ." When we recollect that these Commandments with which Jesus deals were attributed by His hearers to the very voice of Jehovah instructing Moses, we understand the comment, "He taught as one having authority." It is this same phase of the Messianic claim that interprets the scene where our Lord dispenses His disciples from the customary weekly fasts observed strictly by the Pharisees and by John Baptist. Those two parables of the patch on the old garment and the new wine in old bottles are themselves a teaching that Jesus' ethical "principes" meant something more than a reformed and purified Judaism, that His was a kingdom present, not only future, and that the old forms were inadequate to contain the spirit of the new religion. We observe, moreover, that in making this claim Jesus uses a simile suggestive to every Jew of something far higher than

[1] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," pp. 46, 47.

human authority. He is the "Bridegroom" of the faithful. "As long as He is with them they cannot fast." The choice of this metaphor would itself recall the many Old Testament passages where Jehovah is represented as the Husband of the Jewish Church. We who accept the fourth Gospel read that it was this same figure of the "Bridegroom" that John Baptist used when he declared that his own work was to be superseded by that of "the Christ."[1] Those who reject that Gospel must admit the same significance in the eschatological parables of the wise and foolish virgins and the expectant servants (Matt. xxiv.; Luke xii.). It is the return of a "Son of Man" who had already claimed a union with the human spirit on earth. His second coming is the glorious antitype of the first.

I have assumed that Christ's use of these terms "Son of God," "Son of Man," must be viewed by the light of current Jewish literature. Schürer[2] may again be quoted to show that this literature, however imperfect, at once takes us to a higher plane than that of Loisy's Messiah. "The whole view of His Person is in both the above-named works ('Enoch' and 'The Solomonian Psalter') one essentially supernatural. In the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch it is said of Him that He was (before this manifestation on earth) hidden and kept with God (xlvi. 1, 2, lxii. 7). His name was named before the Lord of Spirits, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars were made (xlviii. 35).[3] *He was chosen and was hidden with God before the world was created,* and will be with Him to eternity (xlviii. 6). His countenance is as the appearance of a man, and full of grace, like one of the holy angels (xlvi. 1). It is He who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells, and who *reveals all the treasures of that which is concealed,* because the Lord of Spirits has chosen Him, and His lot before the Lord of Spirits has surpassed anything through uprightness for ever (xlvi. 3). His glory is from eternity to eternity, and His power from generation to generation. *In Him dwells the spirit of wisdom, and the spirit of Him who gives knowledge.* . . . And He will judge the hidden things, and no one will be able to hold vain discourse before Him, for He is chosen before the Lord of Spirits, according to His good pleasure" (xlix. 2-4).[4]

---

[1] John iii. 27-30.

[2] Schürer, "The Jewish People," etc., Div. II., vol. iii., p. 161.

[3] Schürer compares Targum Jonathan on Zech. iv. 7—"The Messiah whose name was named *before eternity*"; but this, of course, is a later work.

[4] The fourth Book of Ezra is in essential agreement with this description; but this is, in part at least, a post-Christian work. On the other

The passages I italicize in the above quotation are to me suggestive of the most definite Christological teaching which we find in the Synoptic Gospels. In Matt. xi. 25-27, Jesus thanks the Father "because He has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes," adding, "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." In Luke this utterance recurs, with little variation (x. 21-22), on the occasion of the return of the seventy from their successful mission. Matthew, on the other hand, loosely connects it with Christ's rebuke of those who condemned John as an ascetic and "the Son of Man" as a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, to which reproach there is attached the saying "Wisdom is justified by her works" (*var. lect.*, "by her children").

Of course, this utterance is in the very spirit of the fourth Gospel, but why is it therefore to be suspected? Its different setting in the two Gospels may suggest that one of the Evangelists has given the wrong occasion, though it is perhaps as probable that our Lord so spoke more than once. But surely it is the poorest criticism to regard a saying so well attested as a posthumous invention because it does not square with one's preconceived theories about what Jesus must have taught? Loisy, indeed, goes on to show that the diction in this passage may perhaps have been affected by the prayer of Ben Sirach in the Apocryphal book Ecclesiasticus,[1] wherein the "unlearned" are summoned to put their neck under the "yoke" of the Heavenly Wisdom (*cf.* verse 26 with Matt. xi. 28, 29). He remarks, "Il est malaisé d'admettre que Jésus dans une oraison ou un discours tout spontanés ait voulu imiter l'Ecclésiastique,"[2] and he attempts on this ground to attribute the words to "le redacteur évangelique." Yet every critical student of the Gospels knows that the eschatological discourses of Jesus embody repeatedly the diction, not only of the Hebrew Scriptures, but of the current Apocalyptic literature. The very term "Son of Man," perhaps, comes directly from the Book of Enoch. Why is the appropriation of phrase more "malaisé d'admettre" here than elsewhere? Loisy's attitude in regard to this utterance, however, illustrates what I have said above as to the arbitrary textual

---

hand, of the section of Enoch quoted above, Schürer says: "Anyone who candidly weighs the arguments on the one side and on the other must feel constrained to admit that the pre-Christian origin is decidedly more probable than the Christian one" ("The Jewish People," etc., Div. II., vol. iii., p. 69).

[1] Chap. li.

[2] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," *loc. cit.*

methods of the "higher" critics. "What is Christianity?" asks Harnack, and while rejecting much else, builds his answer on this very text, however short he falls of its true interpretation. "What is Christianity?" echoes Loisy, and just because he sees the significance of the passage, quietly postulates that it could never have been spoken by Jesus at all. The words accordingly are "un produit de la tradition chrétienne des premiers temps," "un témoignage considérable en ce qui concerne l'évolution de la christologie au premier âge de l'Église."[1] There is, of course, no reason to doubt that our Saviour thus expressed Himself at least once when on earth, and it is an assertion of His Messianic claims which we may read along with His repeated assumption of the titles "Son of God" and "Son of Man."

Before leaving this passage I notice that for the identification of the Messiah with the Heavenly "Wisdom" men's minds were prepared, not only by Ecclesiasticus, but by the so-called "Wisdom of Solomon." Shortly before Christ's coming this work had depicted "Wisdom" as an assessor on God's throne (*ἡ τῶν σῶν θρόνων παρέδρος*, Wisd. ix. 4-9), understanding the works of God, present when He created the world. When, then, our Lord says "Wisdom is justified by its works" (*var. lect.*, "by its children"), or when we find the words "Therefore said the Wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets, etc." (Luke xi. 49), there seems to be good reason to think that along with the Messianic titles "Son of Man" and "Son of God" He appropriated that of the hypostasized "Wisdom."[2] That the latter passage occurs in Matt. xxiii. 34 in the form "Therefore, behold I send unto you prophets, etc.," is not, as Loisy suggests, an argument that a later hand inserted the identification. On the contrary, we may fairly infer that Luke has here the fuller and more exact terms of the saying, and that Christ's hearers sufficiently understood that by the "Wisdom of God" He meant Himself. It is to me an argument in favour of our Lord's appropriating thus the current terminology that the early Christians did so, and that St. Paul speaks of his making it the substance of His Gospel at Corinth, not twenty years later, that Christ is "the Power of God" and "the Wisdom of God." The Abbé would probably reply that this passage (1 Cor. i. 24) is only another proof that "la révélation du secret messianique se fait

---

[1] "L'Év. et l'Égl.," pp. 80, 81.

[2] Possibly even the designation "Word," of the Johannine theology. In Wisd. xviii. 15, *ὁ παντόδυναμός σου λόγος* is personified in a manner that approaches the hypostatic union, and Philo's "Word" is practically identical with "Wisdom" here.

réellement par l'Esprit qui agit dans la communauté des premiers croyants."[1] But the disciple is not above his Master. To most Christians I think it will appear reasonable that the human Jesus had at least as much claim to such inspiration as St. Paul.

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

(*To be continued.*)

## ART. III.—THE BOOK OF GENESIS (*continued*).

HITHERTO we have been discussing such subjects connected with the study of Genesis as are dealt with by Dr. Driver in the introductory part of his volume, whilst making such references as were necessary to the main body of the work. We pass on to the commentary itself and to the essays which will be found incorporated in it. First in order is placed, as is natural,

### THE CREATION OF THE WORLD,

and what is called the cosmogony of Genesis.

Here we come at once to the problems the elucidation of which is very often held to point to a divergence or opposition between science and religion. But, as has been already clearly laid down, when we read the Bible we are not reading in any particular book anything professing to form part of a scientific manual. What is described to us is narrated in popular language. When the book was written—no matter for the moment at what date—it was written by a man of his time, and not by a scientist of the twentieth century, and for men of this time. It would have been useless to have described the creation then in language such as many would understand nowadays. And, after all, we are still, many of us, far from possessing a deep acquaintance with science, and even the scientist himself takes up the language of the past and uses it. He still speaks of sunset and of sunrise, whilst he tells us, when he is talking scientifically, that the sun does *not* set, and that the sun does *not* rise. If it is permitted him to use such language as this in such an enlightened age, why should he put the writers of a less informed age out of court for expressing the broad facts of creation in similar language, and accuse them of contradicting scientific truth because they use the language and imagery of the time? But we

[1] "Autour," etc., p. 118.

must go further than this. We must investigate the question whether the writer, or writers—for we have allowed there may have been more than one—of the documents on which Genesis is founded do actually contradict or run counter to what may be taken to be absolutely ascertained scientific truths, putting on one side such *façons de parler* as we have mentioned above.

Take, for instance, the statement made in Gen. i. 5, that light came into being for the earth on the first day, whereas the sun and moon are first mentioned on the fourth day. These are simple statements; they do not deal with the question of the way in which light was produced, except to say that it was by the Divine fiat. We turn to science, and what does it tell us? The astronomer points to certain parts of infinite space in which there are what he calls *nebulæ*. There is light in the nebulæ, else we could not see them. He tells us that operations are at work there which will eventually lead to the evolution of a solar system like our own—a sun, with its accompanying planets revolving round it. There, at any rate, is light before sun and moon and stars. Now, to have told all this to a Jew all those centuries ago would have been unintelligible to him. But to tell him of light, and then to tell him of the sources of light for himself and for his world, would be but natural in any description of creation. There is no reason for, or need of, reading into the narrative anything that it does not state; all that is claimed for it is that there is nothing in it opposed to the discoveries of modern times. The mention of the appearance of light as anterior to the creation of the sun and moon is a very different thing from the use of ordinary language about the firmament, where all that is implied is the existence of waters held up, as it were, above the earth and separated from them, whilst above these upper waters, if we compare other passages in the Scriptures, were the throne and dwelling-place of God. It is obvious that the word is used figuratively of the dome of heaven, just as much as it is used figuratively of the earth (Isa. xlii. 5, xliv. 24). To come to another point: It is absurd to say that the words "God set" the sun and moon and stars in the firmament mean that He fastened them to it (like, I suppose, bosses in a shield). The word used in the Hebrew is endowed with very varied meanings, and one has only to refer to one passage (from the same document P, according to the critics) to see this. When in Gen. ix. 13 we meet with the words "I do set My bow in the cloud," are we to take them to mean, "I do fasten My rainbow to the cloud"? And yet both passages come from the same author, and we must give him the credit, with reference to the earlier one,

of being able to use his eyes and to observe that the moon, at any rate, was *not* fastened to the firmament, for if it had been it would have always occupied the same relative position to the sun and the stars if they also were fastened to it.

These are but details. We come now to the cosmogony of Genesis as a whole. Now, the present writer cannot claim to any great knowledge of natural science; he can only profess to approach the subject from what he ventures to call the common-sense view of it. In the first place, then, he finds that not merely theologians, but distinguished men of science, during the last century have tried one after another[1] to establish harmony between the ascertainable facts of science and the statements of the Bible, and, though difficulties have presented themselves with regard to their different theories, and some wild assertions have been made, it does not follow that the door is closed against all attempts at reconciliation, and that the scientist is to shut himself within his own barriers, and say, "No, you cannot effect anything of the kind!" For, after all, some of the statements made on behalf of science are but tentative. It must be remembered that science did not arrive at its present dogmatic assertions of scientific truth *per saltum;* on the contrary, it made many tentative hypotheses first, many of which proved to be mistaken. Just in the same way scientists or theologians may make tentative attempts at harmonizing science and the statements of the Bible; and because their particular attempts turn out to be mistaken ones, it does not follow that no reconciliation is possible. Moreover, those who question the Biblical narrative must be tied down to an exact use of terms. When it suits their purpose, the word "evolution" is made much of; on the other hand, when the theologian uses the word "creation," an attempt is made to pin him down to instantaneous work on the part of the Creator, and not to the inauguration of what is to develop gradually. It is here, I think, that we should look for an explanation of the relative antiquity of vegetable and animal life, and of fishes and birds or land animals, remembering all the time that the records of geology as presented to us now can scarcely be termed exhaustive. It is just as much a reading of ideas into the narrative from outside to say that in Gen. i. 11, 12 "vegetation is complete" as it is to attempt to make of its language a scientific explanation of the origin of things.

I may, perhaps, be allowed to venture upon an illustration of what I mean. If you ask anyone who has lived a great

[1] Dr. Driver mentions four attempts connected with well-known names.

deal in the country how often, in the course of his rambles, he has met with the body of a bird that has died a natural death, he will most probably tell you that he has seldom or never seen such a thing; and even the dead bodies of those that have perished by violent deaths so rapidly disappear that they are seldom seen. Arguing from this, it might be said that the bird population of this country is very small indeed, whereas, as a fact, we know it is not so. Well, then, are we bound to assume that there were necessarily no birds before the first appearance of them in geological strata? Again, do we even now know enough about the condensation of a nebula and the evolution of a stellar system from it to be able to say that the consolidation of its parts can only take place in one order? I venture to think not. And when one comes to the comparatively trivial question of carnivorous animals and their diet, one is tempted to ask learned men: Have they ever seen their domestic cats—carnivorous animals, if ever any are—eating, or, at any rate, chewing, grass? If it were wanted for their purposes they would hail this act as a survival of an old mode of life which had been supplanted by the development of carnivorous habits in some prolonged time of drought and dried up vegetation, and that the present dentition of the feline species is a modification of a previous one brought about by change of environment or other causes. But, further, we would draw attention to the following quotation from a well-known text-book, Nicholson's "Manual of Zoology" (7th edition, p. 813):

"The Carnivora are adapted by their organization for a raptorial life, and for a more or less exclusively carnivorous diet, though in exceptional cases the food is not of an animal nature at all."

We must be careful, then, to see that the generalizations we are asked to accept are not too wide.

We come next to the connection of this narrative of the Creation with the Babylonian cosmogony. It would, of course, be impossible to deny, and we should not wish to do it, that such a connection in some form or other is possible, or even probable, when we consider the history of Abraham and the place from which he came. But this is far from allowing that the account of Creation in Genesis was due to theories of the origin of things invented by the Hebrews themselves, or borrowed from their neighbours, or was "derived ultimately" from the Babylonian narrative as it stands now. Many centuries ago Eusebius and other ecclesiastical writers became acquainted with earlier authors, such as Berossus, and with their account of the Babylonian cosmogony. The similarity between it and the Scriptural account was accepted

by them as a matter of course. They saw no difficulty in it. It remained for the present age to make this a reason for casting doubts upon the Biblical narrative, and to express itself startled that such a correspondence should exist.

To begin with, the whole atmosphere of the two accounts is different. There is nothing to correspond to the "In the beginning God created" of Genesis (i. 1). In the tablets, on the other hand, we have an account of the evolution of the Babylonian gods. It will be remembered that we have already mentioned the two forms that religions seem inevitably to take—an esoteric and an exoteric or popular form. If the Bible is a revelation at all, then the account of the Creation may have come in the first place from Babylon, and from Abraham or his ancestors, but it will stand side by side with and in elevating contrast to the corrupter form of the revelation which prevailed in popular belief in Babylon. If the Bible does not contain a revelation, then the account of Creation is a fiction, and it does not matter the slightest what was its source or whether it was a refinement of the Babylonian narrative by a Hebrew author or not.

But then, if this be so, the "Higher Critics" must not base anything upon it. They have no right to quote it as showing (*i.e.*, I suppose, proving) "that the world was not self-originated" (p. 32), or that "it sets God above the great complex world-process." If the cosmogony is an invention of man, matter may, after all, be eternal as much as God. We must not use it to prove the relation in which matter stands to God, or even that in which the first *anthropos*, or man, stood to God. We come back to the point we asserted before in opposition to that part of the Abbé Loisy's teaching, which is most *dangerous*, that a narrative can be *scientifically* opposed to the truth, *theologically* true.

It is scarcely necessary to spend much time on the question of the institution of

## The Sabbath.

For many simple minds the assertion of Exod. xx. 11 will be sufficient: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it." But we can go a little further than this. In the first place, there seems to have been something like weeks in the Assyrian calendar, though in the one which exists the nineteenth day is mentioned as well as the fourteenth and twenty-first, and the term *shabattum*, so far as we know, was not applied to these days, but only to the fifteenth day of the month (Pinches, 2nd edition, p. 527). This Dr. Driver

mentions; but I cannot find, secondly, that, in this connection, he mentions the occurrences of a period of seven days both in Genesis (vii. 10, viii. 10, 12) and on the Flood Tablets (ll. 130, 146). What he does say is that there is no indication or hint of the Sabbath being observed as a sacred day in pre-Mosaic times (p. 18). Now, the argument from omission is a dangerous one. Institutions of a religious kind are in sacred writings often taken for granted. Take the analogous case of the observance by Christians of the first day of the week which we find mentioned in the Acts. Now St. Paul, who is constantly writing about Christian practice as well as Christian doctrine, never in all his extant epistles writes a word about Sunday or its observance, though we know that he preached on Sunday at a Holy Communion service (Acts xx. 7). If we had had only his epistles, which are most, if not all, of them earlier than the Acts, it might have been argued with just as much validity as there is in the argument about the Sabbath that there is no indication of its being observed in Pauline times; and the same might be said of all the other epistles. Such observances are taken for granted by writers of all times; it is very seldom, for instance, that any particular notice is taken of Sunday or Holy Day in English history unless there be something special connected with it—as, for instance, the Battle of Agincourt being on St. Crispin's day, so markedly recorded by Shakespeare:

> "And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
> From this day to the ending of the world,
> But we in it shall be remembered."
>
> *Henry V.*

(*To be continued.*)

## Art. IV.—BISHOP STUBBS AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.[1]

VISITATION charges, as a rule, perish with the using. The only one that can be said to have become a classic is the primary charge of Bishop Butler to the clergy of Durham. Yet there are not a few which acquired considerable celebrity in their day, and may still be read with profit by those who meet with them. Three very different men in the earlier part

[1] "Visitation Charges delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Dioceses of Chester and Oxford." By William Stubbs, D.D. Edited by E. E. Holmes, Honorary Canon of Christ Church and Vicar of Sonning, formerly Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Pp. vi + 360. Price 7s. 6d.

of the last century excelled in this species of composition: Archbishop Sumner, when Bishop of Chester, Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter, and Bishop Thirlwall. Since their time new questions have come to the front. Developments beyond the expectation of any of the three or their contemporaries have been witnessed, and the Church of England has in several respects practically undergone a revolution. The general position of things at the close of the century is reviewed in the charges of the late Bishop of Oxford, recently edited by Canon Holmes. This volume will prove, it is to be hoped, the means of preserving in a permanent form the "beliefs and impressions" of one who had many claims on the attention of the public. His eminence as a historian, and particularly his intimate knowledge of the constitutional and ecclesiastical history of England, gave importance to his utterances on matters connected with the relations between Church and State. Long experience in the weighing of evidence and in the handling of texts and documents rendered him a capable judge of new methods which have become fashionable in certain departments of modern criticism. Nor was it the least of his qualifications that he spent nearly twenty years of his life as a studious and devout country clergyman, accustomed to look at questions of the day from another standpoint than a purely academic one. A touching passage in his last charge contains some personal reminiscences, in which he acknowledges his debt to both of the great schools of thought in the Church. Like many other High Churchmen of the older type, he owed much to the somewhat different influences of his earlier surroundings: "I began life in a centre of Evangelical energy—a real school of life, narrow, it may be, even slightly Calvinistic in its attitude of dogma, but most devoted, generous, studious; too much self-contained to be uncharitable, and placidly recognising its position as a true and faithful guardian of souls, although not the only one; on the whole, in a minority of influence, but not ambitious, thoroughly pastoral, given to missionary and school work quite in advance of common opinion, and, above all things, devoted to the study of the Bible. I have often thought that, if I had had time to write a history of that time and neighbourhood, I could have drawn a picture that would put more modern pretensions to shame, both as to work and as to spirit."[1]

During his episcopate Bishop Stubbs delivered five charges: one in the diocese of Chester and four in the Oxford diocese. The date of the first is 1886, while the others were delivered in 1890 and at three succeeding triennial visitations. During

[1] "Charges," p. 347.

the winter of 1885, subsequently to the General Election which took place in that year, several schemes of Church reform were mooted, with a view to getting rid of some of the reasons alleged in favour of Disestablishment, and no small portion of the Bishop's first charge was devoted to an examination of these proposals. He returned to the subject on more than one occasion afterwards, his opinions upon it remaining unaltered up to the last. The watchword "Church Defence is Church Reform" he considered to be a formula with a double edge, since it might quite easily be made to mean the pulling to pieces of the whole fabric of the English Church, in order to reconstruct it on altogether new principles. To the introduction of laymen into Convocation he was strongly opposed. That the Church should have a council in which the learned and faithful laity could find a place might well, he thought, be an object of desire; but it must be allowed time for growth, and not be adopted as an experiment, and the definition of laymanship presented difficulties of the most serious nature in the formation of an elective body. He remarks on this point: "I hope that the use of the Holy Communion as a test of any kind will never be restored amongst us. It cannot be restored without a return to, and an aggravation of, the miserable abuses which were the cause and justification of the legislation that abolished it."[1] Many pages of this volume are occupied with detailed statements, deserving careful study, of the views held by the Bishop as to the peculiar advantages of the constitution of the Church of England, by means of which the Church is enabled to bear witness to certain definite principles, as well as to occupy a position of authority. In one place he protests against sneers at Anglicanism and the Establishment, and defends the two words as words of honourable history, of great and comprehensive ideas of blessing, of privilege and duty. Elsewhere he maintains that "there ought to be no hesitation in admitting that the Church of England since the Reformation has a right to call herself, and cannot reasonably object to be called, Protestant."[2] Much as he disliked the policy of a certain section of Protestant Churchmen, he was scarcely less severe upon extremes in an opposite direction, and the introduction of numerous novel practices was confessedly "a matter of great grief" to him.

The object of this paper, however, is to draw attention to some notable pronouncements on what is popularly known as the Higher Criticism in the charges of 1890 and 1893. Their republication at the present time is most opportune, and it is well to recollect that they were occasioned by circumstances

[1] "Charges," p. 52.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 341.

which had given rise to much discussion and not a little distress. A few months before the delivery of the former charge great unsettlement was caused by the appearance of "Lux Mundi," a collection of essays that ran rapidly through several editions. The writers claimed—or the editor claimed for them—that their object was "to succour a distressed faith." One essay in the book monopolized public notice, almost to the exclusion of the rest, so much so as to draw from the editor a complaint that the purpose of the volume had been defeated. It is entitled "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration," and in the opinion of many people was more calculated to upset faith than to succour it, being practically a formal surrender of the Old Testament Scriptures. Its author took up the position of, to use Bolingbroke's words, "a Christian on the footing of the New Testament." At his visitation, in the following June, Bishop Stubbs dwelt at some length on the questions raised. Referring to the process of analytical criticism through which the Old Testament Scriptures were passing, he remarked that the results "interfere seriously with the literary and religious beliefs of two thousand years, modify all definite theories of prophecy and revelation, and demand a readjustment, to say the least, of all existing theories of inspiration."[1] He went on to say that the unsettling of matters which had for all these years been regarded as settled has its further result on the acceptance of the New Testament Scripture, and even on the explanation of our Lord's language recorded there. For if the literary and historical truth of the Old Testament code is irreconcilable with the statements of the New Testament writers, by whom it is cited, it is difficult to acquit them of ignorance, and (where they found arguments on the misunderstood theories of authorship) of an ignorance so dangerous as to bring their general credibility into question. "And further than this: when our Lord quotes a passage from the Old Testament, and argues from it on an acceptance of authorship which is now assumed to be disproved, His own credibility, and with it the Divine and perfect knowledge which in His one personality He must, as we have been taught, have possessed, becomes a matter of doubt, and therewith the doctrine of the Incarnation, the complete union of perfect Godhead and perfect manhood in the one person of the Son. Such a result is a very terrible one—very terrible indeed if we at all realize what it means: not only that Christianity is not proved, or that its doctrine of the Incarnation is false, but that a God who would let mankind be cheated of the truth by their own

[1] "Charges," p.93.

best instincts, and by permission of a falsehood, let them be deluded into a progress of development towards a virtue that has no real sanction as virtue, and a hope of immortality that has no certain warrant, can scarcely be a God of love or truth at all."[1] An attitude of patience and avoidance of rash conclusions was desirable, the Bishop maintained, in view of the ebb and flow in other regions of criticism. There was no reason for attributing to the critic a "super-papal function of appeal," and "they who seek another rock because their hold on the faith which they have received has been faint, loose, slippery—whether that rock be in the hardness of self-conceit or in the self-assumed infallibility of a system that dispenses with the foundation of the Scripture—shall have great trouble."[2]

The publication of the charge was followed by a new edition of "Lux Mundi," containing a lengthy preface, the writer of which endeavoured to parry the force of the Bishop's objections. His main point was that Christianity was not affected. The New Testament might be considered safe, and "we are not liable to be asked" why so much uncertainty is admitted in the Old Testament, but need not be admitted in the case of the New. The canons of criticism were different.[3] Viewed in the light of later events, this answer to Bishop Stubbs was anything but a successful performance. The complacent assurance that the canons of criticism are different has been rudely destroyed, Dr. Hort helping to give the theory its death-blow. We are now told that "the rôle of the theological Canute" must be pronounced not merely indefensible, but injurious to the best interests of faith and truth. At the present moment there is probably not a single person on either side who would try to defend the distinction set up in the preface mentioned. In 1891 its author was Bampton Lecturer. He took for his subject "The Incarnation of the Son of God," and applied himself to the task of elaborating a doctrine of the *kenosis*, claiming to have solved the difficulty of reconciling an acknowledgment of our Lord's Divinity with a denial of His superiority in point of knowledge to a German or English professor. It is not to be wondered at if such an amazing paradox shocked great numbers of devout believers, while it was regarded by unbelievers as another futile compromise which would sooner or later break down.

Bishop Stubbs, when his turn to speak came, spoke out

---

[1] "Charges," pp. 93, 94. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 96.
[3] "Lux Mundi," Preface to Tenth Edition (1890), pp. xix, xxii, xxxix.

faithfully and manfully. At his visitation in 1893 he said that he felt this to be the most important of important questions. Three years previously he had been inclined to hope that the increase of doubt and negation might be stayed. But, as it so happened, "time has been given for the explanation of difficulties, and they have not been explained; opportunity for the reconciliation of inconsistencies, and they have not been reconciled; occasion—ample occasion—for the reconstruction of affirmative arguments which seemed to have been impaired by the negative character of the criticism, and they are (to say the least) very slow indeed in the process of reconstruction. Meanwhile, the leaven of misgiving has spread; the sermons preached in churches, where better things might have been expected, have in the mouths of some of the younger clergy, I fear, taken an apologetic and attenuating tone with regard to the great features of the faith; and the popular foible that nothing should be believed against which any objection could or can be raised—a weakness of public sense, which gives to the argument of negation a preponderant importance before discussion is fairly begun—has spread accordingly. Manuals of theology are drawn up and circulated, in which these difficulties have a place, and find far too irresolute and indeterminate handling; matters are treated as conclusively proved that are only negatively mooted, and the true suspensive attitude of real criticism is superseded by the assumption that everything required to be re-stated and re-proved."[1]

In the case of men with whom he was personally acquainted, and whose work had conduced to "these painful stages of theological thought," the Bishop was ready to admit their conviction that the verities of the faith would come out from the ordeal unimpaired. "I admire," he observed, "the strength of their convictions, but I grieve over the short-sightedness and I had almost said the self-will, or absolute selfishness, of their procedure."[2] He thought they understated the merits of the cause which it was their duty to defend, and contented themselves with incompletely realizing the issues of their methods of controversy. Neither did he believe that it was possible to treat the Bible like any other book, since "no other book comes to us with a claim authorized by the Church of our baptism as containing the Word of God, or containing so constant assertion of its claim to be heard as the Word of God, or as cited, *one part of it by another part, by a sort of textual testimony*, as of Divine

[1] "Charges," p. 139. [2] *Ibid.*

authority, or as consistently upheld by the long consent of the Christian ages as the law and the testimony."[1] All this meant that to us the Bible is a paramount witness of truth. We have been taught to base upon it all our faith in the unseen world and the way of salvation. The very fact, indeed, that it is like no other book "has led critics to apply to it methods of arbitrary, wanton, and conjectural criticism which, applied to Greek or Roman, or even Anglo-Saxon literature, would be laughed out of court."[2] There was a wanton criticism against which we had to guard, manifesting itself in "irresponsible levity of hypothesis," and so trifling with the Word of God. Also, if the result of the present speculations should be "the displacement or rejection of any considerable part of the Jewish law and record, it would involve the rewriting of the whole of Catholic, of Christian theology; and, what is more critical still, such an explanation of the way in which the Old Testament Scriptures are used in the New as would call in question the knowledge and honesty of the writers whom we believe to be inspired, and in some matters endanger the authority of the words reported to be spoken by our Lord."[3]

After noticing some other phases of the question, Bishop Stubbs passed to the subject of the *kenosis*, and explained his reasons for not accepting the new interpretation of St. Paul's expression in Phil. ii. 7. He pointed out that the limitation of knowledge is a very different thing from the limitation of the exercise of power. Power itself has its essence *in posse*, its manifestation in exercise of will, while knowledge has its essence *in esse*, and our Lord's omniscience was of the essence of the personality in which manhood and Godhead united in Him. "With this belief," the Bishop continued, "I feel that I am bound to accept the language of our Lord in reference to the Old Testament Scriptures as beyond appeal. Where He says that Moses and the prophets wrote or spoke of Him, and the report of His saying this depends on the authority of His Evangelist, I accept His warrant for understanding that Moses and the prophets did write and speak about Him in the sense in which I believe that He means it. Where He speaks of David in spirit calling Him Lord, I believe that David in spirit did call Him Lord, and I am not affected by doubts thrown on the authorship of Psalm cx., except so far as to use His authority to set those doubts aside."[4]

The conclusion of this portion of the charge must be given

---

[1] "Charges," pp. 140, 141. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 142. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 147, 148. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

in full. Its solemnity of tone presents a striking contrast to the flippancy which characterizes so much of the new theology, and its warm language of high indignation has far more reason in it than the lullabies of those who would hush men to sleep while the foundations of Christianity are undermined. Bishop Stubbs ended by saying: "The doctrine, then, of the perfect possession but habitual restraint of His Divine powers by the Son of man during the thirty years of His life on earth does not allow of any imputation of ignorance or incapacity. If such imputation be once admitted, notwithstanding all argumentative safeguards and compensating considerations, the great Gospel of grace and salvation is touched on its keystone, and on whomsoever it falls it shall grind him to powder. Grant it; then, could Jesus of Nazareth forget, could He mistake, could He become confused in argument, could He be inconsistent in His teaching, could He be Himself mistaken? Grant it, and what safeguard have we that He did not forget, was not mistaken or confused, or inconsistent, or Himself deceived? We may ask no end of such questions. If the Saviour were ignorant once, how, when, or where does the limitation of His knowledge cease, and within what terms, beyond that of the self-conditioning of constant self-restraint, does it affect the region of His mediatorial work? Could our loving God—for if all else is a mistake, there must be a true and a living God—could He treat us so? I will make no apology for saying this to you. I cannot rationalize the doctrine of the Atonement, or weigh or analyze the blood of the covenant. I cannot draw the articles of the everlasting covenant of the Incarnation. It is only in a very distant way that I can fashion to myself my idea of what my Lord has done, is doing, and will do, as I trust, for me. I cannot read the doctrine of the Incarnation as I could a book of Euclid, or the Bible as a poem of Ovid or Milton. But I think that I know whom I have believed. I would that all men could think of Him as I do; but I cannot bear to anticipate a day when the Church shall cry out to Jesus of Nazareth, 'Thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived'; or to the Unknown and Unknowable, 'Why didst Thou let Him deceive Himself and us?' Does it strike you that my words are too strong? I have indeed run on a long way from my starting-point, but He who will help our unbelief and increase our faith will surely give us grace also to observe a loving, trustful, courageous patience, until all such things are made plain, and He has guided His own into all truth."[1]

[1] "Charges," pp. 152, 153.

Many people will bless the Bishop's memory for this noble testimony, and will feel that the example he set might well be followed more generally by the rulers of the Church. It was with justice that he described the conclusions of the new criticism as overthrowing our Lord's authority, and involving (if they were admitted) the re-writing of Christian theology. The wish expressed recently by a distinguished representative of the modern school that all argumentative treatises on prophecy, miracles, and inspiration could be thrown into the fire exemplifies the temper of mind engendered by the system Bishop Stubbs opposed—a temper of mind that would consign to the flames as useless lumber the evidential literature of the Christian Church, and break with the past to begin *de novo*. Young students under training for the work of the Christian ministry are taught to disbelieve. They are taught that the Bible has been discredited, that our Lord was ignorant of the truth, and that theology more than twenty-five years old is now out of date. It needs, however, to be remembered that there is one question which modern criticism has not tried to face. Is it true that Christ will come again? The truth of His second coming—an event still in the future and Divinely revealed—rests entirely upon unfulfilled prophecies. If the predictions of His return are to be believed, the whole critical theory relating to predictive prophecy falls to the ground. Are those who deny our Lord's knowledge of the historical fact of the Flood prepared to deny His knowledge that His own reappearing would correspond with the Biblical description of that event in its suddenness, and in (contradiction to the evolutionary philosophy now in fashion) in its interruption of, and unexpected breaking in upon, the course and order of the world? On what ground is our Lord to be believed when He foretold the world's future, but disbelieved when He spoke of its past? The persistency with which the question is ignored by certain Bishops and professors who have written on Old Testament criticism is truly wonderful, yet the whole controversy narrows itself down to this one issue: "As the days of Noe, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

H. W. Reynolds.

## Art. V.—AN AUTUMN TOUR IN WALDENSIA.

IT is sometimes said that there are only two things in these days which it is impossible to vulgarize—death and snow-mountains. But perhaps it may be doubted, when one thinks of the swarms of cheap-trippers that are annually shot down at the foot of the Swiss Alps, whether their snowy summits can quite escape. Surely the calm solemnity of those upper regions must be disturbed by the uproarious hilarities of the crowded hotels which lie around their feet. One would fain induce those who love quietness, and what Arnold calls "the cheerful silence of the fells," to go further afield; nor need they go far to find, not only scenery of Alpine magnificence seldom explored, but connected with it historical and religious associations to which the Swiss Alps can lay little claim.

Among the many thousands of our countrymen and country-women who pass through the Mont Cenis Tunnel every year, few recollect, as they fly through the valley, that close at hand, on the eastern side of the mountains, lie those historic valleys which have sheltered for many centuries the hardy and long-enduring people called the pioneers of the Reformation, who have remained faithful during all the vicissitudes of their long and troubled history, and still remain the standing protest, not only against the accumulating corruptions of the Church of Rome, but for the simple faith and Apostolic forms of the primitive Christian Church. There, still resident on the south-eastern slopes of the Cottian Alps, in valleys of singular beauty, is the ancestral home of this ancient people; and from thence, in obedience to the example of Peter Waldo, their pious organizer, they are now spreading through all the fertile plains and classic cities of Italy those sacred truths which they have received from their forefathers.

The religious impulse which followed the reforming zeal of Hildebrand (A.D. 1075) resulted in a widespread inquiry into the doctrines and institutions of the Christian Church. On the one hand scholasticism, by keen logical argument, strove to strengthen the dogmas of the Church of Rome; but on the other hand increasing secessions testified against her errors, and sought, by a return to Apostolical Christianity, to resist those corruptions which were rapidly destroying her apostolicity. Having repudiated the authority of ecclesiastical tradition, the Waldenses clung to the Scriptures as the only rule of faith. They rejected purgatory, transubstantiation, and the adoration of images, and in obedience to Waldo, who had had the Gospels translated into the Romance, they went forth from Lyons into the surrounding country to proclaim the old truths

they had learnt from their Bibles. The Archbishop of Lyons forbade such unlicensed exhortations; and when they determined to persevere in spite of him, he excommunicated them. As one of his Archdeacons assured him, "If you admit these men, you yourself will soon be driven out." As has so frequently happened in the history of the Church, short-sighted ecclesiastics have cut off the bough on which they rested, and though a few years later Pope Innocent III. made overtures to win back these zealous evangelicals, the thing had gone too far, and his concessions came too late. Widely over all the North of Italy, Spain, South Germany, and France, their doctrines had spread, in the teeth of episcopal opposition. The pure morals and eager zeal of the evangelists was contrasted with the ignorance and laxity of the priests, and the "poor preachers of Lyons," spite of accusations of blasphemy, had spread through the greater part of Europe a creed which largely anticipated the reformed faith of the next century.

While rejecting transubstantiation, they believed in a mystical presence of Christ in the bread at the Holy Communion as received by the faithful, not in the hand of the priest. They abjured indulgences, but retained confession and absolution as valid even when administered by pious laymen. But from 1233 until the Reformation, the Inquisition, with its tortures to mind and body, was unmercifully inflicted upon the Waldenses, and what were called "Crusades" were organized to attempt their extermination. Under Innocent VIII., in 1488, a great number of fugitives, men, women, and children, were smoked to death in an Alpine cave. Great bundles of hay were lowered to the mouth of the cave and being set on fire destroyed all who had there taken refuge. By these and other means the Waldensian Church was nearly destroyed. Even after the Reformation persecution continued, and in 1655, that terrible massacre took place of some 6,000 inhabitants of the valleys, which roused the indignant interference of Cromwell and inspired the poetical imagination of Milton.

These obscure and inconsiderable ravines among the spurs of the high Alps, though affording but a few square miles of habitable earth, have nourished a hardy handful of men who have made deeper marks on the history of Europe than countries many times their size and natural importance. They have drawn out the sympathies of all who value lofty heroism or can admire the indomitable courage which comes from deep conviction of the truth. They have attracted the respectful notice of historians and theologians, and afforded to the student of ecclesiastical history the most primitive models of Church institutions which survive to us. Every rock in

those valleys has its legend, every precipice its tragedy, and every pass amongst the mountains which hem them in gives its witness to the long and weary struggle of truth against falsehood, in which truth has been victorious at last. The natural charms of their country are a fitting theatre for their stories of love, war, and self-sacrifice. There are few scenes in the world more lovely than are to be found in the Val Angrogna or the Val Pelice, few more stern and terrible than the upper portion of the Val Lucerna or Germanasca; and for wild and untrodden passes amongst Alpine snows and icy glaciers the Col St. Julien and the Col de Pis, or the steeps of Monte Viso or Monte Genèvre, may take rank with those of the Oberland itself.

Full of romantic anticipations and primed with the history of this interesting people, I found myself one autumn at the little Bear Inn in Latour Pelice.

For a fortnight I gave myself up to the happiness of intercourse with the natives, making pilgrimages to every spot sacred to the memory of heroic actions in the four valleys which may still be considered the patrimony of the Israel of the Alps. During that time I visited every principal village to which their historians had directed attention. An interesting account of them may be found in the admirable little book[1] by Dr. Gibson of Edinburgh. But there was one point of high interest which all the writers about the Waldenses mentioned, but of which no one in the valley could give me any definite information. It was the great cavern of Casteluzzo. Leger, Muston, Gilley, Beattie, Bramley Moore, Worsefold, all speak of this celebrated cavern. For centuries, during several successive persecutions, it seems to have formed the chief hiding-place of the persecuted peoples of the towns and villages of the Val Pelice. Whenever the inhabitants of Latour Villaro or Bobbio were threatened with massacre—and they were frequently threatened—the women and children were conveyed to this cave. Leger tells us that as many as 400 persons, young and old, lay at one time, and that for a considerable period, concealed in its recesses. He describes it with some particularity, and a more marvellous retreat could hardly be conceived than that which God provided for these tried and persecuted people in close proximity to their principal centres of population. Dr. Gilley felt its importance in the history of their persecutions to be so great that he made repeated efforts to reach it. His account of the manner in which he ultimately succeeded is to be found on

[1] "The Waldenses: their Home and History," by Dr. Gibson, Edinburgh.

p. 509 of his later Waldensian researches. He ascended to the top of Casteluzzo, and with a number of guides approached the edge of the precipice, which, he says, was as perpendicular as a wall. He was utterly incredulous of any cave there, or, if there were a cave, of any human creature being able to reach it. "He stretched his body and neck over the precipice in vain: not the slightest hold for a man's hand or foot was to be seen." His guide explained that "the descent was to be achieved by stooping over the projecting crag on the edge of which he stood, and catching hold of the rough points of the cliff, and so letting yourself down till you come to a sort of chimney, by which, one at a time, it was easy to descend into the cavern; but," he adds, "how men, women, and children, and aged fugitives, were to perform this exploit, which we confessed ourselves utterly afraid to attempt, did not appear." His guide "supposed there had been a second entrance which was now lost," and most pertinaciously insisted that by that very means he had described men he knew had actually got into the cavern. He directed their attention to immense blocks of stone at the base of the cliff, which appeared as if they had recently fallen from the rocks above, and which had rendered the descent more difficult than formerly. Dr. Gilley and his party then gave it up in despair, but some time afterwards he made a fresh attempt, provided with a rope ladder, spade, pickaxe, lantern, and cords, and this time he was more successful. Making a détour by Borel, he once more reached the point where his guide had conducted him on July 6. "Nothing," says he, "presented itself to the eye which gave the slightest idea that the wall of rock down which we looked with shuddering gaze contained an accessible hiding-place large enough to admit 400 people. The two notable climbers Camforan and Ricca, whose services he had secured, pulled off their shoes and stockings, and looked as if they were rallying their courage for an exploit. Two young mountaineers besides, one twenty, the other sixteen, signified their intention to follow the others at all risks, and the coolness with which they stood over the precipice and moved along its dizzy edge satisfied us that they had nerve enough for anything. When the guides were ready for the descent, they addressed their countrymen, M. Bonjour and M. Revel, and told them that they would not dare to go down. "Then, what will our friends do?" said they. "They are English," replied Camforan, "and will break their necks rather than turn back." Presently they disappeared. How they sustained their footing and to what projecting point they clung I could not imagine. I looked down, but the cliff projected so much that I could not distinguish the means by

which they descended. Presently a shout from below directed us to lower the rope ladder." And then with infinite precautions and infinite congratulations the worthy doctor stepped down the hempen staircase. He estimated the distance from the top of the cliff to the top of the chimney at 20 feet, and the further distance 50 feet, and then a few feet more landed him on the floor of the cavern. His agile companion took care he should come to no harm, and he adds: "The risk which the men encountered who descended without the rope ladder consisted in passing from ledge to ledge where the hold was very slight and insecure. What, then, must have been the horrible nature of the persecutions which compelled women and children to trust themselves to the peril of such an enterprise. It is probable that ropes had been before used to facilitate the descent, for I observed several places which looked as if they had been indented by the friction of cordage."

This, then, was the place to which my inquiries had been directed. The great crag in which the cavern lay is seen from all parts of the valley of the Pelice. On going out on to the balcony of the Bear Inn early on the morning after our arrival, it was the first object which struck the eye. Mont Vandolin lies on the north side of the valley, the first of a vista of eminences which bound the view to the right. On the side of Mont Vandolin, towering above the villages and vineyards of the valley, a castellated spur juts out and rises in a bold bluff against the sky. This is called, from its tower-like appearance, "le bric castelluzzo," and is connected with the masses of the Vandolin by a neck of narrow upland. In the steep face of this cliff a ledge may be discerned from La Torre with a glass. This is all that can now be seen from below of the once-famous cavern; nor is it easy to see that, for amid the seams and ledges which score the face of the precipice it is difficult to say with certainty which of them it is. This accounts for the vagueness with which old residents in La Torre, whose whole lives had been passed in sight of it, answered my inquiries as to its exact locality. Their replies were conflicting and perplexing. The existence of a secret rock refuge somewhere among the unscalable precipices of "le bric castelluzzo" was known to everybody; the way into it was known by none, and even the possibility of finding access to it was stoutly denied. A dismal story was carefully repeated to me, of two young Waldensian students of the college who had some years before made the attempt, and one of them, having slipped, was dashed to pieces on the rocks at the base of the precipice, and his companion returned without having accomplished his purpose.

But I heard of an English clergyman who had succeeded in finding his way into the cave, though without the assistance of rope or rope ladders. He describes his difficulty in finding at last a lad of thirteen as a guide, as for more than fifty years no one, as far as is known, had entered the cave. "He led me up," says he, in his account of his adventure, "round the steep sides of Castelluzzo to the narrow 'col' between it and Vandolin, and thence to the summit of Castelluzzo itself. There we were well repaid by a view of peerless magnificence. Turin, the Superga, the winding Po, most of the marquisate of Saluzzo, Cavour, Paesana, Campiglione, Fenile, were all in sight beyond the Vaudois territory; San Giovanni and Latour lay at our feet; Villaro and Bobbio to the west, and the torrents of Pelice, winding like threads of silver seen at intervals through the valleys; while peering over the ridges of l'Envers, above Roccabetta, and apparently close to us, the snowy peak of Monte Viso shone like a gigantic pharos of frosted silver. The tableland of the summit where we stood was dotted by patches of rhododendron and heather, a seamed and wind-swept rock sloping down on three sides towards a precipice of vast depth and dizzy steepness. We proceeded to the edge of the precipice, and reached the spot, which it would have been impossible to discover without a guide, where the lad said we should have to descend. I looked in vain for any sign of a descent or any possible means of getting on to the face of the rock, which sunk down to the base of the cliff with almost absolute perpendicularity. The little lad then sat down on the edge and pulled off his shoes; he threw his feet over the edge, and they rested two or three feet below on a ledge a foot or two wide, from which a plumb-line might have been dropped clear for some hundred feet. Suddenly he began to thrust his feet inwards through an unseen 'tron,' which seemed to pierce the cliff. Gradually his body disappeared, and I soon heard his voice some distance below calling me to follow. I hesitated for a moment, till assured there were no other means of discovering the mysterious cave. There was nothing for it but to follow, so, removing my shoes and stockings, I squeezed feet foremost through the 'tron' with some difficulty, and found myself on the face of the precipice below it, and just able to get on to a sharp and rapidly descending ridge, on to which I clung, and very slowly and carefully hitched down face foremost in the direction in which my agile guide had disappeared. The ridge seemed to get steeper and steeper, and to lead into the air, after the manner of falling dreams. One foot was hanging over the precipice, and beneath it could be seen villages and fields far below. I felt like a fly creeping

on a vast wall, but unprovided with that adhesive secretion which allows the insect to walk, or those filmy integuments by which, when it can no longer walk, it can fly. I may confess," says he, "that at this moment the strangeness of the position and the uncertainty as to what unknown difficulties lay below so impressed my imagination, that, if I could have turned round and got back again, I should have done so and given up the pursuit. But it was impossible ; the utmost care was needed to avoid being overbalanced by projections of the rock which jutted inconveniently outwards, but afforded no holding. I could now and then hear the voice of the lad some distance below, but during all the descent never caught a glimpse of him, or could learn by what peculiar gymnastics he had got down. The thought of however I was to get obtruded itself uncomfortably, for just then a moment's indecision or loss of nerve must have destroyed me. Pulling myself together, I crept down, and rounding a projection which hid the lower part of the descent, I came to the top of all that is now left of what the old Waldenses called the 'chiminee.' It was probably formerly a shaft through the rock; it is now simply an open cranny down which the climber must get, inch by inch, planting his feet firmly against one smooth and sloping side of it, and his back against the other. He must then look sharply for certain thin ledges, 1 or 2 inches in breadth, to prevent a fatal slip, and at this point he will experience the importance of having taken off his socks as well as his shoes; the prehensibility of the naked foot was invaluable to me. By the aid of it I reached the bottom of this open chimney in safety, though every limb trembled with the unaccustomed exertion; and soon after, relaxing not a muscle, but gingerly descending from projection to projection, I found myself at last in what is left of the great cavern of the Waldenses. It is now an open horizontal gallery of rock cleavage, deeply indenting the southern face of the precipice. It was so exposed that at first I felt some doubt whether it could be the veritable cavern; but my doubt was instantly resolved, for there, on the sides of it, carved on the rock, were the names or initials of the very few persons who have ever managed to get into it. There was the large name of Gilly, of A. Vertu, of Caffadon, of Henri, of J. Gott, Meille, Th. Mallan, 'Rl.' for Revel, and a few other initials, to which I added my own with the date of my visit, feeling that I might possibly doubt hereafter whether I had really visited such a place unless the record of my visit could be appealed to on the spot.

"There was a solemn stillness, full of awe and sweetness, about the place which my young companion did not seem

inclined to break, but he showed me the place where he had been told the Waldensian marksmen picked off their Papist foes, resting their nine-foot-long guns on the outer edge of the rocks. Another place was pointed out where buckets or baskets were let down for those provisions which supported the refugees, and in which, he said, children had sometimes been sent swinging down, to run at the risk of their lives with information of the movements of the enemy and to return with news and provisions. From this lofty erie the poor Waldenses could have distinctly seen their houses in flames, or heard, on still days, the shouts of their brutal pursuers." From this scene of strange loveliness persecutors and persecuted have alike long since passed away to judgment, not without leaving behind them indelible footprints upon the sands of history indicating to all after-ages the principles by which they were respectively animated.

It is quite clear that this is the great cavern of Waldensian history. It is equally clear that it is not in the condition in which it afforded shelter to so large a number of persons. It seems that Dr. Gilly's guide explained the matter when he pointed to "the rocks, crags, and mounds confusedly hurled" at the bottom of the cliff. The whole face of the rock has fallen, including one of the three sides of the shaft or chimney and all the outer walling of the cave itself in which formerly the windows, which Leger mentions, were pierced. Only the inmost parts of it are now left, but its shelter is no longer required; a fresh set of perils, more subtle than the open and bloody persecutions of former times, has now set in, and it has been rumoured that the intercourse between Waldenses and Romanists incidental to their missionary operations has resulted in mixed marriages between them and their hereditary foes, but I am glad to say with results not so disastrous as was supposed. In a parish of 2,000 souls only one out of six instances of such marriages, and that a German, has resulted in the children being educated as Romanists. In all the other cases not only are the children brought up as Waldenses, but the wives also have accepted the Protestant faith of their husbands. The Waldenses possess 114 churches and mission stations served by 61 pastors and evangelists in different parts of Italy beside promising colonies of Waldenses in Uruguay and Argentina with 6,000 members. The London headquarters of the Waldensian Church Missions, which are producing a religious revolution in Italy, is at 118, Pall Mall, S.W. Lieutenant-Colonel Frobisher, J.P., is the active and intelligent secretary. They often ask us to come and see the work which is proceeding, and assure us that our visits to them do them

good. "Come and test our reports," say they, "and assure yourselves that they give a true description of what is being done." We feel sure if people knew how accessible they are many of the crowds which now swarm over Switzerland would prefer these delightful mountains. Torre Pelice, the chief town, is only forty miles from Turin. Fast trains from Paris by Mount Cenis bring you to Turin, and a train goes direct from there to Torre Pelice. At that place a most homely hotel at six francs a day, the Hôtel de l'Ours, is kept by M. Michelin and his obliging Swiss wife, who speaks English. The Pension Bel Air, a few minutes' walk from the town, amidst gardens and woods, is highly spoken of, and from there charming drives may be taken to all the chief centres of Waldensian interest.

FRANCIS GELL.

## ART. VI.—STUDIES ON ISAIAH.

### CHAPTERS II. AND III.

WE take the last verse of chap. ii. in connection rather with what follows than what precedes, because it is united with chap. iii., ver. 1 by the word "for." The connection of thought between chap. ii. and chap. iii. would seem to be this: in the former the prophet, in perhaps the finest of all his magnificent word-pictures, has contrasted the Majesty of God with the littleness of man. He has invoked the vengeance of the Divine Being, Whose greatness he has depicted on the puny worm which has dared to lift up itself against its Maker. He recalls the words—modern criticism, be it remembered, attributes these words to an unknown writer, whose work Isaiah may or may not have seen—in which the founder of Judaism tells us who placed in man's nostrils the breath of life (Gen. ii. 7), and he goes on to predict the punishment in store for a rebellion which is irrational as well as ungrateful.

Vers. 1-6.—We have already noted that moral strength can only co-exist with faith in, and obedience to, Him Who is eternal. The intellectual power, the gift of organization, the capacity for rule which God imparts to those whom He has raised up for special tasks, and which is often dependent on national rivalries and personal ambitions, and independent of moral character, *may* and even *will* do a mighty work for a time. But it has no permanence. The great empires of ancient days—Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Greece—passed swiftly away. They depended only on a fortuitous concurrence of

circumstances. Modern conquerors, too—Clovis, Charlemagne, Jenghiz Khan, Tamerlane, Akhbar, Napoleon—"had their day," and their work "ceased to be." Why Rome was an exception to this otherwise universal rule it is difficult to say. Perhaps it was the Roman respect for law and the Roman institutions generally which has given those institutions such permanence that we may trace their influence even now on the course of modern civilization. But certain it is that no empire can be lasting which does not rest on something deeper than mere personal ability and lust of power. The seeds of dissolution are, from the very beginning, actively at work in a community which forgets God. We have a striking picture in the verses we are now considering of the way in which such seeds are apt to germinate. Temporal prosperity can only be established on principles of justice and truth. "The whole stay of bread and the whole stay of water" is taken away from a society in which self reigns supreme. Where education in uprightness and self-sacrifice is wanting, the nation produces neither the just judge nor the successful warrior. Its statesmen are without foresight; its artificers without skill or industry. Its ruler, absolute in power, is perverted from his childhood by flattery and wanton indulgence, and afterwards is led away by his own passions, and by the misrepresentations of those on whom he is compelled to depend. It would seem that this passage was written in the days of King Ahaz. From what we learn of him in chap. vii. 11, 12, he seems not to have been entirely devoid of force of character. At least, he could cover his conduct with some semblance of rationality. His weakness seems rather that of Richard II. than of Henry III., or Edward II., or Henry VI. That is to say, he was a bad and foolish king, not because he had no power to be better, nor because he was incapable of steady adherence to a purpose, but because he deliberately set himself to neglect his duties. Shakespeare has given us a picture of Richard which, though it does not necessarily represent him accurately, may very possibly fit King Ahaz. He represents the king as encouraging too much familiarity on the part of his inferiors.

> "The skipping king, he ambled up and down
> With shallow jesters and rash bavin wits,
> Soon kindled and soon burned; carded his state,
> Mingled his royalty with capering fools,
> Had his great name profaned with their scorns
> And gave his countenance, against his name,
> To laugh at gibing boys and stand the push
> Of every beardless vain comparative."[1]

[1] "The First Part of Henry IV.," Act III., Scene 2.

And so "familiarity bred contempt." Thus, apparently, it was with Ahaz. He became the tool of his own family. "Children (*cf.* ver. 12) oppressed" his people, and "women ruled over them." How many an Oriental empire has crumbled away in a few years through harem intrigues such as are here hinted at! The word here translated "babes" only occurs here and in chap. lxvi. 4 (a sign of unity of authorship). It probably in the first place meant children, and thence came to mean the *disposition* of children, the unstable, changeable spirit, the want of purpose and seriousness which so many children display. "And I will give lads to be their princes, and children's whims shall be supreme among them." And as a natural result of want of stability at the head, anarchy would become prevalent among the people. There would be no mutual respect, but each man would endeavour to oppress his neighbour—just such a state of things as makes the Turkish Empire a by-word in Europe now. Another object-lesson is at present before us of the tendency of absolute power to weaken an empire by the necessary dependence of the autocrat on those who are at once his vassals and his masters. The Russo-Japanese war began by Russia's neglect of solemn engagements with the world at large. The deception practised by the Government on neighbours and only too obviously upon its head was soon followed by deception practised on its own people. Administrative collapse has followed, and the social and political unrest thus engendered bids fair to produce the state of things described in ver. 5—the dissolution of the social order, and the enthronement of arrogance and violence in its stead. Only "pure religion and undefiled"—only obedience to Christ and His law of love, mercy, and truth, can save a nation from such a fate.

Vers. 6-9 paints in still stronger colours the social disorganization which existed in Judæa, as well as (ver. 8) its cause. Authority had abnegated its powers; society was resolved into its constituent elements; each town and village became an independent unit; anyone who seemed better off than his neighbours was asked to undertake the office of government. But the request was far too dangerous to be granted. The King of one hour was only too likely to be the condemned criminal of the next. We are reminded of the later days of the Roman Empire, when a sudden tumult among the soldiery raised a man to the position of Emperor or commander who never expected or desired such an elevation—an elevation dangerous to decline, and still more dangerous to accept. For the "greatness" thus "thrust on" a man could only be maintained at the sword's point, and the very persons

who had forced the dangerous dignity upon the favourite of the moment would almost certainly forsake him when the hour of peril drew near. The passage has also another meaning for us. It illustrates the tendency of men, when danger besets them, to seek a leader near at hand. It is productive of good as well as evil. In fact it was the foundation of modern society. Our own ancestors, when the Northmen came down and harried their shores, sought their ablest or most powerful neighbour "to master and to lord," for only under powerful leadership could they resist the fierce and ubiquitous invaders. On some such principle as this it was that the King of the West Saxons, whose blood still runs in the veins of our present King, became "master and lord" of the whole island, and by this natural principle of resort to the most influential and, as was not unfrequently the case, the worthiest, these kingdoms were ultimately under one sceptre. The principle, then, is itself a good one. But it failed in Judæa, because the social and moral conditions were retrograding, not advancing, and none under such circumstances would undertake so difficult a task. That great, but unfortunately too little appreciated, poet, Sir Henry Taylor, has well depicted a similar state of things.

> "When they were brought together in the Square
> I spake. I told them that they lacked a chief;
> For though they saw that dangers compassed them,
> Amongst their captains there was none could win
> The love of all, but still some guild or craft
> Would stone him if they might."[1]

The whole play turns on the danger of such a situation. It represents the leadership of a turbulent democracy as accepted with reluctance, persevered in with difficulty, and terminated on the bloody field of Rosebecque. It would have been well for himself had Van Artevelde declined to be a "binder up" (see ver. 7, margin of R.V.) of the wound of his people. Only where patriotism and public faith exist in a high degree can such a position be a safe one. When English politicians prefer party to the public safety, the fate of the British Empire trembles in the balance. It should be ours to demand a high standard in our public men.

Vers. 9-12 contain an accusation, a warning, and a lament. The accusation is (we may observe that the prophet evidently believes the people to be well acquainted with the account of the state of Sodom in Genesis, though the critics suppose it to be the work of an unknown writer with no special claim to authority, and possibly of a date not much anterior to that

[1] "Philip Van Artevelde," Part I., Act II., Scene 1.

of the prophet himself) that Judah sins boldly and shamelessly, as Sodom had done before. Judah is warned that, however circumstances may at present seem to favour evil-doing, punishment will infallibly follow on sin. As Moses had said to the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh, "Be sure your sin will find you out," if you go back from your plighted word. The doctrine that God would reward the righteous and punish the ungodly had been plainly laid down from the beginning (especially in Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii.), else where had their sin been? This is a question difficult to answer, if we imagine Hebrew history as it stands, before criticism resolved it into its constituent elements, to be untrustworthy. The lament is that the mischief comes down from the head to the members. It is "they that lead thee" who "cause thee to err." Therefore let those who are in high places take heed to their ways, for high position and great responsibility can never be divorced.

Vers. 13-15 contain an indictment of, perhaps, the commonest sin of mankind, the habit of growing rich on the sweat of other men's brows. The national conscience in England has not been very long awakened to the injustice involved in it. Disraeli, in his "Sybil," calls attention to the degradation of the future wives and mothers of England which, in 1845, existed almost without protest in the mining districts. He and others have described the fierce insurrection of 1843 on the part of a people who were beginning to be educated enough to feel their wrongs. The writer of these lines remembers being told by an eye-witness how in those days he had seen a manufacturer start out in the morning to his factory in perfect health, and how in the evening this manufacturer was brought back dead—not so much the victim of his own as of other men's sins. Not at first was the rich man's conscience awakened to the "wrong and robbery" involved in all this. It needed the spread of education; the union of working-men to obtain their rights; the full and long-continued discussion of the social condition of the working classes, and of the comforts and privileges they may fairly claim for themselves and for their families. It may be safely said that the conscience of England is awake now. The Church—too often, it is to be feared, even still, the Church of the well-to-do—was slow to realize the true state of things. But now she has her Christian Social Union and other kindred societies seeking to bind all men together in the Divine brotherhood of Christ's Church. Henceforth what we have to fear is in the opposite direction. Danger lurks in the attempt to accelerate unduly the rate of social progress—a course which must inevitably

tend ultimately to retard it. All men have a right to the *necessaries* of life. That must be conceded. But whether they have a right to an equal share of its luxuries is quite another question. At least, it is not possible to secure such a share at once without a revolution, which, if it do not spill much blood, may at least be the cause of much suffering. And that suffering, be it noted, will be felt most heavily by the very class whose sufferings men desire to relieve. It is only by slow and steady progress that a civilization which was once largely pagan can be made wholly Christian. Whether such a civilization involves absolute social equality may well be doubted. But two things are certain. One is that it *is* and *must be* wrong to "crush God's people" and to "grind the faces of the poor"; and the other is that our possessions were not given to us by God for our own use, but for the glory of God and the welfare of mankind at large. Let those that have money "be as those that have none." Let them not squander what God has given them in luxury and self-indulgence, but let them regard it as a trust they hold for the benefit of all.

Vers. 16-iv. 1 relate to the part woman plays in social disorganization. Christianity has raised woman to a position such as she has never before held in the world's estimation. Yet it would be quite a mistake to imagine that in heathen countries she has invariably been the slave of man. In the early Babylonian days she seems to have held a position of much social importance—one even, it might almost be said, of preponderance. Even in the lowest condition to which she has been reduced she has always been a powerful social factor, if not as man's companion, yet as the educator of his children in their early days, on which, as a rule, their whole future depends. Perhaps, from this point of view, there is more meant than meets the eye in the invariable mention in Jewish history of the King's *mother*, presumably as being the deciding influence over his life. When Isaiah describes the luxury of the daughters of Zion he may have intended to imply that in earlier and simpler times, when no such luxury was possible, the faith and life of Jewish women stood at a higher level than in his day. So Juvenal, in the appalling catalogue of the vices of the Roman women of his time contained in his sixth Satire, begins by contrasting the morals of contemporary society with those of ruder ages long gone by. His is, indeed, a shocking picture. Even if the vices he lashes were the exception rather than the rule, they would have been quite enough to account for the gradual break-up of the Roman Empire. As the women are, such, in the long run, will the men become. There is a closer connection than

most people have imagined between the immorality of the upper classes in the time of Charles II. and the shameless political corruption and unscrupulousness which made this country a by-word till the end of the reign of George II. The failure of Mohammedanism as a governing power may be traced to the low estimation in which women are held in its creed. The mere slave of men's passions, woman is doomed to captivity and ignorance. And she revenges herself on her tyrants by bringing them to ruin. It is to the harem life, its littleness, its jealousies, its intrigues, its immoralities, its utter incapacity to rise to high or noble ideas, that the unfitness of the Mohammedan ruler may for his great task be traced. And even in Christian countries, luxury, and its concomitant vanity, are utterly opposed to the thoughtfulness, the tenderness, the sweet unselfishness, the high devotion to a person or a cause, which characterize the female sex when touched by the influences of true religion. The lesson Isaiah would teach us is needed now. Never was luxury so universal. Never were opportunities for self-indulgence so plentiful. Never, therefore, has it been so necessary that the temptations to frivolity, sloth, and love of ease, should be kept in check by the sovereignty within of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. Now, as ever, the indulgence of feminine vanity and extravagance is a social danger. It often does violence to the plainest laws of health. It is often reckless of the comfort and well-being, the moral and religious condition, of others. The laws of English society, very largely women's creation, often contravene the laws of God. Those who have figured in the Divorce Court, if they only possess beauty, accomplishments, riches, are still fêted and caressed by those who should pass them by. Even the improved education of women may only lower them if it makes them forget the position assigned by God to woman in the social economy. And, worse still, our social laws often entangle and draw away those who would fain rise above them. Then let Isaiah's warning to the women of Judah ring in the ears of the women of England. Let them give the lie to the charge that—

> "The woman's heaven
> Is vanity, and that is over all."

And that—

> "An unreflected light did never yet
> Dazzle the vision feminine."[1]

Let them learn that the woman who abuses the good things

[1] "Philip Van Artevelde," Part I., Act I., Scene 6.

of this life instead of using them, who forgets that, like the Son of man, she was sent into this world "not to be ministered unto, but to minister," shall not only bring on herself the curse of ver. 24, but on those also to whom she should have been an impulse and an inspiration (vers. 25, 26). In some way or other our social life, if not ordered as God would have it, will lower the *status* of woman, if not in the way described in chap. iv. 1. We may thank God that no such terrible degradation as is indicated there threatens the women of Christian England at the present day.

We must pass over the mention of the "Branch" till we reach chap. xi. Suffice it to remark here that, viewed in connection with John xv. 1-8, it reminds us of a fact very insufficiently grasped at the present moment—namely, that all resistance to the empire of sin, all victory over temptation, all progress of the individual and the race, is inseparably connected with the indwelling within us of the Incarnate Lord by His Spirit. Not He alone, but all those who are united to Him by faith, are prophesied of as the "Branch" or "shoot." It is their "fruit," the fruit of good works, worked, not by any righteousness of their own, but by the righteousness of the Lord who dwells within them, which are "excellent and comely" for themselves and those around them.

It is seldom, moreover, that the evangelical prophet allows himself to dwell on the mournful side of his picture. Above and beyond the miserable present, which afflicts his soul, does he lift his gaze. He beholds afar off the vision of Divine glory abiding in a redeemed and regenerated congregation of God's people. It is far off still. Yet how much nearer than it was, through Jesus Christ our Lord! In Him we live in a dispensation of forgiveness and acceptance, typified and accomplished by His Cross—a time when the "filth" of His sons and "daughters" is "washed away," purged by the spirit (why the revisers suggest "blast" in their margin it is impossible to understand) of Divine justice, and of that consuming love which purifies and refines by taking away all that is worthless. The type of the law here alluded to by the prophet —that of the pillar of the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night—is fulfilled. There is guidance for God's people in the "day" of prosperity, and in the "night" of perplexity and affliction. Amid the burning "heat" of luxury and ease we shall find a cool retreat in the tabernacle of the living God. And in times of depression, persecution, unmerited neglect, bereavement, loneliness, weakness, sickness—yea, even unto death—there shall be a "covert from storm and from rain."

To quote Sir Henry Baker's exquisite adaptation of Ps. xxiii.:

"In death's dark vale I fear no ill
With Thee, O Lord, beside me;
Thy rod and staff my comfort still,
Thy Cross before to guide me."

NOTE.—It may be useful in these days, when the criticisms of a particular school are represented to us as the established conclusions of modern research, to note certain critical points in the present chapters. The reader is requested to bear in mind the fact that, according to the critics of this school, chap. xi. 10-16, chap. xii., chaps. xiii.-xiv. 23, chap. xv., chap. xvi., chap. xxi., chap. xxiv.-xxvii., and chaps. xxxiii.-xxxix., are *not* Isaiah's any more than the chapters from chap. xl. to the end. Be it therefore observed that the peculiar word "swallow" or "swallow up," as equivalent to *destruction*, used in chap. iii. 12 (Authorized Version, *destroy*) is found in chaps. xxv. 7, 8, xxviii. 4, xlix. 19, which are asserted not to be by Isaiah. Chap. xxxii., in which is a similar train of thought to the indictment of women contained in this chapter, is admitted to be Isaiah's. But no reason is given why chap. xxxii. should be, and the following chapters should not be, by Isaiah. The word translated "beautiful" in chap. iv. 2 is also very characteristic of this book, both in parts attributed to Isaiah and those attributed to other writers. Still, its use, it must be admitted, is not *confined* to this book. The Hebrew word translated "the escaped of (Israel)" is not only found in chap. x. 20, but in xv. 9 and xxxvii. 31, passages which the critics do not ascribe to Isaiah. They rarely occur anywhere else in this sense. Moreover, there is a distinct allusion to the "pillar of the cloud" and of fire mentioned in the Pentateuch. It is true that some of the passages in the Pentateuch, in which reference is made to this miraculous incident, have been ascribed to the supposed author whose writings Isaiah may have seen. But the references in this imagined author to the pillar of fire by night as well as the pillar of cloud by day only occur in two places. The allusion here by Isaiah postulates the frequent and emphatic reference to the fact found in the Pentateuch as we now have it—*i.e.*, in Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, much of which, it is now pretended, was written after his death. Otherwise the allusion would have required some explanation, since but little stress is laid upon the circumstance in the passages in "JE," to whom the sections in question are assigned.

J. J. LIAS.

## ART. VII.—A FEW WORDS ON HEBREW TENSES.

AS there are still, it is to be hoped, some of us who feel that it will take a great deal of argument to convince us that all the old grammarians were in error about the Hebrew tenses, it may be allowable to devote a short space in the CHURCHMAN to the consideration of some questions connected with this subject, in the hope that some help may be rendered to students.

The doctrine that "the ancient Hebrews never thought of an action as past, present, or future, but simply as *perfect*, *i.e.*, complete, or *imperfect*, *i.e.*, as in course of development," is so startling that its advocates themselves can hardly expect it to be admitted as soon as stated. And, in point of fact, they have no such expectation. They write elaborately to prove it. And what they write has an interest, and, in its way, a value. There is, moreover, an element of truth in their view. Naturally, that which is *past* wears a character of "completeness" to the human mind, which that which is *future* lacks. And when we have made that admission, we have probably said the utmost that can be said in support of the current theory. For the statement just quoted challenges examination at once by its strangeness and its comprehensiveness. It seems to argue so extraordinary a difference between the constitution of the Hebrew mind and that of the minds with which we are best acquainted that it *compels* doubt as to its truth—even, it may be added, as to its possibility. Whether it be really possible for the human mind to conceive of a historic past, or of an anticipated future, without specific ideas of time is, to say no more, exceedingly doubtful. This is a difficulty which, on merely ordinary grounds, presents itself at the threshold. But when we come to deal with the Bible we have a further difficulty. We have to ask whether it be likely that He who has given us the Bible, He who "knoweth our frame," our mental no less than our bodily frame (having made both), and who, in the New Testament, uses the Greek tenses with such unfailing precision, should have given us three parts (or more) of His Word in a form in which, to use the familar terms, *order* of time is disregarded, and only *kind* of time is observed? Considerations such as this make the question, serious enough otherwise, more serious still.

Indeed, to come to close quarters, a doubt forces itself upon the mind, Would so desperate an expedient as the new theory ever have been thought of but for one peculiarity of Hebrew which is constantly in evidence, that of the Vau Conversive? For my own part, I very much doubt whether we should ever

have heard of the expedient if it had not been for this striking and confessed difficulty. It is, accordingly, to this difficulty that the following observations will be particularly, though not solely, addressed. They shall be very respectfully offered; yet, as being the result of years of study, and prayerful study too, not without a certain measure of confidence.

Let me begin by owning my indebtedness to one whose name is now not often heard, but who has laid Greek as well as Hebrew students under no small obligations, the late Mr. Granville Sharp. A rule of his (the rule itself being, as he informs us, the carrying further of a rule already laid down by Elias Levita) did much to put me on the track. That rule is, always look for the verb in the *past* tense, on which the subsequent verbs depend, and then remember that *every* future with Vau in the whole succeeding series is "converted." By systematically observing this rule, then, I have been led to the following conclusion—namely, that the relation between the verb with Vau Conversive (whether conversive at past or future) and its antecedent is parallel to that between the construct state in the *noun* and its antecedent. In other words, these converted futures—for it is with converted *futures* that I have mainly dealt in my investigations—regularly refer to actions or conditions which *sprang from*, or, if you like to put it so, were *the children of*, the act, state, or condition expressed by the verb *in the past tense* on which they all, however long the series, depend. It will be seen how well all this agrees with the familiar sayings, "The future is the child of the past," and "The child is the father of the man."[1]

My first lengthy experiment was made upon the history of Joseph. Here, I thought, we have a connected story in which the marks of time are plain. The results were eminently satisfactory and deeply interesting. That experiment was made years ago. Much more recently I have gone through *the whole Book of Genesis* on the same plan. I met with the same results; and so regular is the process that if, in the course of a connected series, something is introduced *independently* (by way, for instance, of *collateral information*), the succession is interrupted, by some specific *change of form*, to be resumed when the interruption is over.

The general issue is that a converted future commonly represents one of two things—a result or a process. And the history of Joseph is specially helpful, as a study, in this

[1] Do we not find something akin to this in the Greek? Not only is the first Aorist, active and middle, intimately related to the first future, but the sound "s" (perhaps the representative of the "substantive verb") is the regular sign of the *genitive* singular of *nouns* and of the *future* of *verbs*.

respect: that as you read you constantly find yourself perceiving, in step after step, "This, then, is exactly the process, or result, which Joseph (or whoever was the chief actor) had contemplated." That this is the case when He is the Doer to whom "all His works are known from the beginning of the world" is only what one would expect. And Scripture, always correct, begins with past tenses, and gives us its first converted future in connection with a Divine utterance.[1]

Now, no proof is needed to show that, to our finite capacities, a process, or result, springing from, or born of, a certain act or state *must*, in relation to that act or state, be *future*.

It may be noted, too, that the actual *forms* of the two Hebrew tenses point to their characters. So also does their *formation*. For what we call the imperative mood is formed from the construct (not from the absolute) form of the infinitive mood; and from this imperative is formed the future tense. While, as to personal aspects, the past tense has the affixes *at the end*, intimating that the action is *behind* you, so to speak; whereas the future has them *at the beginning*, intimating that the action is *before* you. (Hyman Hurwitz, at all events, has drawn attention to the position of these affixes, if he has not made all he might of it. See his Grammar, a very simple and useful one: "Etymology and Syntax," § 246, p. 216; ed. London, 1841.)

Unless I mistake, we have in Genesis alone more than 2,000 instances of the converted future, all which I have examined and registered. I hope, accordingly, that I have shown no undue haste, even had I confined myself to this book, in submitting my conclusions to such as they may concern. And they ought to concern people. The consequences of adopting the proposed modern view are no trifles. That view vitally modifies the whole case. It tends to throw all the Scripture history into confusion. I have, however, carefully noted the tenses in other books, too. And, whether in Genesis or elsewhere, I find myself guided, not only to the conclusions above stated, but to certain others. One of these is that the *position of words* is a most important factor in determining the sense. The value of this rule will be very specially manifest in the Psalms. Take one instructive case: The position of the nominative, before or after the verb, will guide us to judge whether an expression be a command, a prayer, a wish, or simply a prediction. If the nominative

[1] And here the remark may be permitted that, for light upon the meaning of אוֹת, first found in Gen. i. 1, we should look to Gen. v. There we find it again and again; meaning, it seems, "[So-and-so begat] *what developed into* [So-and-so]."

precede, we expect prediction; if it follow, command, prayer, or wish. I do not, as yet, venture to say this rule is quite universal. There may occasionally be circumstances to modify it. That most important principle, correspondence, may be one such. But generally I find the rule holds, and the consequences are highly valuable. Another is that ellipses, in which Hebrew abounds, are not to be filled up at random. The context will commonly teach, or suggest, the right complement. As to this matter of ellipses, Bernard's edition of Job (with that keen scholar Chance's notes, so far as they are available) is very useful. Bernard's tendency, indeed, is to carry the doctrine of ellipsis to excess; but, for all that, he is of great service.

Here I pause. Some of the points to which I have alluded well deserve ample treatment. Notably, the whole subject of correspondence is itself of an importance which it is difficult to overestimate. Its witness to inspiration is such that the neglect of it deprives such as do neglect it of a most powerful weapon. But this at present I only hint at. Enough, however, I hope, has been said to stimulate study, and *prayful* study; for, let us never forget, "the secret of the Lord *is with them that fear Him.*"

## Art. VIII.—THE MONTH.

THE past month has brought into singular prominence and juxtaposition the varied problems with which the Church is at present confronted. They are illustrated by some striking observations made the other day in the *Guardian* (June 22): "It is difficult to define the exact point at which comprehension ends and incoherence begins, but hostile critics of the Church of England have not been slow to take advantage of the strange contrasts presented by the various meetings which were being held simultaneously at the Church House last Thursday afternoon. In a room on the ground-floor there was a sitting of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline; overhead was assembled the annual meeting of the English Church Union, listening to Lord Halifax's strongly-worded criticisms of the genesis of the Commission, and his denunciations of a timid and invertebrate episcopal bench; in another room Dr. Cheyne was exhorting the members of the Churchmen's Union to pin their faith to Jerahmeel and the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and was casting fresh doubt upon doctrines which Christians have always felt to form a vital part of the central truth of the Incarna-

tion. We have to reckon with facts as they are, and, however much we may deplore, we are unable to deny the existence of profound divergences of faith and practice which these gatherings indicate."

In point of fact, the characteristic comprehension of the Church of England is being strained to bursting-point in at least two directions. On the one side, as was painfully illustrated in Lord Halifax's speech, the party led by him are not only repudiating all State control, but all Episcopal control. In a manner which would have shocked the old High Churchmen, they declare, like Lord Halifax, that "it is impossible to look with any confidence to the natural rulers of the Church," and are forcing the services and the teaching of the Church of England into closer and closer unison with those of Rome. The evidence now being received by the Royal Commission will, we apprehend, leave no doubt on this point. On the other hand, the demands of the rationalistic section of the clergy are similarly being strained to bursting-point when we have a Canon of Rochester and a Professor of the Exegesis of Holy Scripture announcing that it is possible that the belief in the Virgin birth may be an echo of Babylonian mythologies, referred to in the Book of the Revelation, and when men like Canon Henson and Dr. Rashdall are claiming the right to repudiate what is, undoubtedly, the settled belief of the ancient Church respecting the Resurrection. At the same moment, honoured Churchmen like Canon Newbolt are combining to resist even such a concession to modern scruples as the disuse of the public recitation of the Athanasian Creed. The danger of a similar strain on the side of the evangelical section is, at present, happily, not serious. The men who would overstrain the Articles and formularies in a Puritan sense are probably few, and are certainly without material influence.

But it must be apparent that such a state of things as is thus exhibited cannot possibly last, and that if the Church is to remain an organized and authoritative institution some limits must be determined beyond which individual or party license will not be tolerated. Can any such limits be suggested? We hope and believe they might be found in a reversion to the characteristic principle of the English Reformation, the appeal to the Primitive Church, and in accepting the liberal acceptation of "Primitive" suggested by Jewel — the Church of the first six centuries. The Church of England was founded at the end of the sixth century, and she might well assert her continuity with the authorized faith and practices of the six hundred years preceding her foundation. The cardinal doctrines of the faith,

a simple but dignified form of worship, and great freedom of private belief on points not authoritatively defined, ought to be sufficient for the legitimate demands of the parties now struggling like centrifugal forces. It would mean, no doubt, some sacrifice of private preferences on all sides; but it would afford a broad and settled basis for definite comprehension, it would involve no party triumph, and, above all, it would be a simple reversion to the position of the Church of England as asserted by all her most authoritative divines. Romanism is impossible; Rationalism is impossible; Puritanism is impossible. But Anglicanism, the historic Anglicanism of the Reformation, is, at least, a possible system for English clergymen and laymen, and it is to be hoped that its reassertion may be the outcome of the present confusion.

## Notices of Books.

*A Protestant Dictionary, containing Articles on the History, Doctrines, and Practices of the Christian Church.* Edited by the Rev. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Donnellan Lecturer (1880-1881) in the University of Dublin, and the Rev. CHARLES NEIL, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Stamford Brook, London. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. xv + 832. 15s.

The publication of this Dictionary is distinctly a step in the right direction, though a very thorough revision is needed to render it complete as a work of reference. It contains a considerable number of valuable articles, together with others which can hardly be called satisfactory, and the omission of various subjects that might naturally be expected to have a place in the contents seems inexplicable. One object of such a work should be to provide writers in the Press with the facts they are most likely to require. At the present moment, for instance, a determined effort is being made to abolish the few remaining disabilities imposed by law upon Roman Catholics. A journalist under the necessity of discussing so important a question ought to be able to find here some information about it, including the history of the Test Acts, the extent of their repeal in 1829, and the legislation affecting the succession to the Crown. With the exception of a brief reference to the Coronation Oath under the heading "Occasional Services," there is nothing upon any one of these matters. Neither is there any account of the circumstances connected with the establishment of the Roman hierarchy in England in 1850. In other cases, where a subject of general interest does receive notice in an article, it occasionally happens that the subject is treated in a rhetorical way, instead of historically, and the facts which an untrained person needs are not given. Even the author of the article on "Reservation" has forgotten to explain why and on what grounds the practice is illegal in the English

Church. An article on "Pentecost" contains statements which we do not profess to understand, especially the passage given as a quotation from Mgr. Duchesne, and the writer ought to have known that our Whitsuntide epistles and gospels are the same as those in the Missal. Sometimes references to authorities are added, while in many instances readers are not told where they can find fuller particulars. The truth is that there are too many contributors—nearly seventy in all—and the volume would have been much more compact and marked by a greater uniformity of style and treatment if it were the work of fewer hands. We have before us the second edition of the late Sir William Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," published in 1865. It is a monument of sound scholarship and patient industry, yet only eighteen people took part in its production.

The chief defects noticed above, however, admit of remedy in a subsequent edition. For we do not doubt that this new Dictionary has come to stay, and in many respects it is very useful as it stands. Some of the doctrinal papers are especially good. Mr. Dimock's exhaustive examination of the history and structure of the Ordinal throws much light upon various vexed questions. There are numerous contributions from the pen of Canon Meyrick, and Mr. Hole writes upon the Decretals and the Prayer-Book. He has also contributed a sketch of the English Church down to the time of the Reformation. A great deal of good work has been put into certain other articles, amongst which we may mention those on the Catacombs and the Huguenots; and Mr. Tomlinson's on "The Lord's Table," with illustrations, is decidedly interesting. But the contents of the book are unequal, taken as a whole, and it is too often forgotten that the style of writing appropriate in a controversial pamphlet may be out of place in the pages of a dictionary. We trust to see a reconstruction of, at all events, parts of the volume when an opportunity occurs.

*The Wonderful Story of Uganda.* By the Rev. J. D. MULLINS, M.A., Secretary of the Colonial and Continental Church Society. London: Church Missionary Society. Pp. xii + 220. 1s. 6d.

The planting of Christianity in Uganda was in one sense the work of the great African explorer whom we have lately lost. Stanley's appeal in 1875 for the opening up of this fresh field led at once to the inauguration of the Mission; and within less than six months from the date of his letter the first volunteers, among whom was Alexander Mackay, had set sail from England. The changes witnessed since are well summed up by Mr. Mullins in a passage that will bear quotation here: "A nation remotely situated in Central Africa, which twenty-five years ago had not received the Gospel, and had not even a written language, is to-day the home of thirty thousand Christians under Christian chiefs; its language has been reduced to writing; the whole Bible, translated into their own tongue, has been for years in the hands of the inhabitants; the people support their own ministry, and even undertake missions to the countries round; and they have enriched the roll of martyrs with many names."

The biographies of Bishop Hannington, Mackay, and G. L. Pilkington have helped to make Uganda a household word with many of us, but they necessarily relate only fragments of the story. Here we have a complete account of the Mission from its beginning to the present time. Mr. Mullins tells the tale in a concise but graphic manner, with all the enthusiasm of one who has long taken a deep interest in the subject. He appends a native convert's narrative of his reminiscences, which is of considerable length, and depicts the state of things in the old heathen days. It is not improbable that the construction of the railway to Uganda, and the influx of large numbers of Europeans, may expose the infant Church to perils wholly different from any which it has hitherto encountered. Its future, fraught with great possibilities, will be watched at home with anxious sympathy. This book, we should add, contains a most useful bibliography on African questions.

*The Clergy List*, 1904. London: Kelly's Directories, Ltd. Pp. 1,806. 10s. 6d.

Great improvements have been made of late years in this well-known publication, with which "The Clerical Guide and Ecclesiastical Directory" is now incorporated, and the current volume is corrected up to the middle of January last. Although it contains nearly two thousand pages, it is arranged in such a manner as to prevent its size from being distressingly inconvenient. One useful feature is a separate alphabetical list of the clergy in the colonies. In its present form the book has become a most valuable work of reference. We recollect the time when it was a mere skeleton of its later self.

*Reports of the Mosely Educational Commission to the United States of America, October-December*, 1903. London: Published for the Proprietor by the Co-operative Printing Society, Limited, Tudor Street, E.C. Pp. 400.

There are few books which give such a good account of American schools and colleges as will be found here. The Educational Commission sent out to America through the enterprise of Mr. Alfred Mosely was composed of twenty-six members, representing different branches of education. Amongst the names that will be more or less known to our readers we notice those of the Warden of Bradfield, Principal Reichel, Professors Rhys and Finlay, and Mr. T. L. Papillon. The results of the tour of inspection have now been published in a joint report of commendable brevity and a collection of highly interesting papers. Each member of the Commission records his impressions in detail, so that the volume contains the views of a picked body of practical men. Religion was a forbidden subject, and the report merely states that the absence of any religious difficulty "serves most materially to facilitate the work of the schools"; but Professor Finlay rather adroitly contrives to insert in his notes a paragraph on the parochial schools existing alongside of the State system. We gather from this paragraph that these institutions educate in Chicago about 100,000 children, and in New York 75,000, while in Philadelphia and other great cities the numbers are proportionately large,

testifying to the strong feeling against secularism. The Commissioners came to the conclusion that the development of education during the last quarter of a century is an effect rather than the cause (as we are often told) of America's prosperity. They regard it, however, as likely to become more and more a cause of progress, and the liberality of wealthy donors in endowing new foundations with a view to the future is almost unbounded. Opinions were divided upon the co-education of the sexes in primary schools, but there was a nearly unanimous condemnation of the growing preponderance of women teachers, who, in many places, constitute the entire teaching staff. It is not an uncommon spectacle to find a young woman of twenty-four or twenty-five, who has just passed the University requirements, teaching English, or even Latin, to youths of eighteen and over. Very few of the male teachers stay in the "profession" more than five years, and fewer still make it their life's vocation.

American methods will appear to many decidedly materialistic, tending to the production of mere money-making machines. The practical character of the instruction and the prominence given to manual training certainly help to put the future citizen in a position to earn his own living. Both the defects and merits of the system are fully set out in these reports, and there are two points which seem especially deserving of attention. No boy in an American school looks forward to digging or delving for hire as a means of livelihood. The unskilled labourer in the United States is supplied from abroad, from Italy, Hungary, the Slav countries, and Scandinavia. It cannot be to the advantage of a free country that unskilled labour should be considered a degradation, fit only for a race of helots. Turning to the question of higher education, the general neglect of Greek is a striking feature. It seems to be banished, though Professor Rhys entertains a faint hope that it may yet have its day when "the rush to become rich has somewhat abated, and many more fortunes have been made." Though Latin is taught, it is in a perfunctory and slipshod style, after a fashion which sent a shudder through more than one member of the Commission. But if Greek and Roman literature be at a discount, America can, at any rate, claim that all its educational institutions are carefully planned with a keen eye to the main chance. Whether this is the highest ideal is another matter.

*An English Garner. Shorter Elizabethan Poems.* With an Introduction by A. H. BULLEN. Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., Limited. Pp. xxvi+358. 4s.

A few poems ranging from the close of the Elizabethan period to the time of Charles II. are added at the end of this anthology. These include Andrew Marvell's "Dialogue between the Resolved Soul and Created Pleasure," and Cowley's fine ode on the chair made out of the relics of Sir Francis Drake's ship, the *Golden Hind*. "The Chronicle" and "The Wish," both of which are excellent examples of Cowley's lighter vein, the former familiar to many, are also given. The main body of the book consists of reprints from the collections of verse made by Elizabethan composers who set the words to music. To trace the authorship of the

words is, in many cases, impossible, but they are presumed to have been written anonymously by noblemen and gentlemen of the Court. A series of madrigals translated from the Italian was published in 1588 by Nicholas Yonge, one of the singing-men at St. Paul's, whose house in London appears to have been a favourite resort for the votaries of chamber music. One famous amateur, Thomas Campion, wrote the words for his own songs, and was a poet of no mean order, possessing a mastery of a variety of metres. The earlier part of the volume thus conveys an idea of the sort of poetry considered at that date suitable for musical purposes—poetry sometimes embodying quaint conceits, but remarkable as a rule for grace and finish of expression and elevation of thought. It is not only from an antiquarian point of view that these reprints are valuable. All lovers of verse will rejoice in them, and will be grateful for the preservation from oblivion of such gems of art as some of Dowland's or Campion's songs, the latter's hymn in English Sapphics, and the Christmas and Epiphany carols from William Byrd. The feeblest portions of the book are the tributes to Queen Elizabeth in Morley's "Triumphs of Oriana," which we could have well dispensed with, though it is noteworthy that one of the best of them is a stanza by the father of John Milton.

*Our Possessions. A Short and Simple View of some of those Good Things which are the Present Portion of the Believer.* By FRANCIS BOURDILLON, M.A. London: James Nisbet and Co. Pp. vi+166. Price 2s.

Mr. Bourdillon's new book is a very beautiful one, likely to rank among the best of the many volumes that we owe to his pen. It contains over twenty chapters on gifts of God possessed by believers in this life, such as the promises, the high priesthood of Christ, access to the Father, and other similar privileges enumerated in Holy Scripture. The chapter entitled "A Strong Tower" is particularly striking. That writings such as those of Mr. Bourdillon enjoy a wide circulation, notwithstanding the decay of faith in so many quarters, seems to us a cheering sign. Appreciation of simple Christian truths is far from being extinct.

*My Favourite Avenues.* By WILLIAM RIDLEY, D.D., Bishop of Caledonia. London: Seeley and Co. Pp. 128. Price 2s. 6d.

This volume of verse comes to us from a Caledonia even sterner and wilder than Sir Walter Scott's, and not hitherto known as the nurse of poetic children. Bishop Ridley may claim the honour of being its first *vates saur* in more than one sense. His poems are full of allusions to local scenery, and some of them have for their theme the holy days and festivals of the Christian year. The rest, founded on the Psalms in the daily services, are allotted to the morning and evening of each day of the month. It is only natural that the contents should vary in merit; but not a few of the poems are above the average, amongst which we may mention those for Whitsuntide and All Saints' Day, while all display deep religious feeling. The book will be found useful for devotional purposes, besides being an interesting memorial of a missionary Bishop eminent for his apostolic zeal.